SENATE

THURSDAY, MAY 19, 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 God, very great yet very near, in whom we live and move and have our being, let not our callousness make Thy presence unreal to us. Wherever goodness is, or truth, or beauty, there Thou art. Make sensitive our spirits that, knowing Thy grace and power, we may be cleansed and strengthened.

We thank Thee for human love which at its best bears witness to Thee and evermore keeps faith and hope alive in the world. With all our imperfections and fallible judgments, grant unto us a compassion for others which understands and pities and forgives. Strengthen and steady us by the memory of men who have gone on to certain defeat, and even to certain destruction, with causes which deserved and were destined to triumph. Undergird us, we pray, with that glorious vision of eternal values which have supported men who were seeking ends too great to be reached in their own lifetime.

We ask it, O Father of our spirits, who hath been our dwelling place in all generations, in the name of Jesus Christ our Lord, in whom Thou hast freely given us all things. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday, May 17, 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 PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF BILL

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, and he announced that on May 13, 1955, the President had approved and signed the act (S. 1094) to amend section 402 of the Federal Employees Uniform Allowance Act, approved September 1, 1954.

REPORTS OF PANAMA CANAL COMPANY AND CANAL ZONE GOVERNMENT — MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which, with the accompanying reports, was referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce:

To the Congress of the United States:

I transmit herewith, for the information of the Congress, the third annual report of the Panama Canal Company and the Canal Zone Government for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1954.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *May 19, 1955.*

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. 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. 128. An act for the relief of Francis Bertram Brennan;

S. 143. An act for the relief of Kurt Glaser;

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. 163. An act for the relief of Philopimin Michalacopoulos (Mihalakopoulos);

S. 271. An act for the relief of June Rose McHenry;

S. 386. An act for the relief of Sandra Lea MacMullin;

S. 409. An act for the relief of Inge Krarup;

S. 416. An act for the relief of Anastasia Alexiadou;

S. 653. An act to provide for the conveyance of Jackson Barracks, La., to the State of Louisiana, and for other purposes;

S. 734. An act to amend title 18, United States Code, section 871, to provide penalties for threats against the President-elect and the Vice President;

S. 891. An act for the relief of Chokichi Iraha;

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

S. 1133. An act to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to pay idemnity for losses and expenses incurred during July 1954 in the destruction, treatment, or processing, under authority of law, of swine, swine carcasses, and products derived from swine carcasses, infected with vesicular exanthema;

S. 1413. An act to amend the act establishing a Commission of Fine Arts; and

S. 1705. An act for the relief of George Paul Khouri.

The message also announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 1650) to authorize the Territory of Alaska to obtain advances from the Federal Unemployment Act, and for other purposes, with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 17) favoring the suspension of deportation of certain aliens, with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the amendment of the Senate to each of the following bills of the House:

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

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

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the amendments of the Senate to the following bill and joint resolution of the House:

H. R. 1328. An act for the relief of Nicholas John Manticas, Anne Francis Manticas, Yvonne Manticas, Mary Manticas, and John Manticas; and

H. J. Res. 211. A joint resolution to confer jurisdiction on the Attorney General to determine the eligibility of certain aliens to benefit under section 6 of the Refugee Relief Act of 1953, as amended.

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

H. R. 245. An act to amend section 2 of the act of January 27, 1905 (33 Stat. 616), as amended (48 U. S. C. 1952 edition, sec. 322);

H. R. 603. An act 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;

H. R. 625. An act 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 Saint Francisville, Mo.:

H. R. 899. An act to authorize and direct the sale of certain land in Alaska to Oscar H. Vogel, of Anchorage, Alaska;

H. R. 926. An act for the relief of Bruno Michael Kiuru;

H. R. 928. An act for the relief of Eugenio Maida;

H. R. 988. An act for the relief of Susanne Fellner;

H. R. 990. An act for the relief of Takako Riu Reich;

H. R. 1034. An act for the relief of Erwin S. DeMoskonyi;

H. R. 1060. An act for the relief of Grace Casquite Hwang;

H. R. 1145. An act for the relief of Ora L. Powers;

H. R. 1217. An act for the relief of Evagelos B. Tzarimas;

H. R. 1218. An act for the relief of Mira Domenika Grgurinovich;

H. R. 1405 An act for the relief of Vassiliki D. Papadakou;

H. R. 1406. An act for the relief of Sister Antonina Zattolo and Sister Antonina Cali;

H. R. 1407. An act for the relief of Henry Kraemer;

H. R. 1408. An act for the relief of Caterina Ruello;

H. R. 1415. An act for the relief of the legal guardian of Frederick Redmond;

H. R. 1461. An act for the relief of Helen E. Cox;

H. R. 1495. An act for the relief of Joseph J. Porter;

H. R. 1503. An act for the relief of Helga Kutschka;

H. R. 1504. An act for the relief of Andreas Kafarakis;

H. R. 1508. An act for the relief of Mrs. Mary Perouz Derderian Donaldson;

H. R. 1651. An act for the relief of Lucette Helene Adams;

H. R. 1802. An act to authorize the leasing of certain lands of the Yakima Tribe to the State of Washington for historical and for park purposes;

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

H. R. 1868. An act for the relief of Ernest Tomassich and Yoko Matsuo Tomassich;

H. R. 1869. An act for the relief of Luis Deriberprey;

H. R. 1897. An act for the relief of Giuseppe Tumbarello;

H. R. 1912. An act for the relief of Howard Rieck;

H. R. 1929. An act for the relief of Eufemia Bencich;

H. R. 1935. An act for the relief of Giuseppa Curro Tati;

H. R. 1962. An act for the relief of Miss Athena Kitsopoulou;

H. R. 1964. An act for the relief of Mrs. Hildegard Herrmann Costa;

H. R. 2338. An act for the relief of Charles F. Bullette;

H. R. 2360. An act for the relief of Gloria Fan;

H. R. 2528. An act for the relief of Mrs. Josette L. St. Marie;

H. R. 2682. An act relative to the exploration, location, and entry of mineral lands within the Papago Indian Reservation;

H. R. 2768. An act for the relief of Charles R. Law, Jr.;

H. R. 2769. An act for the relief of Tennessee C. Batts;

H. R. 2984. An act authorizing E. B. Reyna, his heirs, legal representatives, and assigns, to construct, maintain, and operate a toll bridge across the Rio Grande, at or near Los Ebanos, Tex.;

H. R. 3024. An act for the relief of Margaret Mary Hammond;

H. R. 3194. An act for the relief of E. S. Berney;

H. R. 3268. An act for the relief of Comdr. George B. Greer;

H. R. 3354. An act for the relief of Julius G. Watson;

H. R. 3786. An act to authorize the incorporation of Army and Navy Legion of Valor of United States of America;

H. R. 3813. An act to amend the act incorporating the American Legion so as to redefine eligibility for membership therein;

H. R. 3825. An act to make retrocession to the Commonwealth of Massachusetts of jurisdiction over certain land in the vicinity of Fort Devens, Mass.;

H. R. 3867. An act for the relief of Iwan Bonk and Tacianna Bonk;

H. R. 3878. An act to amend section 5 of the Flood Control Act of August 18, 1941, as amended, pertaining to emergency flood-control work;

H. R. 3964. An act for the relief of Kingan, Inc.;

H. R. 3972. An act for the relief of Anthonius Marinus Kronenburg;

H. R. 4198. An act for the relief of Howard L. Gray;

H. R. 4294. An act to amend section 640 of title 14, United States Code, concerning the interchange of supplies between the Armed Forces;

H. R. 4359. An act to amend the act of September 30, 1950 (64 Stat. 1096), to provide for the conveyance of certain real property to the city of Richmond, Calif.;

H. R. 4573. An act authorizing Gus A. Guerra, his heirs, legal representatives, and assigns, to construct, maintain, and operate a toll bridge across the Rio Grande, at or near Rio Grande City, Tex.;

H. R. 4650. An act to amend the Canal Zone Code by the addition of provisions authorizing regulation of the sale and use of fireworks in the Canal Zone;

H. R. 4753. An act 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;

H. R. 4754. An act to redefine eligibility for membership in AMVETS (American Veterans of World War II);

H. R. 4778. An act to provide for the purchase of bonds to cover postmasters, officers, and employees of the Post Office Department and mail clerks of the Armed Forces, and for other purposes;

H. R. 4791. An act to amend section 40 of the Bankruptcy Act, so as to increase salaries for part-time and full-time referees;

H. R. 4853. An act to authorize the sale of certain land in Alaska to the Pacific Northern Timber Co.;

H. R. 4902. An act for the relief of Martin F. Kendrigan;

H. R. 5146. An act to authorize the President to promote Paul A. Smith, a commissioned officer of the Coast and Geodetic Survey on the retired list, to the grade of rear admiral (lower half) in the Coast and Geodetic Survey, with entitlement to all benefits pertaining to any officer retired in such grade;

H. R. 5224. An act to amend title 14, United States Code, entitled "Coast Guard," to authorize certain early discharges of enlisted personnel, and preserve their rights, privileges, and benefits;

H. R. 5300. An act to authorize the establishment of the City of Refuge National Historical Park, in the Territory of Hawaii, and for other purposes;

H. R. 5389. An act for the relief of Alfred J. Stahl;

H. R. 5398. An act to increase the efficiency of the Coast and Geodetic Survey, and for other purposes;

H. R. 5417. An act to amend section 1721, title 18, United States Code, relating to the sale or pledge of postage stamps;

H. R. 5456. An act for the relief of Emil Arens;

H. R. 5494. An act for the relief of Ivan N. Burlingame, and others;

H. R. 5633. An act for the relief of John L. Boyer, Jr.;

H. R. 5634. An act for the relief of Willie C. Pickett, George Williams, and Herman L. Looney;

H. R. 5635. An act for the relief of Dr. Wolodymyr Fedyniak and others;

H. R. 5787. An act to authorize settlement of claims for residential structures heretofore erected at the expense of patients on the grounds of the Public Health Service hospital, Carville, La.;

H. R. 5809. An act for the relief of A. C. Israel Commodity Co., Inc.;

H. R. 5841. An act to repeal the fee stamp requirement in the Foreign Service and amend section 1728 of the Revised Statutes, as amended;

H. R. 5842. An act to repeal a service charge of 10 cents per sheet of 100 words, for making out and authenticating copies of records in the Department of State;

H. R. 5860. An act to authorize certain officers and employees of the Department of State and the Foreign Service to carry firearms;

H. R. 5907. An act for the relief of Albert Woolson; and

H. R. 6043. An act to amend section 216 (b) of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, to provide for the maintenance of the Merchant Marine Academy.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the following concurrent resolutions, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. Con. Res. 98. Concurrent resolution approving the granting of the status of permanent residence to certain aliens;

H. Con. Res. 99. Concurrent resolution favoring the granting of the status of permanent residence to certain aliens; and

H. Con. Res. 110. Concurrent resolution favoring the granting of the status of permanent residence to certain aliens.

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 President pro tempore:

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

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

H. R. 1328. An act for the relief of Nicholas John Manticas, Anne Francis Manticas, Mary Manticas, and John Manticas.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED

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

H. R. 245. An act to amend section 2 of the act of January 27, 1905 (33 Stat. 616), as amended (48 U. S. C. 1952 edition, sec. 322);

H. R. 603. An act 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;

H. R. 899. An act to authorize and direct the sale of certain land in Alaska to Oscar H. Vogel, of Anchorage, Alaska;

H. R. 1802. An act to authorize the leasing of certain lands of the Yakima Tribe to the State of Washington for historical and for park purposes;

H. R. 2682. An act relative to the exploration, location, and entry of mineral lands within the Papago Indian Reservation;

H. R. 4853. An act to authorize the sale of certain land in Alaska to the Pacific Northern Timber Co.; and

H. R. 5300. An act to authorize the establishment of the City of Refuge National Historical Park, in the Territory of Hawaii, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 625. An act 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.; and

H. R. 3878. An act to amend section 5 of the Flood Control Act of August 18, 1941, as amended, pertaining to emergency flood control work; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 926. An act for the relief of Bruno Michael Kiuru;

H. R. 928. An act for the relief of Eugenio Maida;

H. R. 988. An act for the relief of Susanne Fellner;

H. R. 990. An act for the relief of Takako Riu Reich;

H. R. 1034. An act for the relief of Erwin S. DeMoskonyi;

H. R. 1060. An act for the relief of Grace Casquite Hwang;

H. R. 1145. An act for the relief of Ora L. Powers;

H. R. 1217. An act for the relief of Evagelos B. Tzarimas;

H. R. 1218. An act for the relief of Mira Domenika Grgurinovich;

H. R. 1405. An act for the relief of Vassiliki D. Papadakou;

H. R. 1406. An act for the relief of Sister Antonina Zattolo and Sister Antonina Cali;

H. R. 1407. An act for the relief of Henry Kraemer;

H. R. 1408. An act for the relief of Caterina Ruello;

H. R. 1415. An act for the relief of the legal guardian of Frederick Redmond;

H. R. 1461. An act for the relief of Helen E. Cox;

H. R. 1495. An act for the relief of Joseph J. Porter;

H. R. 1503. An act for the relief of Helga Kutschka;

H R. 1504. An act for the relief of Andreas Kafarakis;

H. R. 1508. An act for the relief of Mrs. Mary Perouz Derderian Donaldson;

H. R. 1651. An act for the relief of Lucette Helene Adams;

H. R. 1868. An act for the relief of Ernest Tomassich and Yoko Matsuo Tomassich;

H. R. 1869. An act for the relief of Luis Deriberprey;

H. R. 1897. An act for the relief of Giuseppe Tumbarello;

H. R. 1912. An act for the relief of Howard Rieck;

H. R. 1929. An act for the relief of Eugemia Bencich;

H. R. 1935. An act for the relief of Giuseppa Curro Tati;

H. R. 1962. An act for the relief of Miss Athena Kitsopoulou;

H. R. 1964. An act for the relief of Mrs. Hildegard Herrmann Costa;

H. R. 2338. An act for the relief of Charles F. Bullette;

H. R. 2360. An act for the relief of Gloria Fan;

H. R. 2528. An act for the relief of Mrs. Josette L. St. Marie;

H. R. 2768. An act for the relief of Charles R. Law, Jr.;

H. R. 2769. An act for the relief of Tennessee C. Batts;

H. R. 3194. An act for the relief of E. S. Berney;

H. R. 3268. An act for the relief of Comdr. George B. Greer;

H. R. 3786. An act to authorize the incorporation of Army and Navy Legion of Valor of United States of America;

H. R. 3813. An act to amend the act incorporating the American Legion so as to redefine eligibility for membership therein;

H. R. 3867. An act for the relief of Iwan Bonk and Tacianna Bonk;

H. R. 3964. An act for the relief of Kingan, Inc.;

H. R. 3972. An act for the relief of Anthonius Marinus Kronenburg;

H. R. 4753. An act 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;

H. R. 4754. An act to redefine eligibility for membership in AMVETS (American Veterans of World War II);

H. R. 4791. An act to amend section 40 of the Bankruptcy Act, so as to increase salaries for part-time and full-time referees;

H. R. 4902. An act for the relief of Martin F. Kendrigan;

H. R. 5389. An act for the relief of Alfred J. Stahl;

H. R. 5417. An act to amend section 1721, title 18, United States Code, relating to the sale or pledge of postage stamps;

H. R. 5456. An act for the relief of Emil Arens;

H. R. 5494. An act for the relief of Ivan N. Burlingame and others;

H. R. 5633. An act for the relief of John L. Boyer, Jr.;

H. R. 5634. An act for the relief of Willie C. Pickett, George Williams, and Herman L. Looney;

H. R. 5635. An act for the relief of Dr. Wolodymyr Fedyniak, and others;

H. R. 5787. An act to authorize settlement of claims for residential structures heretofore erected at the expense of patients on the grounds of the Public Health Service hospital, Carville, La.;

H. R. 5809. An act for the relief of the A. C. Israel Commodity Co., Inc.;

H. R. 5907. An act for the relief of Albert Woolson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2984. An act authorizing E. B. Reyna, his heirs, legal representatives, and assigns to construct, maintain, and operate a toll bridge across the Rio Grande at or near Los Ebanos, Tex.;

H. R. 4573. An act authorizing Gus A. Guerra, his heirs, legal representatives, and assigns, to construct, maintain, and operate a toll bridge across the Rio Grande, at or near Rio Grande City, Tex.;

H. R. 5841. An act to repeal the fee stamp requirement in the Foreign Service and amend section 1728 of the Revised Statutes, as amended;

H. R. 5842. An act to repeal a service charge of 10 cents per sheet of 100 words, for making out and authenticating copies of records in the Department of State; and

H. R. 5860. An act to authorize certain officers and employees of the Department of State and the Foreign Service to carry firearms; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

H. R. 3024. An act for the relief of Margaret Mary Hammond;

H. R. 3354. An act for the relief of Julius G. Watson; and

H. R. 4198. An act for the relief of Howard L. Gray; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

H. R. 3825. An act to make retrocession to the Commonwealth of Massachusetts of jurisdiction over certain land in the vicinity of Fort Devens, Mass.;

H. R. 4294. An act to amend section 640 of title 14, United States Code, concerning the interchange of supplies between the Armed Forces; and

H. R. 4650. An act to amend the Canal Zone Code by the addition of provisions authorizing regulation of the sale and use of fireworks in the Canal Zone; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 4359. An act to amend the act of September 30, 1950 (64 Stat. 1096), to provide for the conveyance of certain real property to the city of Richmond, Calif.;

H. R. 5146. An act to authorize the President to promote Paul A. Smith, a commissioned officer of the Coast and Geodetic Survey on the retired list, to the grade of rear admiral (lower half) in the Coast and Geodetic Survey, with entitlement to all benefits pertaining to any officer retired in such grade;

H. R. 5224. An act to amend title 14, United States Code, entitled "Coast Guard," to authorize certain early discharges of enlisted personnel, and preserve their rights, privileges, and benefits;

H. R. 5398. An act to increase the efficiency of the Coast and Geodetic Survey, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 6043. An act to amend section 216 (b) of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, to provide for the maintenance of the Merchant Marine Academy; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 4778. An act to provide for the purchase of bonds to cover postmasters, officers, and employees of the Post Office Department and mail clerks of the Armed Forces, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTIONS REFERRED

The concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 98) approving the granting of the status of permanent residence to certain aliens, was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the Congress approves the granting of the status of permanent residence in the case of each alien hereinafter named, in which case the Attorney General has determined that such alien is qualified under the provisions of section 6 of the Refugee Relief Act of 1953, as amended (67 Stat. 403; 68 Stat. 1044):

A-7118684, Chen, Jeanne Kuo-Cheng.
A-7790096, Chou, I-Kua.
A-6958664, Hsi, Eugene Yu-Cheng.
A-6848000, Hsi, Eugenia Min-I (nee Huang).
A-6965690, Keh, Shou-bing (Alfred).
A-6845060, Lee, Kui-Lung (Cecelia).
A-6703299, Lee, Tsai Hwa.
A-6967575, Liu, Yung-Szi (Frances).
A-6589958, Tsien, Vee Chang.
E-079901, Chong, Kwai or Kwai Chong Chung.
E-092370, Tan, Tommy Sie-Chang.
A-6620717, Dunn, Lily Wen-Yuen Fong.
A-6564145, Fok, Ruth Louise (nee Shen Hsun-Lan) also known as Ruth Louise Hsun-Lan Sung.
A-6851384, Hsia, Chih Tsing or Hsia Chih Tsing.
A-6403564, Hu, Shengen.
T-1144534, Shew, Jimmie Chu Ting.
A-6457337, Tchou, Montchen Tu-Tsang
0300-217753, Ting, Anna.
A-6008482, Ting, Sheng.
A-6760595, Wen, Richard Yutze.
A-4468478, Chiu, Katherine Yu (nee Tseng).
A-6435876, Chu, Esme Yun-Yun.
A-6691415, Nieh, Eunice Chen Yu.
A-6623014, Ying, Lu Lan.
A-6171334, Chiang, Pang Sun.
A-6851604, Chung, William Y.
A-6457476, Pan, Chi-Hsun.
A-6847923, Pan, Kay.
A-6403565, Shen, Constance Ming Chung.
A-6699858, Tai, Hsia Tao or Tao Tay Hsia.
A-6148143, Tang, Harry Kong Hung also known as Kong-Hung Tang.
0300-455922, Tung, Cheng Yu.
A-6847794, Woo, Dah-Cheng.
A-6848709, Young, Frank Kuankiang.
A-7414876, Chang, Che-Tyan.
A-6844259, Chu, Power Young Chao.
A-6769936, Bittar, Evelyn Edward or Bittar, E. Edward.
A-6522835, Chu, John Wen-djang aka Chu, Wen Djung.
0200-130593, Hsia, David Yi-Yung.
0200-130594, Hsia, Hsio-Hsuan (nee Shih).
A-6421076, Jung, Angela Chih-Ying.
E-5755, Kaasik, Harald.
A-6688266, Teitelbaum, Tauba Raca.

The concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 99) favoring the granting of the status of permanent residence to certain aliens was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the Congress favors the granting of the status of permanent residence in the case of each alien hereinafter named, in which case the Attorney General has determined that such alien is qualified under the provisions of section 4 of the Displaced Persons Act of 1948, as amended (62 Stat. 1011; 64 Stat. 219; 50 App. U. S. C. 1953):

A-7125281, Berend, Peter Mihaly, or Peter Michael Berend.
0300/370564, Boon, Lim Jew.
A-7849663, Brieze, Roberts Martins.
A-7849664, Brieze, Milda Hermine.
A-9555132, Chan, Si Heung.
0300/43030, Chen, Chen Ah.
A-6052568, Chen, Lin or Chen Lin.
0300-27496, Chen, Mrs. Susie or Cheng Shun Fan.
A-9766040, Chit, Ho Fung.
A-8031725, Chiu, Teng Hoik or Ting Hsieh Chow or Chow Ting-Hsieh or Hsieh Ting Chiu.
A-6851319, Chow, Marie Patrice or Kwang Hua Chow.
A-7073707, Chow, Tseng Kam.
A-9658660, Dong, Ng Eng.
0300/387990, Fong, Ho Wah.
A-8057994, Foo, Sin or Foo Sin.

A-6779040, Frankel, Edwin Nessim.
A-6819141, Hajduszewski, Tadeusz.
A-6970000, Hayya, Jacob.
A-6962959, Ho, Frank Hung Fai.
A-9661887, Ho, Lim Gat.
0300/390670, Huen, Kwai Chuen.
A-7863034, Kadegis, Arvids Gustavs.
A-7863033, Kiss, Eduard.
0300-402141, Kok, He Schiek or Schiek He Kok.
A-6788959, Kringelis, Teodors Andrejs.
A-6788960, Kringelis, Austra.
A-6788961, Kringelis, Daina.
A-6788962, Kringelis, Imants.
A-6634875, Krol, Kazimierz Julian.
A-9669192, Kum, Lay.
A-6843498, Lee, Mary Min Chen.
0300/30416, Lee, Yee Kow.
A-7249066, Liepa, Janis.
A-9682636, Man, Seid.
0300-134639, Mao, Henry Shu-Tsing.
A-6379854, Mei, Chu Chow Ah.
A-6794934, Mitri, Moise Hanna.
A-6971771, Pikkel, Miralda (see Piht).
A-7204903, Rod, Anna Agnes (nee Kukol).
A-6848225, Shen, Frederick Albert.
A-8196650, Shim, Chong.
0300-420528, Siang, Sung Chan.
A-7249064, Sturmanis, Karlis.
A-6965379, Tashkovich, Gligor Tashko.
A-6848676, Ting, Lu.
A-7129774, Tsai, Poo Hubbert.
A-7863001, Ulmanis, Ludvigs.
A-7249880, Valm, Mihkel.
A-7250165, Valm, Aleksei.
A-7249882, Valm, Theodor.
A-9802613, Yick, Tong.
A-6967695, Yin, Huo-Bing.
0300-83569, Ying, Chan.
A-9542543, Yu, Ling Tao or Lum Tow EE.
A-8082386, Yuen, Chan Kam or Chan Hong Kow.
A-6703490, Zee, Robin Joseph or Zee Yao-Shun.
0300-397560, Cheung, Wah or Cheung Wah.
0300-427936, Chow, Chung Shan.
0300-390908, Hon, Kong or Hon Kong.
A-8082075, Kwan, Wu Sing.
A-6971768, Sooaar, Voldemar.
A-6971757, Sooaar, Hela (nee Feder).
A-6910014, Lokiec, Majer.
A-8039688, Tsai, Sung Chu.
0300/29659, Chan, Ah Hoe.
0300-418043 Chan, Cheung Yuk or Chan Yuk Cheung.
A-9687373, Chan, Tim.
0300-370929, Cheng, Bou Ching or Mu Bou Cheng Ching.
A-6972945, Cheng, Pauline Ming-Hung.
174/736, Cheong, Mong.
A-9533428, Ching, Mark.
A-9687173, Chiu, Loo or Lo Chin.
A-8039173, Fok, Lam.
0300-400335, Fong, Lee.
A-6936267, Geiger, George.
A-6936268, Geiger, Ella (nee Spielman).
0300-423621, Hin, Wong Sui or Wong Kin.
A-6965180, Hsu, Chien Hwai or Jay Hsu.
A-6965179, Hsu, Jiu Hwai or Mai Hsu.
A-6958731, Janovitz, Serena (nee Simon).
A-6971749, Kaevando, Roman.
A-6971748, Kaevando, Helmi (nee Lents).
A-8015625, Kam, Cheung or Cheung Wuen.
A-6692899, Kramar, Branko.
A-6910269, Kramar, Maria.
A-6985975, Kulp, Karel.
A-6971798, Lepp, Aleksei.
A-6971759, Lepp, Agathe (nee Hanslep).
A-6888878, Lien, Din Shiang.
0300-66727, Linic, Vladimir.
A-9782777, Loo, Sam Teer.
A-6772581, Maksimovs, Eriks or Maximovs.
A-6917065, Maksimovs, Michelis or Mikels Maksimovs.
A-6670578, Pang, Yee.
A-7135610, Perl, Lazar.
A-9765644, Piccini, Francesco.
A-6955590, Pulauskas, Matas.
A-7809727, Shak, To or Doo Sat.
0300-400854, Shing, Lo Kam.
A-7849428, Silins, Adolfs Janis.
A-7849429, Silins, Maija Alexandra.
A-7849430, Silinis, Junior, Adolfs.
A-7084938, Sipos, Marianne Margaret Kertesz.
A-9804295, Suurna, Mihkel.
A-9561923, Tee, Toon Hue.
A-6307394, Tom, Gong or Tom Gong or Tom Shing.
A-9533429, Tong, Shing or Chung Shing or Tom Shing or Chung Chuen.
A-8258584, Too, Fung or Too Fung.
A-8082014, Toong, Cha Chiang or Toong Chue Ching or Peter Chue Ching Toong.
A-8091339, Tuum, Aleksander Villem.
A-6967364, Wang, John Y.
A-6851357, Wang, Richard I-Hsiang.
A-7476304, Yao, Ting Hui or Michael T. H. Yao.
A-9507456, Yow, Choy or Choy You.
A-7292642, Boldyreff, Antonina (nee Zhigmanovsky).
A-7292641, Boldyreff, Helen or Helene.
A-8082841, Chen, Yen or Chen Yi Shi or Yi Shi Chen.
0300-24950, Chojnaki, Eugeniusz.
A-7210403, Christopoulos, Yoanna Khamis or Jeanette Christou Christopoulos.
A-6971650, Erdi, Anthony or Antal.
A-9647005, Fang, Pow Foo.
0300-97188, Fook, Tsang Koon.
0300-424088, Fu, Quo or Pang Choy.
A-6775569, Hlavac, Frantisek Josef.
A-7073610, Hlavac, Marta.
A-8082037, Huang, Mary Sei Mei.
A-6830536, Irani, Joseph Isaac or Joseph Irani.
A-6899364, Kazimierski, Stanley.
A-7863216, Kesteris, Mikelis.
A-7863217, Kesteris, Ilze.
A-7863218, Kesteris, Andres.
A-9836636, Lian, Shin Ah.
A-6851636, Lin, Julius Yun-I.
0300/408693, Moy, Young.
A-7084232, Petraitis, Juczas or Joseph Petraitis.
A-7243875, Stenclavs, Krists.
A-7244305, Stenclavs, Augusts.
A-6704110T, Sun, Pao-Chih or Paulette Pao-Chi Sun.
0300-402447, Teng, Wong Gee or Wong Kee.
A-6851366, Tien-Jan, John Paul Ly.
175/651, Wan, Lam.
A-9778441, Wei, Toh Chung.
A-8065346, Wei, Wang Ah or Wang Ah Vee.
A-6851523, Yang, Thomas Meng Ping.
A-9731090, Ching, Pang.
A-7863027, Eidok, Walter.
A-9644600, Fai, Cheung.
A-7087608, Fasko, Daniel.
A-9764648, Lewandowski, Julian.
0300-399882, Ng. Tou.
A-6986534, Odelia, Sister Mary (li Feng-yu).
A-7863008, Ritums, Janis.
A-7248809, Salme, Karli.
A-9633107, Skkratic, Dragutin Pranjo.
A-7863203, Stendzis, Janis.
A-7863204, Stendzis Ilze Pusaudze.
A-7863205, Stendzis, Imants Arvids.
A-6929742, Tam, Dianalihue Kao.
0300-373583, Wong, Ah King or Wang Ken Sing.
A-6044499, Woo, Sze Lu Hsiang.
A-8078864, Yao, King Fah.
A-8050321, Blascovich, Attilio.
A-7095908, Bogacki, Wacław Zdzislaw.
A-8082842, Bors, Tibor Eugen.
A-7975432, Boucher, Arsene Andre.
A-6967730, Chen Wen Pin.
A-6904310, Cheng, Chang Sin.
0300-417793, Chong, Fong or Chong Fong.
A-6986509, Chu, Sister Mary Dulcia.
A-6522833, Chu, Wei Liang.
A-7863026, Eizis, Aleksandrs.
A-7356380, Frankel, Maurice Solomon.
A-7863031, Galvans, Peteris.
A-8091397, Gega, Anthony John.
A-7863032, Gorbants, Imants.
A-9782690, Hee, Wong.
A-7354351, Huang, Shao Chi.
A-9703852, Kam, Mak or James Mak.
A-6848646, Kao, Rose Tse Ching.
0300-403722, Kee, Shum.
A-7095531, Kersna, Johannes Maks.
A-7095532, Kersna, Salme.
A-9573456, King, Ho Ah.
A-9196442, Kirs, Alexander.
A-7204900, Krno, Ladislav Gejza.
A-7204901, Krno, Katherine.
T-1144870, Krno, Katherine Tatiana.
A-7873848, Kum, Chow.
A-7048906, Laupa, Armas.
A-6812186, Lenart, Leslie Oscar.
A-7863225, Lidums, Rudolf.
A-7863227, Lidum, Olaf Rudolf.
A-5971242, Liu, San Koon or Liu San Koon.
A-6854454, Luca, George or Gheorghe.
A-6854456, Luca, Elena.
A-9684344, Lung, Shung Sin or Chung Sin Lung.
A-9825451, Magic, Zdenko.
A-7138009, Matusoff, Ethel.
A-7223209, Mejzr, Miroslav.
A-7223210, Mejzr, Ruzena.
T-2645007, Mejzr, Miroslava Marie.
A-7193990, Mejzr, Ivanka.
A-7802065, Petersons, Karlis.
A-6971770, Piht, Eduard.
A-6971772, Piht, Liidia.
A-9765057, Polushin, Walter John or Viacheslav Ivanovitch Polushin.
A-6405622, Rashin, Louis Nathan.
A-6703361, Shie, Wei Wu.
A-6855586, Shie, Susan Ding Neh (nee Wang).
A-7193991, Spitz, Ruzena.
0300-396920, Sufich, Giovanna.
A-9554379, Sui, Lui or Liu.
A-7975174, Surian, Luca.
T-1144528, Velcich, John.
0300-289791, Vlacich, Ferruccio.
A-6851354, Wang, Chou-Chiu or Gordon Wang.
A-6881707, Yang, Chi.
A-8065847, Yau, Loo.
A-6949354, Zee, Tsong Ngo or Ah Neng.
A-6589294, Aboody, Reuben Moshi.
A-9948302, Canaletich, Mario Giorgio.
A-6709262, Chang, Yuan Chun.
A-6171208, Chen, Kwei Sen.
0300-280451, Chen, Mes Chih Ping.
A-7879678, Chen, Thomas.
A-6970307, Chen, David.
0300-424485, Chen, Peter.
A-7955258, Chmielewska, Maria.
A-6988894, Chuck, Lou Yuen or Low Yean Choe.
A-7243252, Creglia, Giordano.
A-6971766, Esberg, Adele.
A-6971765, Esberg, Juta.
A-8021324, Fatutta, Marco.
A-8065726, Fong, Wong or Fong Wong.
A-7249077, Freimanis, Teodore Genrichs.
A-7249076, Freimanis, Anna Elena Olga.
A-6263402, Gartenszteig, Israel.
A-8031589, Ha, Tsong Tong or Tsong Tung Ha.
A-6971758, Hiiesalu, Endel.
A-7366483, Hsueh-Yung, Shu or Evan Hsueh-Yung Shu.
A-6660388, Hu, Tsei Suan.
A-7283198, Inwentarz, Izak.
1100-29956, Kao, Yun-Chen or Mary Yun-Chen Kao or Mary Kao.
A-8082033, Kenul, Marcello.
A-8031384, Kow, Ng Kung.
A-6966542, Kuty, Frances.
A-6978177, Lederman, Pejsach or Pejsach Lederman Grezelak or Paul Lederman.
A-6690537, Lee, Han Duck or Henry Lee.
A-6690619, Lee, Tom Shee or Tom Kim Hing.
A-7056802, Loh, Tsau Yueh or Thomas Y. Lowe.
V-305539, Mih, Alexander Wei-Shan.
A-9782737, Ming, Tung.
A-6971802, Oja, Harry.
A-6971796, Oja, Ruth.
A-8065366, Pomasan, Stefano.
A-2823761, Radulich, Mate.
A-7178411, Reinvald, Manivald.
A-8001335, Rubinich, Joseph.
A-7873098, Runco, Anthony.
A-7095534, Savisaar, Elmar Johannes.

A-7095535, Savisaar, Armilda Kolk.
A-7095536, Savisaar, Atso.
03000-418127, Sepcich, John.
A-9770642, Shi, Chang or Fred San.
A-6904332, Sipajlo, Jiri.
A-7809912, Strmecki, Josip.
A-7941177, Szubert, Konrad Joseph.
A-9765493, Tamme, Heinar.
A-6887270, Tang, Michael Tsin-Chien.
A-6448741, Tsu, John Bosco or Bing Ming Tsu.
A-9245758, Yiu, Young.
A-6704228, Zak, Helena or Sister Mercita Evita.
A-7095021, Brody, Alexander.
A-6712046, Fok, Dso Yun.
A-9559819, For, Leung or Leung Kai.
A-9799220, Hop, Chu or Chew Hop.
A-8039680, Jurasic, Angelo or Iurasich.
0300-387739, Kam, Sheh.
0300-245055, Kasser, Elizabeth Aranyi.
0300-245055, Kasser, Ivan.
0300-245055, Kasser, Mary.
A-9623303, Ko, Lee King or Lee Kam Ho.
0300-12942, Leong, Sing To.
A-7483853, Simcha, Helene (nee Rosenberger).
T-666654, Soo, John Yun-Chun.
A-6816885, Spitzka, Aloisia.
A-4039059, Toll, Friedrich Alexander.
A-8106037, Tong, Tsang.
0300-409250, Tsai, Ah San.
A-6694159, Weissbart, Esther Vera (nee Blinchevsky).
A-6847895, Chow, Ho.
0300-405869, Foo, Lee or Lee Wai Foo.
0300-408016, Fook, Lee.
A-6938801, Grive, Ansis.
A-9553994, Hing, Lee Ah.
A-9544110, Koel, Valdemar.
A-7126610, Lee, Ted Teh-Yuan.
A-9684355, Liu, Huo Shin or Fok Lau.
A-9529877, Mai, Lee-Shing.
A-7052332, Markovits, Salamon.
A-7138329, Markovits, Ilona (nee Weisz).
A-6974328, Meisels, Martin.
A-7139340, Shaw, Julia Chang.
A-7297278, Steinmetz, Abraham.
A-6933818, Stern, Tibor.
A-6953157, Sulyok, Dezso Karoly.
A-6970438, Sulyok, Etelka.
A-9571956, Tak, Lee.
A-8091549, Vosilla, Angelo, Otavio.
A-6858256, Wen, Peter Liang.
A-6694209, Wen, Amy Tang.
A-6028252, Wong, Yun Jee.
A-7074880, Yeh, Te Fung.
A-7874913, Celich, Frank.
A-9765153, Donatich, Giuseppe.
0300-429047, Fong, Lee Tsi.
A-6735483, Hallac, Joseph Paul.
0300-413098, Hing, Lo.
A-6578981, Kozarski, Danilo Zivko.
A-6640338, Szor, Leopold.
A-6345116, Szor, Irena Philipp.
A-8039682, Tsai, Hong Ping or Ping Tsai Hong.
A-8021319, Babenko, Gennady Konstantinovitch.
0300-387987, Chan, Hong Kong or Chan Pui.
A-9231941, Chew, Tan Sing.
A-7366302, Chu, Pan.
A-7383067, Garbin, Luka Eduard.
A-6499962, Hirsch, Nathan Alfred.
A-7128158, Ilich, Sofia.
A-6851658, Kao, Chi Tsing.
A-7128158, Ilich, Sofia.
A-6851658, Kao, Chi Tsing.
A-7849673, Kleinbergs, Mile Anete.
A-8082060, Lubicich, Mario.
A-7849671, Ozolins, Armins.
0501-19752, Pe-Kuang, Patrick or Pe-Kuang Tseng.
A-6971769, Peters, Juuli.
A-8065425, Shih, Shio Nia or Shia Nia Shih.
0300-421797, Sing, Wang or Wong Park.
A-6848091, Tan, Ying Chun.
A-6938807, Tipans, Valija (nee Ievins).
A-6887732, Tsao, Shu Yun Tseng (nee Shu Yun Tseng).
A-7056816, Tuzar, Jaroslav.
A-7358945, Tuzar, Jirina.
A-8015056, Tuzar, Jana.
0500-33535, Wimmer, Katalin.
A-6986573, Wong, Kau Sau or Kai Sau Wong.
A-7383351, Yang, Samuel Hsueh-Lun.
A-7383352, Yang, Hsiu-Hwa.
A-7283009, Borsic, Aladar.
A-6371814, Choi, Ho Liang.
0300-405913, Chong, Yun or Cheung Wan.
A-7350611, Chow, Chung Lee or Ven Sih Chow.
A-6320011, Chu, Choy.
A-7189791, Dambos, Kostas.
A-7243855, Fridmanis, Imants Egons.
A-7243067, Fridmanis, Erika Upite.
A-7138432, Grabowski, Bronislaw.
A-9501262, Grandke, Telesfor.
A-6952325, Grunfeld, Juda.
A-6857659, Habbab, Abdulghani Joseph.
0300-379350, Hah, Ng.
A-9686792, Kin, Chan.
A-7061800, Koci, Vaclav.
A-6971809, Kukk, Verner Reinhold.
A-6971810, Kukk, Fronelly Franziska.
A-6971777, Kukk, Harald.
A-5951611, Lung, Ben or Long.
A-8091360, Mon, Lum.
A-7244196, Nagy, Ivan Gabor.
0400/54441, Raicovich, Giuseppe.
0300-92577, San, Lum Hong or Chow King Fen.
0300-410615, Sang, Tsang.
A-8082091, Scaliordick, John or Giovanni Sgaliordich.
A-9560203, Sing, Foo Wah or Foo Wah Teng.
A-7138246, Sturm, Jolana Judita.
A-6381281, Tien, Sheue Fung or Arthur Whitfield or Stanley Tien.
A-9513949, Wai, Nam.
A-6624918, Woo, Henry Kyi-Oen.
A-6971805, Wosa, Aino Adele or Aino Adele Riks or Aino Adele Edal.
A-7961771, Wosa, Oscar Adolf.
A-9705521, Yee, Ho or Yee Ho.
A-8091322, Yee, Sang Fon or Yee Sing or Yu Hsing.
0300-422039, Yow, Ng or Ng Yin.
A-7244303, Akmans, Marta Emiolia.
A-7992859, Chew, Chan formerly Chan Shing Jow.
A-7457745, Foo, William Er Chen.
A-7249874, Kermon, Rudolf.
A-9733412, Kong, Ngo Ying.
A-6958636, Lin, Chao-Han.
A-6849918, Liu, Chia-Lo.
A-1903522, Liu, I. Hsin.
A-9744381, Toong, Ding Yao.
A-7138447, Winternitz, Jenta.
A-7120716, Balassa, Bela.
A-7173016, Balassa, Ida Bogyor.
A-6301049, Cerven, George.
A-6792244, Chang, Sing Chen or Sing Chen Chang.
A-7197313, Chang, Chien Wei Lan or Chien Wei Lan or Chang Lah Chien Wei.
A-7197314, Chang, Chung Yung or Judy Yung Chang or Judy Chung Yung Chang.
A-9635195, Che, Leong.
A-6163714, Ho, Lien Yu.
A-7395257, Ho, Yin Hwa Cheng.
A-7395258, Ho, Henry Nieuhan.
A-7395259, Ho, Stephen Shianoling.
A-7395260, Ho, Barbara Beeyuan.
A-7395261, Ho, Margaret Yustang.
A-6674633, Komarek, Vit.
A-7398466, Krizanova, Maria.
0300-416920, Li, Sheng Sen.
A-6026376, Lo, Arthur Wu-Nien.
A-6403589, Lo, Elizabeth Heng-Hui Shen.
T-1892157, Loy, Too.
A-6935169, Mok, Charlie or Mak Wee.
A-8282626, Sung, Zee Hu.
A-6847853, Tyau, Louise (nee Shu-Chiu Luan).
A-6847962, Wang, Yu Chiang or Richard Y. C. Wang.
A-6453829, Albrecht, Marie Neumannova.
A-7210188, Barta, Tibor.
A-6798984, Briedis, Arturs.
A-7087346, Chuh, Sharlin or Sharlin Charlie Chuh.
A-9569306, Foo, Wong Kia.
A-6849448, Guang, Mann-Lo or Michael Kan.
A-6971789, Hyvonen, Alice Uustalu.
A-6851462, Kiang, Lu Yu.
A-7171983, Knauer, Eugenie formerly Strakaty (nee Petersen) or Indra Devi.
0400/47451, San, Yao Chin.
A-7202554, San, Vera.
A-7202882, San, Sio Chu.
A-7205703, Wong, Sio Yu San.
A-7202553, San, Yu Lan.
0400/54495, San, Yu Lin.
A-7178373, Sarapik, Evart.
A-9825044, Splawinski, Franciszek.

The concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 110) favoring the granting of the status of permanent residence to certain aliens, was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the Congress favors the granting of the status of permanent residence in the case of each alien hereinafter named, in which case the Attorney General has determined that such alien is qualified under the provisions of section 4 of the Displaced Persons Act of 1948, as amended (62 Stat. 1011; 64 Stat. 219; 50 App. U. S. C. 1953):

A-9540876, Andra, Ervin Rudolf.
A-8057219, Bacchia, Ermanno.
T-2786643, Bain, Hong Yuan.
A-9512692, Bang, Cheung or Cheung Ping.
A-9825169, Barulich, Antonio.
A-7186356, Basch, Marton.
A-6207921, Bistreff, Stanu Salvov.
A-6207920, Bistreff, Eugenia.
A-7538670, Chang, Yi-An Rosita.
0300/419969, Ching, Ah.
A-8082325, Chung, Cheng.
0300-396020, Chung, Shin or Shiu Chung.
E-094561, Ding, Sing Yoh.
A-6969986, Fabian, George Stephen.
A-9678368, Fat, Wong or Wong Man.
176/484, Foo, Yee King.
A-8082056, Fook, Lo.
A-7351309, Gruenberg, Dora.
A-9749483, Heinsar, Meinhard or Heinsaar.
A-9686736, Hop, Leung.
A-7779095, Hung, Chung Shu or Francis C. S. Hung.
A-6971746, Huva, Walter.
A-6971747, Huva, Leili.
A-4191741, Kaminski, Kazmer or Kazimierz.
A-7863018, Kancans, Edgar Arnolds.
A-9575626, Kaneps, Peter Voldemars or Peteris Voldemars Kaneps.
A-6967285, Kao, Evelina Tse-Ven.
A-9139291, King, Chin or Chan Kin.
0300-396806, Koo, Lee Yong.
A-7133274, Ku, Min-Chuan.
A-4760478, Lee, Ching-Ye (nee Ling).
A-8117995, Lee, Tong.
A-7064133, Li, Ching Po.
A-6017699, Liang, Vi Kang or Wei Kang Liang.
0300-405868, Ling, Ah Fook.
A-6849848, Ling, Linda Chiu Huang.
A-6703496, Lo, Yu-Cheng.
A-6703484, Lo, Woo-Lih Lena Dunn.
A-6962954, Loh, Arthur Tsung Yuan.
A-6041575, Lowe, Donald Ming-Dah.
A-7046279, Marton, Tibor William or Mayer or Tibor Marton or M. T. Marton.
A-7200780, Mascitelli, Teresa (nee Tobolik).
A-9731869, Ming, Chan Choy.
A-7879331, Mintz, Samson or Szymszon Minc.
A-9825225, Morin, Silvestro.
0300-18256, Nee, Kai Sung.
A-9518299, Neng, Tan Jee or Tan Gee Ning.
A-9577665, Olman, Karl.
A-7371655, Paczosa, Marja.
A-7975173, Pien, Pao Chi.

0501-19744, Hu, Yu Ming.
A-8031504, Ping, Lai or Lai Pyee.
A-9290467, Poa, Tan Ki.
A-6756976, Potasz, Judithe.
0300-304535, Raczynski, Waclaw.
A-6393475, Rajczyk, Szmul Dawid.
A-9554180, Sai, Leong Kee.
A-5869957, Sang, Tsang.
A-6887953, Sefcik, Ludvik Tom or Louis H. Sefcik.
A-8091316, Sen, Tek or Fu Theh Shin.
A-8082001, Shah, Victor Stephen.
A-8091356, Sing, Leung.
A-8106036, Song, Lim Shi.
A-9609271, Soon, Jong.
A-7849432, Steinbergs, Juris.
A-7849433, Steinbergs, Velta (nee Brieze).
A-7849427, Steinbergs, Marija (nee Labonovsky).
A-7074013, Straka, Marie.
A-7886251, Straka, Karel Alex.
A-7061816, Sununu, Alfred Saleh.
A-7991591, Szabo, Senior, Thomas P.
A-7991592, Szabo, Eva Agres (nee Vicenty).
A-7991593, Szabo, Thomas, Jr.
A-7991594, Szabo, Adam.
A-9561964, Sze, Chen Tek.
A-7095904, Szonyi, Giselle.
A-6971787, Tischler, Albert.
A-6971783, Tischler, Vilma.
A-8001228, Tom, Hay or Og Tom or Toy Loo or Choy Loo.
A-9529438, Tsou, Fong Shi.
A-6938806, Vīrdzenieks, Niklavs.
A-9810517, Virkebau, Uno or Wirkebau.
A-8082068, Wai, Lee.
A-6041703, Wu, Nelson Ikon.
E-094562, Wun, Choy or Won Sang or Wan Sang.
A-8039752, Yang, Lee Ah.
A-9677800, Yap, Lee Eng or Yap Eng Lee.
A-9571659, Yeh, Lau.
A-6952737, Yuen, Yee Sin.
A-6967543, Liu, Chin Po.
A-6967507, Liu, Dah Wen.
A-9525198, Kovacevic, Mitar.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED DURING RECESS

Under authority of the order of the Senate of May 17, 1955,

The PRESIDENT pro tempore, on May 18, 1955, signed the following enrolled bills, which had previously been signed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives:

H. R. 1573. An act to repeal section 348 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938; and

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

ENROLLED BILLS PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on May 18, 1955, he presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bills:

S. 1006. An act to authorize the execution of agreements between agencies of the United States and other agencies and instrumentalities for mutual aid in fire protection, and for other purposes; and

S. 1763. An act relating to the extension and the final liquidation of the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

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

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the Farm Credit Administration Subcommittee of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry was authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

DEATH OF GUY E. IVES

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, it is with extreme regret that I announce to the Senate the death of a Senate official who has served this body faithfully and loyally for 43 years.

Guy E. Ives, the Senate printing clerk, passed away at his home last night from a heart attack. Thus ended a career in the Senate that started April 9, 1912, when Guy Ives began as an elevator operator.

I believe that all of us knew Mr. Ives personally and respected him deeply. Since April 20, 1921, he has been the Senate printing clerk, and whole generations of Senators have found the path smoothed before them by Guy Ives' willingness to use his skill and his experience in the Senate's service.

His hard, painstaking work has meant greater efficiency and greater effectiveness. It has speeded the preparation of the reports and the documents which afford the basis of Senate action.

I knew Guy Ives very well. I first became acquainted with him during my previous service as chairman of the Senate Preparedness Subcommittee of the Committee on Armed Services. He was willing to go to any lengths to meet the difficult task of preparing the printing of our reports—as we wanted them, how we wanted them, and when we wanted them.

The passing of such an able Senate official leaves us all with a feeling of deep sorrow. But it can truly be said in consolation for the loved ones he left behind that he earned the gratitude of all of us, and that he was a loyal and faithful servant of his country.

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I should like to join in the remarks made by the distinguished majority leader regarding the passing of a veteran Senate employee, Mr. Guy Ives. All of us have recognized the service he has given to the Senate, faithfully and well, over many years. I am sure the majority leader was speaking for the entire Senate and for Members on both sides of the aisle when he made the remarks he just uttered.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I thank the distinguished minority leader.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

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

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

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

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

Howard F. Vultee, of New Jersey, to be Director, Office of Economic Affairs, United States mission to the North Atlantic Treaty Organization and European regional organizations.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, from the Committee on Armed Services, I report favorably a group of 6,109 routine nominations in the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Air Force, in grades from second lieutenant and ensign to lieutenant colonel and lieutenant commander. Included in the Air Force group are 140 West Point cadets and 185 Annapolis midshipmen for appointment as second lieutenants in the Regular Air Force. All of these names have already appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, so to save the expense of printing on the Executive Calendar of this large group, I ask unanimous consent that these nominations be ordered to lie on the Vice President's desk for the information of any Senator.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The nominations will lie on the desk, as requested by the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. KEFAUVER. From the Committee on Armed Services, I also report favorably the nomination of Lt. Gen. Williston B. Palmer for promotion to four-star general under the provisions of section 504 of the Officer Personnel Act. General Palmer will occupy the position of Vice Chief of Staff, replacing General Bolte, and I ask that his nomination be placed on the Executive Calendar.

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

UNITED STATES ATTORNEY

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of William C. Farmer, of Kansas, to be United States attorney for the district of Kansas.

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

COAST AND GEODETIC SURVEY

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Marvin B. Miller to be commissioned ensign.

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

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

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

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

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

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

ORDER FOR TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there may be the customary morning hour for the presentation of petitions and memorials, the introduction of bills and the transaction of other routine business, subject to the usual 2-minute limitation on statements.

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

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

AMENDMENT OF FEDERAL EMPLOYEES' GROUP LIFE INSURANCE ACT

A letter from the Chairman, United States Civil Service Commission, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Federal Employees' Group Life Insurance Act of 1954 (Public Law 598, 83d Cong.) (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

RENEWAL OF LEASE OF ANNETTE ISLAND AIRPORT TO THE UNITED STATES

A letter from the Acting Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize renewals of a lease of the Annette Island Airport to the United States (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 PRESIDENT pro tempore:

A resolution of the House of Representatives of the State of Missouri; to the Committee on Appropriations:

"House Memorial 2

"Memorializing Congress to appropriate funds necessary to carry out the contracts between generating and transmission cooperatives financed by the Rural Electrification Administration, and the Southwestern Power Administration and to do all in its power to encourage and further public power in the area served by Southwestern Power Administration

"Whereas it has come to the attention of the House that there is growing pressure in Washington, D. C., seemingly emanating from the Interior Department, to discontinue the use of the Southwestern Power Association by using economic pressures to force the generating and transmission cooperatives to deal with private utilities instead of the Southwestern Power Administration; and

"Whereas the proposed new rate schedule of the Southwestern Power Administration is said to be undermining the very purpose of public power by making it impossible for the generating and transmission cooperatives to negotiate economical contracts for peaking power; and

"Whereas the original idea of the Southwestern Power Administration was to make available the maximum quantities of energy to cooperative and other preference customers and ultimately to make power available to the largest possible number of consumers at the lowest rate consistent with good business policy: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of Missouri, That the Congress of the United States be memorialized to appropriate money for the furtherance of the Southwestern Power Administration, and to enact any and all laws consistent with the public-power policy of the United States to make power available to all who need and demand it; and be it further

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

"Adopted May 16, 1955.

"AUSTIN HILL,
"Chief Clerk."

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

"Senate Joint Resolution 6

"Memorial to the Congress of the United States to provide sufficient funds for immediate completion of the Jim Woodruff lock and dam and certain other projects on the Chattahoochee, Flint, and Apalachicola Rivers

"Whereas the Congress of the United States has authorized a public works project to improve the Chattahoochee, Flint, and Apalachicola Rivers in Florida, Georgia, and Alabama; and

"Whereas two phases of this project are now under construction: the Jim Woodruff lock and dam on the Apalachicola River at Chattahoochee, Fla., and the Buford Dam on the Chattahoochee River at Buford, Ga.; and

"Whereas there are three additional phases of the project for which construction funds have not been provided; namely, the channel in the Apalachicola River between the Intracoastal Waterway near Apalachicola, Fla., and the Jim Woodruff lock and dam, the Columbia lock and dam on the Chattahoochee River near Columbia, Ala., and the Fort Gaines lock and dam on the Chattahoochee River near Fort Gaines, Ga.; and

"Whereas each phase must be completed in its entirety before maximum use can be realized and the cost-benefit ratio be obtained as established by the United States Engineers; and

"Whereas the 2 million Americans living in the tririver valley will be greatly benefited if an accelerated construction program is adopted whereby all approved phases of the authorized project are placed on a simultaneous construction status: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the senate (the house of representatives concurring), That the Congress of the United States be and it is hereby requested to provide sufficient construction moneys to continue construction of the Jim Woodruff lock and dam, the Buford Dam and to commence construction on the Apalachicola River channel, the Columbia lock and dam, and the Fort Gaines lock and dam, during the next fiscal year, July 1, 1955, to July 1, 1956; be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this memorial be dispatched to the President of the United States; to the President of the United States Senate; to the Speaker of the United States House of Representatives; to each of the ablest congressional delegation in the United States Congress, the Alabama delegation; to the Chief of Engineers, Corps of Engineers, Washington, D. C.; to each of the Governors of the States of Florida, Alabama and Georgia; and to the president of the Three Rivers Development Association, the Honorable Jim Woodruff, Sr., Columbus, Ga.

"J. E. SPEIGHT,
"Secretary of Senate."

A resolution adopted by the city court of the city of Buffalo, N. Y., relating to Polish independence; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

A resolution adopted by the St. Matthew's Holy Name Society, of Brooklyn, N. Y., favoring the enactment of the so-called Bricker amendment, relating to the treaty-making power; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

RESOLUTION OF SOUTH CAROLINA LEGISLATURE

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD and appropriately referred a concurrent resolution of the South Carolina Legislature memorializing the Congress to enact legislation that will secure to the States their right to collect certain sales taxes on purchases of private contractors executing Government contracts.

The case of *Kern-Limerick, Inc.,* v. *Scurlock* (347 U. S. 110) appears to preclude the States from collecting such taxes in the future. To give such sweeping immunity to this revenue source of the States will work a tremendous hardship on at least 32 States having a sales tax. In certain States the effect of this decision might be to cause them, under their present tax structure, to operate at a deficit.

This is another Supreme Court decision that is not to be taken lightly. The implications of this decision can have grave consequences to our States and to our Nation. Let us act now to halt this process. Congress has the authority and the responsibility to act so as to preserve a healthful balance between the rights and functions of the State governments and the Federal Government. I sincerely urge this body to give early consideration to the enactment of legislation which will preserve this necessary balance.

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

Concurrent resolution memorializing Congress of the United States to enact legislation which will secure to the States the right to levy and collect any nondiscriminatory privilege tax with certain exceptions thereto

Whereas the United States Supreme Court in an opinion written in the case of *Kern-Limerick, Inc.,* v. *Scurlock* (347 U. S. 110) has held that a contractor with a Federal agency can be constituted a Federal purchasing agent in the absence of a Federal act prohibiting this, and thereby the contractor's purchases and use of tangible personal property are immunized from State taxation; and

Whereas under the rule established by this opinion practically any activity engaged in by a private contractor on behalf of a Federal agency can be immunized from any State taxation by appropriate contract phraseology, resulting in serious interference with State and local powers of taxation contrary to the established policy of Congress and the expressed will of the executive branch of the Federal Government; and

Whereas no additional rights of taxation are sought on behalf of the States, only the restoration and preservation of these rights which existed prior to the pronouncement of the rule now complained of; and

Whereas if there is to be any withdrawal from the sovereign States of the Union or

any portion of their power to tax Government contractors, there should be an equal withdrawal from the Federal Government of its power to tax State employees and contractors, to the end that the power to tax shall remain in balance: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of South Carolina (the Senate concurring), That the General Assembly of the State of South Carolina respectfully memorializes the Congress of the United States to enact, as speedily as possible, legislation which will secure and make certain to the States of the Union the power and right to levy and collect any nondiscriminatory privilege tax upon any privilege exercised under the protection and authority of the laws of any State in the Union, except such taxes which the direct incidence shall be upon the United States.

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION OF MINNESOTA LEGISLATURE

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I present a concurrent resolution which was adopted by the State Legislature of Minnesota memorializing Congress to cause to be issued coins commemorating the centennial of the admission of the State of Minnesota into the Union. My colleague, the senior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE], has submitted such a resolution, and this particular memorial from the State legislature encourages the adoption of that resolution. I ask unanimous consent that the concurrent resolution may be printed in the RECORD, and appropriately referred.

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

Concurrent resolution memorializing Congress to cause to be issued coins commemorating the centennial of the admission of the State of Minnesota into the Union

Whereas by act of Congress Minnesota was admitted to the Union May 11, 1858; and

Whereas plans are being made for a statewide celebration of this centennial in the year 1958; and

Whereas Congress has many times previously authorized the issuance by the United States Treasury of commemorative coins for other States: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved (by the senate, the house of representatives concurring), That the Congress be requested to enact such legislation as may be necessary to authorize and direct the United States Treasury to issue 150,000 commemorative half dollar coins, of appropriate design, dated 1958; and be it further

Resolved, That said coins be delivered to the Minnesota Statehood Centennial Commission upon payment therefor and that said commission be, and it hereby is, authorized to sell and distribute such coins; be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to the Members of Congress from the State of Minnesota.

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

Passed the senate the 14th day of April, in the year of our Lord 1955.

HY SERRING,
Secretary of the Senate.

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

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

Approved April 23, 1955.

ORVILLE J. FREEMAN,
Governor of the State of Minnesota.

MINIMUM WAGE AND HOUR LAW—RESOLUTION OF DICKINSON (N. DAK.) CHAMBER OF COMMERCE

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a resolution adopted by the Board of Directors of the Dickinson, N. Dak., Chamber of Commerce, opposing any change in the present minimum wage and hour law.

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

DICKINSON CHAMBER OF COMMERCE,
Dickinson, N. Dak., May 9, 1955.

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

MY DEAR SENATOR: At the regular April meeting of the board of directors of the Dickinson Chamber of Commerce, the following resolution was passed unanimously and is forwarded to you for your consideration:

"Whereas the Congress of the United States is, in bills S. 662, S. 770, and the Smith bill, and others, which would increase the minimum wage and extend the coverage under the Fair Labor Standards Act, considering the problem of wage legislation; and

"Whereas it is the opinion and belief of the Board of Directors of the Dickinson Chamber of Commerce that the question of wages and hours is a private problem of the free competitive system, and that any extension of Government control is interfering with private business, and that the competitive enterprise system itself will control the question of minimum wages and laws: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved*, that the Members of Congress from North Dakota be requested to lend their support to congressional action to defeat any measure intended to change the present minimum wage and hour law, or extend coverage into classifications of business; further

"*Resolved*, That copies of this resolution be forwarded to the Members of the House of Representatives and of the Senate representing North Dakota, and to the governor of the State."

ROBERT A. STRANIK,
President, Dickinson Chamber of Commerce.

Attest:

JOHN W. JOHNSON,
Manager.

FUNDS FOR OPERATION OF CRIPPLED CHILDREN'S PROGRAM—RESOLUTION

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a resolution adopted by Gilbert C. Grafton Post, No. 2, of the American Legion, Fargo, N. Dak., favoring the enactment of legislation to provide sufficient funds for the operation of the crippled children's program, for the fiscal year 1956.

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

Whereas the American Legion since its founding in 1919 has had as one of its four main objectives, care for the children of America; and

Whereas the Social Security Act, as amended, authorized the appropriation of $15 million a year for the United States program for Crippled Children; and

Whereas the 1956 appropriations bill passed the House of Representatives March 21 with only $10,800,000 included in it for the crippled children's program: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by Gilbert C. Grafton Post, No. 2, of the American Legion meeting at Fargo, N. Dak., May 3, 1955, That we favor the full appropriation of the authorized $15 million for the fiscal year 1956 in the operation of the crippled children's program and request Senator MILTON R. YOUNG, of North Dakota, a member of the Senate Appropriations Committee, to support action to amend the House passed bill to that extent; and be it further

Resolved, That Post Adjutant Glen W. Rott be instructed to forward a copy of this resolution to Senators YOUNG and LANGER.

JOHN J. PREBASKE,
Post Commander.
GLEN W. ROTT,
Post Adjutant.

ESTABLISHMENT AND MAINTENANCE OF A NATIONAL SEED STORAGE FACILITY—RESOLUTION

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a resolution adopted by the executive committee of the Greater North Dakota Association–North Dakota State Chamber of Commerce, at Fargo, N. Dak., on April 27, 1955, favoring the enactment of legislation to establish and maintain a national seed storage facility.

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

RESOLUTION ON NATIONAL SEED STORAGE FACILITY

Whereas a national seed storage facility is badly needed in this country to provide a germ plasm bank which will insure protection of the widely diversified sources of breeding material in our national and State programs for developing superior varieties of plants; and

Whereas agriculture, the backbone of North Dakota's economy, could be greatly aided by the establishment of such a national seed storage facility; and

Whereas a third of all the grains introduced from all over the world in the past 50 years have been destroyed because of the loss of germination due largely to improper storage facilities; and

Whereas due to this loss of breeding lines research work has been seriously handicapped in many cases: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the executive committee of the Greater North Dakota Association, North Dakota State Chamber of Commerce, in session at Fargo this 27th day of April 1955, That all help possible be given to secure necessary Federal funds to establish and maintain a national seed storage facility suitable to provide proper storage for a germ plasm bank for our grain.

HOMER W. LUDWICK,
Executive Secretary.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

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

S. 922. A bill to amend the Domestic Minerals Program Extension Act of 1953 in order to further extend the program to encourage the discovery, development, and production of certain domestic minerals; with an amendment (Rept. No. 359).

By Mr. LONG, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs; with amendments:

S. 1464. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to acquire certain rights-of-

way and timber access roads (Rept. No. 364); and

S. 1747. A bill to increase the public benefits from the national park system by facilitating the management of museum properties relating thereto, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 365).

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

S. 180. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Washita River Basin reclamation project, Oklahoma; with amendments (Rept. No. 361); and

H. R. 103. A bill to provide for the construction of distribution systems on authorized Federal reclamation projects by irrigation districts and other public agencies; with an amendment (Rept. No. 362).

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

S. 1755. A bill to amend the act of April 6, 1949, as amended, and the act of August 31, 1954, so as to provide that the rate of interest on certain loans made under such acts shall not exceed 3 percent per annum; without amendment (Rept. No. 363).

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

S. 1138. A bill to continue the effectiveness of the act of July 17, 1953 (67 Stat. 177), as amended, providing certain construction and other authority; without amendment (Rept. No. 367).

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

H. R. 3885. A bill to amend the act of April 29, 1941, to authorize the waiving of the requirement of performance and payment bonds in connection with certain Coast Guard contracts; without amendment (Rept. No. 366).

ELECTION OF PRESIDENT AND VICE PRESIDENT—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, from the Committee on the Judiciary, I report favorably, without amendment, the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 31) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States providing for the election of President and Vice President, and I submit a report (No. 360) thereon.

The report relates to a joint resolution submitted by the distinguished junior Senator from Texas [Mr. DANIEL], and pertains to the so-called Lodge-Gossett bill passed by the Senate 3 or 4 years ago.

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

SUMMARY OF REPORT OF ARMED SERVICES SUBCOMMITTEE ON CIVIL DEFENSE

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, the Committee on Armed Services this morning approved a report of the Subcommittee on Civil Defense which had held hearings to study the problems of civil defense. I believe the report will be of interest to those who are concerned with administering civil defense, and also to the people of the Nation. I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a short summary of the report.

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

SUMMARY OF REPORT OF ARMED SERVICES SUBCOMMITTEE ON CIVIL DEFENSE BY SENATOR KEFAUVER

This subcommittee, consisting of myself (chairman), Senators SYMINGTON, JACKSON, SALTONSTALL, and MARGARET CHASE SMITH, has held extensive hearings for the purpose of examining the policies and operations of the present civil defense program. The subcommittee issued its interim report in order to summarize its finding and recommendations at an appropriate interval during its examination.

In the report the subcommittee found that:

1. Due to lack of progress, the country is presently unprepared to deal with a successful H-bomb attack, with the result that millions of lives possibly could be lost due to the inability to evacuate the cities and care for evacuees.

2. The United States is becoming increasingly vulnerable to an H-bomb attack due to the Russian development of thermonuclear weapons and of heavy jet bombers which are aimed in the direction of the United States.

3. Despite the fact that evacuation of target areas is the only alternative in case of attack, there are presently no adequate evacuation plans for such areas. The report notes that if a 20-megaton weapon were dropped on a city containing a million people in a central area 10 miles across, about 900,000 would be killed if they remained in that area. If they could all move outward 15 miles, probably fewer than 10,000 would be casualties from a direct strike of the weapon.

4. No present plans exist for feeding the evacuated populations.

5. The Nation is medically unprepared to meet an attack. No adequate plans exist for mass medical care or for organizing the vast medical resources of the country.

6. The knowledge concerning radioactive fallout creates an added dimension to the civil-defense problem, requiring erection of protective shelters, research on fallout patterns, and the effect of radiation on all living things.

7. The roads and highways from our large cities are not adequate for civil-defense evacuation. The Federal Government should bear the principal burden for additional evacuation highways. The current road bill should be amended for this purpose.

8. The FCDA has an advisory committee of outstanding citizens who are acutely interested and well versed in problems of civil defense. The FCDA Administrator should call this committee into session for consultation more frequently.

9. The present weakness in the civil-defense program should not be aimed solely at the Federal Civil Defense Administration. The relatively insignificant place occupied by the Federal Civil Defense Administration in the Federal Government, together with its relatively small staff and its physical location, create basic difficulties which, unless resolved, could make unlikely any successful operation of the agency.

The subcommittee in its report recommended that:

1. The President assume the personal responsibility for providing the leadership which will develop an adequate civil-defense program—that he frankly tell the American people what would happen to our target areas in the event of a successful H-bomb attack, and then state in plain terms what the Federal Government intends to do to meet this possibility.

2. The Federal Government assume the responsibility for developing plans for evacuation, mass feeding, and for the medical care of people in case of an attack.

3. The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare has shown commendable initiative in carrying out the delegations given to this Department. Secretary Hobby, in addition to placing responsibilities with her capable Assistant Secretaries, has personally taken an active interest in the whole problem of civil defense. Secretary Hobby's activities, however, are handicapped because of the lack of policy decisions as to who is responsible for sheltering, feeding, and clothing evacuees from target areas. These problems are beyond the capacities of the States alone to meet. The report emphasized that these problems would also require at the same time full utilization of State and local resources.

4. The Federal Government utilize more extensively its authority to delegate civil-defense responsibilities to the various Federal agencies.

5. The question be resolved and clarified in the executive branch as to what responsibilities, if any, the military services should assume in the civil-defense program.

6. The Federal Civil Defense Administration should assume the responsibility for coordination of planning in target areas which overlap several State boundaries.

7. Highway program.

8. Civil-defense advisory committee.

9. Among the broad policy questions, the subcommittee noted the need for: (a) Clarifying the matter of proper division of fiscal responsibilities between the States and the Federal Government; (b) a policy on the sharing of resources in case of attack; and (c) reconsideration of a revised policy on dispersal. It was noted that the subcommittee intends to recommend the formation of a commission to study the dispersal matter.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

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

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

S. 2009. A bill to remove the manufacturers' excise tax from the sales of certain component parts for use in other manufactured articles, and to confine to entertainment type equipment the tax on radio and television apparatus; to the Committee on Finance.

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

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey:

S. 2010. A bill for the relief of Jose dos Santos Soares; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SALTONSTALL (for Mr. KENNEDY):

S. 2011. A bill for the relief of Andonios Demetrios Dilbois; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BEALL:

S. 2012. A bill for the relief of Chong You How (also known as Edward Charles Yee), his wife, Eng Lai Fong, and his child, Chong Yim Keung; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCHOEPPEL:

S. 2013. A bill to provide for an emergency wheat program to be effective in 1956 if producers disapprove marketing quotas for the 1956 wheat crop; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

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

By Mr. WILLIAMS:

S. 2014. A bill to strengthen the law with respect to bribery and graft; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

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

By Mr. LANGER:

S. 2015. A bill to prohibit experiments upon living dogs in the District of Columbia and providing a penalty for violation thereof; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

S. 2016. A bill for the relief of Lawrence F. Kramer;

S. 2017. A bill to amend title 18 of the United States Code so as to prohibit the misuse by collecting agencies of names, emblems, and insignia to indicate Federal agency; and

S. 2018. A bill for the relief of certain individuals whose land was flooded by action of the Federal Government; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CARLSON:

S. 2019. A bill to amend the Federal Employees' Group Life Insurance Act of 1954; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

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

By Mr. MANSFIELD:

S. 2020. A bill for the relief of Carmen Aguado; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MUNDT:

S. 2021. A bill to provide that payments be made to certain members of the Pine Ridge Sioux Tribe of Indians as reimbursement for damages suffered as the result of the establishment of the Pine Ridge aerial gunnery range, and to provide a rehabilitation program for the Pine Ridge Sioux Tribe of Indians; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BENDER:

S. 2022. A bill for the relief of Arnold Rosenthal; and

S. 2023. A bill for the relief of Panayiotis (John) Foradis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2024. A bill to amend the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 to extend the authority of the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to make direct loans, and to authorize the Administrator to make additional types of direct loans thereunder, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. HUMPHREY:

S. J. Res. 72. Joint resolution to establish a Joint Committee on Natural Resources; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

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

AMENDMENT OF INTERNAL REVENUE CODE RELATING TO REMOVAL OF CERTAIN MANUFACTURERS' EXCISE TAXES

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, and the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to remove the manufacturers' excise tax from the sales of certain component parts for use in other manufactured articles, and to confine to entertainment-type equipment the tax on radio and television apparatus. I ask unanimous consent that a statement accompanying the bill may be printed in the RECORD.

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

The bill (S. 2009) to remove the manufacturers' excise tax from the sales of certain component parts for use in other manufactured articles, and to confine to entertainment-type equipment the tax on radio and television apparatus, introduced by Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania (for himself and Mr. DIRKSEN), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

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

STATEMENT TO ACCOMPANY S. 2009

GENERAL STATEMENT

The bill will provide for certain minor technical amendments to the administrative provisions of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 relating to the Federal manufacturers' excise taxes imposed by chapter 32.

Under existing law and administrative practice, repair and replacement parts for automobiles, household-type refrigerators, etc., may be sold tax-free for use by the vendee in the further manufacture of other articles, whether or not these other articles are subject to manufacturers' excise taxes. Section 1 of the bill codifies these provisions and makes them uniformly applicable to all repair and replacement parts, including parts for radio and television receivers and camera lenses.

Section 2 of the bill supplies a needed clarification of the original intent of Congress to confine the 10 percent manufacturers' excise tax on radio and television receiving sets to apparatus of the entertainment type. It would also remove the tax from chassis, speakers, amplifiers, power-supply units, antenna of the built-in type and phonograph mechanisms where the cost of compliance and enforcement is not warranted by the negligible revenues produced.

The enactment of the bill will—

1. Considerably ease excise administrative and compliance problems;

2. Avoid indirect taxation of articles which Congress has not deemed it desirable to subject to direct taxation;

3. Eliminate discrimination against manufacturers of repair and replacement parts where there are substitute parts not subject to tax; and,

4. Remove indirect tax now imposed upon States and municipalities and exports where taxable parts are bought for use by the vendee in the further manufacture of a nontaxable end article.

The enactment of the bill will result in a revenue loss of less than $2 million, a very substantial portion of which will be recouped from major savings in cost of compliance and enforcement.

DETAILED EXPLANATION OF BILL

Section 1. Sales of certain taxable component parts for use in other manufactured articles

Section 1 of the bill is identical (except with respect to effective dates) to section 12 (b) of H. R. 6440, 83d Congress, as reported by the Senate Finance Committee in Senate Report No. 2038. The statement of the Senate Finance Committee with respect to this provision is as follows:

"This section, which was added by your committee, provides that parts, accessories or components subject to manufacturers' excise taxes may be sold free of tax (or a refund or credit provided to the vendee where not so sold) if the vendee uses, or resells, them as material in the manufacture or production of, or as a component part of other articles, whether or not the other articles are subject to a manufacturers' excise tax. Parts, accessories or components presently subject to manufacturers' excise tax are automotive parts or accessories, refrigeration components, radio or television components, and camera lenses. Presently most of these parts or components are taxable if sold to a manufacturer for incorporation in an article not subject to a manufacturers' excise tax, or if sold for resale to such a manufacturer. This is true of radio and television components and camera lenses. Refrigerator components, however, are not taxable if sold for incorporation in, or as components of, refrigeration equipment whether or not such equipment is subject to manufacturers' excise tax. (This provision is eliminated by this bill as no longer necessary.) Under a ruling of the Internal Revenue Service issued in 1932, automotive parts and accessories (other than spark plugs, storage batteries, leaf springs, coils, timers, and tire chains), may be sold free of tax by one manufacturer to another manufacturer even though they are to be used in the manufacture of nontaxable articles. On the other hand, if such parts and accessories are sold taxpaid, no credit or refund may be claimed if they are used in the manufacture of nontaxable articles.

"The adoption of a single rule for these parts or components exempting them from tax where they are sold for incorporation in other end articles, whether or not the end articles are taxable, will result in a uniform application of these taxes and thereby provide greater equity and simplify administration and compliance. Providing for tax-free sales where the end products are not taxable also will prevent the indirect taxation of articles which Congress has not deemed it desirable to subject to direct excise taxation. Furthermore, where there are substitute components for these end articles which are not subject to tax, this removes the discrimination against the manufacturers of the taxable parts or components. Moreover, this will remove the indirect tax paid by States and municipalities, or with respect to articles produced for export, where these parts or components are purchased by manufacturers for incorporation in other articles. It is believed that the effect of this provision on revenues will be negligible."

Section 2. Radio and television receiving sets and component parts

Section 2 of the bill is identical (except with respect to effective dates) to section 8 (b) of H. R. 6440, 83d Congress. The statement of the Senate Finance Committee with respect to this provision is as follows:

"This section, which was added by your committee, provides that the 10 percent excise tax on radios, television sets, phonographs, automobile radio or television sets, and combination radio, television or phonograph sets, is to apply only if the article is of the entertainment type. It also limits to cabinets and tubes, the radio and television components which are to be taxable when sold separately from a set. Under the amendment the following items are exempt from tax: chassis, speakers, amplifiers, power supply units, antennas of the built-in type and phonograph mechanisms. The definition of radio and television components has also been changed so as to tax components for taxable sets, in lieu of components which are suitable for use on or in connection with, as component parts of taxable sets. The word for in this case is to be interpreted in the same manner as in the case of the excise tax on automobile parts and accessories, where it has been interpreted as taxing parts and accessories the primary use of which is in taxable motor vehicles. The above changes also make it possible to remove several provisions in present law relating to the special exemption for communication, detection and navigation receivers when sold to the United States Government, as these receivers will in any case be exempt under the new provisions since they are not of the entertainment type. This exemption, however, is preserved for any article with respect to which the tax is paid under section 3404 (a) or (b) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1939 as in effect

prior to the effective date of the amendments to such section. Therefore, any manufacturer, producer, or importer who has sold a receiver to the United States may still claim a credit or refund for the tax paid under section 3404 (a) or (b) for any article incorporated in such receiver.

"This excise tax has been limited to items of the entertainment type because your committee sees no reason for singling out special communication and navigation equipment used by businesses for special excise-tax levies. This is in conformance with similar actions taken by Congress in recent years in revising the tax bases of the excise taxes on photographic apparatus and film and electric, gas and oil appliances. Moreover, this change and the narrowing of taxable components to cabinets and tubes will considerably ease administrative and compliance problems under this tax. The revenue loss of the provisions in a full year of operation is estimated at $2 million."

EMERGENCY WHEAT PROGRAM

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to provide for an emergency wheat program to be effective in 1956 if producers disapprove marketing quotas for the 1956 wheat crop. Wheat producers will be asked to vote on the question of quotas on June 25.

Under the current law, producers have little choice in their vote. Simply stated, they choose between strict acreage controls at the minimum of 55 million acres with a price support of 80 to 82½ percent of parity or the same restricted acreage, 55 million, and a price support of 50 percent of parity. This is, in fact, no choice.

One of the most serious problems facing wheat producers, particularly in the quality wheat area, is that their acreages have been decreased to such an extent that they no longer have real economic units.

I believe the wheat producers, if given a choice of continuing under the minimum acreage—55 million—at a relatively high Government guaranteed price support, or a slightly relaxed acreage of 62 million for 1956, with a lower support, 70 percent Government guaranty, they will have a realistic choice to make.

The bill simply proposes that wheat producers be given a choice as described above in the referendum on June 25; and the program they choose will be in effect in 1956.

There is every indication that unless wheat farmers are given a realistic choice that the present market quota program may be disapproved. This means that the level of price support for wheat will be at only 50 percent of parity, roughly $1.19 a bushel. Under the program that I am proposing, if the producers should choose the higher acreage and a less Government guaranty, wheat would be supported at an average of about $1.66.

I believe that the Congress owes it to itself actually to find out through a referendum what producers think with regard to variable price supports. This will give Congress that opportunity.

I am hopeful that the Congress will act on this measure in time for it to be placed on the ballot. Failing to do this, I am sure that we must have this or some measure ready to put into effect should the farmers disapprove quotas.

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

The bill (S. 2013) to provide for an emergency wheat program to be effective in 1956 if producers disapprove marketing quotas for the 1956 wheat crop, introduced by Mr. SCHOEPPEL, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

STRENGTHENING THE LAW WITH RESPECT TO BRIBERY AND GRAFT

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to strengthen the law with respect to bribery and graft. I ask unanimous consent that a statement, prepared by me, relating to the bill, may be printed in the RECORD.

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

The bill (S. 2014) to strengthen the law with respect to bribery and graft, introduced by Mr. WILLIAMS, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The statement presented by Mr. WILLIAMS is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR WILLIAMS

The purpose of the bill is to strengthen the law with respect to bribery and graft.

In brief, it will discourage the questionable practice which has been constantly called to our attention by congressional committees whereby Government employees who held positions either in the procurement, lending, or revenue collecting agencies of the Government subsequently obtained rather lucrative positions with the same corporations they favored in negotiating contracts or loans.

This proposed legislation would not prevent the bona fide employment of a Government official by any company with whom he wished to become associated. It simply provides that when such employee accepts a position with a company with whom his agency did business during his period of Government service, the agency with whom he worked would be officially put on notice of his intentions to enter the employment of the company. With the Government properly on notice, the agency involved would have ample opportunity to discover those few cases wherein such employment could be questioned.

This proposed legislation was worked out with the cooperation of the Honorable Lindsay C. Warren, the former Comptroller General of the United States.

In a letter to me under date of August 18, 1950, Mr. Warren says, and I quote:

"The broad subject of Government officers and employees going to work for Government contractors long has been of deep concern to the General Accounting Office. Certainly there can be no objection to any legitimate efforts of such people to obtain employment in private industry, or to efforts of private industry to secure the services of qualified employees. But it is equally certain that arrangements of this kind must be consistent with the public interest. I think you will agree that there is inherent in the public service and in dealings with the Government, the requirements for exceptionally high standards of conduct.

"The real danger lies in the illicit inducement of Federal personnel by Government contractors, and solicitation by those personnel of an advantage from the contractor. As shown in my reports to the Congress and testimony before its committees, this may take the form of highly remunerative positions, or expensive entertainment, or other things of value, in return for special favors or privileges for the contractors. Often it originates or is implemented by veiled or outright connivance on the part of the Government people involved. Whether consummated or not, such dealings are inimical to the interests of the United States. They are nothing less than plain bribery."

The former Comptroller General then suggested certain amendments to strengthen those sections of the criminal statutes, Nos. 201 and 202, dealing with the bribery of Government officers and employees, and they are contained in the first part of my bill.

A new section is added at the end of chapter 11. It is designed to provide information which will form the basis for more effective action to implement the criminal statutes as well as the present safeguards for the expenditure of public funds.

The mere existence of these provisions on the statute books would have a powerful deterrent effect. The intent and the overt act to defeat the public interest or defraud the United States, by connivance between Government employees and contractors for future employment, would be punishable. Yet those whose arrangements are entirely legal and ethical would not be penalized. They would have ample protection to do what the honest businessman does in the everyday course of business. At the same time the Government, through information given to the agencies, would have effective means to check on the legality of the dealings with special reference to established safeguards for the expenditure of public funds.

This bill has been recommended by the Comptroller General as being necessary and I cannot urge too strongly, in view of the extensive Government procurement, that it be given favorable consideration.

AMENDMENT OF FEDERAL EMPLOYEES' GROUP LIFE INSURANCE ACT

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, the Civil Service Commission has sent to the Vice President suggestions for changes in the Federal Employees' Group Life Insurance Act of 1954—Public Law 598.

As chairman of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service in the 83d Congress, it was my privilege to sponsor the legislation. It has been well received by the Federal employees. Experience under the act has demonstrated that some changes would improve the act. I therefore introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend the Federal Employees' Group Life Insurance Act of 1954, and I ask unanimous consent that it may be printed in the RECORD.

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

The bill (S. 2019) to amend the Federal Employees' Group Life Insurance Act of 1954, introduced by Mr. CARLSON, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the third proviso of section 7 (d) of the Federal Employees' Group Life Insurance Act of 1954 is hereby repealed.

SEC. 2. Section 7 (e) of such act is amended to read as follows:

"(e) The companies eligible to participate as reinsurers and the amount of insurance under the policy or policies to be allocated to each issuing company or reinsurer may be redetermined by the Commission for and in advance of any policy year after the first, on a basic consistent with subsections (c) and (d) of this section, with any modifications thereof it deems appropriate to carry out the intent of such subsections, and based on each participating company's group life insurance in force, excluding that under any policy or policies purchased under this act, in the United States on the most recent December 31 for which information is available to it, and shall be so redetermined in a similar manner not less often than every 3 years or at any time that any participating company withdraws from participation: *Provided*, That if, upon any such redetermination, in the case of any issuing company or reinsurer which insured employees of the Federal Government on December 31, 1953, under policies issued to an association of Federal employees, the amount which results from the application of the formula referred to in subsection (d) of this section is less than the total decrease, if any, since December 31, 1953, in the amount of each company's insurance under such policies, the amount allocated to such company shall be increased to the amount of such decrease."

SEC. 3. Section 10 of such act is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 10 (a) The Commission is authorized to arrange with any nonprofit association of Federal employees for the assumption by the fund of any existing life insurance agreements of such association with, or for the benefit of, those of its members retired or otherwise separated from the Federal service who consent to the transfer and deposit required by subsections (c) and (d) of this section, and the Commission is further authorized to insure the obligations assumed with any company or companies meeting the requirements of section 7 (a).

"(b) Any such arrangement shall provide that premium payments by such insured members shall thereafter be made at the same rates to the fund, under such conditions as the Commission may prescribe.

"(c) Any such arrangement shall further provide that, upon the termination of the association's life insurance agreements under subsection (d) and the distribution of its assets, there be transferred to and deposited in the fund the shares of the total assets of the life insurance fund of such association that would otherwise actually be due to those retired or separated members who consent to have their shares so transferred: *Provided*, That the transfer of assets of any association hereunder shall be accomplished in accordance with the procedures and conditions prescribed by the Commission, and in accordance with the requirements of any applicable law of a State of the United States or of the District of Columbia.

"(d) The arrangements authorized by this section shall be made only with those associations which terminte all life insurance agreements with, or for the benefit of, their insured members within 6 calendar months following the date of enactment of this amending act, or such later date as the Commission may agree when there are extenuating circumstances, but not later than August 17, 1957, and such arrangements shall apply only to life insurance grants to any insured member before January 1, 1954.

"(e) The fund shall not assume liability for life insurance as provided in this section in respect to a person who is insured under other provisions of this act, and the liability for life insurance assumed by the fund as provided in this section shall terminate with respect to any person who becomes insured under other provisions of this act."

JOINT COMMITTEE ON NATURAL RESOURCES

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a joint resolution to provide for the creation by the Congress of a Joint Committee on Natural Resources between the Senate and the House of Representatives, a bipartisan joint committee, to serve as a watchdog group to protect the public's interest in developing sound, coordinated national conservation policies, and safeguarding the execution of those policies.

Last year, I introduced a joint resolution calling for creation of such a joint committee. A similar joint resolution was introduced in the House of Representatives. While no action was taken last year, considerable interest has been evidenced in this proposal by sportsmen of America and conservationists generally. For that reason, I am again introducing the joint resolution this year, and urging active support for its adoption.

Every study pertaining to resource development has pointed to the need for greater policy coordination within the executive branch. New recommendations toward that objective are expected to be forthcoming soon from the Commission on Intergovernmental Relations. I feel very strongly we in the Congress should put our own house in order and provide the proper mechanism for similar policy coordination within the legislative branch.

My views about the urgent need for some such action were outlined recently in an article entitled "Protecting America's Natural Resources," which appeared in the winter issue of Heartland, the United States-Canadian Quarterly of Inland America. Because it explains the proposal in detail, I ask unanimous consent for the article to be published at this point in the RECORD.

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

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 72) to establish a Joint Committee on Natural Resources, introduced by Mr. HUMPHREY, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

The article presented by Mr. HUMPHREY is as follows:

PROTECTING AMERICA'S NATURAL RESOURCES

(By Senator HUBERT M. HUMPHREY)

The American people are quite properly concerned over indications that we as a nation may be slipping backward from some of the great conservation policies established since the days of President Theodore Roosevelt.

Much of our Nation's strength and progress has been made possible by our abundance of great natural resources—land, water, timber, oil, and minerals—and the wisdom with which we have developed and used them.

We who are from the great heartland of America, so rich in the abundance of such resources, are particularly concerned with their wise use and preservation for generations yet unborn.

But we have long ago learned the dangers of exploiting and wasting these valuable resources.

We know they are not unlimited. We know that they must be carefully safeguarded from exhaustion.

We have seen what happened down through history to other civilizations, when they exploited their resources beyond replenishment.

We cannot let that happen in our country.

We have tried to make certain it will not happen, as a matter of public policy.

For years we have responded to the will of the people by establishing safeguards over the uses of these resources, and sought to protect them for future generations to share.

Yet, shortsighted pressures still exist for raids on these great national treasures. There are those who would be willing to exploit them for whatever immediate profit they could obtain, regardless of the consequences in the future.

We have seen those forces at work in virtually every field of natural resources; we have seen develop a growing demand for abrupt turnabout in public policy that would cause Gifford Pinchot to roll over in his grave.

Now, if never before, we need a strong revival of a crusading spirit for the protection of our vast forests; for protection and proper development of our water resources; for protection of our soil fertility on our farms; for the safeguarding of our petroleum resources.

We need firm national conservation policies, embracing all forms of natural resources, and putting foremost the public's stake in preservation of such resources for useful purposes in generations to come.

One of our great weaknesses in development of national conservation policies has been the multitude of agencies and groups concerned with different phases of the conservation problem.

We have conservation responsibilities and problems in the Department of Agriculture, the Department of Interior, the Department of Commerce, the Army engineers.

We have conservation policies being passed upon in various forms by the Senate Committees on Agriculture and Forestry, on Interior and Insular Affairs, and on Public Works.

Often we in the legislative branch of government have protested and objected to overlapping or duplicating authorities in the executive branch; we have also protested lack of effective coordination where divided responsibility exists.

There seem to be sound grounds for creation of a Joint Committee on Natural Resources between the Senate and the House of Representatives—a bipartisan joint committee.

Last year, I introduced a resolution in the Senate calling for creation of such a joint committee. A similar resolution was introduced in the House. While no action was taken last year, considerable interest has been evidenced in this proposal by sportsmen of America, and conservationists generally. For that reason, I am again introducing the resolution in Congress this year, and urging active support for its adoption.

It would be a watchdog committee to help develop sound, coordinated national conservation policies, and safeguard the execution of those policies.

It is not the purpose of the resolution to interfere with or curtail existing functions of any congressional committees with reference to conservation of national resources; rather, it would create supplemental functions that should be helpful to all of the existing committees.

The purpose of the joint committee would be to investigate the operations and effects of all Federal statutes dealing with natural resources, to investigate the administration of such statutes by the executive depart-

ments, boards, bureaus, agencies, independent establishments and instrumentalities of the Government charged with their administration, and to make such other investigations with respect to conservation of natural resources as the joint committee should deem necessary.

The committee would be required to make reports to the Senate and House from time to time concerning the results of its investigations, together with such recommendations as it deems advisable.

The resolution calls for a Joint Committee on Natural Resources consisting of 16 members, 8 from each of the 2 Houses of Congress, to be appointed by the Speaker of the House and the President of the Senate, with not more than 8 of the members being from any one political party.

In the meantime, there is much that the executive branch of our Government can and should do toward developing a more forward-looking resource development program before the Congress.

Circumstances of world or domestic conditions may be the controlling factor in deciding when some of the greatly needed improvements can be carried out. But the advance planning for what must eventually be done can and should be started now.

During the sharp dip in employment last summer and fall, much talk was heard about having a shelf of available public-works projects to create employment and maintain purchasing power.

Many of us hope our great natural resources are not overlooked in the development of any such backlog or shelf of potentially desirable projects. All of us know of the great and lasting contributions made to our country by the Civilian Conservation Corps in years gone by, both in physical improvements to our parks and forests and in the rehabilitation of young men who might have become wandering derelicts and delinquents had it not been for useful, healthful, outdoor employment.

We need to be thinking about a similar program for the future—having it ready to go into action immediately if ever again we suffer a sharp slump in our domestic economy that deprives young people of jobs and hope and a future.

We need imaginative thinking—looking into the future.

The demand on these resources is going to be greater and greater as our population soars. We need soon to take stock and prepare for the future.

Nearly a year ago I called on the United States Forest Service, the United States Soil Conservation Service, the National Park Service, and the Fish and Wildlife Service to start thinking about future public-works projects that would make productive contributions to our country's future, as well as provide temporary employment in rural as well as urban areas. I hope it stimulated some constructive thinking. From the letters I have received from these important agencies charged with the responsibility of protecting our resources, they are eager to undertake such efforts—if only there is a public awakening to the need.

Let me quote from a portion of my reply from the United States Forest Service:

"Your suggestion for development of a backlog of public-works projects in forestry is an excellent one. * * *

"We are very much in accord with your views that such a program can make substantial contributions in forest and related resource developments, as well as providing rural and urban employment in productive work. This fact is too little recognized by many of the advocates of public-work programs who have considered them as exclusively construction of large dams, buildings, highways, and projects of that type. Forest and forest-range land treatment have often been omitted from public-works programs—despite the importance that proper forest land treatment and protection can have on minimizing construction needs for downstream flood-control structures."

What are we waiting for, America?

Sooner or later we are going to need a more comprehensive program of protecting and improving our great national treasures—the timber, range, recreation, water, and wildlife resources of our land.

The idea of a watchdog committee in the Congress on natural resources is a step in that direction.

It is a call to protect the public's interests that should not be ignored.

It is an opportunity to aid, not raid, our natural resources.

I hope conservationists of our country will rally to its support.

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. HUMPHREY:

Address entitled "Winning the Cold War," delivered by Senator JOHNSON of Texas at a dinner honoring Gen. David Sarnoff, at the Waldorf-Astoria Hotel, in New York City, on May 15, 1955.

By Mr. DOUGLAS:

Statement made by him on his own behalf and for Senators HUMPHREY, KEFAUVER, and WILEY, introducing leaders of the Mayors' Committee to members of the press on May 18.

NOTICE OF HEARINGS ON S. 1256, TO PROVIDE FOR THE APPOINTMENT OF ADDITIONAL CIRCUIT AND DISTRICT JUDGES, AND OTHER RELATED BILLS

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. President, on behalf of the standing Subcommittee on Improvements in Judicial Machinery of the Committee on the Judiciary, I desire to give notice that public hearings have been scheduled to commence on Thursday, May 26, 1955, at 10 a. m., in room 424, Senate Office Building, on S. 1256, to provide for the appointment of additional circuit and district judges, and other related bills. At the indicated time and place all persons interested in the proposed legislation may make such representations as may be pertinent. The subcommittee consists of myself, chairman; the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN]; the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY]; the Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS]; and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. WELKER].

NOTICE OF HEARINGS ON S. 972 BY THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON BANKING OF THE COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY

Mr. FREAR. Mr. President, on behalf of the Subcommittee on Banking of the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency, I desire to give notice that a public hearing will be held on S. 972 relating to the regulation of branches of Federal savings and loan associations. This hearing will begin at 10 a. m., Tuesday, May 31, 1955, in room 301, Senate Office Building.

All persons who desire to appear and testify at the hearing are requested to notify Mr. J. H. Yingling, chief clerk, Committee on Banking and Currency, room 303, Senate Office Building, telephone National 8-3120, extension 865, before the close of business on Thursday, May 26, 1955.

THE CREDO OF THE LATE SENATOR CLYDE R. HOEY

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, May 12, 1955, marked the first anniversary of the passing of my beloved predecessor, Senator Clyde Roark Hoey, who rightly merited and enjoyed to an unsurpassed degree the affection, the admiration, and the confidence of the people of North Carolina. Senator Hoey met with complete courage the trying problems which confronted him as citizen, churchman, advocate, State legislator, Representative in Congress, governor and Senator. He was able to do this because of his personal credo, which he entitled, "This I Believe." Senator Hoey's credo contains inspiration for all who will read it. For this reason, I ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the body of the RECORD.

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

I believe in faith. I have always had faith. As an adolescent I pondered the full-orbed canopy of the far-extended skyline and believed that there was a great first cause—God. To me there was no other explanation of the universe and no other assurance of protection and guidance. When 12 years of age I was privileged to work in a printing office for long hours daily and many times far into the night. After concluding the labors of the day and night, I would walk along a dark and lonely road, through woods and uninhabited sections for a long mile to my home. Scared of the dark, yes; afraid, to be sure; but armed with a heavy hickory walking stick, I looked up into a starlit sky and thought of my free heritage and believed in a Father God and would not admit my fears to even my colaborers. From the standpoint of the world I was unafraid. I am still unafraid.

Growing into manhood, with manifold responsibilities and perplexing problems, requiring all the resources of which I was capable, there was the constant and increasing need for some reservoir of power that could be tapped in periods of emergencies and hours of crises. In my faith I discovered that reservoir.

I found matrimony a happy estate. Blessed with a radiant and lovely life companion, the establishment and maintenance of a home was a high adventure, and the coming of children into that home brought the full realization of the joy and happiness possible only in this most honored and ancient of earth's institutions. Ten years ago, after 42 years of happy married life, my wife and the mother of my children passed to her reward. My faith in her and her faith in God linger as a blessed heritage in the sanctuary of holy memories. Faith has been indispensable amid the sorrows and sadnesses of life, and has been exhilarating and sustaining in periods of joy and triumph. The experience gained through the years, and whatever learning or knowledge I have acquired, have not lessened, but rather increased, my faith in a God who guides the destiny of nations and individuals and who even marks the falling of a sparrow.

Conscious of my own shortcomings and sins, ashamed of my failures and omissions of duty, and fully mindful of the unfaithfulness which has marked my life, I have never doubted the wisdom and goodness,

the might and the mercy of a gracious, loving Heavenly Father—God.

I join the late great Kansas editor, William Allen White, when he said in a period of crisis, "I am not afraid of tomorrow. I have seen yesterday. I love today, and I face tomorrow unafraid." There are many clouds on the horizon of America. I have had and shall have many dark nights, but there has never yet been a night dark enough to put out the stars—and there shall not be. This is still "my Father's world." And my faith abides.

STEPS TAKEN TO COMBAT PUBLICATION OF COMMUNIST LITERATURE IN JAPAN

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, recently it has been my privilege to have had some contact and communication with the Director of the United States Information Agency, Mr. Theodore C. Streibert, as well as with his very able and competent deputy, Mr. Abbott Washburn. I have written to the United States Information Agency and the respective officials of that organization concerning certain developments in the field of information; and I have received, in reply, a letter dated April 4, which I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

UNITED STATES INFORMATION AGENCY,
Washington, April 4, 1955.

The Honorable HUBERT H. HUMPHREY,
United States Senate.

DEAR HUBERT: This is a preliminary acknowledgment of your good letter to Ted Streibert of March 29 about the overseas information program. Ted is currently out of the city.

With regard to the Communists' cheap-book program in Japan, we are attempting as best we can to meet this with activities about which Dr. Franklin Burdette, Chief of our Information Center Service, will shortly write you. It presents a difficult, complex problem of which money is only a part.

The Neue Zeitung, in West Berlin, was closed not for financial reasons but because German-owned West Berlin newspapers are now fully able to bring complete news from the free world viewpoint to their readers. In the opinion of Ambassador Conant and ourselves, there was no longer any necessity or desirability of a United States Government-owned newspaper in Berlin. Our Berlin Radio Station RIAS, however, continues in full operation as it is the primary source of truthful news for the people of East Berlin and East Germany.

Short-wave voice programs to Finland did not appear to be fully effective at the time they were discontinued—months ago. Accordingly they were sacrificed in the overall 37 percent congressional slash in budget for this work. (Final Truman year: $122.5 million; fiscal 1954: $76 million (net); fiscal 1955: $77.1 million.)

We have requested increases for the work in Burma and India for fiscal 1956, and will know our chances when the House subcommittee markup becomes public on April 13. Are the reports you mention receiving from these countries something you would care to pass along to us? If so, I would like to have them studied by our assistant directors for these areas.

General Gruenther is, of course, right about the enormous jamming capability of the Soviet. Our signals do, however, get through and the evidence shows they are eagerly listened to. The Soviet bloc is currently beaming to foreign peoples some 1,675 hours of broadcasting weekly (Soviet Union, 623 hours; satellites, 812 hours; Red China, 88 hours; clandestine and other sources 152 hours). The Voice transmits some 894 hours weekly (as of March 1, 1955). And we, of course, do no jamming. For us to try to match the Soviet operation, program for program and transmitter for transmitter, would involve tremendous additional appropriations. I am not sure that such a course would be as productive as other avenues of information work.

We are asking Congress for an increase of $1.5 million for radio in fiscal '56. Our total requested increase for USIA amounts to roughly $12 million, which is just about what we asked last year—of which we finally got a little over $1 million. Sincerely hope we do better this year.

With great appreciation for your continued active interest and help.

Sincerely,

ABBOTT WASHBURN,
Deputy Director.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I called to the attention of Mr. Streibert a very serious problem developing in Japan, where the Red Chinese Government has been literally flooding the Japanese market with cheap literature, the price being so cheap as to make such publications readily available to any of the persons in Japan who would wish to purchase such books.

I called this matter to the attention of the United States Information Agency. I am pleased to note that in a letter dated April 12, Mr. Franklin L. Burdette, Chief of the Information Center Service, informed me, in reply, that the United States Government, in cooperation with certain private institutions, is taking very effective steps to combat this flood of cheap literature—and I mean "cheap" as to both text and price—which is coming upon the Japanese market.

I think the Senate will be interested to know that about 90 Japanese publishers issue translations of American books, as compared to about 1 dozen Japanese publishers who now issue Communist or pro-Communist books.

Mr. President, I commend this matter to the attention of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, as well as to the attention of all Members of the Senate.

I ask unanimous consent that the letters to which I have referred be printed at this point in the body of the RECORD.

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

MARCH 29, 1955.

THEODORE C. STREIBERT,
Director, United States Information Agency, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. STREIBERT: It seems that I have been burdening you a great deal of late with requests for information and suggestions that have been sent along from constituents. I hope you will permit me to continue to do this, because I do so in the spirit of being helpful and not critical. Again let me assure you that I have a high regard for the United States Information Agency and the work that it is doing. I only regret that it is not permitted to do more due to what I believe to be inadequate appropriations.

Just the other day I received a letter from a friend of mine in Japan. This friend has been in Japan for several years and has a fairly good understanding of what goes on. My informant stated as follows:

"There is one thing that you ought to do something about. We understand that tons of cheap literature is brought into Japan from Red China and/or Russia. The price is only 20 or 50 yen so that anyone can afford to read it. Japan is a nation that reads. You can be sure that nothing favorable about America will be found in these books. Why cannot similar material to promote good will for America be placed in Japanese bookshops? True, there are probaby hundreds of free pamphlets. That is just the point. How can a bookshop dealer make any profit on free books? The books or pamphlets should be priced cheap enough for the consumer and high enough to give the bookshop owner a small profit."

Just what is the situation concerning American books and periodicals in Japanese bookshops? I am becoming ever increasingly concerned about the insufficiency and inadequacies of our information services. The closing down of the American-sponsored newspaper in Berlin last month, then our Voice of America program in Finland, along with reports that I continue to receive from Burma and India alarm me. What are we going to do about these developments? Surely this rich country can afford to tell its story to the world. General Gruenther testifying in executive session before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee told us only last Saturday that the Soviet Union was spending hundreds of millions of dollars every year just to jam or block reception of Voice of America broadcasts in the Soviet. I believe the record will reveal that he stated the Soviet spends more money to jam our broadcasts than we spend on our entire Voice of America program. Surely our America can match the Soviet, or are we about to confess that the dictatorship of the proletariat has more capital and finance than the Republic of the United States.

Sincerely yours,

HUBERT H. HUMPHREY.

UNITED STATES INFORMATION AGENCY,
Washington, April 12, 1955.

The Honorable HUBERT H. HUMPHREY,
United States Senate.

DEAR SENATOR HUMPHREY: Mr. Streibert has requested that I write to you about the activities we are conducting to meet the Communists' cheap book program in Japan, which you mentioned in your letter of March 29 addressed to him.

According to information supplied by the National Diet Library in Tokyo, there are now published in Japan more books translated from American than from Soviet Russian sources. In 1952 the opposite situation prevailed. The two major factors responsible for this reversal appear to be the extended activities of commercial agents, particularly Charles E. Tuttle & Co., representing United States publishers, and the expanded atcivity of USIS Tokyo. USIS activity is focused chiefly upon increasing the general knowledge of American books among Japanese publishers and intellectuals—through the issuance of a monthly Japanese-language book review, Beisho Dayori—and upon encouraging the publication of important American books by Japanese publishers with various means of USIS assistance. As a result, our competitive standing with Japanese book publishers is better than that of the Russians.

About 90 Japanese publishers issue translations of American books compared to about a dozen who put out Communist or pro-Communist books.

The Japanese book situation is more serious, however, when our books are compared with those coming from Communist China. Since 1953 cheap translations of books from Peking and Shanghai have become noticeably more plentiful. In order to meet this situation, we added last month to the staff of USIS Tokyo an officer who will be mainly concerned with developing large Japanese editions of American books which will sell

at the equivalent of 10 cents. The distribution of these books, beyond the usual bookstore outlets, and in our lack of a disciplined volunteer organized sales force similar to that of the Communists, will also require the attention of this officer. We aim to get these books particularly into the hands of Japanese students.

I should also like to mention the influence of the libraries in the cultural centers which we support in Japan. More than 300,000 American books are contained in these libraries and they are constantly used and highly regarded by Japanese students and intellectuals.

I deeply appreciate your interest in the overseas book program.

Sincerely yours,

FRANKLIN L. BURDETTE,
Chief, Information Center Service.

REPORT TO THE PRESIDENT BY THE SECRETARY OF STATE ON HIS RECENT TRIP TO EUROPE

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, as all of us know, on last Tuesday night, at 7 p. m., the Secretary of State, John Foster Dulles, made his report to the President and to the American people, by means of television, on his recent trip to Europe. His report is of such importance that I believe it should be read by all of us. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that the report and colloquy on that occasion with the President be printed in the body of the RECORD.

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

The PRESIDENT. Foster, it is good to have you here to tell us something of the significant events that took place during your recent visit to Europe. You realize that through the cameras in this room your report will go to the entire Nation. And so I hope that in addition to the details of that trip, you will tell us something about the developing scene in the international field as you see it, and something of the prospects for real progress in our incessant search for peace.

Mr. DULLES. Well, Mr. President, I am delighted to have a chance to report to you and to my Cabinet associates, and as you say, the American people, on what took place, particularly during this last week, a week so crowded with events that I hardly know how to start. But you might——

The PRESIDENT. Well, I will tell you, Foster, I think that it might be well to go clear back to 2 years ago. Then you will remember with our colleagues in the legislative branch on both parties the administration was developing the policies intended to produce, and basic to that policy was the belief—the conviction—that only through cooperative strength developed in the free world could we really face up to this threat that the Communist dictatorship posed to all free men. We believed, as you know, that until Western Europe had been united, until there were some German forces joining the NATO organization, and until we had some confidence in the Russian word through deeds rather than mere protestation, that it would do little good to have talks with them. And you will realize that you and I finally decided that I should make some pronouncement along this line, and did so, on April 16 of 1953.

Now we agreed at that time that if we could, through the kind of steps I have just mentioned, arrive at the point where we had a real basis for going ahead, even if only with faint hope of real progress, that we might finally develop between ourselves and with the Soviets a new relationship that would at least allow some hope of progress toward this great goal of peace that is of course the great dream of every American.

So, against that kind of backdrop, I think you could relate the events of recent times and on your—just your recent trip to Europe, to tell us about the story as you see it

Mr. DULLES. Well, Mr. President, I certainly remember that speech that you refer to. It has been a kind of bible for us in the State Department in the 2 years and some months that have elapsed since then

What happened last week is to a very large extent a coming true of the things that we hoped for and planned at that time. And indeed I think now one can say that what happened may really mark a turning in the tide of history.

The first thing—the thing that you talked about at that time as of utmost importance—was this consolidation of Western Europe and the bringing into NATO of the Federal Republic of Germany as a free and independent, sovereign state. Well, you recall, and probably some of the television audience will recall, because I reported on it at the Cabinet meeting, you remember last October, we signed up at that time the treaties that were to bring this to pass.

But as we have learned through hard experience, there is quite a lot of difference, sometimes, between signing treaties and having treaties ratified and come into force. And in this case there was a terrific battle to bring about, of course, the coming into being of those treaties. And it was a hard battle because the Soviet Union went all-out with everything it had to prevent those ratifications, and there had to be ratifications in 15 countries. Many of them had to act through 2 legislative bodies. And if any one had slipped up, the whole scheme would have collapsed.

And the Soviet Union threatened, and it promised, and it used the Communist Party machinery in these different countries to threaten anybody who voted for these things that they would never be reelected again. That was a pretty tough battle, which was won by the forces of freedom and it involved the greatest diplomatic defeat that the Soviet Union has suffered, I would say, certainly since the war.

And the treaties came into force 12 days ago, exactly. Instruments of ratification were deposited. A week ago Monday we met together in Paris to mark the actual coming into being of what had then been planned—the meeting of the Western European Union, and the meeting of NATO into which Germany walked—in the presence of their great Chancellor Adenauer, whom you know so well and we all admire so much. It was a very significant and historic occasion. We all had little speeches prepared which we made when Adenauer came in, and then when we had finished, Adenauer himself spoke with great dignity and statesmanship. And when he had finished, the NATO Ministerial Council—I think for the first time in history—burst into applause. It is a pretty stuffy and formalistic body, and it was not as I say, I think the first time it ever happened.

But there was a sense of a great event as the free German Republic took its place there. And when you say—because, you see, F and G come together in the alphabet—France and Germany sat side by side, and you saw these two countries sitting there side by side as allies, you felt that a new page had been opened on European history, and that the vision which so many people have had for so many years of a United Europe had actually started to come to pass.

This Western civilization, you know, almost committed suicide with its incessant wars of the last hundred years and more. And it bled itself in man and treasure. But I think now the thing has been put together in such a way that Western civilization took a new lease on life and is going to add strength and vigor for itself and for the benefit of all humanity.

That was the thing we saw happening in Europe. As you said, this unity of purpose and action we had to have. Now I think that is an accomplished fact.

Now I was in Europe and we dealt mostly with European problems, but I never forget the fact that we have got Asian problems as well as European problems, and I took advantage of this NATO Council to talk a bit to them about our Asian problems, because there is a considerable failure to understand the motivation of our Asian policies. And I said to these Ministers there, I said to them, if you like the United States as you see it manifested in Europe, you should understand what we are doing in Asia, because we are doing precisely the same thing in Asia that we want to do here. What are we doing? We are defending freedom where there are freemen who want to defend their own freedom. We believe in collective security to help them do that. We believe in being loyal to our friends and allies. And I said you seem to like those policies when you find them in Europe, and you ought also to recognize that those are the same policies motivating us in Asia, because I said, we don't have a double personality, we are just one nation, and the reason we are acting this way in Europe is because we really believe in these things, and if we believe in them we are going to act the same way in Asia.

The PRESIDENT. That is a wonderful way to tell them.

Mr. DULLES. I think they began to understand, perhaps, for the first time, what was back of our Asian policies. And then I took the opportunity to talk a good deal with the French Prime Minister, Edgar Faure, and the Foreign Minister, Monsieur Pinay, about the situation in Indochina. And the British Foreign Minister, Harold Macmillan, sat in on some of our talks. It was hard to get them in. Our days were busy. We mostly met at night. We had 3 or 4 meetings at night that lasted until 1 o'clock or more in the morning.

The main point I made there was that we had to accept the fact that Vietnam is now a free nation—at least the southern half of it is—and it has not got a puppet government, it has not got a government that we can give orders to, and tell what we want it to do, or we want it to refrain from doing. If it was that kind of government, we wouldn't be justified in supporting it——

The PRESIDENT. That's right.

Mr. DULLES. Because that kind of government is not going to last there. One can only hold free Vietnam with a government that is nationalistic and has a purpose of its own and responsive to the will of its own people, and doesn't take orders from anybody outside, whether it be from Paris—or Cannes for that matter—or from Washington. And that we have got to coordinate our policies to the acceptance of the fact that it is really a free and independent country.

We talked that over in its various implications and ramifications, hour after hour, during almost every day for the 4 days I was in Paris. And I think we came to a better understanding and that there is more chance of coordination of French policies with ours along sound lines than has been the case heretofore. The government of Diem which seemed to be almost on the ropes a few weeks ago, I think is reestablished with strength. It has been through a hard experience and I think it is going to have more support, within and without, than it has had before. And I look to that situation with more hope than we have had before. That is a byproduct of this trip which was designed primarily for European matters. We did, I think, make a considerable accomplishment in relation both to our China policy and in relation to Vietnam.

Well, then, came on to what was in a sense the highspot of the trip, I suppose, which was the signing of the Austrian treaty. Well, that is something that the United States has been working for for a long, long time. I myself first started to work on it in Moscow in 1947, where I went as adviser to George Marshall who was the Secretary of State. And they tell me—Mr. Hoover gave me the figures just a minute or two ago, he dug up in the State Department—that during these 8 years, we have had no less than 379, I think it was, Herbert, 379 meetings at one level or another with the Soviet representatives about this Austrian treaty. And oftentimes we would be just so close to getting it through that we would think it was just around the corner; but the corner seemed to be an interminable series of corners.

The PRESIDENT. It proves in this business you must not be easily discouraged.

Mr. DULLES. Well, we just kept sticking to it——

The PRESIDENT. Yes.

Mr. DULLES. And all of a sudden—well, the heart of the difficulty was that the Soviet Union just couldn't bring themselves to take their Red Army troops out of their zone of Austria; and last year at the Berlin meeting we had agreed on all the terms of the treaty substantially except that at the last minute the Soviets said, "well, we will sign the treaty but with the understanding we can keep our troops on in there indefinitely." Well, of course, that would have been no effective treaty at all. So we turned it down, and we just kept on.

And the Austrian people, incidentally, kept their nerve in a wonderful way in this affair, and they never caved at all. For they knew their independence would not be worth anything if the Red Army was still around.

And all of a sudden, a few weeks ago, out of the blue, came this announcement that the Russians were willing to take their troops out of Austria. I don't think anybody yet knows fully just the significance—the full significance of that. It is just one of these breaks that come, if you keep on steadily, steadily, keeping the pressure on. And all of a sudden you get a break—and this break came. And it seemed to make possible, after all these long years of work, the consummation of this Austrian state treaty.

Now there were several features of the treaty that were still unsettled and where we wanted to get some improvements. And we got the Ambassadors at work in Vienna, while I was in Paris, working on the final details of the treaties, and there were some features, particularly about the economic clauses, which we were very anxious to get changed, and the Russians were very sticky about them.

Well, I said I would not go to Vienna until this thing was all closed up in a way I thought was reasonably satisfactory to the United States. So I planned—you gave me your plane, and it was delightful—that part of it was pretty nice—but I was going to take it on Thursday to go to Vienna, and I just wouldn't go. So we just postponed our plans. And I said I wasn't going to go to Vienna until the Ambassadors had agreed on this treaty in its final form because I felt once I got there in Vienna I would be hooked. So I just put it off. And then on Friday everything was closed up and I got the word that they had agreed. So on Friday I flew down to Vienna. And on Saturday we had a 5-power meeting; that is, the 4 occupying powers and the Austrians, at which we perfected the arrangement of protocol and the like for the carrying out of the treaty signature on Sunday.

And then we had the actual signature of the treaty on Sunday, about 11:30 o'clock I think it was. And that was a real occasion which those who saw it I think will never forget: The tremendous joy of the Austrian people who had waited—because really their occupation goes back to the Hitler time——

The PRESIDENT. Yes.

Mr. DULLES. In 1938, 17 years, been waiting for liberation. And the thing that particularly struck me as I went through the streets was the joy on the part of the older people, particularly the older people who had known the liberties of the past——

The PRESIDENT. Yes.

Mr. DULLES. And had lived through these 17 years of occupation, now at last saw their liberation apparently at hand. And the older people just jumping up and down with joy—wrinkled faces—it just made your heart feel warm at the thought that we had been able to make some contribution to this spirit of joy which animated the whole Austrian people, particularly those that were in the Soviet zone of occupation.

Now a lot of people are trying to find mysterious reasons why the Soviets changed their policy, and that is something that, of course, deserves the very careful thought that we are giving it. As you know, Mr. President, we are studying all this very, very carefully, to discover the implications of it. But there are certainly implications of it that we can be quite sure of, as far as we ourselves are concerned, and which I think we can take great satisfaction from. In the first place, it marks the first time that the Red armies will have turned their face in the other direction and gone back, since 1945, when you were over there effecting the liberation of Europe from our side, and they had moved in from the other side, as you know.

This is the first time a segment of the Red army will have turned around and started to go back. Now that is bound to have a tremendous impact in the other countries where the Red armies are in occupation. It is going to create a desire—a mounting desire—on the part of those people to get the same freedom from that type of occupation that the Austrians have got. And furthermore, this joy at their freedom which was so manifest by the Austrian people, that is going to be contagious and it is going to spread, surely, through the neighboring countries, such as Czechoslovakia. For the first time there will be an open door to freedom on the part of Hungary. These things are bound to have an effect. And the Soviet Union, of course, they know they are going to have an effect. They thought about these things long ago. When they drew their zone of occupation in Austria, you remember, they drew it in a queer line, so as to be sure that they would block the borders to Czechoslovakia and to Hungary.

The PRESIDENT. That's right—that's right.

Mr. DULLES. Now they are giving that up. They know that there are going to be implications there, and that the peoples of these satellite countries are going to want to be getting for themselves the thing that they see the Austrians get. They want to dance in the streets with joy, too, sometime.

The Soviets are accepting those consequences. Why they are doing it, we are not quite sure. Except that we can be quite certain that the policies of strength and firmness that we are adopting, in partnership with the other free countries of Europe, are beginning to pay off. And the people of Austria are the first to say—and all of them did say to me—this is the first dividend from the creation of Western European unity and the bringing of Germany into NATO.

At the time when that was under debate, the Soviet Union was threatening terrible things would happen if we went through with this. But we and the other free countries of Europe did go through with it. And we find that the pay-off is not a terrible disaster, but for the first time an apparent softening of the Soviet policy, a willingness to give greater freedom and liberty to the captive satellite peoples. So I think we can say that those policies are actually beginning to pay off—the policy of strength and firmness, and the standard of moral principle.

I said to a group I was talking to in Vienna Sunday, I said it is not worth much to speculate, really, as to who is winning, whether the Soviet Union is winning or the United States is winning, I said the important thing is that sound principles have won. And in the long run these high moral principles——

The PRESIDENT. That's right.

Mr. DULLES. Are going to be what are going to prevail. If we are behind them then we will automatically get the benefit of prevailing. But that is the important thing to bear in mind, that we had been standing, I think, for good, sound moral principle—with firmness, determination, with strength in the right; and if you do that long enough without weakening, the thing is going to come your way. And I think from that standpoint that time is working for us—as long as we work on these great moral principles.

Now I am going to turn to the thing that I know most people are most interested in, and I guess you have a special interest in, and that is——

The PRESIDENT. The four-power talks.

Mr. DULLES. The four-power talks, because this time, if they come off, you will be in them yourself. Now you said, Mr. President, in recalling what had happened, what you said in your speech of April 1953, that it has always been your resolution not to get yourself into any talks of that sort until and unless certain things had happened, things that made in a sense untouchable—irreversible—the solidity of the West, the freedom of Western Germany as a member of the North Atlantic Treaty Council, and some deeds by the Soviet Union in replacement of just these vague words that they had been talking.

Well, these things have happened, so you felt—as indeed did our allies and a great volume of world opinion feel—that the time had come, perhaps, for a further testing of the Soviet Union through a meeting at the level of the heads of government.

Now, nobody knows better than you that such a meeting has dangers as well as——

The PRESIDENT. Yes.

Mr. DULLES Opportunities. And the biggest danger of all is the danger that hopes will be raised so high that they can't possibly be realized. And then, either of two things will happen, either there will be an open disillusionment and a feeling of dismay on the part of the people, and a feeling that after all nothing can be done, and that the only alternative is war, because the last good chance will have been tried and failed; or, then, there is the possibility that in an effort to avoid that danger the heads of government meeting might arrive at a sort of an appearance of agreement, under ambiguous words where there was no real agreement. And I also—

The PRESIDENT. Foster, I don't believe that danger is quite so great as it was once, because my mail shows this: That the American people are really pretty well aware of what is going on. They realize this is merely a beginning and not an end. I have taken tremendous hope——

Mr. DULLES. Yes.

The PRESIDENT. And confidence from the tenor of the remarks I have seen in our newspapers, and commentators, and everybody else—I am sure that there is greater maturity than we would have expected several years ago.

Mr. DULLES. I do think the American people have become pretty sophisticated on this matter——

The PRESIDENT. Yes.

Mr. DULLES. And they are not easily going to be fooled. I don't think they are going to get their——

The PRESIDENT. Yes.

Mr. DULLES. Expectations too high. There is, perhaps, rather more danger in some of

the other countries than there is in the United States.

The PRESIDENT. Yes.

Mr. DULLES. But you and I worked out the form of invitation to this meeting, in agreement with our allies, in a way which I think makes it crystal clear that that danger will not be incurred. Because, as you recall, the definition of the purpose is that we are to meet to try to find new paths, a new approach, new procedures, for solving some of these problems——

The PRESIDENT. That's right.

Mr. DULLES. And you will not attempt yourself to solve then. Now the heads of Government, great as they are, are not going to be able to get together for 3 or 4 days, and find a substantial solution for some of these problems that have defied solution for so many years, or even for so many generations.

The PRESIDENT. They couldn't even build Rome in 1 day.

Mr. DULLES. But therefore I think it is quite important to keep it clear, as the invitation did, that it is just for that purpose.

The PRESIDENT. Yes.

Mr. DULLES. Now we weren't at all sure that the Soviet would accept that limited meeting. But I had a dinner in Vienna Saturday night, which was attended by the British and French Foreign Ministers and also by Mr. Molotov who is the Soviet Foreign Minister. And we sat around after dinner for several hours talking about this whole business, the philosophy of the approach, the limited scope that the meeting would have, and so far as I could judge, the Soviet Union accepted it, at least they said they did, and that would be on the record. Other details we have not worked out yet. But on the whole, it looks as though the kind of meeting that you are willing to have will also be the kind of meeting that they will be willing to have. And I think that will be a meeting which can be held safely, without running these great risks, and which may open up new opportunity.

Now, everybody wonders why the Soviets may be willing to change their practices. And I have thought about it quite a lot. Nobody can be sure. But I thought of this, Mr. President, that in every one of our well-ordered communities there are a lot of people who don't believe in their hearts in the rules and the laws that are there, but they find it more convenient to conform and not always to be bucking these things. Therefore, in any well-ordered community there are a lot of people who live up to the rules and the ordinances, and so on, even though they don't, perhaps, believe in them for themselves.

And it may possibly be the case that the Soviet Union, after this experience of trying to buck everything, may be feeling that it may be more convenient for them to conform to some of the rules and practices of a civilized community.

I don't think for a minute that they have got religion, or have been converted, but it just may be, as a practical matter, they may think they can get along better by conforming to some of these rules and practices which normally govern——

The PRESIDENT. Yes.

Mr. DULLES. A civilized community. And I think that is a possibility which is at least worth exploring and that this meeting will give a further chance to explore it. And it may at least set up new processes for a solution of some of these great problems—problems like the unification of Germany, the problem of levels of armament, the problem of atomic weapons, the problem of the satellite countries, the problems created by international communism, which is such a pest around the world. If we can begin to think about how those problems can be solved, by a new spirit and a new purpose to their solution, then I think that something of good can come out of this meeting. And I just do feel that we can face the future with new confidence, because these policies that we have adhered to, which have involved sacrifice, been supported by the American people on a bipartisan basis, they are beginning to pay off. And I think if we stick to those policies we are going to be all right.

The danger is that we relax and think that these policies have served their purpose, therefore let's switch to something different.

The proper thing is, these policies work, therefore let's stick to them. If we do that, then I think we can face the future with new confidence.

The PRESIDENT. In a word, we want to stay strong and will stay vigilant, but we are not going to extinguish the hope that a new dawn may be coming, even if it rises—the sun rises very, very slowly.

Thank you very much, Foster. It has been a real privilege to hear such a brilliant report on a very significant 2 weeks.

Mr. DULLES. Well, it has been a great opportunity for me, Mr. President, to have this chance to tell you these things.

JUSTICE OWEN J. ROBERTS

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, I wish to join those who earlier paid tribute to Justice Owen J. Roberts. With his passing, I have lost a valued friend of many years. He was a great Justice of the Supreme Court, and a steadfast worker for many worthy international causes.

Born on May 2, 1875, in Philadelphia, Owen Roberts obtained his law degree from the University of Pennsylvania at the age of 20. He gained considerable attention as assistant district attorney of Philadelphia County, as a teacher of law at the University of Pennsylvania, and as a special United States Attorney General under President Coolidge.

In 1930, President Herbert Hoover appointed him to the Supreme Court, where he served with great distinction until his retirement in 1945. A lifelong Republican and a conservative, Owen Roberts never permitted any label to govern his decisions on the Court. During the 1930's his vote often was the deciding one. His vote upheld the Wagner Act and the unemployment provisions of the Social Security Act. He was strongly opposed to the famous Court-packing plan. As a bridge between conservative and liberal thinking in the Court, Justice Roberts' position was a vital one.

In 1942, he was appointed Chairman of the Commission To Investigate the Pearl Harbor Attack.

After his retirement from the Court, Justice Roberts continued to contribute his great talents and energies to many activities. For a time he served as dean of the law school of the University of Pennsylvania. As president of the Atlantic Union Committee, Justice Roberts worked long and hard for peace and for a stronger unity between the United States and the nations of Western Europe.

His was indeed a full and profitable life. His many contributions to a better America and a better world will not soon be forgotten.

Mrs. Smith joins me in expressing deepest sympathies to Mrs. Roberts and to their daughter and two grandchildren.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks editorials on Owen J. Roberts, from the New York Herald Tribune and from the New York Times of May 18.

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

OWEN J. ROBERTS

Justice Owen J. Roberts was one of those stalwart, independent characters that in every generation come along to put their special mark on the Supreme Court. A lifelong Republican, appointed by President Hoover in 1930, he eluded classification in any narrow terms. His decisions frequently determined which side of the Court should have the majority, and they could rarely be predicted in advance. His general views seemed to shift as the broad popular thinking of the country came to accept the social legislation of the thirties. He was a judge who upheld precedent and principle; but he was also one of those statesmen who have kept the Supreme Court from falling into a position of sterile obstruction.

Justice Roberts' early career had been marked by brilliance in his studies and by a rapid rise in the fields of both business and education. His experience as a professor of law at the University of Pennsylvania gave him not only the exact legal knowledge which served him in good stead on the Nation's highest court. It also left him with the ability to deliver his opinions clearly, usually from memory, in a style that even the layman could understand. His robust physical energy, lasting into old age, enabled him to accept a heavy load of opinion writing.

The possession by any nation of men of Justice Roberts' independent stripe, whose sound judgment is instinctively trusted, is an invaluable asset. To such as he, when a supreme controversy rages, men can look with confidence for an unbiased appraisal of the facts. And so it was that Justice Roberts was chosen to head the Commission which investigated the disaster at Pearl Harbor. He continued to work after his retirement, promoting causes he believed in, particularly a more effective form of international government than he felt was provided by the United Nations. He died yesterday after a full life, a man whose efforts had won him great success and whose qualities had won the universal respect of his fellow countrymen.

OWEN J. ROBERTS

The career of Justice Owen J. Roberts as a member of the bench of the Supreme Court of the United States for 15 years, as a successful lawyer in Philadelphia before and after his judicial service, as a prosecutor in connection with the Teapot Dome scandal, as chairman of the commission to investigate what happened at Pearl Harbor, and as a leading figure in many public, educational, and communal causes, was one in which the bench and bar of this country may well take pride. He possessed complete intellectual integrity and was a most conscientious workman.

His service on the bench encompassed the era which dealt with much of the early New Deal legislation of the Roosevelt administration. Although Justice Roberts had always been a conservative Republican, it soon became evident that his conclusions on the bench resulted from independent judgment in each instance, with a minimum of political or philosophical prejudice.

After Justice Roberts retired from the Supreme Court bench, he served for a while as dean of the Law School of the University of Pennsylvania, and his subsequent activities identified him with causes which in his judgment would advance the cause of peace

in the world and benefit his native land. His was a broad and a full life, in which he attained the pinnacle of his profession and maintained always the respect and confidence of those with whom he worked and lived. Dying yesterday at the ripe age of 80, he still leaves a void.

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, in common with my colleagues in the Senate I was deeply grieved to learn of the death of Owen J. Roberts, a great American, and a distinguished son of Pennsylvania, who served for 15 years as an Associate Justice of the United States Supreme Court.

Justice Roberts passed away Tuesday, May 17, at the age of 80.

Owen Roberts possessed one of the most brilliant legal minds of our country. In addition to his distinguished career on the bench and at the bar, he achieved outstanding distinction as an educator, as a leader in religious affairs, and as the author of many books and articles dealing with the Constitution.

He was a life trustee of the University of Pennsylvania, where he served for 20 years as a teacher of law, and later as dean of the law school.

In 1946, he was elected president of the house of deputies of the Protestant Episcopal Church, the first layman ever to achieve that high honor.

He took an active part in many civic and charitable activities, in which his able leadership was an inspiration to all who were associated with him.

Justice Roberts retired from the Supreme Court bench in 1945, after participating in decisions which had tremendous importance in shaping the course of our Nation.

In recent years Justice Roberts directed his talents to the field of international affairs, working to promote peace and better understanding among the free nations of the world.

To the members of his family, I extend my deepest sympathy.

ALLEGATIONS OF IMPROPER ADVERTISING OF OLEOMARGARINE

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, when the Federal taxes and certain restrictions on oleomargarine colored to resemble butter were removed, many of us were greatly concerned, not only because of the effect on our great dairy industry, but also because of the danger of violations of fair-trade practices on the part of an industry which has sought to invade the dairy markets and trade on the age-long public acceptance of butter as an essential food in the human diet.

There have been many reports of such practices, which we foresaw if oleomargarine was allowed to be manufactured and sold in a form made artificially to resemble butter in color, texture, and taste.

We are confronted at this time with depressed prices in dairy products, so serious as to present a national problem in our farm economy.

Certainly a very large contributing factor has been the fact that the dairy producer, who is entirely dependent on the income from a dairy herd, has been forced into competition with a product which may taste the same and look the same, but is not the same as butter.

No one proposes prohibiting the sale of oleomargarine as a food product; but it should stand on its own, as such, and should not masquerade as butter.

In three recent cases, where violations of the limited restrictions placed on oleomargarine were alleged, the Federal Trade Commission, for the first time, has noted that certain oleomargarine manufacturers are using advertising which implies that their brands are dairy products. Two of these manufacturers were ordered to stop these practices. A third case was sent back to the examiners, for new hearings.

These decisions of the Federal Trade Commission, announced Monday, are significant and important. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that the press announcement of the Federal Trade Commission, outlining the action taken with reference to the three cases of alleged improper advertising of oleomargarine, be printed in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks.

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

FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION,
Washington, D. C.

For the first time, the Federal Trade Commission today issued decisions under the new oleomargarine amendment to the Federal Trade Commission Act. Two oleomargarine manufacturers were ordered to stop using advertising which, by the use of dairy terms, conveys that their brands are dairy products within the meaning of the act. In a third action, the Commission concluded that the advertising by another company may be unlawful, and remanded the case to the hearing examiner for further proceedings.

In opinions by Chairman Edward F. Howrey accompanying two of the decisions, the Commission explored in detail the legislative history of the oleomargarine amendment and concluded that "It was intended, we believe, to reach a form of advertising which through suggestion, the association of ideas, and the use of dairy terms may lead the consumer to believe that the oleomargarine in question is a dairy product." All three of the decisions were reached by a unanimous Commission.

Cease and desist orders were issued against the maker of Farm Queen, E. F. Drew & Co., Inc., 15 East 26th Street, New York City, and the maker of Reddi-Spred, Reddi-Spred Corp., 311 Walnut Street, Philadelphia, Pa. In the third case the Commission reversed a hearing examiner's initial decision dismissing a complaint against the Blanton Co., 3400 North Wharf, St. Louis, Mo., which sells Creamo.

In the case involving Farm Queen the Commission found that such statements in advertising as "Churned to delicate, sweet creamy goodness," "The same day-to-day freshness which characterizes our other dairy products," represented or suggested that Farm Queen is a dairy product. In the case of Reddi-Spred, the Commission found misleading the emphasis in advertising on the unknown percentage of butter in this oleo coupled with the statement that it shouldn't be confused with ordinary margarine because of its butter content.

In remanding the Creamo product case for further proceedings, the Commission stated that certain advertising, as well as the name Creamo, standing alone, might lead people to believe this oleomargarine is a dairy product.

Involved in each of these cases is the 1950 oleomargarine amendment of the FTC act. This amendment, section 15 (a) (2) of the FTC act, declares misleading any representation, "made or suggested by statement, word, grade designation, design, device, symbol, sound, or any combination thereof," that oleomargarine is a dairy product.

Discussing this law in the Commission's opinion in the Drew Co. case, Chairman Howrey said, "The real purpose of the amendment seems to be * * * to stop the practice of suggesting that oleomargarine is a dairy product by associating it with dairy terms * * *. It was intended, we believe, to reach a form of advertising, which, through suggestion and the association of ideas, leads or may lead the customer to believe that the particular oleomargarine in question is a dairy product."

Referring to the Blanton Co. case, the Chairman stated, "We are not dealing here with the usual misrepresentation case, that is, with false and misleading advertising which may have the tendency or capacity to deceive in violation of section 5 of the FTC Act, but solely with the question whether or not the respondent has through the use of any [of the methods named in the oleomargarine amendment] suggested that the oleomargarine sold by it is a 'dairy product'."

In the Drew Co. case, the Commission affirmed with modification an initial decision by Examiner Everett F. Haycraft, issued July 29, 1954. Granting an appeal from that decision by counsel supporting the complaint, the Commission included among the prohibitions in the order the use of the phrase "country fresh."

This phrase, among others prohibited by today's order, is contained in handbills, leaflets, and other advertising devices. Among the statements made are these:

"Farm Queen margarine * * * is always country fresh * * *."

"Starting now our drivers will have it for you with the same day-to-day freshness which characterizes our other dairy products."

"* * * Churned to delicate sweet creamy goodness."

In the case of Reddi-Spred Corp., the Commission reversed an initial decision by Examiner Abner E. Lipscomb dated October 29, 1954, which dismissed the complaint.

In that case the Commission found that certain statements in the firm's advertising suggest "that while it is technically oleomargarine it is actually a dairy product." Typical of the challenged advertisements used in newspapers, on television, and through other channels is the claim:

"Reddi-Spred Brand * * * a premium oleomargarine containing not only vegetable fats but also real fresh butter * * *. Yes; it's the butter that makes it taste better * * * that's why we say, 'Don't confuse ordinary margarine with Reddi-Spred. Compare it with any spread at any price * * *.' Compare, but don't confuse Reddi-Spred with ordinary margarine."

The Commission concluded that the fact Reddi-Spred is called oleomargarine in these ads does not preclude the suggestion that it is a dairy product.

On this point Chairman Howrey, in the Drew case, after reviewing legislative debate on the oleomargarine amendment, stated: "The whole controversy leading up to amended section 15 of the Federal Trade Commission Act seems to be based on the assumption that the word 'oleomargarine' is not by itself a sufficient negation; in other words, Congress seems to have conclusively presumed that many people think that the product, even when described by its correct name, is a dairy product and that the use of the name 'oleomargarine' does not prevent it from being palmed off to the public as such."

Reversing Examiner Haycraft's decision of November 8, 1954, in the Blanton Co. case which dismissed the complaint after the close of the case in chief of counsel supporting the complaint, the Commission held that such statements as "better tasting because

it's made better with sweet fresh milk plus pure cream," standing alone without qualification "might well lead some people to believe that the product is a dairy product."

In this case Chairman Howrey observed: "If all the advertising under scrutiny which used the name 'Creamo' or the terms 'milk' and 'cream' had clearly and conspicuously stated the percentages of cream and milk contained in the product, then they would have been sufficiently informative and would adequately have negated any suggestion that respondent's 'oleomargarine * * * is a dairy product'."

The chairman noted that some advertisements and radio continuity did include the statement, "contains 5 percent light cream."

According to the Oleomargarine Act its prohibitions do not "prevent a truthful, accurate, and full statement in * * * advertisement of all the ingredients contained in * * * oleomargarine * * *."

This case was remanded to Hearing Examiner Haycraft "for further consideration in accordance with this opinion and [the opinion in the Drew Co. case].

The orders in the Drew Co. case and the Reddi-Spred Co. case in addition to containing the prohibition against representing or suggesting that margarine is a dairy product provide:

"That nothing contained in this order shall prevent the use in advertisements of a truthful, accurate, and full statement of all the ingredients contained in said product, or of a truthful statement that said product contains butter or any other dairy product provided the percentage thereof contained is clearly and conspicuously set forth."

The complaint against E. F. Drew & Co., Inc., was issued October 19, 1953; the complaint against Blanton Co., March 18, 1954; the complaint against Reddi-Spred, June 30, 1954.

RETIREMENT OF FEDERAL JUDGE ALBERT L. WATSON, MIDDLE DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, 26 years ago, when I served as Republican State chairman of Pennsylvania, I had the pleasure of recommending Albert L. Watson, an able and distinguished jurist, for appointment to the Federal bench in the Middle District of Pennsylvania.

Judge Watson has just submitted his resignation as Chief Judge to President Eisenhower. I call his retirement to the attention of the Senate because his outstanding service to his State and the Nation is deserving of the greatest praise.

His unswerving devotion to the highest principles of his profession honored the bench on which he served. Pennsylvania is proud of Judge Watson. I am happy to join the citizens of the Keystone State in extending to him our wholehearted and sincere appreciation and our best wishes for many years of health and happiness.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted at this point in my remarks an article from the Scranton (Pa.) Tribune which reviews Judge Watson's brilliant career.

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

JURIST USED FRANK, HAPPY PHILOSOPHY

Federal Judge Albert L. Watson has the happy faculty of being able to blend cracker-barrel philosophy with the candor of a prize-fighter.

When he addressed a class of 34 new citizens January 12, 1949, in his court, here, he told them, in effect, to punch any Red on the jaw if they heard him run down the United States Government.

His recommendation to "use physical force" hit the headlines and made the Russian press, drawing a bitter reply from Pravda, the Communist Party newspaper in Moscow.

By the same token, he can be mild and mellow, as when he made this statement, December 20, 1954: "Being happy is not only a right, as held by the Declaration of Independence, it is also a duty which we owe to ourselves and to others."

At each yearly milestone, he usually had a statement for news reporters on his outlook on life.

On December 5, 1951, when Scranton was in the throes of major industrial rehabilitation, he declared: "Scranton will never die because its people have faith and courage and the will to do things."

On November 20, 1952, when reports buzzed he was ready to retire, he said this: "My health is perfect, I enjoy my work, and I have given no thought whatsoever to stepping down."

Perhaps he best exemplified his philosophy when he said on December 1, 1953: "I believe that nowadays the things to put aside for one's old age is all thoughts of retirement."

Then he said this was his "code," called "Things to Remember"—"The belief in God beyond everything, the value of hope, the virtue of tolerance, the spiritual quality of true courtesy, the sound of laughter, the pleasure of work, the God-given beauty of flowers, the challenge of life, the good fortune of having good friends, the thrill of seeing justice done, the responsibility of citizenship, and the preservation of freedom."

Judge Watson has been an indefatigable worker. He once told a reporter the first case he tried when he became a Federal jurist already had been on the books for 12 years.

In one year, he also remarked, he turned out 83 opinions, including those of former Judge Albert W. Johnson, one-time colleague on the bench, who was off sick.

During 1954, for example, he handled 57 out of 151 cases, several of them major crime cases. From July 1953, to July 1954, he wrote 18 out of 40 opinions handed down by himself, and Judges John W. Murphy and Frederick V. Follmer.

He says there is no backlog of cases in this district. "It's current, and I'm glad," he remarked.

Judge Watson was born December 6, 1876, at Montrose, the son of Willoughby W. Watson, a lawyer, and Annie Marie Kemmerer. He was reared in the Mauch Chunk area, went to the School of Lackawanna here, and later to Lawrenceville School, Lawrenceville, N. J., where he was editor of the school paper and literary magazine, was in the Banjo Club and Dramatic Club.

He was a debater and a letter winner in baseball and football and was captain of the Dickinson House Championship football team.

He went to Amherst College, Amherst, Mass., earned his B. S. degree in 1901, and joined Psi Upsilon fraternity. There, too, he was a debater and was on the declamation team, also winning his letter in baseball and football.

He studied law with the firm of Watson, Diehl, Hall & Kemmerer and later joined the firm.

Judge Watson was admitted to the Lackawanna County courts December 15, 1902, to Orphans Court, on motion of his father, in the same month, and to the United States District Court, March 31, 1905.

On March 3, 1908, he was admitted to the Superior Court; May 4, 1908, to the Supreme Court of Pennsylvania, and March 31, 1909, to the circuit court of appeals.

In 1917 he was named to a Commission On Investigation of Various Systems of Recording Deeds, Mortgages, etc., for the State of Pennsylvania. In 1923 he was counsel for the Workmen's Compensation Bureau, and the same year was a trustee and president of the Board at Scranton State Hospital.

Judge Watson was named to the Lackawanna County bench in 1926 by the late Gov. Gifford Pinchot, and in 1929 was appointed by former President Hoover to the Federal bench in this Middle District.

He is a member of Westminster Presbyterian Church and was a deacon of Second Presbyterian Church before its merger into the present congregation. He is a member of the American Bar Association, the Pennsylvania bar and Lackawanna bar.

Judge Watson is a 32d degree Mason, a member of Peter Williamson Lodge of Masons, Irem Temple of the Shrine, and of the Alumni Council of Lawrenceville School.

He is also a member of the University Club of New York City and the Waverly Country Club.

His first wife, Mabel E. Watson, whom he married in 1902, died in 1923, and in 1930 he married Effie Woodville Watson, who was socially prominent in New Orleans, where Judge Watson frequently has held court.

He has two sons, Albert Leisenring Watson, Jr., and Righter Watson, and a stepson, Navy Capt. J. L. Warren Woodville, Jr., who is stationed near Paris, with Supreme Headquarters, American Expeditionary Forces (SHEAF).

DELAYS IN DISTRIBUTION OF SALK VACCINE

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for not to exceed 4 minutes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Senator from California may proceed.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, it seems to me that it is high time that a number of misapprehensions about the Salk poliomyelitis vaccine and the activities of the Public Health Service and the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare are clarified.

It would be a matter of regret to me, and to many millions of American parents, if this subject should become involved in partisan politics.

If this were to happen, it would create and foster needless uncertainty with respect to the vaccine's value and safety.

Moreover, it would make the efforts of all who are working with the problem—scientists, manufacturers, and public administrators—doubly difficult. Is it not time to reassess the situation and take a calm look at it?

In the first place, let me say that I have the assurance of the Surgeon General of the Public Health Service that there is no new ban on the vaccine, the headline of a local morning newspaper to the contrary withstanding.

In her report to the President last Monday, Secretary Hobby clearly stated:

> Safety of the vaccine must be the paramount consideration; and the questions relating to safety in quantity production must be determined by the best scientific advice, uninfluenced by any other factors.

Furthermore, Surgeon General Scheele has repeatedly laid emphasis on safety.

What are the facts? On April 27, after 6 cases of paralytic polio appeared following vaccination with the product of 1 manufacturer, the Public Health Service acted swiftly and decisively. In

the interests of the children of America, it banned use of further lots of that company's vaccine.

After long and careful consultations with the most eminent medical and scientific experts in America, including the discoverer of the vaccine himself, Dr. Jonas Salk, the Public Health Service concluded—again in the interest of safety—that a doublecheck of the manufacturing and testing processes of all manufacturers should be undertaken.

The inspections of two manufacturers have been completed and vaccine released. The Surgeon General has said that the study of other manufacturers is proceeding as rapidly as possible. In the interest of the children of America, again, the Surgeon General has emphasized that this process will move as rapidly as is necessary to get the job done properly, but no more rapidly.

I am sure I speak for millions of Americans in applauding this decision.

With respect to the vaccine of the Cutter Laboratories which is under suspension, I am advised by the Surgeon General that samples of the finished vaccine and samples from key stages in the production are now undergoing exhaustive testing at the National Institutes of Health. I have every faith that this study will be completed as rapidly as possible.

Here are some further facts about this reappraisal:

The Public Health Service staff has held extensive consultations with experts in virology and immunology, both before and after April 12. It has also conferred with the technical personnel of vaccine manufacturers to explore all steps in the manufacturing and testing process to evaluate recent experiences. Surely this is in the tradition of reasoned, scientific caution.

As of May 13, announcement had been made that the Public Health Service had cleared 4,250,000 cubic centimeters of Parke Davis Co. vaccine. After a team visit to the Eli Lily Co. plant, it was announced that all previously cleared lots of their vaccine, amounting to 3,600,000 cubic centimeters, were cleared. Both these clearances were immediately made known to the public.

Earlier this week a team from the National Institutes of Health and a consultant visited the Wyeth Laboratories, Inc., in Marietta, Pa., and a team is now at the Pittman-Moore Co. in Zionsville, Ind.

The Public Health Service has announced, following press inquiries yesterday, that it intends to complete its visit to Pittman-Moore and to await further information on Wyeth vaccine before it makes any announcement of further clearances.

It is difficult for me to understand why some individuals seek to create public confusion by not accepting these facts and letting the Public Health Service continue its review in accordance with the high scientific principles which have traditionally guided it.

Let me make this clear. I am advised by the Surgeon General that the Public Health Service has not called a halt in the vaccination program. It has not banned vaccine again. These are the facts.

Headlines and political speeches do not change them. It is difficult for me, as it must be for millions of parents, to understand why, at a time like this, anyone should attempt to play upon the emotions of American mothers and fathers for partisan reasons or in careless disregard of the facts, and in so doing, discredit this wonderful vaccine.

I have faith in the conscientiousness and integrity of the Surgeon General of the Public Health Service and his professional staff. I accept his counsel and judgment on poliomyelitis problems. I am willing to accept delays, in the interests of sound scientific decisions. We need caution rather than headstrong action, calm and objective thinking rather than hysteria, rational scientific advice rather than political propaganda. Any injection of politics into this situation is not only unwarranted, but it is contemptuous of the high art and science of medicine. It serves to hinder and obstruct the careful analysis which is necessary to safeguard the health and safety of American children. That is the first consideration of the Surgeon General. I submit that it is the only consideration which we, as Members of Congress, can countenance.

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

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. First, let me say to the Senator that it was my privilege to attend the hearings at which this subject matter was discussed. I also believe that it is of the utmost importance that this vital issue, pertaining to the health of the American people, particularly children, be considered carefully, prudently, and in a thoroughly objective manner.

However, I should like to ask the Senator 1 or 2 questions. I have hesitated to ask these questions, but I think they are called for.

Why was it that, in respect to this vaccine, the United States Public Health Service did not institute early the kind of tests which it subsequently instituted?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I will say to the Senator that I do not have all the scientific reasons. However, as I understand, tests were conducted, not only by the Public Health Service, but also by the Institute of Poliomyelitis, which has done such effective work in this field, as well as by Dr. Salk himself.

As I recall, the data finally released indicated that the vaccine would not necessarily be 100 percent effective. In fact, the very first report indicated that it might not be 100 percent effective. In other words, until further inoculations were made, a certain number of cases of poliomyelitis might develop, but scientifically, they would not be any greater than the apparent possibilities indicated by the tests made by Dr. Salk and other doctors. It may be that if a person who had contracted poliomyelitis was given a shot of vaccine, the shot could act as a booster, as I understand. I am told that there is a possibility of such a thing happening. I do not mean that poliomyelitis might develop from the shot alone, but the shot might expedite the development of the disease.

However, whatever the reason may be, when additional cases of polio developed, I believe the Public Health Service was on sound ground in taking the extra precaution of retesting the vaccine and reexamining the situation, to determine whether additional precautionary steps should be taken.

I am told that in the development of vaccines, it is not an unusual situation for vaccine to be reexamined and retested.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I concur with that statement of the Senator from California. However, I respectfully suggest to him that in the tests of 1954 every batch of vaccine was tested three times, in the laboratories of the National Institutes of Health, at the Salk laboratory, and at the manufacturer's laboratory. Extensive tests were made at those three laboratories.

I further respectfully suggest that in 1955, so I have been informed, one test is made, and that test is conducted at the manufacturer's laboratory. Nothing further was done until the Cutter Laboratory vaccine was found to be defective. That discovery alerted the Public Health Service to the necessity of further tests.

I also respectfully suggest that the Public Health Service now feels compelled to institute a much more intensive testing procedure than it had originally planned to undertake at the beginning.

Mr. KNOWLAND. The Senator from Minnesota may be more scientifically capable than the Public Health Service. However, I remind the Senator that the Public Health Service has not been built up on any partisan basis. It has been built up under both Republican and Democratic administrations. Certainly the Service has competent and efficient men on its staff. I will not quarrel with the Public Health Service if it believes that out of a super abundance of caution it wishes to retest or reexamine its processes with relation to the polio vaccine.

As the Senator knows, the first and most important thing to consider is the effect of the vaccine on the children of the country.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The time of the Senator from California has expired.

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

Mr. KNOWLAND. I have no more time to yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I be granted 2 more minutes, so that we may conclude this colloquy.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Senator from Minnesota may proceed.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I wish to say to the Senator from California that what the junior Senator from Minnesota is talking about is the procedure being followed to assure the efficacy and the safety of the vaccine. That is the most important factor.

I am sure our laboratories are doing everything they can to assure safety and

efficacy. I feel, however, that there has not been, on the part of our Government laboratories, the fullest followthrough in terms of testing the vaccine that we had a right to expect.

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

Mr. HUMPHREY. I feel very keenly about this matter. I have a 7-year-old son who has already been inoculated. He is supposed to have his second inoculation on the 27th of May. Judging by press reports, it is apparent that there is a great deal of uncertainty about this whole matter. Certainty should have been established on the day of the release of the vaccine. We have had far too much "in and out" and "up and down," and "release and holding back" on this very important subject, to the point where it has caused grave public concern.

All I am asking is that there be the fullest examination and the fullest testing of the vaccine so that the American people may be reassured.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I think that is precisely what Dr. Scheele and other Public Health officers are endeavoring to do. But, as I understand, a scientist in the medical profession never freezes his thinking. I do not believe he should.

If after what appeared to be adequate tests—and I do not believe that the Public Health officials would have released any vaccine if they had not felt the tests of it had been adequate—there was even the remotest possibility of room for improvement by further tests of the vaccine, it was proper that such further tests be made, rather than that Public Health officials should freeze their thought on the subject. Accordingly, I believe the Public Health Service did precisely the right thing by calling a halt to the distribution and, in effect, saying, "We want to doublecheck the vaccine."

I can find no quarrel with that procedure or point of view. I would rather have the Public Health Service do that than to say that there is no room for improvement. That line of thinking would not be in keeping with the principle of scientific research. I hope that we shall continue to improve the vaccine over the years.

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

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, let us not have any charges made of politics. I have three children within the age group of the vaccination. When I express my legitimate concern as to the efficacy and safety of the vaccine I do not want anyone to say that I am playing politics.

The best way to keep politics out of the matter is to make sure that every statement which comes from the Public Health Service and from the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare will not be retracted within 24 hours. There has been too much up and down and in and out on this matter.

I respectfully suggest further that a sufficient explanation has not been given. I should like to know whether the vaccine which is now being used is exactly the same vaccine which was previously tested.

I shall have further conversations and discussions in regard to this subject. I have been delving into this matter, as Dr. Scheele knows. I shall have further conferences with leading officials of the Public Health Service. I know a little bit about vaccine control. I desire to make clear, too, that I am not speaking only as a Senator but also as a father of 3 boys aged 7, 11, and 13 years.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I will say to the Senator from Minnesota, the reason I was concerned with this matter was that I read an article published in this morning's Washington Post and Times Herald. I immediately contacted the Public Health Service and the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, to get the facts. I have stated the facts as they have been made known to me. The newspaper article is not an accurate presentation, and it may very well cause a great deal of alarm among parents. I fully agree with the Senator from Minnesota that we are entitled to have the facts. We should have only the facts. Certainly we should not have, for whatever the purpose may be—either because of misinformation or because of politics—a disturbing of the situation when the whole subject is in the competent hands of the Public Health Service.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, I wish to associate myself with the distinguished Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] in his remarks on this very important subject.

Mr. NEUBERGER subsequently said: Mr. President, before presenting the material which I intend to submit, I should like to say to the distinguished minority leader that I agree with his recent remarks that politics should not be introduced into the vital issue of the Salk vaccine. I have been corresponding with an official of the nation to the north, Canada, which also has been considering this problem; and, following the morning hour, I expect to make some very brief comments on how we can learn from Canada's methods of developing and distributing the Salk vaccine. I hope the distinguished minority leader will not have any business to call him elsewhere, because I should like him to hear how Canada handles the problem.

THE ARMY'S NEW COMMAND MANAGEMENT SCHOOL AT FORT BELVOIR, VA.

Mr. PURTELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may be granted 2 minutes beyond the regular allotment of time to speak with reference to the Army's new Command Management School at Fort Belvoir, Va.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none; and the Senator from Connecticut may proceed for 4 minutes.

Mr. PURTELL. Mr. President, recently it was my pleasure to participate in the program of the Army's new Command Management School at Fort Belvoir, Va. I should like to share with the Senate some of my thoughts and observations on this stimulating and encouraging experience.

As civilians we have in the past tended to regard the function of our Armed Forces as essentially limited to their activities in the event of war and quite ignored their responsibility for our continuing defense in peacetime. In recent years, however, this dual attitude has been abandoned, for the world situation demands that we maintain effective and coordinated military forces. Even a country so magnificently endowed as is ours does not have unlimited resources at its disposal. Therefore, economy of resources, both material and human, is a most important requisite for our national security.

We in the Senate have recognized this fact, and once again the Army has demonstrated clearly and practically its understanding of, and concern for, this elemental truth. With the establishment of the Command Management School, the Army is looking forward to the same success in the handling of its resources in nontactical missions as it has achieved in combat on so many battlefields scattered throughout the world. To insure this accomplishment and its related contribution to the combat effectiveness of our ground forces, the school has been placed under the jurisdiction of Gen. John E. Dahlquist, commanding general of the Continental Army Command, with the technical assistance and advice of Lt. Gen. Laurin L. Williams, comptroller of the Army.

At the Command Management School the Army makes available to its senior officers and key civilian officials, and indeed to selected representatives of all the Armed Forces, advanced business management trends, techniques and training which will assist them considerably in fulfilling their increasingly complex and vital responsibilities.

Today the Army finds itself engaged in the operation of many large scale business type activities; indeed, the Army and its activities constitute our country's largest business. This means that our military leaders must be familiar with business management as well as military strategy and tactics. The Command Management School was established to fill this real need.

Fort Belvoir, with its excellent facilities and proximity to the seat of government, was selected as the site for the Command Management School, which, I am sure, will enhance the already splendid reputation of that efficient installation. Fort Belvoir, as Senators know, is the Army's engineer center. Also located there under the fine leadership of Maj. Gen. Louis W. Prentiss and his capable Chief of Staff Brig. Gen. Max S. Johnson are the Engineer School, the Army's oldest school, and the Engineer Research and Development Laboratories. Because of the availability of suitable academic and administrative accommodations and the warm personal support of General Prentiss and General Johnson, the Command Management School has a fine opportunity to grow and to develop to the utmost its great potential.

A native of the great State of Connecticut, Col. Frank Kowalski, Jr., is commandant of the school. He and his

carefully selected staff and faculty have performed their duties in such an exemplary fashion that in the short space of 7 months, the Command Management School has proved its worth so significantly that it has been established as a permanent activity with the Army school system.

Every 4 weeks a new class of about 50 senior officers and ranking civilian officials, each with many years of valuable experience, is assembled at the school for the 3-week course. Under the guidance of the faculty, they pool their knowledge and experience to enlarge their comprehension of the nontactical management problems that are so much a part of our Armed Forces. Their discussions and the problems considered are practical and realistic and so are the solutions presented by the class members. Efficiency, economy, increased production constitute the omnipresent theme in their work, a theme that we in the Senate can readily appreciate.

The keen interest and enthusiasm of the class participants, their willing acceptance of new procedures and techniques clearly indicate that for these men the learning process has not yet ended. The test for ideas is not their conformity to the traditional approach to Army management but rather whether or not they will work.

As a result of the advanced instruction they receive, graduates of the Command Management School are equipped positively to assist in the elimination of the extraneous and wasteful, while, at the same time, substantially contributing to the fighting effectiveness of our Armed Forces. The motto of the Command Management School has living meaning for this new contribution to our national security and might well be accepted by all of us: From knowledge the power of decision.

I am very greatly honored, Mr. President, by being given an opportunity to present this statement.

MISS MARGARET PERRY, OF MONMOUTH, OREG., HONORED AS TEACHER OF THE YEAR FOR 1955

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, we of the State of Oregon are justifiably proud of Margaret Perry, of Monmouth, Oreg., who has been selected as the 1955 teacher of the year by McCall's magazine. Our country is only going to be as good as the next generation of Americans can make it. Miss Perry is one of those unselfish individuals who are helping to prepare the coming generation for citizenship and a useful life ahead.

Margaret Perry, who is a personal friend of both Mrs. Neuberger and myself, has been accompanied to Washington by two pupils selected by vote of her fourth-grade class. They are Sue Mull and Frank Richard (Dickie) Peterson. The editors of McCall's have arranged a high honor in behalf of Miss Perry and her students, for they were received at the White House today by the President of the United States, Dwight D. Eisenhower.

Recognizing the great importance of teachers to the Nation, McCall's magazine has honored an outstanding teacher each year for the past decade. I am happy to report that another teacher mentioned this year is likewise from Oregon, Miss Elsie May Cimino of the Union High School of Hillsboro.

When we contemplate the public service of teachers like Margaret Perry and Elsie May Cimino, it should help to enlighten us toward further popular support of education. It also should serve to convince us that such unjust impositions as special test oaths for schoolteachers are not necessary to assure patriotism in our schools.

My wife and I are proud of the fact that, during our tenure in the Oregon State Legislature, we fought for adequate financial support of education, for special pilot courses for retarded children, for basic school support from State funds for each pupil and against oaths singling out teachers and setting them apart from the rest of the population.

Teachers like Margaret Perry help to justify an unselfish interest in education on the part of every citizen. The June issue of McCall's says:

> Margaret Perry is an extraordinary teacher. She is, furthermore, a dedicated teacher. She devotes hours to the education of student teachers.

Knowing Margaret Perry as I do, Mr. President, I am fully aware that she has accepted this high honor as teacher of the year principally because she realizes that she is a symbol of thousands of other teachers who share her devotion to learning, to the ideals of our country and to the future welfare of America's boys and girls.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that the article about Margaret Perry, entitled "McCall's Teacher of the Year," from the issue of McCall's magazine for June 1955, be reprinted in the body of the RECORD.

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

McCALL'S TEACHER OF THE YEAR—FOR 23 YEARS MARGARET PERRY'S CAREER HAS BEEN OTHER PEOPLE'S CHILDREN

The fourth-grade students of the Monmouth Elementary School in Oregon staged a protest at the end of the last school year because their teacher, Miss Margaret Perry, couldn't be promoted to fifth grade along with them. The demonstration wasn't very effective—Miss Perry is still teaching fourth grade—but it was gratifying proof of the affection her pupils have for the woman who has been named McCall's teacher of the year.

This affection and respect is shared by Miss Perry's principal, Dr. William F. Wagner, who says with a broad smile, "If all teachers were like Miss Perry there would be no need for principals." Mothers of the fourth-graders are equally enthusiastic. "I don't know how Miss Perry does it," says a parent who moved to Monmouth last fall, "but this year Ginny likes school. That never happened before." And a student teacher who worked with Miss Perry last year is still talking about her as "the greatest influence for good in my short life."

There seems to be no question about it in Monmouth or among professional educators anywhere else in Oregon: Margaret Perry is an extraordinary teacher. She is, furthermore, a dedicated teacher. Such time as she can spare away from the classroom she gives to a dozen or more organizations which are aimed at improving the standards of the profession and widening public interest in it. She devotes hours to the education of student teachers. Her conversation and her reading are primarily about education, and most of her close friends are teachers. "But the most important thing I do," says Miss Perry, "is to teach children."

What is it that makes Margaret Perry so unusual a teacher? One factor is certainly her personality. She has an infectious warmth that has a way of spreading over to other people. She has friendly eyes, and a smile that brightens her face and brings an immediate response from those with whom she is speaking. Always calm and apparently easygoing, she has a fine sense of humor and a pleasant, hearty laugh. Her superintendent, Henry Tetz, says, "If Margaret were standing in a group of people you wouldn't notice her particularly. But put her in front of a class of pupils or a gathering of teachers and everyone immediately responds to her."

Anyone watching her class in action can see that response. She has taught her boys and girls to like reading, and because they like it they read well. Enjoy these stories, rather than read them, is her assignment to her students. They can, and often do, get up on their feet and address the class. They know how to work with others. They can originate ideas.

A child arriving in class the first thing in the morning may find a book on his desk that Miss Perry has selected for him. Because Miss Perry is so interested in him the child feels a comfortable self-confidence. The fourth-grader may have something very personal to relate to Miss Perry—about the violin he has with him, a recent visit to the dentist, his haircut, a new rock for the science table collection, a Walt Disney television show. The teacher is genuinely interested.

She listens to troubles, keeps confidences. And she remembers throughout the day that Susie's thoughts may be wandering off to her mother, who is ill, or her father, who's off on a business trip. She makes each one feel that being there makes a difference to the teacher and the class.

This sense of belonging is increased by Miss Perry's emphasis on participation. There are a pupil president, vice-president, secretary, treasurer, host and hostess, and these offices are filled each month by different children elected by the class. Those who hold office, as well as those who don't, have daily functions and responsibilities.

In every subject ("I teach everything from physical education to music," she says), Miss Perry proceeds on the theory that children are eager to learn. There's no satisfaction she knows that quite equals the expression on a child's face when he realizes he has learned something. For this reason she never tires of the children's questions, and she tries painstakingly to answer them. She will work over a subject with a class until she is confident that everyone understands it. "I thought I had a lot of patience," one of her student teachers confessed, "until I saw Miss Perry at work."

Her success in making school a lively experience for her pupils is borne out by the pupils themselves. They love school, and, as any observer in their classroom can see, are in no hurry whatsoever to leave at the end of the school day. One guest was amazed, when he walked into Miss Perry's classroom recently, to find the students actually playing school during a recreation period.

Almost as long as she can remember Margaret Perry, who is now 41, has had the ambition to be a good teacher herself and to help others become good teachers. It started when she entered the first grade in a rural school near Winner, S. Dak., and continued as she began to teach 23 years ago—when she was 18 years old—in a two-

room rural school. Here she had every age and every subject from the 4th through 8th grades. In 1945 she went to Hillsboro, Oreg., to accept an elementary-school job offered by her former superintendent in Winner. Five years later she moved to Monmouth.

One remarkable feature about the Monmouth Elementary School is that it is in one of the few school districts in the country where a teacher may earn more than the majority of her pupils' parents. Miss Perry is paid $5,000 a year. The average income in this farm community of 5,000 is somewhere in the neighborhood of $3,500.

The school, which takes its pupils both from Monmouth and the neighboring town of Independence, is affiliated with the Oregon College of Education, and its buildings are right on the college campus. In addition to her fourth-grade duties Miss Perry, along with the majority of her 14 colleagues, teaches student teachers. All the teachers at the school, with one very youthful exception, have a master's degree, and they average 5.3 years of training in education.

Miss Perry cherishes especially two mementos of her career. One is from a 9-year-old named Sammy who arrived very early at school one morning and left a rose on her desk with a note: "To Miss Perry." He suddenly remembered there were two Miss Perrys in the school, so he added a second line: "To big Miss Perry with love from Sammy."

The other is a letter from a former student teacher. "I want to thank you," the letter reads, "for demonstrating to me so clearly what a really good teacher is like. I have gathered a world of materials, but I don't believe they will mean as much to me as your lesson in how a teacher can bring out the good in a class. You have been so human and lovable, and when I get to be a bright light in teaching you will know that you had quite a share in the doing."

POWER STRUGGLE AT HELLS CANYON

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD an excellent article from America, an eminent national weekly magazine. The author, Father Mark J. Fitzgerald is a distinguished economist and a professor at the University of Notre Dame.

Father Fitzgerald has presented the Hells Canyon controversy in a nutshell. Since his deadline, a Federal Power Commission examiner has found that the high dam is the better project. For various dubious reasons based on a rather strange construction of the Federal Power Act, he recommended a license for only one of the Idaho Power Co. dams and dismissal of the applications for the other two small company dams. So when this article is read, it should be noted that the company plan has been rejected in large measure by the FPC examiner. The dam for which a license was recommended would have an installed capacity of only 360,000 kilowatts.

I recommend this article to the Members of the Senate and all citizens concerned about full and wise development of the Nation's natural resources.

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

POWER STRUGGLE AT HELLS CANYON

(By Mark J. Fitzgerald)

Congress now has before it legislation (S. 1333) to authorize Federal construction of a high dam on the Snake River in famed Hells Canyon, Idaho, the deepest gorge in North America. Yet for many months the Federal Power Commission has been weighing arguments, presented in a year-long hearing, for and against the request of a license by a private power company to build three small dams in place of this large Federal dam.

THE QUEST FOR KILOWATTS

The Pacific Northwest's hope for freedom from the status of an economic colony controlled by the East lies in its largely untapped resource, falling water. Apart from a declining, seasonal timber industry, and some minerals, there is not much else on which to build an industrial economy. Though the Columbia River Basin in the Northwest, which includes Hells Canyon, has 42 percent of the Nation's hydroelectric power, it is only about one-seventh developed. Thirty million kilowatts of low-priced power could actually be drawn from the rivers of this area, and low-cost kilowatts are the key to increased industrial growth.

If the water resources in the Columbia Basin remain only fractionally developed, over one-tenth of the country's land area will be retarded economically. Already expansion of the electro-process industry, which was hardly known in the Northwest before Grand Coulee Dam was built, has come to a halt because new starts for power dams have not been forthcoming. Industry fears a serious kilowatt shortage within the next decade. The electro-process industry now accounts for over one-third of the total regular consumption of electric power in the Columbia region and is the means by which the area hopes to attain leadership in the production of phosphates, aluminum, and its lighter and stronger rival, titanium.

Present power requirements in the Northwest are expanding every 10 years at over twice the national average. In 1953 it was estimated that energy supplied the Northwestern States by the Bonneville Power Administration was 438 percent above the amount supplied in 1940. The power needs for the entire Nation during that time increased only 212 percent. Since World War II, population has increased almost one-third in the Northwest as against half that percentage for the country. Despite lagging industrial expansion, heavy requirements for electric service by farm and residential users have steadily increased the power consumption in this area since 1945.

To meet the future demand for electric power in the Northwest, almost 11 million kilowatt-hours will have to be available by 1963. Without new construction starts, however, capacity in 1963 will be short of requirements by more than 1 million kilowatt-hours. Moreover, nonindustrial needs will consume all the scheduled power increases during that time. On this basis, the prospect for industrial expansion in the Columbia Basin is a bleak one.

TWO PROPOSALS

Consistent with his far-sighted belief that every river should serve the public in as many different ways as possible, President Theodore Roosevelt in 1908 ordered that the Hells Canyon powersite, as part of the forest reserves, be placed under the protection of the Federal Government. It was Theodore Roosevelt's firm conviction that a river system from its headwaters to the sea is a single unit and should be treated as such. The entire Columbia River Basin, of which the Snake River is an important tributary, well illustrates the many purposes which can be served by treating a river as a single system. Hydro-power, flood control, irrigation, and navigation, all can be developed on a vast scale if the water resources of the area are properly balanced and coordinated.

After years of study by the Corps of Army Engineers it became evident to this agency that a high dam at Hells Canyon would be an essential part of a comprehensive plan of water storage for the Columbia River Basin. This dam would provide maximum storage to impound the high river flow each spring, both to prevent flood damage and to harvest an ample supply of water for the heavy power demands each winter.

Army engineers consider Hells Canyon the strategic site to help avert a recurrence of the disastrous flood of 1894, which, if repeated in our time, would cause damage estimated at $350 million. Without a coordinated system of storage dams in the Columbia River Basin, the area will remain subject to such divergent calamities as the 1948 flood, which took 50 lives and caused $100 million in damage, or the fall and winter drought of 1952, which ruined crops and caused industrial unemployment because of the low supply of hydropower.

In the Columbia Basin it is becoming evident that water must be harvested as carefully as any life-giving crop so that it can be used for a variety of purposes before finally reaching the Pacific. Water is wealth, and fortunately can be stored in the mountains by building dams. Otherwise the Northwest could not be sanguine about facing its mounting dependence on this precious commodity.

As an alternative project to the high Federal dam at Hells Canyon, the Idaho Power Co., largely owned in the East, seeks authorization to build three private low dams on the Snake River. If all three of these dams were actually built, they would provide only one-fourth the water storage of 4.4 million acre-feet projected for the Federal dam. Moreover, the three low dams would generate no more than 885,000 kilowatts of power as compared with 1.46 million kilowatts possible with the high dam at Hells Canyon.

These points of difference on storage and power serve to challenge the entire policy of river development laid down by Theodore Roosevelt when he first set down the Nation's conservation program. Multipurpose use of the Snake River for power, irrigation, and flood control would be forever restricted under the three-dam plan. Each year there would be 575,000 kilowatts less power than with the high dam.

To gage the significance of this loss, it may be noted that the economic impact of electric power from Grand Coulee Dam has enabled its operator, the Bonneville Power Administration, to estimate accurately the number of new jobs and households, the value of new investment and tax revenue which can be expected from each additional million of kilowatts added to the Northwest power pool. Using this guide, 575,000 less kilowatts each year would mean 26,000 fewer jobs in industry and about the same number lost in the service trades. Payrolls would fail to expand by $180 million, and future production would lag by more than one-half billion dollars each year.

The reduction in stored water from the use of the three dams would lower by 570,000 kilowatts the power potential of other dams in the Columbia Basin below Hells Canyon, since water for power production can be used repeatedly as it flows downstream. The yearly value of this amount of power loss has been estimated at over $11 million. This permanent block to power expansion in the Hells Canyon area would intensify the already predicted power shortage and serve to make power a high-cost commodity, thereby further hampering industrial development.

MULTIPURPOSE DEVELOPMENT

The somewhat more than a million acre-feet of water storage possible with the three-dam project would be insufficient as an aid to flood control. In contrast, the Hells Canyon Dam, since it could store over 4 times this amount of water, is listed as 1 of the 5 major reservoirs projected under

the main flood-control plan for the Columbia Basin.

Opponents of the Hells Canyon project have argued that its vastly greater storage capacity would take more water from the Snake River than can be spared in view of the irrigation necessary in southern Idaho. On this point the records of the United States Geological Survey show that there is enough water in the Snake River, in the driest years and after all irrigation diversion, to fill two reservoirs of the size proposed for Hells Canyon.

Studies by independent experts confirm the position that there will be enough water in the Snake River to provide for all demands of irrigation and for the economical operation of Hells Canyon Dam as well. Further, Senate bill 1333 declares that all present and future irrigation rights on the Snake River are safeguarded in the Hells Canyon project, since storage will begin only after irrigation needs are met. Besides irrigation, it is estimated that the reservoir at Hells Canyon, coordinated with other storage dams on the Columbia and the Snake Rivers, will make available in the Columbia Basin 500 miles of low-cost water transportation, a boon to manufacturers and farmers.

LONG-RANGE ECONOMY

Estimates by consulting engineer John S. Cotton place the outlay for the Federal Hells Canyon Dam at about $534 million, compared with approximately $340 million for the 3-dam project. Mr. Cotton emphasizes, however, that the lower cost of the 3-dam scheme is more than offset by the permanent loss to the Northwest each year of 575,000 kilowatts of regular power with an annual value of $5.9 million. Judging the 2 projects for economic feasibility, he approves the high dam because it assures full development of power resources.

At the Hells Canyon Dam, the cost per kilowatt-year would be under $21, compared to almost $40 with the 3-dam construction. This big difference of $19 in rates would be a lasting barrier to extensive industrial and irrigation development under the Idaho Power Company plan. Factors helping to explain the lower rate for Hells Canyon power are the superior engineering design, more economical power loads, better pooling of power and long-range planning of transmission service. The oft-cited tax return of almost $10 million per year predicted from the 3-dam project appears small compared to the loss of tax revenue of 4½ times that amount on income and investment from private enterprise which would be excluded from the area because of the high power rates.

The low power rates under the Federal project, by promoting private investment and employment, assure payment within 50 years of the cost of Hells Canyon Dam plus interest. For similar reasons, other Federal dams in the Northwest such as Bonneville and Grand Coulee are years ahead on their payment schedules, with an interest charge of 5 percent and ample reserves in addition.

Mindful of the long-range benefits at stake, the issue of Hells Canyon should be judged on the basis of whether public authority or a private power concern can better serve the country's interest here. Included in that broad consideration are the many private utility companies themselves, whose low-head dams stand to gain from falling water which would be sent them from the reservoir at Hells Canyon. For private enterprise in general, it should not be forgotten that Grand Coulee, a public project comparable to the Hells Canyon Dam, has done more to encourage expansion of private industry than numbers of small, single-purpose dams privately owned.

Key questions posed about the whole issue of Hells Canyon are whether there shall be maximum or merely fractional development of our water resources; whether the recommendations in the exhaustive No. 308 Report on the Coumbia Basin brought out by the Corps of Army Engineers after years of research shall be followed or scrapped; whether the Pacific Northwest is to expand economically with low-cost power or be hamstrung industrially because of the high price of kilowatts.

Much more is in question than just Hells Canyon itself. If this power source fails of realization, a number of other dams projected in the Columbia Basin may face Congressional rejection because their economic feasibility depends on coordination with Hells Canyon. In a larger sense the national conservation policy first set forth over 50 years ago is facing serious danger. Invaluable power sites throughout the Nation, which have long been under public protection as part of the Federal conservation program, may become easy prizes for private exploitation at public expense.

Should the Federal Power Commission rule in favor of the 3-dam project it would be tantamount to discarding the historic principle laid down by Theodore Roosevelt, and later made part of the Federal Power Act. This states that for successful development of our waterways we should follow a general plan prepared by the best experts in the field and providing for every potential use of a river. Congress could still set aside an FPC ruling for the 3-dam project by directly authorizing construction of Hells Canyon Dam. In the same legislation it could, for future guidance of the Commission, reaffirm in even more emphatic language what is meant by a full and comprehensive development of water resources.

PROPOSED AGREEMENT FOR COOPERATION WITH NATO CONCERNING ATOMIC ENERGY

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, on May 4 the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy filed its report (No. 267) with the Senate on the proposed Agreement for Cooperation with NATO. This proposed agreement was to be signed on NATO's behalf by 14 countries.

On May 12, 1955, Secretary Wilson informed our committee that Germany would also sign this document since it had been admitted to NATO on May 6. In the opinion of Mr. Wilson, this makes no change in the proposed agreement requiring resubmission to the Joint Committee.

I request unanimous consent to have Secretary Wilson's letter printed in the RECORD at this point in order to complete the public record with respect to this proposed agreement for cooperation.

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

THE SECRETARY OF DEFENSE,
Washington, May 12, 1955.

Hon. CLINTON ANDERSON,
Chairman, Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, United States Senate.

DEAR SENATOR ANDERSON: On April 13, 1955, the President, pursuant to section 123c of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, submitted to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy a proposed agreement for cooperation with the North Atlantic Treaty Organization regarding atomic information. This agreement will be with the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, and the text provides that it will be signed on behalf of the Organization by the parties to the North Atlantic Treaty.

After the proposed agreement, as submitted by the President, has been before the joint committee for the 30-day statutory period, the agreement should be signed by all of the parties to the North Atlantic Treaty. On this basis, it will come into effect when all of the parties to the Treaty have given notification to the United States that they are bound by the terms of the agreement as is required by paragraph 1 of article VI of the agreement.

On April 1, the Senate gave its advice and consent to German accession to the North Atlantic Treaty, and on May 6, 1955, the Federal Republic became the 15th member of NATO.

In view of the foregoing, and after consideration of the legal aspects of this situation, the Acting Secretary of State and I have determined that Germany should sign the proposed agreement at the end of this month along with the other 14 NATO members.

Sincerely yours,

C. E. WILSON.

ENDORSEMENT OF POSTAL PAY BILL

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD the text of a telegram relating to the postal pay increase bill. The letter was sent to President Eisenhower by Donald S. Leonard, who was the Republican nominee for Governor of Michigan last year. I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a letter sent to me by Mr. W. C. Doherty, president of the National Association of Letter Carriers.

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

Hon. DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER,
The President, Washington, D. C.:

I am confident that your approval of S. 1, providing for a long overdue and much deserved pay increase for postal employees will receive the overwhelming endorsement of Michigan citizens who are in sympathy with the plight of the postman and favor a realistic consideration of his wage problem consistent with other governmental and industry pay advances.

As the 1954 Republican nominee for governor, I feel that the national administration should support the action of the Congress especially when it is considered that the percentage differential of this bill over other proposals only amounts to the cost of one quart of milk daily per employee.

DONALD S. LEONARD.

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF LETTER CARRIERS,
Washington, D. C., May 17, 1955.

Hon. WILLIAM LANGER,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR LANGER: Attached hereto is a copy of a very interesting telegram sent to President Eisenhower under date of May 14. You had the pleasure of meeting Mr. Donald S. Leonard in the Senate reception room today.

Mr. Leonard, the Republican nominee for Governor of Michigan last year, is very sincere in his support of the postal-pay measure presently in the White House. The thought occurs that it would be wholesome indeed if you could possibly insert the telegram in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at your convenience.

With kind regards and all good wishes, I remain

Sincerely yours,

W. C. DOHERTY,
President.

THE PRESIDENT'S ROAD PROGRAM

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD certain editorials commenting on the President's road plan.

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

[From the Milwaukee (Wis.) Journal of February 28, 1955]

LET'S KNOW WHERE WE ARE GOING ON HIGHWAY PROGRAM

Some of President Eisenhower's enthusiasm for a giant highway-construction program seems to have drained away.

Last July the administration's $50 billion "grand plan" set the Governors of the 48 States back on their heels when it was presented by Vice President NIXON at their annual conference. But last week the President's message to Congress was a mild recitation of highway needs and a hesitant endorsement of the controversial financing scheme proposed by the Presidential Highway Study Committee headed by Gen. Lucius Clay.

Mr. Eisenhower accepted the Clay committee's estimate that Federal, State, and local governments should spend $101 billion in the next 10 years on highway construction. He accepted the further recommendation that Federal spending of $31 billion be concentrated primarily on the key 40,000-mile interstate highway system. But then he dumped into the lap of Congress the most important problem of all—how the Federal share should be financed.

The Clay committee had recommended a Federal highway corporation to float $20 billion in 30-year bonds. These bonds would be outside the Federal debt—yet would have to be paid off by annual appropriations from Congress.

The president didn't wholly embrace this scheme, perhaps because it had been denounced by Senator BYRD, of Virginia, and other Democrats. His message said only that he was "inclined to the view that it is sounder to finance this program by special bond issues. * * *" Yet Congress was offered no alternative guidance.

Since the problem is so largely back where it started, the most searching study of the whole program is warranted. Few will deny that our highways are in bad shape. The Federal Government has a primary interest in the interstate system which links 90 percent of the population centers of 50,000 or more and carries 20 percent of the rural traffic. But with demands for defense, education, and other needs so pressing, dare we go overboard on highway construction?

Rebuilding our highways is not going to be cheap and easy for the Federal, State, or local governments. Hocus-pocus financing, such as the Clay committee recommended and the President is "inclined to," won't solve the money problem by trying to cover it up.

Let's first make absolutely certain what our legitimate needs are, then build soundly and economically for both present and future.

[From the Portland (Maine) Express of February 24, 1955]

SOMETHING SMELLY HERE

To finance the Federal Government's share of a proposed multi-billion-dollar highway building program, the Eisenhower administration proposes establishing a Federal Highway Corporation. The corporation would be empowered to issue bonds. The bonds would not be considered a part of the national debt, for some reason. The debt limitation law would therefore not apply in this case.

Democratic Senator HARRY F. BYRD, of Virginia, cites a danger inherent in this type of spending. He sees it as a scheme establishing a precedent that might cause Congress to lose all control over the Federal budget.

The Virginian calls the program inflationary, moreover, at a time when the economy is booming. And it seems to him that the administration "is proposing deficit spending—and I don't know why."

Neither do we. There is a remarkable fishy smell about this whole proposal to take control away from the people's representatives in Congress and vest it in a new corporate authority. What is the big idea?

Why was Congress empowered to set a ceiling over the Federal debt if the Government can set up corporations which borrow money outside of the budget, corporations whose debts are not included in the national total?

Says Senator BYRD:

"If they can set up a corporation to borrow money outside the budget and the debt limit to build roads, they can do anything."

The Senator is right. Once the precedent were established, the Government could set up independent corporations to borrow money for defense plants, housing, airports, collective farms, or projects similar to the Tennessee Valley Authority. Once the corporations were formed, Congress—the elected representatives of the taxpayers—would have little or no control over them. And it would be silly to say the borrowings of such corporations did not constitute a very real part of the public debt.

A big new network of highways would certainly be beneficial, for defense purposes as well as to meet the Nation's growing traffic needs. But it could be argued that we are making fairly good progress in that direction right now—and doing it without Federal pump priming. Gasoline taxes, State and Federal, are bringing in huge sums annually. There is no desperate need to borrow against the future for a Federal superhighway network.

Certainly, if Federal bonds are issued, they should be issued as a part of the Federal budget and included as part of the Federal debt.

Thoughtful Americans will not take kindly to any tricky financial schemes to evade the intent of our budget laws. Such trickery does not square with Mr. Eisenhower's earlier pledges of integrity, economy, and a balanced national budget.

[From the Houston (Tex.) Chronicle of February 26, 1955]

PRESIDENT'S HIGHWAY PROPOSAL IS RUNNING INTO ROUGH SLEDDING

President Eisenhower's $100 billion Federal highway program is running into all sorts of complications, as could be expected of so ill-advised a measure. One of the Senators who introduced the bill, Senator FRANCIS CASE, Republican of South Dakota, announced that he will not support the bill in its present form. CASE said he hadn't read the bill when he introduced it.

Senator HARRY BYRD, Democrat of Virginia, Senate economy leader and one of the financial experts of the Federal Government, termed sections of the bill "pork barrel" legislation.

On the other side of the fence, some of the New Deal Democrats are blasting the proposal because they say it doesn't go far enough. They contend that while the President calls it a $100 billion Federal program, it actually would provide only $25 billion during the next 10 years. Only $25 billion.

The New Dealers can't let the Eisenhower administration get away with bigger promises and bigger give-aways, so they'd like to top his fantasy with a superfantasy.

The divergence of congressional opinion on the Eisenhower program is revealing. It shows how difficult it is, seemingly impossible even, to get Congress back into a frame of mind to live within the Nation's income. In this respect, the American people obviously are far ahead of congressional thinking. Millions who voted for President Eisenhower in 1952 thought they were voting for a balanced budget and an end to reckless spending by the Federal Government. They have not realized their hopes.

The Eisenhower highway proposal is perhaps the greatest deviation from the Republican campaign promises of 1952. Not only because of the enormous amount of money involved; not only because it further centralizes power in Washington and catapults the Federal Government closer to national socialism, but also because it proposes a dangerous new way for financing Federal give-aways, is the highway measure an ill-advised thing. The Federal Government would raise the money through the issuance of bonds of some authority to be set up, thus circumventing the national debt limit.

Obviously, the bill will be warmly debated in the Senate and House. It is to be hoped that one of the bodies will kill it.

[From the Oskaloosa (Iowa) Herald of February 25, 1955]

Senator BYRD and others have already had something to say about this bookkeeping. The proposal is for the Federal Government to borrow some $25 billion from the public, spend it on roads, but then pretend that it has added not one penny to the Federal debt. It would do this by setting up a highway authority which would do the actual borrowing but whose debts would be guaranteed by the Treasury, just like any other Federal debt.

This would simply be a bit of shenanigans to get around the legal limit on the Government's debt. And if it can be done for highways, then, of course it can be done for those other things—schools, hospitals, and the like. This would open the way for a Federal bookkeeping system that would be essentially dishonest, because it would offer the pretense that a debt isn't a debt.

Yet there is more to this program that ought to be looked at than the bookkeeping. For this is not simply a program for increasing Federal assistance to State highway commissions; it would begin to make the planning and paying for the Nation's roads a Federal responsibility.

[From the Hendersonville (N. C.) Times-News of February 26, 1955]

BOTH POLITICAL PARTIES CHARGED WITH PORK-BARREL TACTICS

Senator HARRY BYRD brands the President's $101 billion highway program a clever pork-barrel political maneuver. Similar criticism comes from other sources, including the press and some political leaders.

On the other hand, similar charges of engaging in "pork" production are lodged against the Democratic plan for tax reduction. David Lawrence views this plan as "the cheapest form of demagogery."

Thus, the stage setting seems to be emerging for a couple of violent contests.

The Charlotte Observer views the road plan as a pork-barrel move and says the tax-cut plan is "pure politics." This newspaper approves the road plan if it is confined to what the President called a strategic network. If it extends to secondary and feeder roads and streets, the Observer is against it.

President Eisenhower has already announced that he will ask for tax reduction in 1956, shortly before the next election. Ike opened a big hole in his position by

making that admission; but it seems clear that the Democrats are planning to beat him by way of walking through the breach before 1956.

David Lawrence's summary in a heavy assault on the tax-reduction plan is here quoted:

"The Democratic majority in Congress has apparently decided to constitute itself a 'wrecking crew,' with the obvious purpose of wrecking the Eisenhower administration even if it means wrecking the Nation's economy at the same time.

"The party that promised the electorate in the congressional campaign last autumn that it would uphold the hands of the President and support his measures now has turned on him, and on the country, too, and has embarked upon a course of irresponsibility which cannot be justified even on the ground of partisan benefit. For the new proposal to buy the American voters by giving everybody $20 off his tax bill and also freeing nearly 5 million voters from paying any taxes at all is the cheapest form of demagogery."

These and many other attacks on the taxing and road construction proposals indicate the extent to which the people have lost confidence in the integrity of party leadership. If the charges are basically sound the indictments are justified; if the proposals are honest suggestions as to national policies, the persons in the Government responsible for them are due credit for honesty of purpose. President Eisenhower and the Republicans, or the Democratic leaders, in these cases, may be wrong; if they are wrong and these plans are adopted and fail, great will be the tragic aspects of these policies.

In that case the people would be the chief sufferers from the mistakes in government.

Highway planning and construction must continue in order to meet the needs of a growing and expanding Nation. This problem can only be ignored at great inconvenience and cost to highway users. The country must try to keep pace with the demands of adequate highway construction and maintenance.

Good business judgment should be applied in this department of national and State spending of public money, as in all other departments. Doubtless all intelligent citizens are agreed at this point—the division of opinion occurs when determination of what is needed, what is financially possible, and what is politically expedient, must be made.

The Republican campaign promises made in the last national contest were summed up in promises to wipe out extravagance and irresponsible management in government and to balance the national budget and stop inflation.

The country is expecting the administration to make good that promise. Newspaper readers who have closely watched the procedure of the administration are justified in doubting that steps being taken will achieve the ends promised.

The same conditions which apply to national highway problems are true of the other large and important business problems which are directly connected with the operations of government.

If the Eisenhower administration spends as much or more cash than the previous "Dealer" administrations expended, how can inflation be stopped and the budget balanced?

Some progress in that direction can be made by eliminating extravagance in Government management and unnecessary spending. Much progress can be made by eliminating politically expedient spending.

To contend that Government expenses cannot be reduced is an assertion which cannot be successfully supported by the facts. Senator BYRD and other conservative businessmen, including the Hoover Commission, have pointed out in factual order how the Federal budget can be balanced. Balanced—not in a few months, but within reasonable time. This cannot be done, however, by increasing expenditures daily, weekly or annually.

The only way to practice economy is to economize. The only way to balance a budget is to reduce the expense account to a point within the income.

[From the Pottsville (Pa.) Republican of February 24, 1955]

ADEQUATE HIGHWAYS WILL COME SOME DAY

President Eisenhower's $10 billion highway-construction program is being assailed by some United States Senators. Senator BYRD, Virginia Democrat, calls it "pork barrel"—meaning that it is purely for political purposes in the areas where the funds would be spent. Senator GORE, Tennessee Democrat, calls the President's idea to have a portion of Federal gas tax funds earmarked for 30 years for construction of superhighways as irresponsible financing.

Ten billion dollars sounds like a lot of money—and it is. Senator BYRD, for whom we have considerable respect as a watchdog of the Treasury, was probably shocked at mention of the amount. We pour out billions of dollars every year because of the Communist threat. Why can't we spend a few billions on roads which are badly needed in many States? And why should a long-range financing program for adequate highways be termed irresponsible financing?

The motorists of this Nation—and they are increasing in number every year—have long thought that they are not getting a fair return in new roads for the huge amount of money they are paying in local, county, State, and Federal taxes. Much of the motorists' dollar is going into general funds.

If it would become necessary to quickly evacuate big metropolitan areas, it would soon be discovered how inadequate the highways are. There have been instances when a few inches of snow caused traffic jams that virtually tied up a big city for hours. Imagine what a sudden rush of panic-stricken people would do to highways leading out of a large city.

A few Senators can indulge in loose talk about the Eisenhower road program, but it is something that must, of necessity, come some day. The increasing number of automobiles on the streets and highways is causing serious business complications all over the country by the reason of the resulting congestion. Eventually, every community will wake up to the realization that something must be done about it.

[From the Newburyport (Mass.) News, March 2, 1955]

THE FEDERAL ROADS PROGRAM

The National Advisory Committee for a National Highway Program, appointed by President Eisenhower, has proposed that the Federal Government spend an additional $25 billion—over what is now being spent—in the next 10 years for an interstate highway system.

The committee proposes that the extra $25 billion would result in the construction of 40,000 road miles, or about 800 miles per State. The committee would finance this project by borrowing $20 billion at 3 percent interest, while collecting $5 billion in fees from filling stations, motels, and so forth.

However, Senator HARRY F. BYRD, Virginia Democrat, has pointed out some of the dangers which such a program might entail. Once again, BYRD has ably presented the other side of the argument concerning a desirable program.

First, BYRD points out that the 10-year program would result in an interstate highway system which would be little more than 1 percent of all public road mileage. Concerning the cost of this, if the 3-percent interest rate was paid on the borrowed $20 billion, the last bonds maturing in 1987, the interest in this period alone would cost taxpayers another $11.5 billion.

Senator BYRD offers an alternative program: First, he would repeal the 2-cent tax now being collected by the Federal Government, with the idea that the States would impose it themselves to get revenue for their own road program. Second, he would continue the Federal-aid program as it is today to primary, secondary, and urban road systems, on the long standing matching basis.

Third, he would continue to collect the lubricating oil tax now collected by the Federal Government. And fourth, he would put a one-half cent per gallon Federal tax on gasoline, and the revenue from this tax—plus the lubricating oil tax—would pay the Federal Government's way for the highway-aid program.

We are strongly in favor of the Byrd program and hope that Congress will give it a trial before it sets up a vast Federal road bureaucracy.

[From the Haverhill (Mass.) Gazette of March 1, 1955]

FEDERAL HIGHWAY PROGRAM

President Eisenhower presented his highway construction program to Congress without emphasis on the means of financing it. He said merely that he was inclined to favor the financing plan recommended by the President's Committee on a National Highway Program.

The committee's recommendations, as described by Senator BYRD, fall generally into 2 parts: (1) Continuation of the regular Federal aid to highways at the rate of $623 million a year, and (2) expenditure during the next 10 years of an additional $25 billion for an interstate highway system. BYRD estimated the Federal expenditures for the 2 programs in 10 years would amount to $31 billion.

The $25 billion of Federal expenditures would be financed by the collection of $5 billion from filling stations, motels, and restaurants operated along the new highways and by selling $20 billions in 30-year 3-percent taxable bonds.

Legislation to provide for carrying out the committee's recommendations was introduced coincident with the presentation of the President's plan.

Previously another highway construction bill had been introduced by Senator GORE and hearings on it have been started by the Senate Public Works Committee. This bill would authorize Federal appropriations of $1.6 billion a year for the next 5 years. The States would have to match $1.1 billion of this amount dollar for dollar. The rest of it they would have to match on a basis of $1 for every $2 advanced by Washington. If the States matched the Federal money, the Gore bill would mean an annual expenditure of about $3 billion a year for 5 years.

BYRD has another plan which has not yet been formally expressed in legislation. He would amend the recommendations of the President's committee to provide:

"1. That the 2-cent gasoline tax now being collected by the Federal Government be repealed, thus permitting the States to reimpose it.

"2. Present Federal aid to primary, secondary, and urban road systems, which for many years has been integrated with State highway systems, be continued on the long-standing match basis. This amounts to $535 million.

"3. That the lubricating-oil tax now collected by the Federal Government be continued.

"4. A one-half-cent-a-gallon gasoline tax be asssessed. Revenue from this tax plus the Federal lubricating-oil tax shortly will be enough to compensate the Federal Treasury for this program."

There is a fundamental difference between the Gore and Byrd plans, on the one hand, and the Eisenhower plan, on the other. BYRD and GORE propose a pay-as-you-go method of financing Federal aid on highway construction. The Eisenhower plan advances what BYRD calls procedures that "violate financing principles, defy budgetary control, and evade Federal debt law." Let us quote BYRD further on the Eisenhower plan:

"The committee recommended to the President that the program be financed through a Federal corporation which, without either assets or income, would borrow $20 billion from the public. The Treasury, under a contract with the corporation, would guarantee the corporation's bonds, but the debt would not be included in the record of obligations guaranteed by the United States. Annual appropriations to meet principal and interest payments would be requested, but the request could not be refused or reduced by subsequent Congresses, for 30 years, if the faith and credit of the Government are to be honored. If financial difficulty should develop at any time, the corporation with no further authorization could make mandatory calls upon the Treasury for amounts up to $5 billion outstanding at any one time. * * *

"If the Federal Government can properly borrow money for roads in this fashion, without regarding it as debt, and spend it without budgetary control, it may be expected that similar proposals will be made for financing endless outlays which may be desirable for education, hospitals, public health, etc. * * *

"This would mean operating the Government on two sets of books: One set for activities financed by borrowing outside the debt and expenditures outside budgetary control, and the other set for activities financed by borrowing on the record and expenditures under budget control.

"Count it as you will, as we spend more than our income we add to our debt. The least the Government can do, in fairness to taxpayers, it to keep books and accounts in a manner reflecting the true state of our fiscal affairs. * * *"

It is no wonder, we think, that Senator SALTONSTALL's comment on the President's program was:

"We have got to build roads, but I want to know a little more about the method of financing."

The Senator is right. We must build roads and Federal assistance in financing construction is sound, both because of the interstate nature of highways and because of the need to weld the highway system to the requirements of the national defense. But the need is not so urgent that it requires either a departure from sound financial practice or from Eisenhower's devotion to decentralization of Federal authority. In this connection, it is pertinent to note that BYRD's proposals call for greater States responsibility in a highway building program.

[From the Bradford (Pa.) Era of March 3, 1955]

HIGHWAYS FOR AMERICA

The President wants this country to build new highways and lots of them. Luckily for him, he is not too dogmatic about how to finance it all.

The plan he sent to Congress this week calls for spending $101 billion over the next 10 years on highways. Almost a third of the money would be put up by Uncle Sam; the rest by the States. One feature of the financing has drawn heavy fire. This calls for a Federal authority that would issue about $25 billion worth of bonds. These would be paid off out of gas taxes, tolls, and the like.

The authority idea would nicely circumvent the budget. Uncle Sam would be in the hole for $25 billion but that fact would not show up in the regular debt. We in Pennsylvania are very familiar with the trick.

A lot of Senators, including the powerful HARRY BYRD, of Virginia, are opposed to an authority. They say that money spent ought to show up clearly in the budget as just that.

If the Government did take the authority drug in this instance, it might find the habit irresistible. Soon we might have Federal authorities to finance schools, hospitals, civilian defense, and what-have you. Then it would be almost impossible for the citizen to know what the budget meant and what was the true state of the national debt.

Whatever the disagreement on financing, however, few can disagree on the need for an all-out highway program. Our roads are far below the needs of this most motorized nation in the world. They are falling further below every day.

Our economy is growing. Commerce, safety, and defense require that our highways keep pace with this growth. That is really the heart of the highway matter before Congress.—Pittsburgh Post-Gazette.

[From the Fayetteville (N. C.) Observer, February 26, 1955]

IKE'S ROAD PLAN: IS IT NECESSARY IN ATOM AGE?

Senator HARRY FLOOD BYRD, of Virginia, the Nation's foremost apostle of economy, has branded President Eisenhower's $101 billion road-construction program as a "pork-barrel" scheme. His views concerning this proposed measure are reminiscent of his attitude toward some of President Roosevelt's pump-priming legislation back in the 1930's.

Mr. Eisenhower, however, uses the atomic age rather than pump-priming, as an argument for his road program. He points out that the Nation must possess an excellent system of roads for use in evacuations in event of atomic attacks.

There is some question of just how much value a system of super highways would be in event an A-bomb or an H-bomb splattered upon them. One theory is that the best defense against atomic attack this country can devise is a mighty buildup of weapons for retaliation.

The President's road-building program would cover a 10-year period and about a third of the cost would be borne by the Federal Government with the State and local governments paying the balance. It must be noted that North Carolina now is considering a $97 million primary road program for the next 2 years. Additional appropriations, which would be necessary under the Eisenhower program, would create new and more perplexing taxation problems.

It must be admitted, however, that an adequate national highway system must be maintained if the Nation is to be in readiness for war, whether that war be atomic or otherwise, since the Nation cannot gird itself for defense without a workable system of land communication.

Main question raised by the Eisenhower proposal is whether it is too ambitious, especially since the Government is operating in the red despite monumental taxation.

A compromise would seem appropriate as to the $101 billion highway proposal. From a political standpoint, it will be interesting to note how those anti-Eisenhower political elements, which have been pressing for more "made work" governmental projects, will view the proposition. If they oppose the President on this, their position is likely to be rather inconsistent.

[From the Tulsa (Okla.) World of February 23, 1955]

STRUGGLE OVER ROAD BILLS

Congress is wrestling mightily over the Eisenhower highway program. Formal dissent to the administration measure, listed as a $101 billion affair, is found in the Gore bill, which differs materially in the matter of State-Federal partnership in road-building.

That the President's bill, as drawn up by Gen. Lucius Clay and others, is in for a rough time is putting it mildly. The objections piled up fast, even before the measure was sent to Congress. The most bitter fight will probably be upon financing. The official bill has been itemized this way:

Interstate network, joining 50 percent of all cities over 50,000 population, $23 billion; primary system, connecting all principal cities and manufacturing areas, $30 billion; secondary system, including farm-to-market roads, $15 billion; other streets and roads, including urban feeder streets, $33 billion. The proposal covers 10 years of activity. The Federal Government would put up $25 billion for the interstate system and proportionate amounts for the other items.

To finance this program, there is proposed a 30-year bond issue, to be paid off by gasoline and diesel taxes and taxes upon motels along the right-of-way. To this plan, the influential Senator HARRY BYRD has made stiff objections; it would dry up gasoline as a source of general revenue. These taxes, according to a late statement from the White House, would be earmarked for debt retirement. The aggregated interest, according to Senator BYRD, would be $11,500,000,000. The Byrd proposal is to cut the Federal gasoline tax from 2 mills to one-half mill and leave much of the road program to the States; they would be enabled to use their own gasoline taxes to a great extent and thus cut down the Federal expenditures.

The measure wil be fired upon from many angles. Western Congressmen are not quite happy over it; they say it refers to thick populations rather than distances. The official bill provides for continuation of the matching program between States and the Nation.

There is, however, one general agreement: We must have more and better highways. The big fight has some undoubted political phases, but the struggle is not over the desirability of a big program but upon financing it and preserving the balance between the State and Federal Governments and dealing equitably with diverse areas.

[From the Grants Pass (Oreg.) Courier of February 21, 1955]

A DANGEROUS PRECEDENT

Everyone realizes that the huge number of motor vehicles being operated daily by the people of the United States calls for huge outlays of funds with which to provide more and better highways.

Thus one may sympathize with the objective of the President's $101 billion Federal highway program.

However, the President's proposal contains a provision which sets up a precedent which is so dangerous that we believe the method should not be used under any circumstances.

We refer to the proposal to set up a Government-owned corporation, without assets, which would be authorized to borrow $20 billion, this debt not to be included in the national debt, but still a financial obligation of the Government.

This method of increasing the national indebtedness without running afoul of the statutory debt limitation was worked out by the President's highway commission, headed by Gen. Lucius Clay.

Probably there is no greater authority on tax matters in the United States today than Senator HARRY F. BYRD, of Virginia.

BYRD is a Democrat but he fought Truman spending policies year after year. Today, he is doing what he can to warn the Nation of the danger in the President's road program.

Here is a statement from Senator BYRD on the subject:

"Actually the committee recommends that the Federal Government assume virtually the complete obligation for the so-called interstate highway system (abolishing the 60–40 Federal-State matching requirement in this program) and that it be financed by methods which are unique so far as I know, and thoroughly unsound.

"The committee recommended to the President that the program be financed through a Federal corporation which, without either assets or income, would borrow $20 billion from the public. The Treasury, under a contract with the corporation, would guarantee the corporation's bonds, but the debt would not be included in the record of obligations guaranteed by the United States. Annual appropriations to meet principal and interest payments would be requested, but the request could not be refused or reduced by subsequent Congresses, for 30 years, if the faith and credit of the Government are to be honored. If financial difficulty should develop at any time, the corporation, with no further authorization could make mandatory calls upon the Treasury for amounts up to $5 billion outstanding at any one time.

"Such procedures violate financing principles, defy budgetary control, and evade Federal debt law.

"If the Federal Government can properly borrow money for roads in this fashion, without regarding it as debt, and spend it without budgetary control, it may be expected that similar proposals will be made for financing endless outlays which may be desirable for education, hospitals, public health, etc. In fact I am informed that such a plan is now under consideration for school construction.

"This would mean operating the Government on two sets of books: One set for activities financed by borrowing outside the debt and expenditures outside budgetary control, and the other set for activities financed by borrowing on the record and expenditures under budget control.

"Count it as you will, as we spend more than our income we add to our debt. The least the Government can do, in fairness to taxpayers, is to keep books and accounts in a manner reflecting the true state of our fiscal affairs.

"When the Government contracts a bona fide debt, but arbitrarily removes it from classification as public indebtedness, it creates fiscal confusion and disorder, and destroys confidence in Government credit.

"You cannot avoid financial responsibility by legerdemain, and you cannot evade debt by definition. The obligations of the Federal Government and all its citizens will still remain."

We agree with BYRD's position that adoption of the President's program would do away with any national debt control and, ultimately, lead to highly dangerous inflation.

[From the Newark (N. J.) News of February 24, 1955]

FINANCING ROAD PROGRAM

President Eisenhower has presented compelling argument in support of his national roadbuilding program. Few question the necessity of improving and expanding our highway system.

Opposition centers chiefly on tentative proposals for financing the Federal Government's share of the $101 billion project. Though he leans to the idea of a bond issue, the President has not taken a hard and fast position but apparently is ready to consider any reasonable plan.

Senator BYRD has served as a useful watchdog over Federal finances, but he goes too far when he puts the pork-barrel label on the President's program on the ground that it would reimburse States like New Jersey for some of the funds they have already invested in superhighways.

He overlooks the fact that these States have not yet completed road programs that are highly important to interstate, even transcontinental, commerce.

There is plenty of room for discussion of the financing. State interests have suggested in the past that the gasoline tax be a source of revenue left wholly to the States, which will have to provide the greatest share of the funds invested in this roadbuilding effort.

This would argue for tolls, rather than gas taxes, to liquidate the debt. Tolls are working out very well in the large turnpike projects already completed and might be less objectionable politically.

[From the Lynchburg (Va.) News of February 16, 1955]

IKE'S WAY OUT

It is becoming more and more evident that the administration acted without thinking through when it plunked for that multibillion-dollar Federal highway-construction program on which the Clay Commission recently reported, and, which, it is announced, will go to the Congress next week.

First was the mistake of underestimating the strength of the opposition to the plan itself, both in theory and in practice. It has been denounced as unsound governmental philosophy and as a fiscal crime. Opposition has been vocally vigorous and weighty in argument. Senator HARRY F. BYRD, of Virginia, as chairman of the powerful Senate Finance Committee, is the most influential opponent, but he is not alone. The program faces what appears to be an almost insuperable barrier. It is hardly probable that the administration had anticipated running into anything like it.

Now, we are informed by Roscoe Drummond, writing on this page today, that the delay in presenting the program to the Congress has been due to the second mistake the administration made in this matter. It endorsed the program without first deciding upon the method of financing the program, whether to pay out that huge sum annually from taxes or whether to issue bonds to mature under the Clay plan, in 30 years. Opposition to the bond issue feature is not confined to those who oppose the whole program from principle. The fiscally sound are, as Drummond described Senator BYRD's state of mind, horrified at its unsoundness. Why not, then, abandon that proposal and turn to a pay-as-you-go plan? The answer is simple: To do that would mean to forfeit all hope of reducing the national debt, of balancing the budget and reducing taxes next year or for years to come, even if sweet peace descends to envelop the world. It is a poor choice that is presented, and it still is not announced which the President has made or will make.

There is, of course, a way out. A few days ago in response to a question as to why he had changed his mind radically about the advisability of a decision he had made previously, President Eisenhower remarked simply that he had discovered that he had made an error and naturally moved to correct it. He has made two errors with his highway-construction program, a program that is out of line with the Federal Union which this Government was intended to be and which by the terms of the compact, known as the Constitution, it is, a program that cannot be financed by any method with any pretentions to soundness. His way out is to admit the mistake, pigeonhole the Clay report, and forget all about the thing. There are so many important questions to give him headaches that he would be wise to get rid of this one while he can. And while about it he might take a quick look at his school-construction program with its bribe to localities to go head over heels into debt. We say a quick look because that ought to be sufficient to lead him to discard this migraine provocative, too.

AIR FORCE POLICY OF PROCUREMENT DISPERSAL

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, last February, before a House of Representatives Subcommittee on Appropriations, the Secretary of the Air Force, Hon. Harold E. Talbott, made some comments with respect to the policy of dispersal in the overall policy of aircraft procurement.

Mr. President, I think you are undoubtedly acquainted with the fact that a great segment of the economy of southern California is geared to aircraft production for the United States Air Force. By reason of the comments which the Secretary made, there was considerable concern and no little apprehension among the people connected with the industry and generally throughout the State of California regarding the status of the industry, and, indeed, doubt of what the policy of dispersal meant. That apprehension was shared in Washington by my colleague the senior Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND], by the members of the House delegation from California, and by myself.

My colleague and I prepared a letter, addressed to the Secretary of the Air Force, in which we asked, as carefully as we could, a number of pertinent questions, and we requested the Secretary of the Air Force to give us answers to those questions.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point a copy of the letter which my colleague and I sent to the Secretary of the Air Force, and a copy of the letter which the Secretary made to us by way of reply.

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

UNITED STATES SENATE,
May 11, 1955.

Hon. HAROLD E. TALBOTT,
Secretary of the Air Force,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. SECRETARY: In view of the apprehension which has developed in our State—particularly in southern California—following testimony you and General Twining gave in the House Appropriations Subcommittee recently, concerning the Air Force policy of procurement dispersal we appreciated the opportunity to confer with you.

Management, labor and local government officials in California have voiced serious concern as to what may be intended. We wish, therefore, to ask several specific questions relative to the Air Force procurement policy as it affects the relationship of the Air Force with contractors on the west coast and we shall appreciate very much an answer from you to each of the following questions:

1. What is the dispersal policy of the Air Force in connection with procurement?

2. Is it the same as for the Army and Navy?

3. How long has the present policy been in existence?

4. What, if any, is the difference in your policy from that announced in 1947 by the President's Commission on Aviation Policy?

5. Within congressional limitations of appropriations, your obligational authority, and the requirements of national defense, will Air Force dispersal policy permit the continued placing of contracts with California manufacturers? As far as can be foreseen, will Air Force purchases under your dispersal policy result in maintenance of employment at approximately present levels?

6. Does the dispersal policy preclude increasing the employment level in southern California aircraft plants engaged in military production under the present contracts?

7. Is it contemplated that reorders of aircraft currently being produced in southern California will be awarded present contractors on a basis that will assure continued operations at southern California plants presently working on Air Force contracts?

8. Since there are tremendous numbers of small concerns in California engaged in subcontracting and supplying prime contractors, will the Air Force desire for dispersal affect their participation in future procurement?

9. Is the policy of dispersal limited to bringing about erection of any required new production facilities in other locations of the United States? Or, will the policy lead to curtailment of production by existing west coast contractors and the transfer of present production to other areas of the country?

The phenomenal population and production growth of California in the past decade shows no signs of tapering off. As we are sure you appreciate, a substantal degree of the economy of the southern California area is directly related to military aircarft manufacture and Air Force procurement policy. The people of southern California, both workers and management, have set astounding records for efficient performance both in war and in peace. In justice to this great industry, and to the communities in which it is situated, we earnestly feel that the matter of Air Force procurement policy as it involves dispersal of producing facilities should be clarified.

Very sincerely yours,

WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND.
THOMAS H. KUCHEL.

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE,
Washington, May 16, 1955.

Hon. THOMAS H. KUCHEL,
United States Senate.

DEAR SENATOR KUCHEL: This will reply to your letter of May 11, in which you ask several specific questions relative to the Air Force procurement policy as it affects the relationship of the Air Force with contractors on the west coast.

I am pleased with the opportunity this provides to discuss with you this very vital national military problem. The answers to your questions are as follows:

1. What is the dispersal policy of the Air Force in connection with procurement?

Answer: Basically, our policy with respect to dispersal is to place our orders in such a way that we will avoid increasing the heavy concentrations of key defense industries in single locations. Our best method of bringing about dispersal is to make certain that the new organizations and new facilities which the Government must finance directly or indirectly are steered away from areas of concentration. Our real concern is the tendency of these concentrations to increase.

2. Is it the same as for the Army and Navy?

Answer: This policy is the same for the Army, the Navy and the Marine Corps. It is also a defense policy and an Office of Defense Mobilization policy.

3. How long has the present policy been in existence?

Answer: This general policy has been in existence since the start of heavy aircraft expenditures during World War II.

4. What, if any, is the difference in your policy from that announced in 1947 by the President's Commission on Aviation Policy?

Answer: This policy is the same as that announced in 1947 by the President's Commission on Aviation Policy—the Finletter Committee. The following quotation from this report deals with this policy:

"At the end of World War II, the aircraft and aircraft engine plants were well dispersed, as shown on the map elsewhere in this section. A large part of our total production of military aircraft is now concentrated in the Los Angeles area, on Long Island, and at Seattle.

"It is regrettable that the wartime-plant dispersion was not maintained. Our reserve plants (i. e., Government-owned plants not now in operation) are still well dispersed. If, in response to a mobilization order, reserve plants are brought into production, the total aircraft manufacturing plant pattern would represent an effective geographical dispersal. If, on the other hand, an attack should precede activation of the reserve plants, the industry will offer highly concentrated targets. We recommend that, in future plant expansion, the services avoid further concentration in these areas as far as possible."

5. Within congressional limitations of appropriations your obligational authority, and the requirements of national defense, will Air Force dispersal policy permit the continued placing of contracts with California manufacturers? As far as can be foreseen, will Air Force purchases under your dispersal policy result in maintenance of employment at approximately present levels?

Answer: The Air Force will definitely continue to place large contracts with California manufacturers. It is here that we have many of our most important engineering organizations and production facilities, and we definitely plan to use them. Procurement of military equipment of the highest quality in the shortest time and at the lowest cost is our primary objective, and to attain it we must use existing facilities and know-how to the fullest extent possible.

This will not necessarily result in maintenance of employment at approximately present levels. However, as our total requirements for aircraft and other equipment go up or down, as they have in the past, we would expect that part manufactured in California would go up or down also. Actually, as we complete the aircraft for the 137-wing Air Force, we expect that there will be a general decrease in aircraft production, and that there will be some decrease in employment in California. This is not the result of the dispersal policy, however.

6. Does the dispersal policy preclude increasing the employment level in southern California aircraft plants engaged in military production under the present contracts?

Answer: The dispersal policy does not preclude increasing the employment level in southern California aircraft plants engaged in military production under present contracts. However, the most important factor to bear in mind is the fact that as certain models are completed and other models started, that employment will go up in some plants and down in others.

7. Is it contemplated that reorders of aircraft currently being produced in southern California will be awarded present contractors on a basis that will assure continued operations at southern California plants presently working on Air Force contracts?

Answer: We are continually reordering aircraft from southern California plants and expect to continue to do so. In addition, we expect to place orders for new designs with these firms in cases where the work can be done with existing facilities.

8. Since there are tremendous numbers of small concerns in California engaged in subcontracting and supplying prime contractors, will the Air Force desire for dispersal affect their participation in future procurement?

Answer: Generally speaking we are not as concerned about the concentration of small suppliers as we are about the larger companies since the type of work they perform is generally already broadly dispersed. Most of this work is placed by the prime manufacturers who like to have at least two sources of supply in different locations, and we are not as worried as we are in the case of the manufacturers of our major items where it is too costly to establish multiple sources except in special cases. We would not, however, give Government support to the creation of a new organization or the establishment of new facilities if we thought there was an undesirable tendency to concentrate a critical item in a given area.

9. Is the policy of dispersal limited to bringing about erection of any required new production facilities in other locations of the United States? Or, will the policy lead to curtailment of production by existing west coast contractors and the transfer of present production to other areas of the country?

Answer: We have no intention of curtailing production by existing west coast contractors by the transfer of present production to other areas of the country. It is, however, definitely our intention to implement this policy by controlling the location of new facilities.

I hope that the answers to these questions will permit you and your constituents to better understand the dispersal policy of the Air Force and the Defense Department.

Sincerely,

HAROLD E. TALBOTT.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I wish to say that my colleague and the House of Representatives delegation from California and I do not propose to see any policy of dispersal upon the part of the Military Establishment applied in such a way as to do an injustice to our State or to any other part of the country.

The answers which were given by the Secretary of the Air Force allay, I think, to an extent, much of the apprehension which has arisen in California. However, we propose to pursue the matter further.

MINING CLAIMS AND FISHING

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, sportsmen and other conservationists are greatly concerned over some of the legislation pending before the Congress involving changes in policies toward use of our public lands.

One of the serious questions arising has been abuse of the mining claim privilege of "weekend miners" to place out of bounds to the public, thousands of acres of choice fishing streams, timber stands, home sites, scenic camping grounds, and lake frontages.

I regret that the House of Representatives has passed a bill to throw the door open even wider to these spurious "prospectors."

However, I note that all conservationists are pleased that a new amendment to the mining law is being considered by

both the House and Senate to correct many of the abuses resulting from the old law of 1872, and at the same time protect legitimate mining.

No one is opposing bonafide mining claims; all sportsmen ask is that we recognize the facts that exist about spurious mining claims.

I want to commend the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] for introducing S. 1713 to accomplish this purpose of protecting future fishing on our western public lands, and urge its support. Hearings are now in progress.

I have had the privilege of reading an advance copy of an article on this subject to appear in the June issue of the Sport Fishing Institute Bulletin. Because it is a sound explanation of the issue, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this article, entitled "Mining Claims and Fishing," be printed in the body of the RECORD. I commend it to my colleagues for consideration.

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

MINING CLAIMS AND FISHING

The public lands in our 12 Western States furnish some of America's finest fishing. Of our 30 million anglers, most of those who have never had a try at catching wild fish in these highly scenic surroundings are undoubtedly looking forward to the day when they can have this pleasant and exciting experience.

If you are one of the many anglers bent on realizing this long-time ambition, you might be in for a rude awakening when you reach your destination. In one of the national forests, or on some of the extensive tracts managed by the United States Bureau of Land Management, you should have no trouble in finding just the sort of stream you have dreamed about—a clear, unpolluted mountain stream, well supplied with wild trout. But, you might also find something else. Stretched across the trail may be a barbed-wire fence or a locked gate, or there may simply be a conspicuous sign, telling you to keep out.

It's quite possible that someone may have staked out a mining claim on 20 acres of land. This would cost him $1.25. By staking this claim across the canyon, the person who owns the claim can keep you out of many miles of stream simply by making access to the water above the claim virtually impossible.

Someone may keep you from fishing on a stream flowing through land which belongs to all of us, simply by forking over $1.25. He can have his own private fishing stream, at your expense.

All this can happen because of a mining law adopted 83 years ago.

Actually, all a person has to do to stake a claim is to mark off the four corners of a 20-acre tract and record it in the county office. Any number of claims may be located so long as the mineral deposits discovered are sufficient to justify development by a prudent man. Along with the more valuable minerals, deposits of all the common varieties of sand, stone, gravel, pumice, and pumicite may be the basis for claims locations.

In all too many cases the claimants are "weekend miners" and under their spurious operations thousands of acres of choice fishing streams, timber stands, homesites, scenic camping grounds, and lake frontages have been placed out of bounds to the public.

As of January 1952, there were 36,000 mining patents on the national forests involving 918,000 acres of land. Although these had gone to patent under the mining laws, only 15 percent are commercially successful mines.

According to reports, there are 84,000 mining claims on these same forests involving 2,100,000 acres, with only 2 percent producing minerals in commercial quantities. Probably no more than 40 percent would be valid even under the weak provisions of the law. What's more, the timber tied up on these lands is worth more than $100 million and would build about 800,000 5-room houses. Since there is no time limit for claims to be brought to patent, the land is tied up indefinitely.

All rights to the surface uses go with the claims. The claimant has the trump card. Access to nearby lands and waters may be cut off, fishing prohibited along previously open streams, lake frontages, picnic and campsites taken over, timber products and grazing rights usurped.

These statutes tie the hands of the Federal land administering agencies. It would cost about $20 million to examine existing claims and protest those that are invalid. Three thousand man-years of work would be required. More than 16,000 claims are filed each year, and nothing would prevent the claimant from refiling once his application for patent is rejected.

Back in 1872, when the present law was passed, there were only a few people in the West to stake out claims. There were few users of our public lands. The law at that time was a good one.

But conditions have changed. Thousands of people have filed spurious claims to get a chunk of public land, and the waters and timber on it, for their own exclusive use. Now the uranium prospecting craze is really pointing out the need for a change in the law.

Fortunately, some of the streams have been withdrawn or reserved for possible power development. But even these may be opened to the undesirable practices which exist elsewhere. The House of Representatives has passed a bill (H. R. 100) which would throw these remaining lands open to the "prospectors." Several times in the past the House has passed such a bill, but each time it has died in the Senate.

Fortunately, a new amendment to the mining law is being considered by both House and Senate. It's a bill which would correct many of the abuses resulting from the law of 1872. At the same time, it would protect legitimate mining. Incidentally, some of these public lands support extensive mining. We object to the abuses—not to mining.

Our objection is to the spurious mining claims, not to the bona fide ones.

Under these proposed amendments, access to, and use of, fishing streams covered by unpatented claims appears to be assured.

The new bill in the House was introduced independently by several Representatives. The first was H. R. 5561, by Congressman WILLIAM A. DAWSON, of Utah. In the Senate the bill is S. 1713, introduced by Senator Anderson in behalf of himself and several other Senators. What happens to this introduced bill may have a very decided effect on future fishing on our western public lands.

POSTAL FIELD SERVICE COMPENSATION ACT OF 1945—VETO MESSAGE (S. DOC. NO. 44)

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a veto message from the President of the United States.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I may say, for the information of the Senate, I have consulted with the able minority leader. He has consulted with the ranking minority member of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. I have consulted with the able chairman of that committee. On behalf of myself and the minority leader, I ask that the reading of the message be deferred until a proposed unanimous-consent agreement, which is now at the desk, can be read and acted on.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the clerk will read the proposed unanimous-consent agreement.

The Chief Clerk read the proposed unanimous consent agreement, as follows:

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT

Ordered, That on Tuesday, May 24, 1955, at the conclusion of the routine morning business, the Senate shall proceed to the reconsideration of the bill S 1, the Postal Field Service Compensation Act of 1955, returned by the President of the United States to the Senate without his approval, and that on the question—"Shall the bill pass, the objections of the President of the United States to the contrary notwithstanding?"—and all motions, if any be made, relating thereto, debate shall be limited to 3 hours, to be equally divided between the proponents and opponents of the said bill and controlled, respectively, by the majority leader and the minority leader (May 19, 1955.)

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The Secretary will now read the message from the President of the United States.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

To the United States Senate:

I return herewith, without my approval, S. 1, to increase the rates of basic compensation of officers and employees in the field service of the Post Office Department. I take this action for three reasons. First, the bill creates new discriminations or inequities which would affect many thousands of postal employees. Second, the bill creates grave administrative problems such as the establishment of thousands of individual pay rates. It forces awkward and unfair administrative practices in a Government department whose operations affect every person, every enterprise, every community in the country. Third, the bill imposes a heavier burden upon the taxpayer than is necessary to establish salary rates throughout the Department which will compare favorably with rates for similar work elsewhere in Government and in private industry.

At the outset of this administration, the Postmaster General began a comprehensive study of the entire postal system.

The principal purpose was to discover effective ways and means by which the American people could be assured more speedy, certain, economical, and efficient handling of their mail. Obviously, this purpose can be achieved only if, first, postal employees are dedicated and satisfied in career service because of fair compensation, good working conditions, adequate benefits in vacations, insurance, sick leave, and old-age security; and second, the Department's administrative structure, incorporating the best management practices, is so designed

that merit and responsibility are recognized and rewarded.

In accordance with the findings of the comprehensive study, on January 11, 1955, by special message to the Congress, I recommended an increase in the salaries of postal employees which would be composed of two elements—a general increase in postal pay and a reclassification of postal positions that would eliminate inequities. To accomplish these purposes I recommended a 5-percent pay raise and adjustments in classification to bring about proper wage relationships among the various jobs in postal service. The cost of the reclassification proposals would have brought the total increase to 6½ percent, with an aggregate annual cost of $129 million.

Those recommendations, if adopted, would have placed the salaries of postal employees in proper relationship to the salaries paid for similar work in nearly all the larger cities. The pay raises recommended were substantially greater than the increase in the cost of living since the last adjustment in postal wages.

Subsequently, the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee, by a substantial bipartisan majority, reported a bill—H. R. 4644—which, although approximately $30 million a year more costly than my recommendations, embodied the essential elements of a reclassification system. In the matter of reclassification, that bill, as reported by the committee, could have been, and still can be, with certain corrections, the basis for legislation which would establish fair relationships between the salaries of various positions in the postal service on the sound principle of equal pay for equal work and more pay for more difficult and responsible work.

It has always been recognized that in the consideration of pay legislation, there can be a reasonabl difference of opinion as to what constitutes an appropriate increase. But there can be no compromise with the principle of fairness, and any pay legislation must be fair to all to whom it applies. It must be workable administratively and not be excessive in cost.

The bill before me fails to meet these criteria. Specifically:

First. It discriminates against large groups of postal employees such as rural letter carriers, special-delivery messengers, and many supervisors and postmasters. These total tens of thouands.

Second. Aside from creating new and serious administrative problems, the total cost of the bill, approximately $180 million a year, is substantially greater than is necessary to adjust postal salaries to a fair level, either from the standpoint of pay for comparable work or from the standpoint of increase in the cost of living.

I regret the necessity of the action which I am taking. It is my earnest hope and recommendation that the Congress will quickly consider and enact postal pay legislation that will be in the public interest and fair to all of the half million employees who man the postal service. To meet this test, such legislation should provide a reasonable increase in pay for all postal field-service employees. It should provide for reclassification of postal positions to bring about proper wage relationships so as to eliminate inequities. It should not discriminate against some groups in favor of others, and it should be administratively workable.

Because the enactment of such legislation will substantially increase the postal deficit, I wish again to emphasize the imperative need for postal rates that will make the postal service self-supporting and be based on service rendered to the user. We can no longer afford to continue a costly deficit operation paid for by millions of taxpayers in amounts out of all proportion to the postal services that they as individuals receive.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *May 19, 1955.*

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MCNAMARA in the chair). The message, with the accompanying bill, will be printed, and will lie on the table.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, the veto by the President of S. 1, a bill providing an 8.6-percent increase in the salaries of the postal employees, is shameful.

This action indicates to me that President Eisenhower is more concerned with soothing the easily ruffled feelings and bruised pride of Postmaster General Summerfield than he is in the economic problems of our postal employees.

It is shameful that these employees should be denied for a second time by Presidential action a pay raise which they justly deserve. First, they were denied an increase in pay last August because the President wanted Congress to increase the price of postage stamps. Now it seems to be denied because the President feels that Congress increased their pay per week by an amount equal to the cost of a bottle of milk above the amount the President's arrogant and unyielding Postmaster General would agree to.

The charge that the conference committee agreement created a number of new inequities should be dismissed as pure hokum. The Senate has been skeptical all along of the position classification plan proposed by the Post Office Department, for the reason that it provided increases of up to 58 percent to the higher-paid employee, as contrasted with increases of only 5 or 6 percent to the rank-and-file employee. In spite of this skepticism, the Senate reluctantly adopted, with some changes, the administration's classification plan, in the hope that such a compromise would result in an immediate pay increase for the postal employee. Apparently a military dictatorship does not recognize compromise, or the prerogative of the Congress of the United States.

Mr. President, we can only conclude that President Eisenhower and his Cabinet of millionaires do not embrace the workingman with the same warmth of feeling that they do the Dixons and the Yates.

I fail to understand how the President can justify his position of requesting billions and billions of additional dollars to squander abroad, while, at the same time, denying a decent wage to our own employees here at home.

Let me assure the good postal employees of the Nation that our fight in their behalf will continue.

Mr. CARLSON subsequently said: Mr. President, this afternoon the Senate received the veto message from the President on Senate bill 1, the postal pay bill. The President used his constitutional privilege and prerogative in connection with that measure. The leadership has set next Tuesday as the time when the veto message will be taken up and considered by the Senate. I wish to make the statement that if the President's veto shall be sustained by the Senate, I shall have ready for introduction a bill providing for a 7.6 percent increase in pay. It is my hope that if the veto shall be sustained the Senate will give early consideration to the measure I shall introduce, in order that the postal workers may have the benefit of an increase in pay.

Second, Mr. President, if such a bill is passed by the Senate, I am in position to introduce a bill providing for an increase of 6 percent for the classified workers.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, as Senators are aware, it is planned to consider today Senate bill 153, proposing amendment of the Rural Electrification Act of 1936. We hope an early vote may be reached on that bill.

I desire to make an announcement, so the Senate will be upon notice, that conferences have been held with regard to other bills on the calendar, and the minority leader has gone over them and approved them for consideration by the Senate. I should like to have Senators who are interested in the proposed legislation know of the possibility that these bills will be brought before the Senate at any time which may be convenient.

First, Calendar No. 352, Senate bill 1580, to regulate subsistence expenses and mileage allowances of civilian officers and employees of the Federal Government. The bill was introduced by the distinguished Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON].

Next, Calendar No. 354, Senate bill 1048, the so-called roads bill. We plan to make it the unfinished business tomorrow; to have no votes taken on it tomorrow; and to debate the bill on Monday. I doubt that there will be any votes on the bill on Monday.

On Tuesday, in accordance with the unanimous-consent agreement which has been entered into, following the morning hour, we shall have 3 hours of debate—with one and one-half hours to each side—on the President's veto message of the postal pay bill. I assume that at some time between 3:15 and 4:15 p. m. on that day we are likely to have the yea and nay vote on the question of passing the bill, the objections of the President of the United States to the contrary notwithstanding. Then we shall resume consideration of the roads bill, and shall take as much time as may be necessary to obtain action.

We wish to give notice, next, regarding Calendar No. 355, House bill 3322, which relates to the utilization of surplus property for education and public health purposes. That bill was reported from the Committee on Government Operations by the senior Senator from Arkansas [Mr McCLELLAN].

Next, Calendar No. 356, Senate bill 1805, providing for more effective evaluation of the fiscal requirements of the executive agencies of the Government. The bill was also reported from the Committee on Government Operations by the senior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN].

Next, Calendar No. 357, Senate bill 1795, providing an increased allowance for subsistence and travel expenses, under the Travel Expense Act of 1949, as amended. The bill was reported from the Committee on Government Operations by the junior Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON].

Next, Calendar No. 358, Senate Resolution 102, conferring jurisdiction on the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment on the claim of the George D. Emery Co. That resolution was reported from the Committee on the Judiciary by the senior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE].

Next, Calendar 359, Senate bill 4052, continuing in effect the provisions of title II of the First War Powers Act, 1941. That bill was also reported from the Committee on the Judiciary by the senior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE].

Next, Calendar No. 360, Senate bill 33, relative to the exploration, location, and entry of mineral lands within the Papago Indian Reservation. The bill was reported from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs by the junior Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER].

Next, Calendar No. 362, Senate Joint Resolution 67, authorizing the Secretary of Commerce to sell certain vessels to citizens of the Republic of the Philippines, to provide for the rehabilitation of the interisland commerce of the Philippines. The bill was reported by the able chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, the senior Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON].

Mr. President, it is my understanding that most of the measures I have enumerated will not require any great amount of time. There will be an explanation of each of them, and there will be some discussion of them; but I understand there is no great controversy about any of them.

In the case of every measure I have listed, I have consulted the minority leader. I have asked the staff to notify the Senators who are interested in the measures referred to, and when time permits, we wish to have the Senate proceed to their consideration. I should like all Senators to be aware of the contemplated program.

AMENDMENT OF RURAL ELECTRIFICATION ACT OF 1936

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 153) to amend the Rural Electrification Act of 1936.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment submitted by the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] as a substitute for the bill, as amended.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, the junior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] is now present in the Chamber. During the period when the Senate was in recess I was informed that an agreement had been reached in connection with the amendment offered by him a few days ago. I should like to have the junior Senator from Minnesota make a statement for the RECORD. In the meantime, we shall notify other Senators. It is somewhat difficult to get all Senators who are for or against an amendment and Senators who agree on an amendment in the Chamber at the same time. If the Senator from Minnesota will make a statement about what has happened, and what the amendment as modified now provides, perhaps my colleagues can reach other Senators who are interested. I want the Senator from Minnesota to give the Senate assurances with respect to certain conversations he has had with other Senators.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment in the nature of a substitute, offered by the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY].

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I should like at this time to read for the purpose of the RECORD and for general discussion and understanding a letter which I have received this morning from Mr. Earl L. Butz, Assistant Secretary of Agriculture, dated May 19. This letter follows a conversation which I had last evening with the Administrator of the Rural Electrification Administration, Mr. Ancher Nelsen, in which Mr. Nelsen agreed to support the amendment which has been offered, with a certain clarifying modification.

The proposed modification of the amendment does not change the substance of the amendment which I offered on Tuesday. It merely clarifies the language and transposes certain language to a more appropriate place within the amendment. I shall send to the desk the amendment which I should like to have made the pending question, to replace the amendment previously offered by me, designated "5-17-55-A." I repeat that the modification or clarification does not in any sense change the substance of the amendment which I offered on Tuesday, but merely realines the language and makes it much more clear and understandable.

I now withdraw the pending amendment and offer the amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment previously offered by the Senator from Minnesota is withdrawn. The amendment now offered will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. It is proposed to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

That subsections (c), (d), and (e) of the Rural Electrification Act of 1936, as amended (7 U. S. C. 903 (c), (d), and (e)) are amended to read as follows:

"(c) Twenty-five percent of the annual sums herein made available or appropriated for loans for rural electrification pursuant to sections 4 and 5 of this title shall be allotted yearly by the Administrator for loans in the several States in the proportion which the number of their farms not then receiving central station electric service bears to the total number of farms of the United States not then receiving such service: *Provided*, That if any part of such sums are not loaned or obligated during the first 6 months of the fiscal year for which they are made available, such part shall thereafter be available for loans by the Administrator without allotment: *Provided, however*, That not more than 25 percent of said sums may be employed in any one State or in all of the Territories.

"The Administrator shall within 90 days after the beginning of each fiscal year determine for each State and for the United States the number of farms not then receiving such service.

"(d) The remaining 75 percent of such annual sums shall be available for rural electrification loans in the several States and in the Territories, without allotment as hereinabove provided in such amounts for each State and Territory as, in the opinion of the Administrator, may be effectively employed for the purposes of this act, and to carry out the provisions of section 7: *Provided, however*, That not more than 25 percent of said unallotted annual sums may be employed in any one State, or in all of the Territories.

"(e) If any part of the annual sums made available for the purposes of this act are not loaned or obligated during the fiscal year for which they are made available, such unexpended or unobligated sums shall be available for loans by the Administrator in the following year or years without allotment: *Provided, however*, That not more than 25 percent of said sums for rural electrification loans may be employed in any one State or in all of the Territories."

SEC. 2. Section 4 of such act is amended by striking out "10 percent" and inserting "25 percent."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment, in the nature of a substitute, offered by the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY].

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I introduced S. 153 because it was recognized that there was no need for earmarking funds. The only question now is with reference to areas or communities where there is need for rural electrification and for REA associations; and once a community can justify its ability to pay back, the funds are always made available. There is no question today about whether funds should be earmarked.

I discussed the amendment offered by my colleague with the Director of REA, Ancher Nelsen, last evening, and today I received a letter from Mr. Earl L. Butz, Assistant Secretary of the Department of Agriculture, dated May 19.

I understand an identical letter was received by my junior colleague. I was

informed that both of us received the same letter.

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is correct.

Mr. THYE. The Rural Electrification Administration does not materially object to the amendment. It feels it would be far better than the restrictions imposed on REA in the present administrative act. Therefore, in order that we may obtain action on the question without lengthy debate, I am willing to accept the amendment.

Every one of us has uppermost in his mind the welfare of REA. All of us are trying to make it function 100 percent in every State and in every community. If there is a fear on the part of some that certain communities may be placed in jeopardy because of lack of funds, and if that fear is allayed by the proposed amendment, I have no objection to the adoption of the amendment, and as the author of S. 153 I accept the amendment. I have discussed it with the cosponsors of the bill, the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG]. I know that REA will be improved by the adoption of this amendment. I am sure that at some future time that all restrictions on REA funds will be removed.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I thank my colleague. I join with him in saying that the whole purpose of the amendment and of the bill introduced by my senior colleague is to improve and to strengthen rural electrification. It is the feeling of the junior Senator from Minnesota that the pending amendment upon which the Senate will shortly vote, will meet the requirements of the rural electrification program.

As the senior Senator from Minnesota has stated his desire, it is my hope also that at a later date, when the States which have not progressed as far as other States have with their initial REA development have caught up, we will be able to remove all restrictions. The objective of the bill introduced by the senior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE], the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG], is deserving and worthy. I had hoped that the distinguished Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS] would be on the floor at this time.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I discussed the matter with the Senator from Mississippi. He is agreeable to the adoption of the amendment.

Mr. THYE. I discussed the matter with the Senator from Mississippi on the floor earlier today. I told him that I was prepared to accept the amendment.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the letter from Mr. Earl L. Butz, Assistant Secretary of the Department of Agriculture, dated May 19, 1955, printed in the RECORD, at this point.

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

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
Washington, D. C., May 19, 1955.

Hon. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY,
United States Senate.

DEAR SENATOR HUMPHREY: This is in response to your request for our views on the revision of S. 153 which was offered in the Senate on May 17.

As we understand it, it is now proposed to modify the State allotment formula as it now appears in the Rural Electrification Act so that 25 (in place of 50) percent of the annual electrification loan funds shall be allotted among the States in proportion to the number of unelectrified farms. The remaining 75 percent could be loaned without allotment, subject to the limitation that not more than 25 (in place of 10) percent thereof may be employed in any one State. The effect of the proposed amendment of subsection (e) would be to release that part of the funds subject to State allotment which had not been obligated or loaned during the first 6 months of the fiscal year for which they are made available so that they may be loaned in any State subject only to the 25-percent limitation. All funds not loaned or obligated during the fiscal year for which they are made available would be carried over and be available for loan in subsequent years in any State without allotment subject only to the 25-percent limitation.

The proposed revision will afford greater flexibility in the administration of the electrification loan program than is possible under the existing State allotment formula. Applying the revised allotment formula to the electrification loan funds carried in the 1956 appropriations, and using electrified farms as of July 1, 1954, as the formula base, we believe that the revised formula will permit the making of any loans for which applications are now on hand or which to our knowledge are being worked upon in the field.

We would prefer, for the reasons presented to the subcommittee which conducted hearings on S. 153, that the administration of the loan program be placed on the basis of actual needs for funds to carry out the purposes of the act rather than on a formula which is based on the ratio of unelectrified farms, a factor which is not determinative of needs today. We shall, of course, carry out to the best of our ability any statutory directive received from the Congress.

It would help to clarify the intent of the proposed amendment if it were revised to read as follows:

(c) "Twenty-five percent of the annual sums herein made available or appropriated for loans for rural electrification pursuant to sections 4 and 5 of this title shall be allotted yearly by the Administrator for loans in the several States in the proportion which the number of their farms not then receiving central station electric service bears to the total number of farms of the United States not then receiving such service: *Provided,* That if any part of such sums are not loaned or obligated during the first 6 months of the fiscal year for which they are made available, such part shall thereafter be available for loans by the Administrator without allotment: *Provided, however,* That not more than 25 percent of said sums may be employed in any one State, or in all of the Territories. The Administrator shall within 90 days after the beginning of each fiscal year determine for each State and for the United States the number of farms not then receiving such service."

(d) No change.

(e) "If any part of the annual sums made available for the purposes of this act are not loaned or obligated during the fiscal year for which they are made available, such unexpended or unobligated sums shall be available for loans by the Administrator in the following year or years without allotment: *Provided, however,* That not more than 25 percent of said sums for rural electrification loans may be employed in any one State or all of the Territories."

It would be helpful, if, during the discussion of the bill, attention is drawn to the effect of the formula on the reserve or contingency authorizations such as have been included in the REA loan items in recent years. In the event S. 153 is enacted prior to June 30, 1955, with the allotment formula revised as proposed, we would interpret the amendment as freeing the current reserve authorization of $35 million, if it is drawn upon, as well as to any other unobligated funds, from the State allotment restrictions, since the first 6 months of fiscal 1955 have already elapsed. Further, with respect to the reserve loan authorization of $100 million provided for fiscal 1956, in the event these funds are not drawn upon until after December 31, 1955, we would consider them available for loan free of the State allotment formula and subject only to the 25-percent limitation.

We believe this is a reasonable interpretation of the effect of the proposed language with respect to these funds under the applicable language of the appropriation acts. However, if it is questioned, we would prefer that it be clarified now for our guidance in administering the act.

The Bureau of the Budget advises that there is no objection to the submission of this report.

Sincerely yours,

EARL L. BUTZ,
Assistant Secretary.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I hope the amendment will be agreed to and the bill passed.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, I merely wish to say that I am happy to see that a solution of the difficulty has been reached. I have felt for some time that there was need for greater leeway in the handling of REA funds in the discretion of the Administrator.

A year ago, when we had before us the question of voting additional funds for loans by REA, I voted for the additional $35 million for the discretionary fund because I felt the additional sum was needed. My reason for so voting is the same reason which leads me to vote for the bill at this time. It is to permit the Administrator to place the greatest emphasis where the greatest need exists. Therefore, I am glad to vote for the bill.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I have agreed with the point made by the Senator from South Dakota that the REA formula needed some modifications to meet the realities. However, I have never agreed, and do not agree now, that the formula ought to be abolished. In fact, I believe that would be a serious mistake, from the standpoint of the REA associations. It is unfortunate that those who undertook to abolish the formula did not, instead, undertake to revise it according to the realities. However, the REA associations agree on that course of action, except the association in the State of Mississippi. I understand that the associations voted unanimously in favor of it at their national convention.

The REA Administrator has seen fit to ask Congress to abolish the formula entirely. The Senate committee at one time agreed. I am not being critical of the members of the committee, but I wish to point out that no legislative committee has ever undertaken a review of the formula so as to bring it into line with present needs from the standpoint of electrification, replacements, transmission lines, and a number of other electrical items with which I am not too

familiar, but which have to do with increasing the amount of electricity to the people who are now being served. I believe that such a review was essential in order to obtain a really practical formula under which Congress could appropriate money. Perhaps the House committee will hold some hearings on the subject and develop facts along that line.

However, we are face to face with the proposition of retaining a part of the formula, and the amendment is worked out along that line. The members of the Committee on Appropriations have been greatly interested in having some kind of a formula retained. I believe that if no formula is provided with reference to these matters, trouble will soon develop for the REA's, popular and powerful as they may be. So I am certainly glad that some measure of the formula is being retained. I think it will serve a good purpose. I think the bill as amended will be stronger.

I wish to thank the junior Senator from Minnesota and the senior Senator from Minnesota for their patient consideration of the matter.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Mississippi yield?

Mr. STENNIS. I yield.

Mr. THYE. I recognize that the Senator from Mississippi has been greatly concerned because he wished to be certain that no farm or community in his State would be placed in a position of jeopardy because of lack of funds. I can fully understand his concern. For that reason I was most anxious that there should be a meeting of minds and the best solution of the problem should be reached, so that the Administrator of the REA program would be unshackled and could make available, in his discretion, as much of the funds as might be possible, and that every year the appropriation could be reviewed.

I was speaking for the cosponsors of the bill when I stated that we would accept the amendment and permit action to be taken on the bill. I also stated that the Senator from Mississippi and I had discussed it since the Senate reconvened today.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I appreciate the Senator's remarks. It is my opinion, as an individual Senator, that we should have gone a little further into the matter of actual need. So far as my State is concerned, I think the conditions will be taken care of under the amendment.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Mississippi yield further?

Mr. STENNIS. I yield.

Mr. THYE. I would assure every citizen of the State of Mississippi that so long as the distinguished Senator is a Member of this body they will have no need to worry about whether they will receive the necessary funds, because the Senator will see that they get the funds. That I can say without any question.

Mr. STENNIS. I appreciate the sentiments of the Senator from Minnesota. He is overgenerous, indeed.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Mississippi yield?

Mr. STENNIS. I yield.

Mr. CARLSON. I have been interested in the colloquy between the Senator from Mississippi and the Senators from Minnesota. I want to be sure that the citizens of the State of Kansas will be protected by the amendment on which the Senators have agreed. Are the allocations such that the citizens of Kansas will be protected?

Mr. STENNIS. I think I can assure the Senator from Kansas that his State will be taken care of under this amendment.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I should like to include in my remarks the Senator from Kansas. I know of no two Members of the Senate who have greater concern for the farming or rural areas of their respective States than the Senator from Kansas and the Senator from Mississippi have. Both of them work for the interests of their citizens.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, the statement just made by the Senator from Minnesota disarms me, of course. I had in mind some rewriting of the present language so as to provide such a reallocation of funds as would enable as many persons as possible to be served with electricity. As I understand the statement of the Senator from Mississippi, he is rather insisting that Congress shall have some control over the funds. Therefore, does the Senator from Mississippi feel that under this new provision all the States will be properly cared for?

Mr. STENNIS. I do. The money is to be released to the Administrator to use in his discretion, with the limitation that he cannot use more than 25 percent of the other 75 percent of the funds in any one State. I think that will take care of the situation.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I think there is no doubt that the State of Kansas and the other States are most generously taken care of. I have the personal assurance of the REA Administrator to that effect.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, this colloquy has convinced me that good work has been done in trying to draft an amendment which will protect the citizens of all the States. I appreciate what has been done.

Mr. STENNIS. At the same time, it protects the legislative viewpoint. I have always insisted that there should be some kind of a formula.

Mr. President, under the circumstances as they have been stated, I shall support the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. ALLOTT subsequently said: Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD prior to the taking of the vote on Senate bill 153 a statement prepared by me, and also a letter from Mr. Ancher Nelsen, Administrator of the Rural Electrification Administration.

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

STATEMENT BY SENATOR ALLOTT IN BEHALF OF THE PASSAGE OF S. 153, AS AMENDED

I have listened carefully to the debate and read much of the RECORD concerning this matter and I would like to compliment all the Senators who took part in the debate on the objective manner in which this most important subject has been handled.

I should like to also compliment the distinguished majority leader and my able colleague, the distinguished minority leader, for their part in the presentation of this proposed legislation on the floor of the Senate.

The passage of S. 153 is most essential to the rural areas of Colorado and I am informed by Mr. Ancher Nelsen, the capable Administrator of the Rural Electrification Administration, that Colorado is the only State in which the operation of the State allotment formula contained in the Rural Electrification Act is presently preventing prompt action on approval of loans.

I am informed that the processing of four loans in Colorado, totaling in amount approximately $13,300,000, is nearing completion. These loans are for generation, transmission, and distribution requirements. However, under the present State allotment formula of the Rural Electrification Administration, the funds remaining available for loan purposes in Colorado are approximately $7,200,000. This indicates that the amount required is $6,100,000 short of being able to meet the legitimate applications. This shortage exists because of the allotment formula not because of the money, which is now available in the loan fund. As has been said before, there remains in the national fund available for loans at this time $108,000,000.

On the anniversary of REA many laudatory statements were most justifiably made by my colleagues in the Senate but I should like to add one paragraph as a tribute to the sound business philosophy behind the Rural Electrification program when properly managed. As an example, and to show that Rural Electrification is no give-away program, I should like to call my colleagues' attention to the Morgan County Rural Electrification Association in northeastern Colorado. This Rural Electification Association is paying off the first portion of their system indebtedness 17 years ahead of schedule and, in addition, have been able to refund $127,000 to their consumers in their 1954 electrical bills. This is a patronage dividend equal to 13 percent of their gross electric bills for that year. Rural Colorado is now more than 93.8 percent electrified but additional work must be done. I am sure that, if time permitted, I could cite other examples of good business management in county rural electrification associations in Colorado. At the same time I am pleased to say that generally the cooperation has been good between the rural electric associations and the private power utilities that supply the municipal areas of our State. At the present time, they each seem to recognize the legitimate function of the other and I believe there is no intention of either to jeopardize the other's rightful and lawful function.

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
RURAL ELECTRIFICATION ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, D. C., May 17, 1955.

Senator GORDON ALLOTT,
United States Senate.

DEAR SENATOR ALLOTT: This is in response to your request for information on the status of pending electric loans in Colorado and on any matters that may delay their approval.

Colorado is the only State in which the operation of the State allotment formula contained in the Rural Electrification Act is working to prevent the prompt meeting of loan needs. Processing of 4 loans in Colorado, totaling in amount approximately $13,300,000, is nearing completion. These loans are for generation, transmission, and distribution needs. Funds remaining available for loan purposes in Colorado under the

limitations of the allotment formula approximate $7,200,000. This reflects a shortage from the amount required of more than $6,100,000.

This shortage exists because of the allotment formula and in spite of a national remaining availability of loan funds approximating $108 million.

Following the appropriations hearings, we estimated that our needs for Colorado in excess of the State ceiling would amount to approximately $5,500,000. However, we pointed out that the loans for this amount would be processed in May or June and probably would be approved after July 1. Since that time, however, the situation has become more urgent in view of recent developments. First, as work has progressed on the processing of the applications the figure needed for the State has had to be somewhat increased. Second, the situation requiring prompt action on the loans has intensified. The area is critically in need of additional facilities for generation, transmission, and distribution of power.

The Department is giving exhaustive study to every possible avenue of relief to meet this situation. We deplore the possibility of being forced to delay action on these loans until the new fiscal year—a delay which, in view of the short construction period in Colorado, could be harmful to the satisfactory progress of the electrification effort. A supplemental authorization of about $115 million would be required in order to obtain the $6,100,000 needed, by reason of the operation of the allotment formula. Enactment of legislation to amend the Rural Electrification Act by eliminating the formula, now before both Houses of the Congress, seems to offer the most orderly and expeditious way of meeting this urgent need.

Sincerely yours,

ANCHER NELSEN,
Administrator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the third reading and passage of the bill.

The bill (S. 153) was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

FILLING OF TEMPORARY VACANCIES IN THE CONGRESS CAUSED BY DISASTER

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 234, Senate Joint Resolution 8.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A resolution (S. J. Res. 8) to amend the Constitution to authorize governors to fill temporary vacancies in the Congress caused by a disaster.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Texas.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the joint resolution, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment to strike out all after the resolving clause and insert:

That the following article is proposed as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, and shall be valid to all intents and purposes as part of the Constitution if ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States within 7 years from the date of its submission by the Congress:

"ARTICLE—

"On any date that the total number of vacancies in the House of Representatives exceeds half of the authorized membership thereof, and for a period of 60 days thereafter, the executive authority of each State shall have power to make temporary appointments to fill any vacancies, including those happening during such period, in the representation from his State in the House of Representatives. Any person temporarily appointed to fill any such vacancy shall serve until the people fill the vacancy by election as provided for by article I, section 2, of the Constitution."

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I should like to invite the attention of the membership of the Senate, particularly the able minority leader, to the fact that this is a joint resolution to amend the Constitution, and, in accordance with our general practice and our agreement ever since the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] has been in a leadership position, and I have occupied a similar position, we expect to have a yea-and-nay vote on a joint resolution of this kind.

Therefore, I should like to give notice to the Senate that at the conclusion of the debate on the joint resolution there will be a yea-and-nay vote.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, my remarks will be addressed to Senate Joint Resolution 8, which is now the unfinished business.

During the past 9 or 10 years we have all been aware of the tremendous scientific progress in nuclear fission and of its potentialities for both good and evil. While we have the greatest hope that this tremendous new development will eventually be directed toward peaceful ends, it is still the better part of prudence for a nation, as well as individuals, to insure as far as possible, against all eventualities.

At the outset, I wish to pay tribute to the distinguished minority leader, the senior Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND], for being one of the first among us to take note of the constitutional problems I am about to discuss. I shall have more to say later about the part he has played in the development of the proposal now under consideration.

The Senator from California first introduced a joint resolution on this subject in the 81st Congress, and reintroduced similar proposals in the 82d and 83d Congresses. I also introduced a similar measure in the 83d Congress.

The resolution offered by the senior Senator from California in the 83d Congress was adopted by a vote of 70 to 1.

The Senator from California did not introduce such a resolution at this session. If he had, his measure would have been reported, instead of the one which is now before the Senate.

I hardly need remind the Senate of what would happen if 1 of the 20 megaton thermonuclear weapons were exploded on the Nation's Capitol. This weapon, which is already in existence, is the equivalent of 20 million tons of TNT and is about 1,000 times more powerful than the atomic bomb which was dropped on Hiroshima, according to a statement by Admiral Strauss and Dr. Libby in official information issued by the Atomic Energy Commission.

Following a surface burst of this weapon, it could be expected that a crater perhaps a mile and a half across and 200 feet deep would be blasted out of the earth.

The explosion of a similar weapon in the Pacific was sufficient to have buried 14 Pentagon buildings, and to have caused damage to a large additional area.

The fireball would blanket an area about 4 miles across. Blast pressures would cause the complete destruction of all structures and installations within a radius of 5 miles from the point of burst; in other words, an area 10 miles across.

Within this area of complete destruction we could expect fatal casualties of about 90 percent of the people, and there would be casualties of lesser magnitude throughout concentric circles for the next 15 miles. I use the word "lesser" advisedly—depending, of course, on the question of whether warning might be sufficient to secure shelter against radioactive fallout.

The question with which the Senate is concerned, in the measure before us today, is what would happen to the Government of the United States, from a constitutional viewpoint, under such conditions as I have outlined.

There is no question that government of a sort would survive, but what we want to assure is that representative, constitutional democracy could be reconstituted.

In providing for a method of government which would best reflect the public will the constitutional drafters produced a tripartite authority, composed of the executive, legislative, and judicial branches. They designed the Constitution as not simply a fair-weather document, but a document to function during war as well as peace. It is no reflection on the framers of the Constitution, however, that they could not possibly foresee a 20-megaton weapon when they met in Philadelphia to draft this Nation's most basic document.

Considering first the executive branch of the Government, the Constitution authorized the Congress to provide for any sudden vacancy occurring in the office of the President after the succession of the Vice President to that position. Public Law 199, passed by the 80th Congress, provided that the line of succession after the President and Vice President should be the Speaker of the House, the President pro tempore of the Senate, and the Secretaries of State, Treasury, and Defense, the Attorney General, the Postmaster General, and the Secretaries of Interior, Agriculture, Commerce, and Labor, in that order.

Members of the judiciary are, of course, appointed by the President, with the consent of the Senate, and the functioning and perpetuating of that office presents no great difficulties.

In the legislative branch we have two equal houses. Under the Constitution, as expanded by the 17th amendment, the State executives are authorized to fill vacancies in the Senate temporarily by appointment pending the next election. There is no such authority, however, in connection with vacancies occurring in the House of Representatives. Thus there would be no way of immediately reconstituting the House should there be a disaster to the Capitol.

As I mentioned earlier, one of the first to recognize this potential danger to our constitutional democracy was the distinguished minority leader [Mr. KNOWLAND]. He introduced measures in the last three Congresses proposing an amendment to the Constitution. As I also said earlier, if he had introduced a similar bill at this session, I believe his proposal would have been the one to be reported at this time.

I was first made aware of this problem a number of years ago by a letter from the President of the Board of Trustees of the McCallie School of Chattanooga, Dr. J. P. McCallie, which is set forth on pages 10 and 11 of the record of hearings. I submitted a proposed amendment in the last Congress and again in this Congress.

During the study of the Subcommittee on Constitutional Amendments and the hearings on this proposal we found a great difficulty in the original proposal introduced by me and in the one the Senator from California had introduced. Both of these proposals predicated the appointive power on the existence of a national disaster or emergency. During the hearings it became evident that certain problems would arise if the power conferred could be invoked only in the event of a disaster causing a given number of vacancies. For instance, it would become necessary to decide what officer of the Government should proclaim the existence of a disaster and then to determine which of the vacancies were actually caused by the disaster or which were occasioned by natural causes. The proposal now before the Senate avoids these problems by eliminating reference to disasters.

The subcommittee was helped greatly in its consideration of the problem by letters received from a number of distinguished constitutional lawyers, including Dr. Edward S. Corwin, Dr. Noel T. Dowling, William W. Crosskey, and Harold G. Gallagher, all of which are printed in the appendix to the hearings which were held on March 15 of this year. It was largely as a result of their points of view and their statements of what they believe should be done that the resolution now under consideration was recast so as to avoid the confusion, possible litigation, and uncertainty which would arise, first, in determining what a disaster was, and also in setting forth in a constitutional amendment who should proclaim a disaster.

The resolution now before the Senate provides that on any date the total number of vacancies in the House of Representatives exceeds one-half of the authorized membership, that is 218, and for a period of 60 days thereafter, the executive authority of each State shall have power to make temporary appointments to fill any vacancies then present or which may occur during that period in the representation from his State in the House of Representatives. Any person temporarily appointed to fill any such vacancy is permitted to serve only until the people fill the vacancy by election as provided by article I, section 2, of the Constitution. The Senator from Texas [Mr. DANIEL], a member of the subcommittee, was very helpful in perfecting this language, and it has been approved by both the subcommittee and the full Judiciary Committee.

As Senators will observe from the language of the proposal, it does in fact permit the invocation of this extraordinary power only when this country is in a period of national emergency or disaster, but avoids the language which was so troublesome. A commonsense interpretation would dictate that whenever vacancies in the House of Representatives exceed one-half of the authorized membership, the Nation would be confronted by a national emergency or disaster in the ordinary sense of those terms. Consequently, it is clear that this extraordinary power will rarely be used, if ever—and we can all hope that it will never be used. If it must be used, however, the period within which governors may exercise their authority is limited by the terms of the resolution to 60 days after the last date on which the vacancies in the House exceed one-half of the membership.

The terms of the appointment are likewise limited by direct reference in the resolution to article I, section 2, of the Constitution. Article I, section 2, contains two provisions which limit the term of these temporary appointees. First, there is the provision requiring the Governors of the States to issue writs of election to fill vacancies as they happen in the House of Representatives. Secondly, there is the constitutional requirement that elections for Members of the House of Representatives shall take place every 2 years. Thus the terms of these appointees may be limited by either the holding of a general or special election. As I see it, special elections would likely be held within 60 days or 90 days following the creation of the vacancies, but no such time limit has been established on the terms of the appointees for the reason that an atomic attack on other cities might have impaired the election machinery within the States so that elections could not be held within that period. Nevertheless, it is clearly the sense of those who have thus far approved the proposed legislation that the appointments shall be temporary and that the Governors of the States shall be obliged to fill the vacancies by election as soon as possible and practicable. The requirements of article I, section 2, of the Constitution on the Governors are mandatory, and if they should unreasonably delay calling elections, they would be subject to writs of mandamus.

Mr. President, I am glad we are considering this proposal at a moment when tension is somewhat relaxed. That, I believe, is exactly the time when we should be considering an amendment such as this. I hope that we are making lasting progress toward a peaceful world. But the fact is that we have had two wars in 37 years, and if another should unfortunately come, then it might be too late for the consideration of such a measure as this.

I call attention to the hearings, which show that the agencies of the executive directly concerned with civil defense and the continuity of the Government approve the proposed amendment. These executive agencies approved a similar proposal during the last Congress, when the joint resolution of the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] was before the Committee on the Judiciary. The State governors who responded to the committee's invitation to submit views during this year likewise approved of its purpose.

With some knowledge of the tremendous destructive power of thermonuclear weapons, it would, in my judgment, be the height of folly to delay submitting this amendment. The proposed constitutional amendment would require at least 2 years for ratification, since it must be approved by a two-thirds vote both here and in the House, and ratified by three-fourths of the State legislatures, many of which meet only every 2 years.

In considering this proposed amendment, I ask the Senators to think of the institution it seeks to preserve. If a situation such as this resolution foresees should arise, then we can be sure that the Chief Executive, whoever he might be, would act promptly so that chaos would not develop. But aside from that consideration, a situation of this type would be replete with historic and far-reaching consequences. A President in such times would welcome the counsel and legislative assistance of Congress. And the people, whose rights would be so vitally affected by these decisions, would require participation in them through their representatives.

I hope, Mr. President, that the joint resolution will be approved, as one containing a similar idea was approved by the Senate last year.

Mr. KNOWLAND and Mr. STENNIS addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator yield, and if so, to whom?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I yield first to the Senator from California.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I wish to join with the distinguished Senator from Tennessee and fully endorse the proposed constitutional amendment, provided for in Senate Joint Resolution 8, which is before the Senate at this time. I commend the Senator for having introduced and shepherded the proposal through the committee.

As has been so generously indicated by the distinguished Senator, this has been a matter which has caused me some concern ever since I was a member of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, and members of the committee gained additional knowledge as to what possibility might happen to our constitutional processes.

I may also say to the Senator from Tennessee I had proposed a joint resolution for introduction in this session, but when the Senator from Tennessee very promptly introduced his joint resolution on the 6th of January, so far as I was concerned I deferred to him, as I had no pride of authorship in the matter. I knew we were both interested in the end result, and I was very happy to see the joint resolution of the Senator from Tennessee. Therefore, I did not introduce my joint resolution which was similar to the one which had been debated on the floor.

I think the resolution in its present form is an improvement over the one the Senate acted on last year and overwhelmingly approved by a vote, I believe, of 70 to 1.

While it is not within our province either to predict or to suggest what the other House of Congress may do, I hope it will promptly be able to act on the joint resolution so that the proposed amendment can be submitted speedily to the several States. As the Senator from Tennessee has so ably pointed out, it is a form of insurance which we hope we shall never be called upon to use, but it seeks to correct what certainly is a weakness in our constitutional system.

While in the event a disaster of such great magnitude should befall, the Government of the United States would be able to function, because the President of the United States, or whoever his successor might be, would see to it that the processes of government were carried on, I think we have a responsibility to see to it that the processes of constitutional government are adequately safeguarded. Constitutional government under our system requires the ability of both the House of Representatives and the Senate to act.

Under the situation which existed at the time the Constitution was drafted there was no likelihood of the occurrence of a disaster of the magnitude which is now possible, whereby a majority of the Members of the House might be wiped out in a single instant. Science has progressed considerably since that time.

So far as the Senate is concerned, there would be no problem, because if we were to be obliterated today, the governors of our respective States could, if the need were sufficiently urgent, make appointments immediately thereafter, and new Senators could be on their way to wherever the seat of government might be, and could function as the Senate of the United States. But that is not true of the House of Representatives. Because of the delay which would result under the processes of writs of election, and particularly if we visualize the disturbed conditions which would exist in the country in such an emergency, and the difficulty of holding normal elections, a gap might be left in which that great body could not function. It is the House of Congress in which tax legislation originates, and where, as a custom, appropriation bills have originated, and the House has other clearly defined constitutional functions. If the House could not act, it would handicap the proper functioning of the Government under our constitutional processes.

So I wish to commend the Senator from Tennessee, and to join with him in urging prompt and overwhelming approval of Senate Joint Resolution 8.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I thank the Senator from California very much.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Tennessee yield to me?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I yield.

Mr. STENNIS. I appreciate the courtesy of the Senator from Tennessee in yielding to me, Mr. President.

The brief remarks I wish to make will be made with great deference to the present author and the prior author of the proposed constitutional amendment. Last year, when the joint resolution proposing this amendment passed the Senate by a vote of 70 to 1, I was the 1 Senator who voted against it. Later I received a very good letter, the author of which said he did not know whether I stated my reasons for voting against the proposed constitutional amendment, but that if I had not, he suggested that I not give them, because he admired the idea of having 1 Member stand against the rest of the membership of the Senate, whereas if I gave my reason for doing so, he might not agree with me. [Laughter.] Mr. President, I think that was a splendid letter, and perhaps today I should follow that advice.

However, I shall briefly state my reasons for believing we are getting the cart before the horse in reference to matters of this kind. I think it is a very serious thing to amend the Constitution in any way; but, in the first place, I think the proposed amendment would be evidence that we would be legislating in an atmosphere of fear.

This morning I read a news item to the effect that an Air Force general had said Russia has air superiority or air equality with us. I do not think he was correct in making that statement; but I believe that such statements instill a sense of fear in the minds of our people.

Somewhere else I read that someone advised the people that they should apply for FHA loans in order to build shelters to protect themselves from atomic attacks. I do not agree with that recommendation, because I do not think any attack is imminent; and I believe that such statements tend to instill a false sense of fear in the minds of the people.

Mr. President, if we pass the pending joint resolution, I believe we shall be sending to the people another message to the effect that we believe an attack is either imminent or probable, and that we are afraid of what might happen. This is merely another instance which demonstrates, I believe, that we could not give the Russians a better series of propaganda points, to be used throughout the world as evidence that we are afraid of them, that we think we are going to be attacked, and soon. I think we have overdone this thing, Mr. President.

I believe that by such means we help create a sense of fear in the minds of ourselves and in the minds of all the people of the Nation, instead of giving them sound assurance that we shall carry on and shall strengthen our defenses. By giving such assurance we shall bring about calmness and abiding faith that we shall continue to be the leading Nation in the world.

Mr. President, I believe it is one of the great heritages of the House of Representatives that no person has ever taken a seat or cast a vote in that body except by virtue of election by the people. That is a great pillar in our form of government, and it is one which I do not wish to have destroyed on the mere possibility that a way off yonder, somewhere, at some time, the Russians may attempt to attack us. Even if such an attack were probable, I think the physical facts are such that we certainly shall have a fair warning of a few hours or a few minutes, and certainly sufficient time for the Members of Congress to leave this building.

If that great heritage of the House of Representatives is to be destroyed, let the suggestion come first from the House of Representatives, Mr. President. The House did not even take up this proposal last year, as I understand, after the joint resolution was passed by this body by a vote of 70 to 1.

So I submit that if any change is to be made in the constitutional provision regarding the election of the Members of the House of Representatives, that great institution—and it is great; it is perhaps the greatest of the legislative branches of the Government—in the event fate should decree that steps should be taken to replace its Members, at least we can in good countenance await a suggestion from the House of Representatives.

Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Tennessee for yielding to me.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, 2 years ago, as chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary, and later as chairman of its Subcommittee on Constitutional Amendments, I presided at long and extended hearings on this subject.

This year, the distinguished senior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] has devoted very long and, I may say, very weary hours not only in going over the testimony which was adduced last year, but also in listening to a group of new witnesses. In considering the proposed constitutional amendment, he called many meetings of the subcommittee, at which he presided as chairman; and I wish to say that he went into the matter with great interest, and in the most minute detail.

Mr. President, it is not often that a body such as ours has a Member who will devote such long hours to a task. The distinguished Senator from Tennessee has devoted many, many hours to the proposed constitutional amendment. It is very natural, and often occurs, that the Senator who presides at such hearings will ask another Senator to preside over them at least for a part of the time. However, in this instance, the Senator from Tennessee sat through all the hearings and all the interrogations, except in the case of a few questions which some of us asked on the side. The distinguished Senator from Tennessee had, of course, the assistance of an able staff, which in my opinion did an extremely fine job; and in that connection I desire to pay tribute especially to Wayne Smithey, who has helped the committee immeasurably in its consideration of the proposed constitutional amendment.

Mr. President, I believe that the proposed constitutional amendment provided for by the pending joint resolution is an improvement over the one for which the Senate voted a year ago; and I hope the joint resolution will be unanimously passed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I should like to comment briefly on some of the observations which have been

made by the distinguished Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS].

In the first place, this matter is not one relating only to the succession of the Members of the House of Representatives. If it involved only matters affecting the House of Representatives, there might be some validity to the argument that we should not be concerned with the proposal until after the House of Representatives had acted on it. However, this joint resolution relates to the preservation of constitutional government, a matter in which this body and every person in the Nation has a great interest. Not only do we wish to be sure that the Government of the United States will continue, in the event of an emergency, but we wish to have constitutional government continue. The 17th amendment, which was ratified in 1913, affects the election of Members of the Senate. I remember that at that time many of those who were particularly interested in having Senators elected by the people were Members of the House of Representatives. So in both these matters, which relate to carrying on our constitutional government and giving the people more "say" about it, all of us have an interest.

As to the question of alarming the people, Mr. President, let me say I have always felt that we follow the best course of action when we tell the people the facts. If the people know the facts, they do not become unduly alarmed. They form calm judgments.

So far as concerns the possibility of alarming the people because of a civil-defense program, in that event it might be that the making of any appropriations for civil defense would tend to alarm the people. However, the people need to know the facts. I am sure they wish to know that the situation is in such shape that they will be represented in the Congress of the United States, no matter what emergency may arise.

If we accede to this argument, we might as well say a husband should refrain from buying insurance for fear of alarming his wife or a parent should refrain from having his child vaccinated for fear of alarming the child.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The pending committee amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. It is proposed to strike out all after the enacting clause, and to insert:

That the following article is proposed as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, and shall be valid to all intents and purposes as part of the Constitution if ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States within 7 years from the date of its submission by the Congress:

"ARTICLE —

"On any date that the total number of vacancies in the House of Representatives exceeds half of the authorized membership thereof, and for a period of 60 days thereafter, the executive authority of each State shall have power to make temporary appointments to fill any vacancies, including those happening during such period, in the representation from his State in the House of Representatives. Any person temporarily appointed to fill any such vacancy shall serve until the people fill the vacancy by election as provided for by article I, section 2, of the Constitution."

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I should like to ask a question of the Senator from Tennessee. I note that the preliminary section of the amendment embraces a cut-off date, which is a departure from any draftsmanship I have ever seen in the case of constitutional amendments. I am always concerned about submitting proposed amendments to the Constitution unless there is some definite date which will determine whether or not the amendment is to be approved by the requisite three-fourths of the States. This amendment does not specifically say that it shall be inoperative if it is not ratified within 7 years. How does the Senator from Tennessee construe this language? It provides that it shall be valid if it is ratified within 7 years, but it does not say that it shall not be effective if it is not ratified within 7 years.

Mr. KEFAUVER. That question was discussed with some of the witnesses who appeared before our committee. The general idea was that it was better not to make the 7-year provision a part of the proposed constitutional amendment itself. It was felt that that would clutter up the Constitution. Sometimes that is done. We wanted to put the 7-year limitation in the preamble. So the intention of the preamble is that it must be ratified within 7 years in order to be effective. I think that is what the preamble means. It provides:

That the following article is proposed as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, and shall be valid to all intents and purposes as part of the Constitution if ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States within 7 years from the date of its submission by the Congress.

Article V of the present Constitution contains approximately the same language. It provides:

The Congress, whenever two-thirds of both Houses shall deem it necessary, shall propose amendments to this Constitution, or, on the application of the legislatures of two-thirds of the several States, shall call a convention for proposing amendments, which, in either case, shall be valid to all intents and purposes, as part of this Constitution, when ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States—

And so forth. So I believe the language of the joint resolution follows almost exactly the language prescribed for amending the Constitution.

Mr. RUSSELL. I am not concerned about the fact that the proposed amendment would be a legal and appropriate part of the Constitution if ratified within 7 years. What troubles me is that if it is not ratified within 7 years, there is the likelihood that it will be circulating in space. At the present time a number of proposed amendments to the Constitution which have been submitted are floating around in space. Some of them have been ratified by 1 State, and some by 10 or 15 States. It seems to me that there should be a cutoff date in proposed constitutional amendments, if they possess sufficient merit to commend themselves to the legislatures within a given period of time.

Let me say that I heartily approve the Senator's proposed amendment to the Constitution. But there should be no question about the termination date. I wonder if the Senator would object to inserting, on page 2, line 8, after the word "Constitution", the word "only."

Mr. KEFAUVER. So as to read—"to all intents and purposes as part of the Constitution only if ratified—" and so forth?

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I should have no objection to such an amendment. I am advised by Mr. Smithey, of our staff, that he discussed with the legislative counsel's office the question the Senator has raised, and it was their opinion that the proposed amendment would not be floating around in space. However, I do not want the contingency mentioned by the Senator from Georgia to occur, anymore than he does. I think the insertion of the word "only" would make clear the intent.

Mr. RUSSELL. Then, Mr. President, I offer an amendment to the committee amendment, on page 2, line 8, after the word "Constitution," to insert the word "only."

Mr. KEFAUVER. I appreciate the suggestion, and I accept the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] to the committee amendment.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the joint resolution.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, and was read the third time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Shall the joint resolution pass?

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, on the question of final passage of the joint resolution, I ask for the yeas and nays. The majority leader [Mr. JOHNSON of Texas] has already indicated that there should be a yea-and-nay vote on all proposed amendments to the Constitution.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call may be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The question is on the passage of Senate Joint Resolution 8. The yeas and nays having been ordered, the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. CLEMENTS. I announce that the Senator from Nevada [Mr. BIBLE], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE],

the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. SCOTT], the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS], and the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] is absent by leave of the Senate because of illness.

I further announce that on this vote the Senator from Nevada [Mr. BIBLE], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. SCOTT], the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS], and the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON], if present and voting, would each vote "yea."

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER], and the Senators from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY and Mr. WILEY] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER] and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. WELKER] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DUFF] is detained on official business.

If present and voting, the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DUFF], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER], and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY] would each vote "yea."

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 76, nays 3, as follows:

YEAS—76

Aiken	Ervin	Martin, Pa
Allott	Frear	McClellan
Anderson	Green	McNamara
Barkley	Hayden	Millikin
Barrett	Hennings	Monroney
Beall	Hickenlooper	Mundt
Bender	Hill	Murray
Bennett	Holland	Neuberger
Bricker	Hruska	Pastore
Bridges	Humphrey	Payne
Bush	Ives	Potter
Butler	Jackson	Purtell
Capehart	Johnson, Tex.	Robertson
Carlson	Johnston, S. C.	Russell
Case, N. J.	Kefauver	Saltonstall
Case, S. Dak.	Kerr	Schoeppel
Chavez	Kilgore	Smith, Maine
Clements	Knowland	Smith, N. J.
Cotton	Kuchel	Sparkman
Curtis	Langer	Thurmond
Daniel	Lehman	Thye
Dirksen	Long	Watkins
Douglas	Magnuson	Williams
Dworshak	Malone	Young
Eastland	Mansfield	
Ellender	Martin, Iowa	

NAYS—3

Byrd	George	Stennis

NOT VOTING—17

Bible	Jenner	Scott
Duff	Kennedy	Smathers
Flanders	McCarthy	Symington
Fulbright	Morse	Welker
Goldwater	Neely	Wiley
Gore	O'Mahoney	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Two-thirds of the Senators present having voted in the affirmative, the joint resolution is passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "Joint resolution to amend the Constitution to authorize governors to fill temporary vacancies in the House of Representatives."

DELAYS IN DISTRIBUTION OF SALK VACCINE

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, yesterday we learned that once again it has been decided to hold up distribution of the Salk antipolio vaccine because of confusion—the term used in the official explanation—confusion about the reports of tests of vaccine produced by another one of the private firms licensed to make Salk vaccine. Once again parents are left in doubt as to when their children may have the benefit of adequate, properly safeguarded inoculations with the wonderful new medicine.

Mr. President, when it comes to the proper handling of problems vitally affecting the health of the Nation's children, the present national administration could learn much from the example of our northern neighbors in Canada. This is not a political issue, and we must study what Canada has done in this program.

During the period of the development and the nationwide trials of the Salk vaccine, there has been close cooperation between our Canadian friends and those in charge of our own polio research. Canada suffered its own worst polio epidemic 2 years ago, and Canadians were glad to be able to make important contributions to the development of a means of eliminating this dread disease. For example, much of the fluid for growing the polio virus cultures was produced in the Connaught Medical Research Laboratories at the University of Toronto, and Canadian children participated in the statistical testing program.

CANADA HAD VACCINE PROGRAM READY EARLY

But on top of this valuable cooperation toward the final success of the vaccine, there has also been one important difference:

The announcement, on April 12, 1955, of that long-sought success found the Government of Canada prepared. On April 12, the Government of Canada had a national program. The Government of the great United States had none.

Canada has undertaken the distribution of Salk vaccine in accordance with a strict and orderly program which can command the confidence of Canadian parents, and which stands in sharp contrast to chaotic confusion which has developed in the United States in the 6 weeks since the vaccine was heralded as the answer to the dreaded infantile paralysis.

On April 12, 1955, the Minister of National Health and Welfare, the Honorable Paul Martin, was able to announce a comprehensive national program which had been developed in anticipation of the success of the vaccine. I think it is worthwhile to quote to the Senate an excerpt from his statement, because it speaks for itself in demonstrating the contrast with the unpreparedness of the Eisenhower administration. The Canadian minister referred to the need to complete vaccination of children before the beginning of the potential polio season on July 1. He then said:

> Because of these considerations and the fact that the production and testing of the vaccine is a long and complicated process extending over several months, the Government (that is, the Government of Canada), decided last fall that, although effectiveness of the vaccine had not yet been conclusively established, no time should be lost in making plans for the production of vaccine so that substantial quantities might be available in time for this year's polio season.

I invite special attention to the two following paragraphs from the statement of Canada's Minister of National Health and Welfare:

> Accordingly, arrangements were worked out, in cooperation with the ten provincial governments, under which the federal and provincial governments would share on a 50–50 basis the cost of underwriting the production of the vaccine at the Connaught Medical Research Laboratories. As a result, sufficient supplies are already available in Canada to immunize more than 500,000 children in selected early school-age groups under the active direction and supervision of provincial and local departments of health.
>
> For this production program and for related research carried out at the Connaught Laboratories, the Institute of Microbiology and Hygiene in Montreal, and other institutions, the Federal Government has provided grants exceeding $500,000.

Has any Senator heard any convincing explanations why our own Secretary of Health and Welfare could not have made such a statement on April 12, 1955?

COST: $1.50 IN CANADA, $4.20 IN UNITED STATES

Is there any convincing explanation why, 6 weeks after that date, our own Department of Health and Welfare should be once again stopping the already hopelessly delayed distribution of Salk vaccine, while they look into what they call "this whole very confused picture?"

Mr. President, there is another facet of the Canadian program which will be of interest to the American people. The Canadian Government obtains the supplies for its program of distributing the vaccine by purchasing the entire output of the Connaught Laboratories. The cost of the vaccine—of enough carefully tested vaccine for three immunizing inoculations—is $1.50. One dollar and a half, not for each shot, but for the vaccine for all three shots. That is the cost of the vaccine for the Canadian Government's program. There is no other price for private purchasers—because the government contracted for the entire output, no supplies from these laboratories are available through private channels in Canada.

I think the Senate will recall, Mr. President, that an Assistant Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare recently told the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare that the cost to the United States Government of privately produced vaccine would be about $3.00 for a 3 cubic centimeter vial, and that through private channels 3 cubic centimeters would cost wholesalers from $3 to $3.60, and physicians from $4.20 to $4.50. I leave it to your imagination what the cost of shots may be to the children who

are able to gain access to immunization through these channels—after, that is, the "very confused picture" has been cleared up and distribution begins once again. But the children of Canada get the same vaccine, without the confusion, at a cost to their government of $1.50 for three vaccinations.

DEEDS MUST SPEAK LOUDER THAN WORDS

I repeat, Mr. President, the accomplishment of our northern neighbors in preparing and carrying out this program contrasts tellingly with the confusion resulting from our own lack of a program. I think the American people are entitled to know the Canadian story, to learn that such problems can be handled rightly by a government which, when the public interest demands it, is not afraid to govern.

I should like to digress for a moment.

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

Mr. NEUBERGER. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. In the first place, I am sure the Senator from Oregon is familiar with the fact that the 1951 census of Canada, according to the World Almanac, shows that the population of Canada is 14 million. That is slightly larger than the population of the State of California, and it is considerably smaller than the population of the State of New York. I am sure the Senator is also familiar with the fact that the so-called polio season varies considerably between the United States and Canada. Polio apparently is encouraged by warm weather. Figures show that the States in the northern areas had proportionately fewer cases of polio than States in the dry and more southern areas.

As I understand from testimony which I have read, the polio season seems to start in the southern portion of the United States and then gradually works northward.

Is it not possible that Canada is not faced with the same problem of a changing polio season, as we are in the United States, and that practically all of Canada is in the general area of States in the northernmost part of our country, with the exception perhaps of some of the New England States?

Mr. NEUBERGER. I thank the distinguished minority leader for his observation. The Senator is correct when he says that Canada has approximately 10 percent of the population of the United States, and perhaps even less than that.

However, I do not understand how that fact has anything to do with the basic policy of whether our Government should have been as prepared as the Canadian Government was prepared for the distribution of the vaccine. One of our States has a population of no more than 150,000 people, and another of our States, with 16 million people, has a population that is greater than the population of Canada. Although there is that great difference in the population in various States of the Union, the basic principles of government within those States do not differ at all.

With respect to what the distinguished minority leader said about the polio season, it is true that the polio season during the spring prevails more in the southern area of our country than in the northern area. However, I should like to invite the attention of the distinguished minority leader to the fact that one of the States in which the children have suffered most from inoculation with serum made by the Cutter Laboratory is the State of Idaho, one of the most northerly States of the Union and just across the border from the Canadian Provinces of British Columbia and Alberta, in which the Canadian children have also received inoculations of vaccine. There is hardly any difference in climate between the northern section of the State of Idaho, on the one hand, and the extreme southern part of the Provinces of Alberta and British Columbia on the other hand. Most of the people in those Provinces live along the southern border of Canada, along the railway belt. Nevertheless, it is in Idaho that children have suffered most from the distribution of defective vaccine.

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

Mr. NEUBERGER. I yield.

Mr. PURTELL. Can the Senator from Oregon inform the Senate how many cc.'s have been used in Canada in the vaccination of Canadian children?

Mr. NEUBERGER. I do not know.

Mr. PURTELL. In other words, the Senator has no knowledge of the number of children in Canada who have been vaccinated?

Mr. NEUBERGER. I do not know the exact number of children who have been vaccinated in Canada.

Mr. PURTELL. Does the Senator know of any number of children in our country who have been denied the use of the vaccine because of the lack of a distribution plan?

Mr. NEUBERGER. In this country?

Mr. PURTELL. Yes.

Mr. NEUBERGER. I have seen repeated announcements to the effect that there will not be a sufficient quantity of vaccine to go around.

Mr. PURTELL. We are talking about a distribution problem, not a production problem.

Mr. NEUBERGER. It is obvious that there is a distribution problem, if there is not enough vaccine to go around.

Mr. PURTELL. Does the Senator feel that there will not be a sufficient amount to go around and that therefore a distribution problem is presented? Does he feel that there will not be enough vaccine to go around because of a distribution problem? Is not the problem one of making sure that the vaccine which will be distributed will be the type which will give immunity, or at least not cause polio?

Mr. NEUBERGER. That is what our Government has not done. By its own admission, the vaccine which perhaps has caused polio in some children has already been distributed and has been used.

Mr. PURTELL. Will the Senator from Oregon tell me in what respect our Government has failed to act in that regard?

Mr. NEUBERGER. Of course I shall tell the Senator. Our Government has failed, in my opinion, to give the slightest support to a governmental control program that should have been applied to a serum as new as this is, before there was wholesale licensing of manufacturers to produce it.

Mr. PURTELL. Will the Senator inform the Senate whether he believes Canada is preparing its vaccine in a way which will guarantee that there will be complete immunization with its use?

Mr. NEUBERGER. When a vaccine is as new in its application and in its production as polio vaccine is, I should say that Canada, by licensing only one public laboratory at the University of Canada to produce it, and by testing each batch of vaccine, is following a wiser public policy than is being followed by this country in its wholesale granting of licenses to a vast and diverse number of private manufacturers.

Mr. PURTELL. Does the Senator from Oregon realize that there is not a vast and diverse number of manufacturers who are making the serum, but only six manufacturers? Does he not further realize that in a Nation the size of the United States, with a population of 163 million people, not 14 million, as is the case with Canada, it would be many months before children in the first to third grades of our schools could be inoculated if the manufacture of the serum were limited to one producer?

Mr. NEUBERGER. I will say that if tests of the serum were necessary in 1954, similar tests should have been made in 1955. Such tests were not made in 1955. There has been entirely too much "on again, off again" in connection with this whole subject. First the vaccine is distributed, then it is recalled. Physicians are advised to give the shots, then they are advised not to give the shots.

Mr. PURTELL. Is the Senator advising the Senate that Canada has a better way, a surer way, and that we lack the knowledge Canada possesses, which would enable us to go forward in a like manner?

Mr. NEUBERGER. We do not lack the knowledge. Our scientists have the knowledge. What we have lacked is a governmental program to provide for the testing of all the vaccine used, and a governmental program to see to it that the first batches available go only to those children in the most susceptible age brackets and to pregnant mothers—

Mr. PURTELL. Does the Senator from Oregon realize that the National Foundation has an order for 18 million cc's of the Salk vaccine?

Mr. NEUBERGER. Does the Senator from Connecticut doubt the statements appearing in the press and magazines of the United States? For example, in Time magazine, which is certainly partial to the administration, it is stated that in many instances the vaccine has gone not to doctors who have patients who are most susceptible, but to the doctors who have the most business with the drug houses.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield?

Mr. NEUBERGER. I yield.

Mr. ALLOTT. Can the Senator refer the Senate to any material which upholds the statement he has just made?

Mr. NEUBERGER. I asked the Senator from Connecticut if he had seen the statement made in Time magazine and if he doubted it.

Mr. ALLOTT. I doubt it.

Mr. PURTELL. I have not seen the statement, and I am not in the habit of either denying or confirming statements which I have not read.

Mr. NEUBERGER. I am quoting to the Senator a statement appearing in Time magazine, a magazine which is very partial to this administration, that drug houses are distributing vaccine to doctors of their own choosing, rather than to those most entitled to receive it. If that statement is incorrect, I should be very happy to know it, because I think the national welfare is the most important consideration.

Mr. PURTELL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield for a moment?

Mr. NEUBERGER. I yield.

Mr. PURTELL. Did the Senator take the time to check to see whether the statement was or was not correct before quoting it in the Senate of the United States?

Mr. NEUBERGER. I presumed that if Time magazine, which is so friendly to the administration, makes a statement of that kind, it must have checked it. Does the Senator doubt that drug manufacturing firms are producing vaccine which, unfortunately, has been defective, and that it is going to doctors to whom they wish to sell it?

Mr. PURTELL. I doubt it. Eighteen million cc.'s of vaccine have been ordered by and will be delivered to the foundation.

Mr. ALLOTT. Does the Senator from Oregon know that there have been no deliveries since April 21?

Mr. NEUBERGER. If that be true, I am very glad of it. During the period between the announcement of the discovery of the vaccine and April 21, there was strong protest on the floor of the Senate and elsewhere because of the completely chaotic situation which prevailed in those weeks. If what was being done up to April 21 was all right, why was it necessary to stop it?

Some of us may remember, Mr. President, a phrase President Eisenhower used in trying to illuminate the progressive moderation, or the dynamic conservatism, supposedly guiding the policies of his administration. As I recall, President Eisenhower said that he was a conservative in financial affairs, but a liberal in human affairs. Those are fine phrases, Mr. President. But phrases alone will not guide a great Nation. Deeds, too, are essential. In the crisis of the Salk vaccine, the national administration has tried to substitute words for deeds.

This is particularly distressing when we consider that, across the frontier to the north, our closest neighboring land, the Dominion of Canada, has put into effect a program for governing the distribution and the manufacture of antipolio vaccine in the interest and welfare of every Canadian child and parent. Deeds speak louder than words. When will the Eisenhower administration follow Canada's constructive leadership in this vital field of child health?

Mr. President, I wish to say, in conclusion, that I was much interested in the question asked me by the junior Senator from Colorado. I want to ask if the policy followed by the administration prior to April 21 was a wise one, why did the administration change its policy on April 21? It seems to me that April 21, 1955, was not the time to be ready with a program, but that last fall, perhaps, when the news of the Salk vaccine was available to the Departments of Health of both Canada and the United States, was the time to be ready with a program. The Canadian Minister pointed out that Canada was getting ready in the fall of 1954. If we have any program at all it dates only from April 21, 1955, which is certainly a vastly important time to the parents and children of the United States.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. NEUBERGER subsequently said: Mr. President, I should like to comment very briefly on the colloquy I had this afternoon with several Members across the aisle on the question of the distribution of the Salk antipolio vaccine. During that discussion I was citing the program worked out by the Department of Health and Welfare, of the Government of Canada, for an orderly production, testing, and distribution of the Salk vaccine in that great nation across the border to the north. During the discussion, several Members across the aisle took exception to my statement that the Salk vaccine had been distributed by drug houses in the United States not necessarily to doctors who have patients who are children, and who thus are most susceptible to polio, but to doctors who have favorable relationships with those drug companies.

Since the discussion occurred, I have had an opportunity to check with the Library of Congress; and at this time I should like to quote exactly from several issues of Time magazine, and from the New York Times.

The following is an exact quotation from the issue of Time magazine for May 2, 1955; and the article from which I shall quote discussed the production and distribution of the Salk vaccine:

> The situation was further complicated when, weeks ago, "detail men" for drug companies called on doctors and asked how much vaccine they wanted. How much they actually got depended less on how far ahead the company was with its production program than on how the salesmen liked individual doctors.

Mr. President, if that statement in Time magazine was not accurate—and the Senator from Connecticut said he doubted its accuracy—then it seems to me that a serious charge of that nature should have been denied at the time, which was May 2, either by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, or by the six drug companies which have been licensed to produce the Salk vaccine. That was a serious statement in a nationally circulated magazine.

It is passing strange, indeed, that members of the political party representing the administration have waited until May 19—more than 2 weeks later—to deny that charge, if indeed the charge was inaccurate.

The issue of Time magazine for May 9, 1955, carried an article entitled "Vaccine Gray Market." I shall not read into the RECORD or quote the entire article; but one of the statements in the article, which is about the Salk vaccine, reads as follows—and I am now quoting from the article in Time magazine:

> Moreover, 80 packages had been handed out as largesse to employees of the drug houses and their friends and relatives.

Mr. President, that was over 1 week ago. If packages of the Salk vaccine are being given out as "booty" to persons who work for the drug houses and their personal friends and favorites, that is also, indeed, a serious charge; and if the charge, as published in Time magazine, is not true, why was the charge never denied by the proper Government department and by the drug houses?

Perhaps the Members of the Senate remember when the public first learned, in the news, of the defective vaccine from the Cutter Laboratory. I have before me a clipping from the New York Times, and the headline reads as follows:

> MISUSE OF VACCINE LAID TO FIVE DOCTORS

The article in the New York Times goes on to point out that a number of adults in the city of New York received innoculations of the antipolio vaccine, although everyone knows that children are infinitely more susceptible to the disease, and therefore are far more entitled to receive the "shots."

Mr. President, let me say that these are not pleasant things to relate. For the past week, I have been communicating with Canadian officials, in an effort to learn how Canada has handled the program, so that perhaps our country can benefit by Canada's example and by studying what Canada has done.

I regret that the Members across the aisle doubted what I said in reference to the lack of a program in the United States. They questioned my comments about the fact that in this country the vaccine had gone to doctors favored by the drug companies, rather than to doctors with the patients who are the most susceptible to the disease.

All I can say in conclusion, Mr. President, is that perhaps these magazines and newspapers may have been in error—although they are among the leading publications in the country—but if they were in error in what they printed, that should have been pointed out at the time of publication, and not today, on the floor of the Senate, a considerable number of weeks later.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, for the information of the Senate, particularly those Members who desire to make their plans for today, I should like to announce that for the remainder of the evening the plan is to consider 4 or 5 bills on the calendar which have been previously cleared with the minority leader, and which the Senate has been informed were expected to be considered when action was concluded on the joint

resolution which was passed earlier in the afternoon.

No rollcalls are expected, Mr. President. I do not think there is any thing controversial in the measures to be considered.

It is hoped to have the road bill, S. 1048, made the unfinished business, to have just general discussion of it on Friday, then recess until Monday, and have further discussion of the road bill on Monday. Under the agreement reached today, action on the President's veto of the postal pay bill will be taken on Tuesday, and we shall then proceed with the road bill as far as possible.

Mr. President, I now desire to make a motion.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas has the floor.

IMPROVEMENT OF ADMINISTRATION OF THE FEDERAL PROPERTY AND SERVICES ACT OF 1949

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 355, House bill 3322, and I call the attention of the senior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN] to the motion.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H. R. 3322) to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, so as to improve the administration of the program for the utilization of surplus property for educational and public-health purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Texas.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 3322) which had been reported from the Committee on Government Operations with amendments, on page 1, line 3, after the word "That", to insert "(a)"; in line 8, after the word "following", to strike out "No property shall be transferred under this subsection until the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare has received from an appropriate State agency or official a certification that such property is usable and needed for educational or public health purposes in the State."; on page 2, after line 7, to insert:

(b) Paragraph (2) of section 203 (j) of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 is amended by inserting at the end thereof the following new sentence: "No property shall be transferred (except surplus property donated in conformity with paragraph (3) of this subsection), until the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare has received from an appropriate State agency or official a certification that such property is usable and needed for educational or public health purposes in the State, and no property shall be transferred pursuant to this paragraph until the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare has determined that such agency or official has conformed to minimum standards of operation prescribed by the Secretary for the disposal of surplus property."

On page 3, line 4, after the word "under", to insert "paragraph (2) of"; on page 4, line 4, after the word "for", to strike out "educational purposes or" and insert "educational"; in line 5, after the word "health", to insert "or memorial"; in line 13, after the word "restriction", to insert "which occurred prior to the enactment of this act"; in line 14, after the word "is", to insert "pending at the time of, or"; on page 5, line 1, after the word "if", to insert "(1) such violation occurred prior to the expiration of such one-year period and (2)"; in line 3, after the word "is", to insert "pending at the time of enactment of this Act or is"; in line 4, after the word "commenced", to strike out "within" and insert "not later than"; in line 16, after the word "property", to strike out "donated" and insert "disposed of"; in line 21, after the word "donated", to insert "or disposed of", and after line 22 to insert:

SEC. 6. (a) Section 203 of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 is amended by striking out the words "Federal Security Administrator" and "Federal Security Agency" wherever they appear in subsection (j) or (k) of such section, and by inserting in lieu thereof the words "Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare", and Department of Health, Education, and Welfare", respectively.

(b) Section 203 of such act, as amended by this act, is further amended (1) by striking out in paragraph (1) of subsection (j) thereof the words "the States, Territories, and possessions" and inserting in lieu thereof the words "any State", and (2) by adding at the end of such subsection the following new paragraph:

"(5) The term 'State', as used in this subsection, includes the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, and the Territories and possessions of the United States."

(c) Clause (D) of paragraph (1) of subsection (k) of section 203 of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 is amended by inserting after "District of Columbia" a comma and the words "the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico."

The amendments were agreed to.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, H. R. 3322, which was passed by the House, came to the Senate and was considered by the Committee on Government Operations, which made some minor amendments to the bill.

The bill provides that surplus personal property carried in a working capital or similar fund in any Federal agency is to be considered for donation to educational or health institutions on the same basis as surplus personal property which is not carried in such a fund. The purpose of the bill is to make clear that the Congress does not intend, and has never intended, to exempt surplus personal property from the donation program merely because it is carried in a working capital fund managed by the Department of Defense or any other agency, regardless of the time it was procured or the accounting classification under which procured or carried on the books of the owning agency.

Mr. President, there has been quite a loophole in the act affecting surplus property, which is intended, under existing law, to be made available for health and educational purposes. The purpose of the bill is to close that loophole and to make all Government personal property which may become surplus available for donation, where suitable, for educational or health uses, by having the property designated as surplus, rather than sold and disposed of by the agency wherein the excess or surplus arises.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. DOUGLAS in the chair). The bill is open to further amendment.

If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment of the amendments, and the third reading of the bill.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

AMENDMENT OF LEGISLATIVE REORGANIZATION ACT OF 1946

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 356, Senate bill 1805, amending the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Texas.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1805) to amend the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, to provide for more effective evaluation of the fiscal requirements of the executive agencies of the Government of the United States.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, bills similar to the pending bill have previously been passed twice by the Senate.

The bill provides the Congress with the machinery necessary to enable it to meet its constitutional responsibilities in connection with the appropriation of funds required for the conduct of the Federal Government.

I may say that the bill seeks to accomplish this objective by establishing a Joint Committee on the Budget, composed of Members of the Senate and the House Appropriations Committees, which would assist the Congress in exercising adequate control over the expenditure of public funds by the executive branch of the Government.

In 1952 a similar bill, in substantially the form of the pending bill, was passed by the Senate by a vote of 55 to 8, but failed of passage in the House. Thereafter, the bill was reintroduced in the 83d Congress, as Senate bill 833; and at that time it was cosponsored by 54 Members of the Senate. In that Congress the bill was passed unanimously by the Senate, but likewise failed of passage in the House.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to amendment.

If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill (S. 1805) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 138 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, is hereby amended to read as follows:

"JOINT COMMITTEE ON THE BUDGET

"SEC. 138. (a) There is hereby created a joint service committee, to be known as the

Joint Committee on the Budget (hereinafter in this section called the 'joint committee') and to be composed of 14 members as follows:

"(1) Seven Members who are members of the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate, 4 from the majority party and 3 from the minority party, to be chosen by such committee; and

"(2) Seven Members who are members of the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives, 4 from the majority party and 3 from the minority party, to be chosen by such committee.

"(b) No person shall continue to serve as a member of the joint committee after he has ceased to be a member of the committee from which he was chosen, except that the members chosen by the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives who have been reelected to the House of Representatives may continue to serve as members of the joint committee notwithstanding the expiration of the Congress. A vacancy in the joint committee shall not affect the power of the remaining members to execute the functions of the joint committee, and shall be filled in the same manner as the original selection, except that (1) in case of a vacancy during an adjournment or recess of Congress for a period of more than 2 weeks, the members of the joint committee who are members of the committee entitled to fill such vacancy may designate a member of such committee to serve until his successor is chosen by such committee, and (2) in the case of a vacancy after the expiration of a Congress which would be filled from the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives, the members of such committee who are continuing to serve as members of the joint committee, may designate a person who, immediately prior to such expiration, was a member of such committee and who is reelected to the House of Representatives, to serve until his successor is chosen by such committee.

"(c) The joint committee shall elect a chairman and vice chairman from among its members at the first regular meeting of each session: *Provided, however*, That during even years the chairman shall be selected from among the members who are Members of the House of Representatives and the vice chairman shall be selected from among the members who are Members of the Senate, and during odd years the chairman shall be selected from among the members who are Members of the Senate and the vice chairman shall be selected from among the members who are Members of the House of Representatives.

"(d) The joint committee may make such rules respecting its organization and procedures as it deems necessary: *Provided, however*, That no measure or recommendation shall be reported from the joint committee unless a majority of the committee assent.

"(e) It shall be the duty of the joint committee—

"(1) (A) to inform itself on all matters relating to the annual budget of the agencies of the United States Government, including analytical, investigative, audit, and other reports on Federal operations prepared by the General Accounting Office pursuant to section 312 of the Budget and Accounting Act, 1921, the Government Corporation Control Act, and section 206 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, and by other Federal agencies; (B) to provide the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate with such information on items contained in such budget, and the justifications submitted in support thereof, as may be necessary to enable said committees to give adequate consideration thereto; (C) to consider the President's messages on the state of the Union and the Economic Report, to consider all information relating to estimated revenues, including revenue estimates of the Department of the Treasury and the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation, to consider essential programs, and to consider changing economic conditions; and (D) to report to the Appropriations Committee of the House of Representatives and the Senate its findings with respect to budget estimates and revisions in appropriations required to hold expenditures to the minimum consistent with the requirements of Government operations and national security;

"(2) to recommend to the appropriate standing committees of the House of Representatives and the Senate such changes in existing laws as may effect greater efficiency and economy in government;

"(3) to make such reports and recommendations to any standing committee of either House of Congress or any subcommittee thereof on matters within the jurisdiction of such standing committee relating to deviations from basic legislative authorization, or to appropriations approved by Congress which are not consistent with such basic legislative authorization, or to cutbacks in previously authorized programs which require appropriations, as may be deemed necessary or advisable by the joint committee, or as may be requested by any standing committee of either House of Congress or by any subcommittee thereof;

"(4) to report to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate at the beginning of each regular session of the Congress the total estimated costs of all programs and projects authorized by the Congress, together with estimated costs of such programs and projects during the fiscal year under way, the ensuing fiscal year, and subsequent fiscal years, and to make such interim reports as may be deemed advisable.

"(f) The joint committee, or any subcommittee thereof, shall have power to hold hearings and to sit and act anywhere within or without the District of Columbia whether the Congress is in session or has adjourned or is in recess; to require by subpena or otherwise the attendance of witnesses and the production of books, papers, and documents; to administer oaths; to take testimony; to have printing and binding done; and to make such expenditures as it deems necessary to carry out its functions within the amount appropriated therefor. Subpenas shall be issued under the signature of the chairman or vice chairman of the committee and shall be served by any person designated by them. The provisions of sections 102 to 104, inclusive, of the Revised Statutes (U. S. C., title 2, secs. 192–194) shall apply in the case of any failure of any witness to comply with any subpena or to testify when summoned under authority of this section.

"(g) The joint committee shall have a staff director, an associate staff director, and such other professional, technical, clerical, and other employees, temporary or permanent, as may be necessary to carry out the duties of the joint committee. Such employees shall be employed without regard to the civil-service laws, and their compensation shall be fixed without regard to the Classification Act of 1949, as amended. The staff director shall be appointed by and responsible to the members of the party of which the chairman of the joint committee is a member, and the associate staff director shall be appointed by and responsible to the members of the opposition party. No person shall be employed by the joint committee unless the members appointing him have favorably considered the data with respect to him submitted by the Federal Bureau of Investigation after a thorough investigation of his loyalty and security.

"(h) The joint committee shall make available members of its staff to assist the staffs of the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and of the Senate and the several subcommittees thereof during the periods when appropriation bills are pending.

"(i) Professional and technical employees of the joint committee, upon the written authority of the chairman or vice chairman, shall have the right to examine the fiscal books, documents, papers, and reports of any agency of the United States Government within or without the District of Columbia, and data related to proposed appropriations incorporated in the annual budget transmitted by the President.

"(j) The annual budget of the United States shall henceforth include a special analysis of all active long-term construction and development programs and projects authorized by the Congress, showing for each the total estimated cost, and the actual or estimated expenditures during prior fiscal years, the current fiscal year, the ensuing fiscal year, and subsequent fiscal years. All grant-in-aid programs shall be included in this analysis, in a separate grouping, showing under the heading 'Subsequent Fiscal Years' for grants of indefinite duration the estimated annual cost for a 10-year period.

"(k) Qualified members of the staff of the Bureau of the Budget shall, at the request of the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives or the Senate, or any subcommittee thereof, be assigned to attend executive sessions of the subcommittees of the Appropriations Committees and to explain the content and basis of proposed appropriations.

"(l) The Comptroller General of the United States shall, at the request of the chairman of the Joint Committee on the Budget, make such investigations and reports with respect to any agency as will enable such joint committee to give adequate consideration to items relating to such agency which are contained in the budget as submitted by the President, and the justifications submitted in support thereof; and, for this purpose, the Comptroller General is authorized to employ technical and professional personnel without regard to the civil-service laws, rules, or regulations, and fix their compensation without regard to the Classification Act of 1949, as amended.

"(m) When used in this section, the term 'agency' means any executive department, commission, council, independent establishment, Government corporation, board, bureau, division, service, office, officer, authority, administration, or other establishment, in the executive branch of the Government. Such term includes the Comptroller General of the United States and the General Accounting Office, and includes any and all parts of the municipal government of the District of Columbia except the courts thereof.

"(n) There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this section. Appropriations for the expenses of the joint committee shall be disbursed by the Secretary of the Senate upon vouchers signed by the chairman or vice chairman."

SEC. 2. Effective at the beginning of the second regular session of the 84th Congress, section 133 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(g) (1) All bills and joint resolutions authorizing appropriations reported from committees of the Senate or the House of Representatives shall be accompanied by reports in writing, which shall be printed; and there shall be included in each such report or in an accompanying document an estimate from the department or other agency of the legislative, executive, or judicial branch of the Government primarily concerned of the probable cost of carrying out the legislation proposed in such bill or

resolution over the first 5-year period of its operation or over the period of its operation if such legislation will be effective for less than 5 years. If the chairman of the committee determines that no existing department or agency is primarily concerned with the legislation, the estimate shall be made by the Bureau of the Budget.

"(2) Estimates received from departments or agencies under this subsection may be submitted by the committees to the Bureau of the Budget for review, and such reviews, when practicable, shall be included in the reports or accompanying documents before said bills and joint resolutions are reported.

"(3) The Joint Committee on the Budget shall maintain compilations of all such estimates, and semiannually shall print those compilations (together with any comment of the Bureau of the Budget) for the information of the Congress."

SEC. 3. Section 139 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(e) The Joint Committee on the Budget is authorized to recommend that joint hearings be held by the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate, and of subcommittees thereof; but such joint hearings shall not affect the power of the respective committees, and of subcommittees thereof, to conduct separate additional committee hearings, and shall not affect the independence of committee deliberations and decision. The chairman of each such joint hearing shall be the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, or of the appropriate subcommittee thereof, of the House in which the bill is pending at the time of the hearing, and the vice chairman shall be the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations of the other House, or of the appropriate subcommittee thereof."

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President——

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. DOUGLAS in the chair). The Senator from Utah.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I desire to move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 358, Senate Resolution 102; and if the Senator from Utah will yield, since he has been recognized, I should like to make that motion and have the resolution brought before the Senate.

Mr. WATKINS. What is the resolution?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. The resolution relates to conferring jurisdiction on the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment on the claim of the George D. Emery Co.

Mr. WATKINS. The resolution has no relationship to the Kempner estate, has it?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. No, none whatever, nor to the State of Utah, nor to any particular church, nor to any particular day of the month. The resolution is simply a private resolution coming from the Senator's own committee.

Mr. WATKINS. I wished to be sure the resolution came from the Judiciary Committee.

Very well, Mr. President; I yield.

GEORGE D. EMERY CO.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 358, Senate Resolution 102, to confer jurisdiction on the Court of Claims in connection with the claim of the George D. Emery Co.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Texas.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution (S. Res. 102) conferring jurisdiction on the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment on the claim of the George D. Emery Co.

Mr. President, the purpose of the resolution is to refer the bill (S. 427) for the relief of the Geo. D. Emery Co., to the Court of Claims. The claim involves difficult questions of fact and law, including compensation for services performed by this company on behalf of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation and other Government agencies, in connection with establishing an abaca plantation in Ecuador, in accordance with the Abaca Production Act of 1950—Public Law 683, 81st Congress.

The procedure involves a hearing by the Court, with a report back to Congress, giving such findings of fact and conclusions thereon as shall be sufficient to inform the Congress of the nature and character of the demand, as a claim, legal or equitable, against the United States.

Mr. President, I am informed by the chairman of the Judiciary Committee, from which this measure comes, that this formula has been used many times by the Congress in connection with complex claims brought to the attention of the committee.

It is the intent of the Judiciary Committee that the Court of Claims consider only equitable or legal rights to unrecovered expenses, not any claim to profits.

Mr. President, I ask for a vote on the resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution (S. Res. 102) was agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the bill (S. 427) entitled "A bill for the relief of the Geo. D. Emery Co.," now pending in the Senate, together with all accompanying papers, is hereby referred to the United States Court of Claims pursuant to sections 1492 and 2509 of title 28, United States Code; and said court shall proceed expeditiously with the same, in accordance with the provisions of said sections, and report to the Senate, at the earliest practicable date, giving such findings of fact and conclusions thereon as shall be sufficient to inform the Congress of the nature and character of the demand, as a claim legal or equitable, against the United States, and the amount, if any, legally or equitably due from the United States to the claimants.

THE COLORADO RIVER STORAGE PROJECT

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, as a representative of the arid West, which has been helped immeasurably by the Bureau of Reclamation in the development of its limited water resources, I am gratified that Commissioner of Reclamation W. A. Dexheimer has come out in a frank and forthright statement to set the record straight on the soundness of the Colorado River storage project and the reclamation program generally.

Commissioner Dexheimer has shown great forbearance and patience in keeping silent during the past several months when individuals and propaganda-pressure groups have been directing one of the most unfair and untruthful attacks ever unleashed at a public-works program.

Commissioner Dexheimer is a highly respected engineer who participated in planning and construction of Hoover Dam, Shasta Dam, and other great engineering works. His statement will carry great weight among engineering people and reasonable people who respect fair play and consideration of all the facts.

In view of the importance of giving these facts on the Colorado River storage project and the Government's reclamation program a public airing to counteract some of the untruthful propaganda which is being poured out by people who seek to prevent water development in the arid West, I hereby request unanimous consent to have Mr. Dexheimer's statement of May 13, 1955, printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection——

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, reserving the right to object—although I shall not object—I desire to point out to my good friend the Senator from Utah that I do not believe I took an unreasonable position regarding the proposed Colorado storage project legislation; nor do I believe that the senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], who now occupies the chair, took an unreasonable position on the measure.

Let me say to the Senator from Utah that reasonable men may disagree about questions which are subject to debate, and I do not assert that my friend the Senator from Utah should be classified as unreasonable.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, I did not know that the Senator from California thought I was referring to him. I do not know that the statement which I mentioned refers to him.

Mr. KUCHEL. I thank my friend.

Mr. WATKINS. However, if Mr. Dexheimer's statement applies to the Senator from California rather than to Mr. Moley and the magazine Newsweek, it will have to apply; I cannot help it.

Let me say I have no disrespect for the distinguished senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], who now is presiding over the Senate. However, I wish to have the statement to which I have referred printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Utah?

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

Commissioner of Reclamation W. A. Dexheimer said today that critics are attempting, by unwarranted distortion and omission of facts, to discredit and bring to a halt efforts to help meet the West's critical water shortages.

His statement follows:

"The Bureau of Reclamation expects and welcomes thoughtful and constructive criticism which is based on solid facts and knowl-

edge of what has been accomplished in the past half century and what is proposed for the future.

"However, it is time to take a close look at the indiscriminate attack of those critics who are attempting, by every means at their command, to destroy public confidence in our efforts to assist the arid Western States in meeting their water needs. The attacks are currently centering on the proposed upper Colorado River storage project which was worked out under the terms of the Colorado River compact and in cooperation between the Federal Government and the States of Wyoming, Utah, Colorado, and New Mexico, to enable the States to utilize their apportioned share of Colorado River water. These critics are much less careful in their handling of the facts than those individuals and groups who have opposed virtually every major project ever undertaken by the Bureau of Reclamation.

"Yet, who is there today who will challenge the worth of such facilities as the lower Colorado River development, Hoover Dam, Imperial Valley, the Central Valley project, Grand Coulee Dam, Boise Valley, Salt River project, or the Colorado Big Thompson project.

"Leslie A. Miller, who is a former governor of Wyoming and who should be aware of the importance of reclamation work in that State as well as elsewhere in the West, has repeatedly cited the increased cost of the Colorado-Big Thompson project as a reason it should not have been built and why other projects, such as the upper Colorado River storage project, should not be undertaken.

"Let Mr. Miller repeat his accusations, as made in the Reader's Digest and other periodicals, in front of any group of Colorado farmers who were saved from almost total drought disaster last summer by the successful functioning of this project. Or let him put his accusation in proper perspective by quoting the correct original estimate of costs and then point out that World War II intervened between the time this estimate was given and the time the bulk of the project was constructed. He conveniently neglected to mention the 250 percent increase in the construction cost index during the 18 years between authorization and completion of construction.

"Like Raymond A. Moley, in his multitudinous dissections of reclamation in Newsweek magazine, Mr. Miller neglects to mention that reclamation, unlike other water resources work undertaken by the Federal Government, is on a hard-cash repayment basis. They choose to ignore the fact that out of a total reclamation expenditure of $2,850,146,288 in the last half century, $577,822,640 has been repaid and that $60 million is flowing into the Treasury annually at the present time. This includes interest on the Federal investment in hydroelectric and municipal water facilities.

"It should be remembered that more than half of Reclamation's annual appropriation is now coming from the revolving Reclamation Fund which was established by the Congress by the Reclamation Act of 1902. This same Congress established the principle that funds for irrigation development should be loaned without interest as a means of advancing the national economy. The same principle has been followed by every Congress since 1902.

"The facts are that this investment is paying off, not only in the cash repayment to the Treasury but in its positive contributions to the national economy and well-being.

"The records are replete with instances of reclamation project areas pouring into the Federal Treasury in income taxes alone, more each year than the total Federal investment in project facilities. Buying power of more than $750 million annually is contained in the crops the farmers take from their irrigated fields on Federal reclamation projects.

"The Federal Government, over the years, has spent millions and billions for flood control, navigation, transportation subsidies, drought relief, crop support, and crop insurance without expectation or hope of reimbursement. But these areas of disaster continue to plague us while the irrigated oases in the arid West remain solid units of stabilized agricultural production. I have no quarrel with the Federal policy, but why pick on western irrigation?

"It was interesting to note in the Saturday Evening Post of April 30, an editorial supporting an increased appropriation of $18 million for a channel-deepening project in the Delaware River which would benefit particularly the United States Steel Corp. by permitting oceangoing ore boats to unload at dockside for the new Fairless plant. Will this investment be paid back by local beneficiaries? The Saturday Evening Post editorial is proposing a writeoff of this local harbor improvement in the Delaware River. Reclamation investments will be returned to the Treasury. The West only asks for a loan and a reasonable time to repay.

"Specific criticism of the proposed upper Colorado River storage project by Mr. Miller, Mr. Moley, et al., concerns three main points: (1) An incredible bill from the nonpayment of interest on irrigation features of the project; (2) compounding of the crop surplus problem by the addition of new irrigated lands; (3) the construction of Echo Park Dam in the Dinosaur National Monument would be an opening wedge in the desecration of our national park system.

"Mr. Moley's description of an incredible bill for interest is just that—totally incredible. The facts are that 63½ percent of costs are chargeable to power and municipal and industrial water and will be repaid with interest at 2½ percent which is the same interest paid by the United States Treasury.

"The upper Colorado River project report, as approved by the Secretary of the Interior, proposes an expenditure of about $300 million for irrigation phases of the project. These funds will be spent over a period of more than 25 years and repayment on each irrigation unit will start soon after it is completed. A few years are allowed before repayment begins to permit the farmer to establish himself on the land.

"Current national troubles with crop surpluses have been used to becloud the reclamation picture and particularly to delay the authorization of several projects which are now before Congress. Completely ignored by the critics is the fact that most products of western irrigated farms are not under price support or acreage control and are not surplus. Seventy-five percent of land irrigated by the upper Colorado River projects would be for livestock production.

"More important in the agricultural production picture is the long-range population estimate. The Bureau of the Census fixes our national population at 200 million in 1975. Byron T. Shaw, Administrator of the Agricultural Research Service in the Department of Agriculture, is authority for the statement that, 'If the average American is to continue to have as much meat to eat as he did last year, all acreage that is currently idle will have to be put back to work by 1950. By 1975, even if all marginal lands are used, there might be a deficit of more than 100 million acres. To meet this, livestock production alone will have to be doubled on the land at hand.' Few new lands in the upper Colorado River Basin would receive water before 1975 if the project was authorized tomorrow.

"The Bureau of Reclamation makes no pretense of expecting to solve this approaching national food-production crisis by the construction of reclamation projects alone. We believe that in the decades ahead there will be a continued increase in per acre production and also in total acreage under production, both by irrigation and the drainage of present swampland. However, at the present time, according to Department of Agriculture statistics, we are fighting a losing battle to maintain our present cultivated acreage.

"Urban inroads are claiming more acreage than we are placing in production by irrigation. We must plan now for the future. To do otherwise would be criminally shortsighted.

"The so-called invasion of national parks should be considered in the light of a careful documentation of dam sites and reservoir areas withdrawn specifically for power and reclamation purposes along the Green and Yampa Rivers and events leading to the subsequent enlargement of Dinosaur National Monument to encompass the same area by Presidential order on July 14, 1938.

"One reclamation and 10 power-site withdrawals (land and dam sites set aside by Federal action) were made along these rivers between 1904 and 1925 covering, among other areas, the Echo Park and Split Mountain dam and reservoir sites. The National Park Service, by letter dated August 9, 1934, to the Federal Power Commission, observed that the proposed proclamation (to enlarge Dinosaur Monument) would protect all existing rights, and inquired as to whether the Echo Park and Blue Mountain sites might be released. The Federal Power Commission replied on December 13, 1934, that the Commission believes that the public interest in this major power resource is too great to permit its impairment by voluntary relinquishment of two units in the center of the scheme. The Commission will not object, however, to the creation of the monument if the proclamation contains a specific provision that power development under the provisions of the Federal Water Power Act will be permitted."

"The request was renewed in a letter dated November 6, 1935, over the signature of Harold L. Ickes, then Secretary of the Interior. The Federal Power Commission again rejected the request on January 6, 1936, quoting the identical language of the previous letter to the National Park Service. The Presidential proclamation of 1938 made the enlarged Dinosaur National Monument subject to all existing rights. Therefore, it would appear that there is actually no invasion of the national park system but merely the exercise of a previously established reservation. The original 80-acre Dinosaur Monument contains all known fossils and is 20 miles downstream from any proposed reservoir. It would not be disturbed.

"Despite this previous withdrawal of the Echo Park and other multipurpose dam sites for reclamation purposes, we are not anxious to construct a reclamation structure in this area if alternate sites are feasible. Conclusive investigations over 20 years have ruled out any of the suggested alternates because they would provide less storage space, involve greater evaporation losses and reduce the power output from the upper Colorado Basin system. The large reservoir storage is essential to hold floodwaters in years of excess runoff for use in drier years and seasons of low-river flow. Maximum power output is essential because power revenue will repay the bulk of project costs.

"Development and conservation of a maximum supply of water and power is essential to the continued economic growth of the area. There is and will continue to be a market for the 6-mill power which will be produced. All 10 private utility companies serving the area have testified before the committees of Congress that they would take all available power at the 6-mill rate. Preference agencies have also expressed a need for the power output.

"Reclamation engineers have established a worldwide reputation in water conservation by the investigation, design, construction, and operation of the numerous reclamation projects which now dot the western scene. We do not take lightly the challenge to our integrity by those critics who prefer the scattergun attack to a careful adherence to the facts."

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, both Mr. Dexheimer's statement and the Tribune editorial are clear and forthright, and need no explanation. In view of the liberties which have been and are being taken with the truth in regard to the reclamation program, it is both timely and refreshing to have the Reclamation Commissioner and a great newspaper speak out so firmly in defense of accuracy and fair play.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the editorial referred to, which was published in the Salt Lake Tribune on Sunday, May 15, 1955, printed at this point in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks.

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

ANSWERING MOLEY-MILLER PROPAGANDA BLAST

"Why pick on western irrigation?"

With this question, Reclamation Commissioner Wilbur A. Dexheimer last week-end pointed up a brilliant defense of the upper Colorado River project against the published attacks of ex-New Dealers Leslie A. Miller, of Cheyenne, and Raymond A. Moley, Newsweek columnist.

Mr. Dexheimer is no wild-eyed promoter of big dams. His record is one of stanch conservatism. Before a reclamation project is submitted to Congress he insists that its engineering and economic feasibility be proved. The Bureau of Reclamation has refused to go ahead on a number of projects in recent years, despite terrific local pressure, because of doubts as to feasibility.

Mr. Dexheimer pulled the rug out from under the Moley-Miller team by pointing out that their attacks on economic feasibility of the upper Colorado project fail to give credit for reimbursable features of reclamation loans or the corollary benefits in increased taxes and new markets. And he pointed out that some enemies of reclamation projects are thumping for huge harbor and dredging projects which would return not a cent directly to the taxpayer, notably the proposed $18 million Delaware River Channel deepening project.

Unlike many other water resources projects undertaken by the Federal Government, reclamation is on a hard cash repayment basis. Of the $2,850,146,238 expended for reclamation in the last half century, $577,822,640 has been repaid and $60 million is flowing back into the treasury each year.

Other studies show that reclamation projects will repay more than construction costs over the years through increased tax yields. Some areas developed through reclamation in 20 years have paid $2.75 into the Federal Treasury in taxes for every dollar spent on construction.

Glib opponents of reclamation—or their ghost writers—are constantly warning taxpayers as to their share of the total cost of such projects as the upper Colorado. Actually, sound studies show the upper Colorado project would be self-liquidating. Moreover it would open up vast storehouses of raw materials and provide job opportunities for many people. It would accelerate the decentralization of industry and create new wealth markets and defensive materials for all the country.

The attack on the economic and engineering feasibility of the upper Colorado program has gained momentum since the phony cries of "national park invasion" failed to block the program. Facts and figures showing that both Federal water and power withdrawals antedated extension of the national monument to include Echo Park have greatly weakened the invasion arguments. Mr. Dexheimer likened Echo Park's relation to the overall project to one wheel of a wagon. It might still run without the wheel but not very far.

The calamity howlers will continue to try to stir up opposition throughout the country, just as they did before the building of Hoover Dam, the Colorado-Big Thompson, and other western reclamation projects. But it was one of the most violent of the critics who, in a more temperate article quoted a western hydrologist as giving the "last word" on the matter of water costs: "There is no price for water and so there can be no ceiling price."

EXTENDING TITLE II, FIRST WAR POWERS ACT, 1941

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 359, House bill 4052, which would continue in effect the provisions of title II of the First War Powers Act, 1941.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Texas.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 4052) to amend the act of January 12, 1951, as amended, to continue in effect the provisions of title II of the First War Powers Act, 1941.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, this bill is part of legislative program of the Department of Defense for 1955, and was introduced at that Department's request. Its purpose is to extend for 2 years, or until June 30, 1957, title II of the First War Powers Act. The existing law provides that the extension may be terminated at any time by concurrent resolution of the Congress, and this proposal would in no way change that provision.

The basic purpose of the statute is to permit the President to authorize any department or agency of the Government exercising functions in connection with the prosecution of the national defense effort to enter into contracts and into amendments of modifications of contracts, and to make advance, progress, and other payments thereon, without regard to the provisions of law relating to the making, performance, amendment, or modification of contracts, whenever he deems such action would facilitate the national defense, subject, however, to certain safeguards set forth in title II.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the third reading of the bill.

The bill (H. R. 4052) was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

SALE OF CERTAIN SHIPS TO CITIZENS OF THE REPUBLIC OF THE PHILIPPINES

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 362, Senate Joint Resolution 67.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 67) to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to sell certain vessels to citizens of the Republic of the Philippines, to provide for the rehabilitation of the interisland commerce of the Philippines, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Texas.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the joint resolution, which had been reported from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce with amendments, on page 1, line 8, after the numerals "1946," to strike out "two" and insert "five"; on page 2, line 1, after the colon, to insert *"Carrick Bend, Masthead Knot, Snug Hitch"*; in line 3, after the colon, to strike out *"Provided,* That with respect to vessels under charter on the date of enactment of this act, and which have been continuously under charter for a period of 5 years or more, there shall be subtracted from the sales price, as depreciation, $95.05 per day per vessel for the period beginning July 1, 1954, and ending with the date of execution of the contract of sale of the respective vessel" and insert in lieu thereof *"Provided,* That with respect to each of the said vessels one-half of the charter line paid to the United States shall be subtracted from the sales price as additional depreciation for the period beginning July 1, 1954, and ending with the date of execution of the contract of sale of the respective vessel: *And provided further,* That the Secretary of Commerce after consultation with the National Advisory Council in International Monetary and Financial Problems, shall fix the terms of payment on unpaid balances, which terms shall in no event be more favorable than the terms applicable in the case of sales to citizens of the United States. ", so as to make the joint resolution read:

Resolved, etc., That notwithstanding the provisions of section 14 of the Merchant Ship Sales Act of 1946 (Public Law 321, 79th Cong.), as amended, or any other provision of law, the Secretary of Commerce is hereby authorized and directed to sell to citizens of the Republic of the Philippines in accordance with the Merchant Ship Sales Act of 1946, five vessels named herein: *Carrick Bend, Masthead Knot, Snug Hitch, Boatswains Hitch,* and *Turks Head,* which at present are in the Philippines: *Provided,* That with respect to each of the said vessels one-half of the charter line paid to the United States shall be subtracted from the sales price as additional depreciation for the period beginning July 1, 1954, and ending with the date of execution of the contract of sale of the respective vessel: *And provided further,* That the Secretary of Commerce after consultation with the National Advisory Council in International Monetary and Financial Problems, shall fix the terms of payment on unpaid balances, which terms shall in no event be more favorable than the terms applicable in the case of sales to citizens of the United States.

In determining the order of preference between applicants for the purchase of such

vessels, first preference shall be given to the applicants who are charterers of such vessels under the terms of the aforesaid act of April 30, 1946, as amended, at the time of making application to purchase vessels under the terms of this act; second preference shall be given to applicants who suffered losses of interisland tonnage in the interests of the Allied war effort: *Provided*, That applications for the purchase of said vessels are received by the Secretary of Commerce within 1 year after the date of enactment of this act.

Except with the prior approval of the Secretary of Commerce, any vessel sold under this joint resolution shall, for a period of 10 years from the date of sale of the vessel, be operated only in the interisland commerce of the Philippines.

Delivery of the vessels for the purposes of sale shall be made at a port in the Philippines designated by the Secretary of Commerce.

Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the said vessels shall continue to operate in the Philippines under existing charters until such time as the agreements of sale are executed and deliveries of the vessels thereunder are accomplished.

For the purposes of this act, the term "citizen" includes any individual, corporation, partnership, association, or other form of business entity authorized to do business under the laws of the Republic of the Philippines.

The amendments were agreed to.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, may we have an explanation of the joint resolution?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, Senate Joint Resolution 67, as amended, would authorize and direct the Secretary of Commerce to sell in accordance with the Merchant Ship Sales Act of 1946, as amended, five vessels named in the resolution which are presently under charter to shipping companies in the Philippines. First preference between applicants for the purchase of the vessels would be given to the present charterers, the Philippine Steam Navigation Co.—charterers of the SS. *Boatswain Hitch* and the SS. *Turks Head*—and the Compania Maritima—charterers of the SS. *Carrick Bend*, the SS. *Masthead Knot*, and the SS. *Snug Hitch*. Second preference would be given to applicants who suffered losses of interisland tonnage in the interest of the Allied war effort. Applications for purchase must be received by the Secretary of Commerce within a year after enactment of the resolution.

In line with the views expressed by the conferees on Senate Joint Resolution 72, 83d Congress, 2d session, the joint resolution as amended would subtract from the sales price of each of the vessels one-half of the charter hire paid to the United States Government from July 1, 1954, to the date of execution of the contracts for each vessel. And, in line with the recommendation of the Secretary of Commerce, the Secretary would be directed to fix the terms of payment on the unpaid balances, which terms shall in no event be more favorable than the terms applicable in the case of sales to citizens of the United States.

Unless the purchaser is given prior approval by the Secretary of Commerce, any vessel sold under this joint resolution must be operated only in the interisland commerce of the Philippines for a period of 10 years from the date of sale. The existing charters are authorized to be continued until such times as the vessels are sold and delivered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution is open to further amendment. If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the joint resolution.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

EXPLORATION, LOCATION, AND ENTRY OF MINERAL LANDS WITHIN THE PAPAGO INDIAN RESERVATION

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 360, Senate bill 33.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (S. 33) relative to the exploration, location, and entry of mineral lands within the Papago Indian Reservation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON].

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, while I am waiting for certain information, I shall make a brief explanation of the bill.

The purpose of S. 33 is to repeal the provisions of the Executive order of February 1, 1917, which created the Papago Indian Reservation, the act of February 21, 1931, the act of June 18, 1934, and the act of August 26, 1937, insofar as they refer to location and entry under the mining laws of lands within the Papago Reservation. The bill provides that all tribal lands within the reservation are withdrawn from all forms of exploration, location, and entry under the above laws, and that minerals underlying the reservation are made a part of the reservation to be held in trust by the United States for the Papago Indian Tribe.

The reservation includes 2,700,000 acres of which, according to the latest available figures—as of December 1953—only 12,360 acres are included in mining claims, and only approximately 3,600 acres have been covered by mineral patent. A savings clause preserves all valid rights established heretofore under the mineral laws, but the enactment of the bill will protect the Papago Indians from further diminution of their reservation. Recent accelerated uranium prospecting has further increased tribal concern that the surface of large areas of land may later be lost to tribal utilization. The loss of further surface resources of the Papago Indian Reservation will increase the problem of administering Indian affairs on this reservation.

The committee believes that this reservation should be closed to all forms of mineral entry, that the Papago Tribe should be given fee title to the tribal lands, and that mining operations should be carried on under leases issued under the Tribal Leasing Act of May 11, 1938 (52 Stat. 347, 25 U. S. C. 396a–f) as provided in S. 33.

The author of the bill, the distinguished junior Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER], reported it from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. I understand that he is detained from the Chamber. However, the report from the committee is unanimous, and I hope the bill may be passed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to amendment. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the provisions with respect to subjection of mineral lands within the Papago Indian Reservation to exploration, location, and entry under the mining laws of the United States in the Executive order dated February 1, 1917, creating the Papago Indian Reservation, and in the third proviso in section 1 of the act of February 21, 1931 (46 Stat. 1202), and the provisions of subsection (b) (1) and (2) of the remainder, following the word "purposes," of subsection (b) (4) of section 3 of the act of June 18, 1934 (48 Stat. 984; 25 U. S. C. 461–479), as amended by the act of August 26, 1937 (50 Stat. 862, 863; 25 U. S. C. 463), are hereby repealed, all tribal lands within the Papago Indian Reservation are hereby withdrawn from all forms of exploration, location, and entry under such laws, the minerals underlying such lands are hereby made a part of the reservation to be held in trust by the United States for the Papago Indian Tribe, and such minerals shall be subject to lease for mining purposes pursuant to the provisions of the act of May 11, 1938 (52 Stat. 347): *Provided*, That the provisions of this act shall not be applicable to lands within the Papago Indian Reservation for which a mineral patent has heretofore been issued or to a claim that has been validly initiated before the date of this act and thereafter maintained under the mining laws of the United States.

SEC. 2. Section 6 of the act of May 11, 1938 (52 Stat. 347, 348; 25 U. S. C. 396f), is amended by deleting therefrom "the Papago Indian Reservation in Arizona."

FEDERAL AID ROAD CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I am about to move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 354, Senate bill 1048, a bill to amend and supplement the Federal-Aid Road Act approved July 11, 1911 (39 Stat. 355), as amended and supplemented, to authorize appropriations for continuing the construction of highways, and for other purposes.

The bill was introduced by the able junior Senator from Tennessee [Mr.

GORE]. In accordance with the statement previously made to the Senate, I assure the Senate that no votes will be taken on this measure today or tomorrow, except upon the motion to proceed to consider the bill, and certainly none will be taken before Monday of next week.

I now move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate bill 1048.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (S. 1048) to amend and supplement the Federal-Aid Road Act approved July 11, 1916 (39 Stat. 355), as amended and supplemented, to authorize appropriations for continuing the construction of highways, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Texas.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Public Works with amendments.

ORDER FOR RECESS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate concludes its business today it stand in recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. DOUGLAS in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

COST OF DEFENSE—FARM INCOME

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, under date of Friday, May 6, in the Washington Post and Times Herald, there was published a press story from the United Press, under the headline "Wilson Sees 3.5 Billions Arms Rise."

The article reads as folows:

WILSON SEES 3.5 BILLIONS ARMS RISE

Defense Secretary Charles E. Wilson indicated yesterday that future annual defense appropriations may have to be $3.5 billion more than the amount Congress is expected to provide for the year starting July 1.

Even with the "strict austerity" he is enforcing, Wilson said military spending will continue at the "high rate" of $35 billion a year for a long time. The House Appropriations Committee yesterday approved appropriations of $31.5 billion for the fiscal year starting July 1.

Wilson said when unspent funds carried over from the Korean war years are used up, "requests for new obligational authority" will have to be increased to support the long-pull defense outlays.

He made the forecast in an annual report submitted to the President and sent by the White House to Congress. It covered the year which ended last June 30.

The report included these highlights:

Wilson cited guided missiles as the one area where deliveries and spending are rising.

Army Secretary Robert T. Stevens said there is "aggressive" research on weapons "to meet the threat of low altitude air attack and the possible danger of intercontinental missiles."

Air Secretary Harold E. Talbott said that hydrogen bomb training has been made part of the regular courses in Air Training Command and the Air Force Academy because of the "rapidly growing demand" for personnel in the thermonuclear program.

Navy Secretary Charles S. Thomas dealt at length with the "startling strength" of the Russian navy and urged "very substantial" new United States shipbuilding. Otherwise, he said, "the day may not be too far distant when we shall find Soviet warships freely cruising in every ocean, bringing the Red flag into every port and lying with their guns and guided missiles off our very shores."

I call attention to the second paragraph of the article:

Wilson said when unspent funds carried over from the Korean war years are used up, "requests for new obligational authority" will have to be increased to support the long-pull defense outlays.

Mr. President, it is interesting to note that the chief spokesman of the administration for the Department of Defense is belatedly saying to the American people that the administration has been able to reduce some of the defense appropriation requests because, Mr. Wilson says now, in 1955, when unspent funds carried over from the Korean war years are used up, requests for new obligational authority will have to be increased to support the long-pull defense outlays.

I believe the facts are becoming ever more clear, namely, that the administration in many of these areas has lived on some borrowed time, if not on some borrowed capital, and has lived off the fat of more lush and profitable days.

I merely wanted to bring the matter to the attention of the Senate because when we examine the cash expenditures of this administration, we find that the situation is not any different than it has been during the past 10 years.

AGRICULTURAL INCOME

I should like to call attention to another item published in one of the newspapers. The headline of the article reads, "Farm Income Boost of 40 Percent Seen by 1975."

That headline would give one the impression that everything will be rosy in American agriculture in 1975. It predicts a 40 percent increase in agriculture income.

I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

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

FARM INCOME BOOST OF 40 PERCENT SEEN BY 1975

An Agriculture Department economist predicted yesterday that the needs of an expanding population may boost the income of American farmers at least 40 percent by 1975.

Nathan Koffsky, Chief of the Farm Income Branch, told a meeting of the Newspaper Farm Editors Association that the income of the Nation as a whole will be 50 to 60 percent higher 20 years from now if present trends continue.

To meet the needs of a larger population and its prospective larger buying power, he said, farmers must increase their output of food and fiber products at least 40 percent.

"I am not worried about the possibility of American farmers being able to meet this increased demand," he said. "But I can't say the same about some other areas of the world."

Koffsky said a general economic boom now in progress should do much to stabilize farm returns this year near last year's level.

He said consumers are spending 3 percent more than a year ago, a development which Koffsky said should contribute heavily toward halting a postwar decline in farm income.

Secretary of Agriculture Ezra T. Benson, greeting the visiting editors, said much progress has been made by agriculture during the last 2 years in adjusting from wartime to peacetime conditions.

He said there have been fewer dislocations and hardships than ever before in a like period. But the Nation still faces a serious problem in adjusting wheat production and surpluses to their normal levels, Benson added.

The editors heard discussions of other phases of the Department by officials.

Those attending the meeting included: Robert C. Bjorklund, Wisconsin State Journal; Rex B. Conn, Cedar Rapids Gazette; Bill Durham, Star-Telegram, Fort Worth, Tex.; Hal M. Herd, Nashville Tennessean; Dave Hess, Cincinnati Enquirer; Bill Humphries, News and Observer, Raleigh, N. C.; and others.

Mr. HUMPHREY. It is interesting to note that the same story which predicts a 40-percent rise in farm income also states:

Nathan Koffsky, chief of the farm income branch, told a meeting of the Newspaper Farm Editors Association that the income of the Nation as a whole will be 50 to 60 percent higher 20 years from now if present trends continue.

I want that particular statistical fact to be clear in our minds. The total income in the Nation will be from 50 to 60 percent higher, but the agricultural income will be about 40 percent higher. What does that indicate? It indicates clearly and unmistakably that there is a continuing falling off of agricultural income. That is one of the reasons the junior Senator from Minnesota has believed, and continues to believe, that we must take a brandnew look—to use some good administration phraseology—at the critical agricultural problem, and particularly at the problem of low farm income. We must not only take a new look, but we must also take some action.

I am pleased to be able to report to the Senate that the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry has now decided to hold hearings on proposed price-support legislation and other proposed legislation affecting the price level of agricultural commodities.

It ought to be crystal clear that no one seems to be very happy or satisfied with the present agricultural act. The act is not doing what it was supposed to do, namely, raise prices and balance production. Production is still out of balance and prices are going down.

The only area of our economy which is suffering today, despite the so-called boom times in which we live, is the agricultural area of the American economy. While one should not ever pose as a prophet—and I do not pose as one—I believe it is fair to say that what we see today in terms of agriculture as related to the rest of the economy is very much what we saw some 25 years ago pertaining to agriculture and its relationship to the rest of the economy.

I repeat that the administration's farm program is having two results. It is aggravating the problems of production and reducing the price levels in the

market place for agricultural commodities. I am pleased that the Senate, as well as the House of Representatives, is concerning itself with this question. I predict, with a reasonable degree of certainty, that as a result of the hearings which now will be held by the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, we will hear the views of the American farmer and those associated with him, and that they will tell the sad story of the breakdown in agricultural price levels and in the net income of the American farmer.

AGRICULTURAL SURPLUSES

Finally, Mr. President, I wish to say that one of the most disappointing developments of this year has been the failure of the Department of Agriculture and of the State Department to move the agricultural surpluses. Surely there is enough creative thinking in the United States and in our Government to figure out a way by which we can utilize the abundance of food and fiber in this Nation on a good, sound, economic, and humane basis. We have vast quantities of feed grains and vast quantities of wheat on hand. The people of the world need those surpluses, and the world markets are available. I regret to say that the food and the fiber are not being moved in the amounts they should be moved. We see example after example of that fact.

I call the attention of the Senate to the fact that within the past 6 months the fine little country of Norway has purchased 3 million tons of wheat from the Soviet Union primarily because our law provides that our surplus commodities must be shipped in American bottoms.

That fact has literally frustrated the entire movement of surplus commodities. Recently, Denmark, where there is a real need for American feed grains, which we have in abundance, found itself in the same situation. Unless we open up the present agricultural legislation and adopt a remedial amendment to the act, we will find that our program of disposal and sale of surplus commodities will be for all practical purposes obviated and denied.

If our merchant marine needs help—and I believe it does—we should give it help directly, not tie down a worthy program with an unworkable provision.

I call the attention of the Senate to the fact that we are literally losing the world markets for agricultural commodities because of the restrictive provisions in the law which make it literally unworkable.

Some of us in the Senate have suggested that immediate action be taken to remove from the market the pressures of the so-called surpluses of food and fiber. These surpluses hang over the market like the sword of Damocles. It is ready to fall and strike at any moment and it causes the market to be in economic uncertainty and to have the jitters.

One effective procedure would be to take some of the wheat, for example, and to process it into feed. I am referring to the low-grade wheat. Feed from that source should be made available to the drought areas of the United States. That wheat could be processed into feed. I find that if approximately 3 million tons of wheat, which is a small amount for a great economy like ours, were so processed, we would literally remove the excess production from the American wheat market.

Furthermore, if we took a certain amount of the wheat and placed it in an international food arrangement, such as has been recommended by a number of Senators, we could stabilize the domestic market and add a degree of security and stability to the international market.

I have spoken on this subject today because for some reason or other there seems to be a note of silence on this crucial issue. I do not intend to stand idly by or to hush my tongue on a matter so important as this as long as there is human suffering in the world, about which we are not doing anything, so long as there are markets in the world into which we are not selling, and so long as there is a depressed economic market at home, about which we are doing little or nothing.

RELAXATION OF INTERNATIONAL TENSIONS

From all I can read and hear, we are going to enter into a period where there may be some relaxation of international tensions. We are looking forward to what we call the meeting of the Big Four, the heads of state of the United States of America, Great Britain, France, and the Soviet Union. The American people are hoping and praying that this meeting will result in some constructive act for peace and tranquility; at least, that it will bring about an easing of the international tension. I also am looking forward to such a result, and I have faith in those representing our country who are going to attend the meeting. I am not one who feels that the President of the United States, or whomever he may take with him, would knowingly, willingly, or in any other way do anything that would not protect the honor of the United States. I am happy that there are people in high places who are desirous of seeking peace on sensible terms.

But the truth is, Mr. President, that we have now entered upon a period in which the strategy of great powers is involved. I think we must be sure of several things. First of all, we must be sure that we are strong militarily, without talking about it and without brandishing a club, without frightening friend and foe alike. Let us be calm in our courage and in our strength. In so doing, I think we will present to the world a Nation that is fearless. I think we sometimes exhibit too much concern and too much fear of the Soviet Union.

Let us realize our own strength and realize it with calm assurance of the power of our great productive system and the world's finest political and economic system. When we realize these things we will not enter into any conference with a spirit of fear. Fear always has a way of destroying one's strength and of immobilizing one's effectiveness.

So I hope, Mr. President, that we shall enter upon every negotiation in a spirit of confidence supported by facts.

Furthermore, I am convinced that for a period of time we are going to be called upon to test our system, our heritage, and our principles. For the past 10 years we have had to build up our armed strength again. We have been confronted with threats of violence and open warfare. The United States of America is not a warrior at heart. We are essentially soldiers of peace. We are essentially citizens in the best sense of that term. I think we are now going to have an opportunity really to demonstrate what our way of life means, if we are willing to apply ourselves to it.

I have said a number of times that we may well be in for a period of free time, so to speak, or extra time, in which to reevaluate the world scene. But time is a meaningless word unless we use it. The real issue is: Who will use this time and for what purpose? If there should be a relaxation of world tensions, will world communism use the time to promote its diabolical system of conspiracy, or will we use the time more effectively to wage a successful political offensive, telling the true story of democratic life, and will we use the time to strengthen the areas of the world which are still struggling for their independence? Will we use the time for training students among the free nations of the world, and to promote world trade, and strengthen the basic foundation of commerce in the world? Will we use the time that may be available to us to set a new high moral standard in international politics around which men and women of good faith can rally? Will we use the time to strengthen the United Nations? Will we use the time to find new friends in the areas of Asia and Africa? That is the issue. What will we do with the time which may be made available, God's will permitting, if the conferences are successful?

Surely, Mr. President, the Soviet Union is much weaker than we are, if we truly appraise the facts. I think we have a tendency to overestimate her power. At least, we have had a tendency to overestimate the attractiveness of what she has to offer. I think the time is now at hand for a great political, economic, and psychological offensive on the part of the United States and our allies. Let us strengthen and firm up the great Nation that is ours. Let us be very, very careful that we do not in any way relinquish the principles in which we believe—self-determination, independence, freedom, and equality for peoples everywhere in the world where our programs and policies may be placed into effect.

Mr. President, I listened with keen attention to the report of the Secretary of State, presented on television and radio, following his visit to Paris and to Vienna. I commended the Secretary of State on that report, because I thought it was temperate; I thought it was moderate; and I am happy to state from my own observation that I think the Secretary was careful in his reference to hopes he had that might not be realized. In other words, he was a cautious diplomat, and he gave a cautious and prudent report.

If I have any observation to make—and I do not wish it to be critical, but

I make it merely as an observation—it is that for 5 months the American people have had their eyes focused upon the Far East, and now, literally, as if we turned off the lights in one room and turned them on in another room, our attention is focused entirely on Central and Western Europe. Strange as it may seem, the Soviet Union was able to divert our attention almost instantly from the Far East, from Formosa, Asia, the Bandung conference, to Vienna, Austria. The Soviet did seize the initiative, but we are delighted that there is a treaty of independence with Austria. The Senate will have an opportunity to examine it, and, I am convinced, will ratify it. From all I have heard, at least, the treaty is reasonable and fair to the Austrians and in no way violates the principles to which this country adheres.

But, Mr. President, I wish to warn my colleagues—and I say this from personal conviction and personal observation—that communism is a worldwide apparatus which works all dimensions, all areas, at the same time. We Americans are prone to look at one area at a time. We are prone to examine one room of the world, so to speak, at a time. I suggest that we must not have a parochial or provincial attitude. We must be willing to look at the total world scene at one time and be able to make value judgments as we go along.

Let us not have our attention entirely focused on the European area now as we had it entirely focused for a while on the Asian areas a few months ago. Let us keep an eye on both the east and the west. Let us keep our eye on Formosa, Indochina, Afghanistan, India, Vietnam, and remember that those areas are of crucial importance. It may very well be that the Communists are hoping that by political action, with no violence and no war, we will relax and lull ourselves into a false sense of security, and that those areas will fall into the Soviet sphere. Let us see to it that those areas of the world remain within the area of freedom.

Mr. President, as I conclude this message, may I sound this note of warning, that the crucial issue in Western Europe is still Germany. I have stated on this floor not once but a dozen times that we must never forget that what the Soviet Union has in its mind most of all is a neutral Germany which will not participate in the Western defense collective security system. We must have the courage to make certain that that does not happen. I am hopeful that the comment which was made by our Chief Executive in a recent press conference—I believe it was on yesterday—will not be interpreted to mean that the United States of America would settle for a kind of neutral Germany.

I recall that the President was asked about the so-called neutrality of Austria, and he remarked that Austria is not a neutral in the sense of having no armed strength; but that Austria is a neutral like Sweden and Switzerland; a neutral which has armament to protect itself, and a nation which will protect itself.

The Soviet Union was very careful to let that happen. The Soviet Union could have prevented it from happening. I say that if that is the principle which is to be applied to a unified Germany, it will mean that Germany will be in a central position to play off the East from the West.

Mr. President, we must make certain that Germany remains within the North Atlantic Treaty Organization. We must make certain that Germany's orientation is to the areas of freedom. We cannot run the risk of having a powerful Germany, in the role of a neutral, play off the East from the West.

I serve a solemn note of warning that in any negotiations which may occur in the months ahead, what happens in Germany will be of crucial importance to the American people. Therefore, let us strengthen in every way we can the ties of friendship between ourselves and the Federal Republic of West Germany. Let us make it crystal clear that we will not bargain away Western European collective security in the name of some kind of newfangled neutralism. This could be the issue which might well determine the developments of the future.

I rise to say this today because it is on my heart. I think we ought to speak aloud and use every opportunity to discuss these matters while there is still time for reasonable men to have honest discussion and even honest dissent.

REGULATION OF SUBSISTENCE EXPENSES AND MILEAGE ALLOWANCES

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 352, Senate bill 1580.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the bill by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 1580) to regulate subsistence expenses and mileage allowances of civilian officers and employees of the Federal Government.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request of the Senator from Texas?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I offer an amendment on line 7, to strike out "$13" and to insert in lieu thereof "$12."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment offered by the Senator from Texas.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 1, line 7, it is proposed to strike out "$13" and to insert in lieu thereof "$12."

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. In justification of the amendment, I may say that the military pay bill, which has been previously acted upon by Congress, provided a maximum of $12. It is the belief of the distinguished junior Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], who is chairman of the Committee on Armed Services, and of other members of the committee which handled the proposed legislation that there should be a uniform per diem allowance.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the report of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service printed at this point in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The report (No. 348) is as follows:

The Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, to whom was referred the bill (S. 1580) to regulate subsistence expenses and mileage allowances of civilian officers and employees of the Federal Government, having considered the same, report favorably thereon without amendment, and recommend that the bill do pass.

PURPOSE

S. 1580 would amend sections 3 and 4 of the Travel Expense Act of 1949 (5 U. S. C. 836–837) to raise the maximum allowable per diem rate for travel within the Continental United States from $9 to $13, and the maximum mileage rates, for the use of privately owned motorcycles and automobiles, from 4 and 7 cents to 6 and 10 cents, respectively.

JUSTIFICATION

The existing maximum per diem allowance for civilian employees while traveling within the limits of the United States is limited to $9 by the Travel Expense Act of 1949. The rate of $13 provided by this enactment is based on an allowance of $7.30 for hotel room, $4.50 for meals, and $1.20 for incidental expenses. These amounts are based upon the following:

Hotel costs: A large hotel accounting firm found, upon a study of room rates of 375 hotels used by businessmen in traveling, that the average room rate for a single room during 1954 was $7.30.

Cost of meals: The allowance of $4.50 is based upon a similar study and allocates $1 for breakfast, $1.25 for luncheon, and $2.25 for dinner. Two hotel accounting firms report that the price of hotel and restaurant meals has increased not less than 20 percent since 1949.

Incidental expenses: The $1.20 for incidentals is intended to cover such items of expense as tips and fees while traveling, hotel tips, tips to waiters, laundry, cleaning and pressing, telegrams for room reservations, etc.

COST

The Bureau of the Budget estimates the total additional cost of this bill will not exceed a maximum of $30 million a year and its actual cost may be several million dollars a year less.

AGENCY REPORTS

Following are agency reports on S. 1580 as introduced and reported:

EXECUTIVE OFICE OF THE PRESIDENT,
BUREAU OF THE BUDGET,
Washington, D. C., April 14, 1955.

Hon. OLIN D. JOHNSTON,
Chairman, Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: This will acknowledge your letter of April 1, 1955, inviting the Bureau of the Budget to comment on S. 1580, to regulate subsistence expenses and mileage allowances of civilian officers and employees of the Federal Government.

In his message to the Congress on Federal personnel management the President stated that a legislative proposal would be submitted for an appropriate increase in the per diem allowance for civilian employees who travel on official business. On March 8 the Bureau of the Budget transmitted to the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House a draft bill which would carry out the President's recommendation. Copies of this correspondence, which was referred to the Committee on Government Operations, are enclosed for your information.

Briefly, the Bureau's bill proposes that the maximum per diem travel allowance be increased from $9 to $13; that special provision be made for unusual types of travel where

the maximum rate would be much less than the necessary actual expenses incurred; that present mileage allowances remain unchanged; that the maximum per diem allowance for civilians performing work for the Government without compensation be increased from $10 to $15; and that the travel rates for civilian employees who travel as witnesses on behalf of the United States be governed by the Travel Expense Act of 1949, as amended, rather than by separate legislation.

These proposed amendments were developed after extensive study and consultation with the major agencies of the Government. It is suggested that if your committee plans to take up legislation amending the Travel Expense Act, consideration be given to the changes proposed by the Bureau's bill.

Sincerely yours,

PERCIVAL F. BRUNDAGE,
Acting Director.

UNITED STATES CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION,
Washington, D. C., May 10, 1955.

Hon. OLIN D. JOHNSTON,
Chairman, Committee on Post Office and Civil Service,
United States Senate.

DEAR SENATOR JOHNSTON: This is in further reply to your letter of April 1, 1955, requesting the views of the Civil Service Commission on S. 1580, a bill to regulate subsistence expenses and mileage allowances of civilian officers and employees of the Federal Government.

Section 2 of the bill would increase the maximum per diem allowance from $9 to $13 for Federal civilian employees who travel on official business within the limits of the continental United States. Section 3 would increase from 4 cents per mile to 6 cents per mile the allowance to employees for use of their privately owned motorcycles, and from 7 cents per mile to 10 cents per mile for use of their privately owned automobiles or airplanes, when traveling on official business.

On March 8, 1955, the Bureau of the Budget submitted to the Congress a legislative proposal which, among other things, would increase the maximum per diem allowance from $9 to $13 for civilian employees who travel on official business within the limits of the continental United States. A study by the Bureau of the Budget indicated such an increase was warranted on the basis of average hotel room rates, the increased price of hotel restaurant meals, and the increased cost of incidental expenses. The Commission endorses this provision of S. 1580.

The administration's legislative proposal recommends against any increase in mileage allowances to employees for use of privately owned vehicles while traveling on official business. No change in the present allowances was found to be justified on the basis of cost figures for the operation of automobiles, and the average mileage allowances most commonly used by private companies which compensate their employees on a flat mileage basis for use of personal cars on company business. The Commission does not favor section 3 of S. 1580.

The administration's legislative proposal also recommends three other changes in the present travel allowances. They are: (1) a special provision for unusual types of travel where the maximum rate would be much less than the necessary actual expenses incurred; (2) an increase from $10 to $15 in the maximum per diem allowance for employees serving without compensation; and (3) that travel rates for civilian employees who travel as witnesses on behalf of the United States be governed by the Travel Expense Act of 1949, as amended, rather than by separate legislation.

Because S. 1580 does not carry out all the recommendations contained in the administration's legislative proposal, we strongly recommend favorable action on the draft bill submitted to the Congress on March 8, 1955, instead of S. 1580.

We are advised that the Bureau of the Budget has no objection to the submission of this report.

By direction of the Commission:

Sincerely yours,

PHILIP YOUNG, *Chairman.*

COMPTROLLER GENERAL OF THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, April 19, 1955.

Hon. OLIN D. JOHNSTON,
Chairman, Committee on Post Office and Civil Service,
United States Senate.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Reference is made to your letter of April 1, 1955, acknowledged by telephone April 6, enclosing copies of S. 1580, 84th Congress, and requesting our report and comments thereon.

The bill would amend sections 3 and 4 of the Travel Expense Act of 1949 (63 Stat. 166). Specifically, the maximum allowable per diem rate for travel within the continental United States would be raised from $9 to $13, and the maximum mileage rates, for the use of privately owned motorcycles and automobiles, from 4 and 7 cents to 6 and 10 cents, respectively.

With respect to the maximum per diem rate contemplated by the bill, upon the basis of recent experiences by employees of our Office the existing maximum rate of $9 is inadequate. We have found generally that our employees are required to expend approximately $12 per day for suitable lodging, meals, and additional necessary subsistence expenses incident to official travel. We recognize, however, that governmentwide experience may reflect a need for a maximum per diem of $13. Accordingly, it is recommended that section 3 of the Travel Expense Act of 1949 be amended by eliminating the figure "$9" and substituting either "$12" or "$13" in lieu thereof, as the overall facts presented to your committee may warrant.

Concerning the proposed increased mileage rates for the use of privately owned motorcycles and automobiles, there is no information available here relative to the necessity therefor.

Sincerely yours,

JOSEPH CAMPBELL,
Comptroller General of the United States.

CHANGES IN EXISTING LAW

In compliance with subsection (4) of rule XXIX of the Standing Rules of the Senate, changes in existing law made by the bill, as reported, are shown as follows (existing law proposed to be omitted is enclosed in black brackets, new matter is printed in italics, existing law in which no change is proposed is shown in roman):

"SECTIONS 3 AND 4 OF THE TRAVEL EXPENSE ACT OF 1949

"SEC. 3. Civilian officers and employees of the departments and establishments (except justices and judges covered by section 456 of title 28 of the United States Code), while traveling on official business and away from their designated posts of duty, shall be allowed, in lieu of their actual expenses for subsistence and all fees or tips to porters and stewards, a per diem allowance to be prescribed by the department or establishment concerned, not to exceed the rate of [$9] *$13* within the limits of the continental United States and in case of travel beyond the limits of the continental United States not to exceed rates established by the Director of the Bureau of the Budget for the locality in which the travel is performed: *Provided,* That such civilian officers and employees who become incapacitated due to illness or injury, not due to their own misconduct, while traveling on official business and away from their designated posts of duty, shall be allowed such per diem allowances, and transportation expenses to their designated posts of duty, in accordance with regulations promulgated and approved under this act.

"SEC. 4. Civilian officers or employees of departments and establishments or others rendering service to the Government shall, under regulations prescribed by the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, and whenever such mode of transportation is authorized or approved as more advantageous to the Government (except that no determination of advantage is required where payment on a mileage basis is limited to the cost of travel by common carrier, including per diem), be paid in lieu of actual expenses of transportation not to exceed [4] *6* cents per mile for the use of privately owned motorcycles, or [7] *10* cents per mile for the use of privately owned automobiles or airplanes, when engaged on official business within or outside their designated posts of duty or places of service. In addition to the mileage allowances provided for in this section, there may be allowed reimbursement for the actual cost of ferry fares, and bridge, road, and tunnel tolls."

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, the bill was reported unanimously by the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. I understand why the reduction has been made from $13 to $12. So far as I am concerned, as chairman of the committee, and only as the chairman—I have not had time to discuss the matter with all the members of the committee—it is perfectly agreeable to reduce the amount, so as to make it uniform throughout the Government.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON].

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill (S. 1580) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That this act may be cited as the "Travel Expense Act of 1955."

SEC. 2. Section 3 of the act of June 9, 1949 [5 U. S. C. 836–837] is amended by striking the figure "$9" and inserting "$12" in lieu thereof.

SEC. 3. Section 4 of said act is amended by striking the figures "4 cents" and "7 cents" and inserting "6 cents" and "10 cents", respectively, in lieu thereof.

SEC. 4. This act shall take effect no later than 30 days following its enactment.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, in view of the action taken on Senate bill 1580, Calendar No. 352, I ask that Calendar No. 357, Senate bill 1795, which treats with the same subject, be indefinitely postponed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, Senate bill 1795 is indefinitely postponed.

FEDERAL-AID ROAD-CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1048) to amend and supplement the Federal-Aid Road Act approved July 11, 1911 (39 Stat. 355), as amended and supplemented, to authorize appropriations for continuing the construction of highways, and for other purposes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, do I understand correctly that Senate bill 1048, the Federal-aid road bill, is the unfinished business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Senate bill 1048 is the unfinished business; it was not displaced by the bill just passed.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRESS IN THE SENATE

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, fewer than 10 bills are on the Legislative Calendar. As a result of the cooperation of all Members of the Senate, it has been possible to pass promptly measures which have been thoroughly considered and recommended to the Senate by the committees.

If the chairmen of committees have any important or necessary measures ready for consideration and will report them to the Senate, the Senate will be in a position to consider them.

All the bills which are still on the calendar are there because certain Members did not care to have them acted on at this time.

I hope the committees will take notice of the status of the calendar and, when possible, will make prompt reports on items of proposed legislation.

ANNOUNCEMENT OF STATEMENTS BY GEN. GEORGE C. MARSHALL AND ROBERT SCHUMANN APPROVING THE PROPOSAL FOR A CONVENTION OF NATO NATIONS

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I listened with much interest to the excellent address delivered by the distinguished junior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY]. I agree with him fully on the two principal points he made, namely, that it is necessary for the United States to strengthen and firm up the great alliance which is ours, and also that all means, political and economic, which are feasible and proper for the purpose of keeping the Federal Republic of West Germany in the orbit of the West should be adopted by the United States Government. It is in connection with those general matters that I also wish to speak this afternoon.

I want to advise the Senate of statements made yesterday and today by two of the world's most honored men—men who during their lifetime have made monumental contributions to the Western alliance which seeks to preserve freedom and individual liberty.

I have here the statement of Gen. George C. Marshall, who led this Nation in war, and then, as Secretary of State, gave to the world the great and imaginative program known as the Marshall plan. I shall read General Marshall's words:

A few days before the death of Justice Owen J. Roberts, I accepted his invitation of May 5 to become a member of the Council of the Atlantic Union Committee which he has headed since its foundation in 1949. In accepting I wrote him May 12:

"I am honored to be counted among those who support the unity of free nations."

Justice Roberts' services to defense as well as to the judiciary were manifold, but perhaps the finest thing he did was the sacrifice he made in resigning from the Supreme Court to devote himself to the cause of Atlantic Union.

The subject today is vitally important and the period fateful. All probably agree to the importance of Atlantic unity but few act.

Recently a resolution calling for action was introduced in Congress by a distinguished bipartisan group from both Houses. It proposes that delegates from the United States and other NATO democracies meet in a convention "to explore and report to what extent their peoples might further unite within the framework of the United Nations, and agree to form, federally or otherwise, a defense, economic and political union." This prudent proposal, which commits us only to exploration, deserves support.

Thinking back on the development of our own Federal Union—on the doubts and difficulties which preceded the final union of the Colonies, on the remarkable advance in freedom, invention, production, and living standards which followed on the solution of the early difficulties, and on the high degree to which the States have continued to maintain their individual personality and institutions—Americans should have a sympathetic understanding of this effort to overcome the limitations of national barriers in the approach to a solution for common problems.

What I said when I addressed the Conference of Governors on July 14, 1947, I would repeat today: "There is no blinking the fact that this country now stands at a turning point in its relations to its traditional friends among the nations of the old world."

Either it must finish the task of assisting these countries to adjust themselves politically to the changed demands of a new age, or it must reconcile itself to seeing them move in directions which are consistent neither with their own traditions nor with those of this country. Whatever course is adopted will affect the lives and fortunes of people in every State of the Union.

I have just received the text of a statement made today by Robert Schumann, Minister of Justice in the present French Cabinet, who gave the world the Schumann plan for European Union. This is Mr. Schumann's statement in full:

The setting up of an exploratory committee (Comité d'Etude) regarding Atlantic union which is advocated at present in the United States Congress by so many distinguished Senators and Representatives, is of the highest importance to all nations belonging to NATO.

I have long been an ardent partisan of a European federation to be integrated itself in the Atlantic community. But certain European nations have hesitated to advance far in this direction so long as the United States, Canada, and Great Britain were not disposed to explore in common with them an eventual political, economic, and military union.

If the American Congress accepts the Atlantic proposal of Senator KEFAUVER, all the democratic European nations should be happy to accept the invitation to send delegates to such a study commission. Should there result from the work of this conference and from later proposals the outline of an acceptable plan of union, in which each of the member nations would be attributed an equitable voting right protecting it from any eventual domination by a single nation—which would be contrary to the democratic ideal of the union—we would then certainly have made a great step toward world peace and general prosperity.

In connection with these two statements by leaders on both sides of the Atlantic, I want to make it quite plain that they are entirely independent statements. Neither General Marshall nor Mr. Schumann knew of the other's action.

What we see here, Mr. President, at this great moment in world history, is a remarkable coincidence of events and views on both sides of of the Atlantic, as we have previously seen in history an awakening to great events which foreshadow a new progress in men's ability to live together in liberty and peace.

It seems to me that events are moving very rapidly in that direction today. On last February 9, along with 14 of my colleagues in the Senate, I submitted Senate Concurrent Resolution 12, the resolution which both General Marshall and Mr. Schumann discussed. That resolution requested the President to invite the other democracies which sponsored the North Atlantic Treaty to name delegates to an exploratory convention to explore and report "to what extent their peoples might further unite within the framework of the United Nations, and agree to form, federally or otherwise, a defense, economic, and political union."

Since I offered that resolution, we have seen Germany added to NATO. We have seen the Paris agreements ratified. We have seen an Austrian treaty move much closer to adoption. We have seen scheduled a four-power conference, and we have noted the exchanges of armament control plans.

While I know of no reason now for delaying action on this resolution, it does seem to me that there are several reasons why there should be hearings, followed by favorable action. And I would observe that the distinguished chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee [Mr. GEORGE] has informed me that he hopes the committee can give consideration to this resolution when the mutual-security program has been disposed of.

The Soviet treaty proposal to Austria is interpreted by many as a move toward neutralizing the Germans. To offset it, as the Senator from Minnesota has said, we need to make this move toward closer Atlantic unity, which will reassure both French and Germans that their future lies in the Atlantic community. The fact that the administration feared the earlier action on the Atlantic resolution would lead the French and Germans to defer ratification of the London-Paris accords, because they would much prefer an Atlantic union, speaks for itself as to the great hope that this resolution can rouse, and of the timely service it can perform in speeding German rearmament and binding all Western Europe firmly to us.

Furthermore, as a result of the Paris agreements, we are allowing the rearming of the Germans without taking the precaution of at least trying to unite the West into an economic and political community which would make remote the possibility of a rise of another Hitler. The Germans have made great progress in rebuilding their nation, and it is apparent that the hope of their distinguished leaders and of the people themselves is to become a contributing and permanent part of the West. They cannot take the position of which they are

capable, however, by a military alliance alone, just as none of the other nations can contribute fully by military alliances alone. There must be means of economic, political, and foreign policy consultations and unity. If we can make this possible, then we will have achieved the dreams of peace-loving men for centuries.

Moreover, I believe it will be agreed that the Kremlin's strategy in the Big Four talks will be to try to divide us from the British and French. It would seem wise to guard now against this by having the proposed nondiplomatic convention called to explore strong Atlantic unity. The United States hand at the Big Four meeting would be greatly strengthened by this display of unity and by the knowledge Moscow would have that its efforts at division were doomed to frustration.

Mr. President, conventions such as the one I have proposed, outside of diplomatic channels, have an impressive record of achievement. It is not unlike the procedure followed by our Government in 1947 in naming committees of distinguished citizens to advise us freely on the problems that we faced then—a procedure that resulted in the establishment of the Marshall plan. We should never be loath to encourage meeting of representative citizens.

There is nothing revolutionary about my proposal. It is simply in the best traditions of our Nation. I sincerely hope that with the support of such distinguished world leaders as General Marshall and Mr. Schumann, and with the support of thousands of our own fellow citizens, this resolution will receive the Senate's blessing, and the President will call the convention.

CROOKED RIVER PROJECT NEEDED BY CENTRAL OREGON

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, last week the Bureau of Reclamation proposed construction of a new irrigation project in the State of Oregon. The new unit—called the Crooked River project—calls for the use of power revenues from the Dalles Dam, an unrelated Federal project, to pay part of the construction costs.

I support the Bureau's plan for use of power revenues to help finance the Crooked River project, despite the opposition voiced recently by Gov. Paul Patterson, of Oregon.

Despite the objections of Oregon's Governor, I will make every effort to hasten legislative action on this proposal, which will create new farming opportunities in my home State and will improve the water supply of farmers now facing shortages.

Opposition by the Oregon Governor to using power revenues as an aid to irrigation reflects an extremely shortsighted viewpoint. Farmers cannot carry the full burden of repayment for the remaining undeveloped reclamation projects in Oregon. Only high-cost projects remain, and unless assistance is obtained from power revenues, agricultural expansion in Oregon has about reached the end of the line.

The Oregon Governor's opposition first became known to me at the hearings conducted by the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs in Portland, Oreg., last April 6. At that time, Governor Patterson said he was opposed to use of power revenues from dams to help pay for irrigation projects to which they are not physically related. I asked Governor Patterson specifically about power-revenue assistance for the Crooked River project, and he replied that he was opposed to such aid to irrigation.

I was amazed that the chief executive of my home State would take such a position. Adoption of the Oregon Governor's policy would end our hopes for more irrigation in eastern Oregon.

The timing of the Governor's statement was noteworthy because a concerted drive is now on to discredit full use of water resources for additional irrigation in the West. I believe that the enemies of irrigation are not taking sufficient note of our rising birth rate, and the problem it poses in relation to future food supplies. It appears likely that our population will reach 200 million by 1975. Today we farm about 365 million acres of land. This is about 40 million acres more than is needed to feed our Nation without exporting part of the farm output. The increased population by 1975 will require cultivation of a minimum additional eighty to one hundred million acres of new land to feed the hungry mouths of the expanded population.

I should like to point out that new irrigated land cannot be brought under cultivation overnight. The Crooked River project is not a project of vast proportions. It involves the investment of about $6 million of Federal funds, and will irrigate about 10,000 acres of new land and provide additional water for 10,220 acres now inadequately irrigated. But it will require nearly 5 years from start of construction until water is delivered to the land.

History of reclamation in the West shows that it has come about as a result of joint development of water for irrigation and for hydroelectric power. Use of power revenues to aid irrigation goes back to the earliest projects of the Federal reclamation program. A financing method similar to that proposed for the Crooked River project was approved at the last session of Congress in connection with the Foster Creek irrigation project in the State of Washington. The same principle is proposed in our Hells Canyon bill to provide financial support for the Mountain Home project, if authorized by Congress. It is my belief that Governor Patterson's opposition represents a complete reversal of the tried and tested formula for development of the arid West.

I was glad to join with Oregon reclamation advocates in urging the Interior Department to approve use of some power revenues from the Dalles Dam for helping to support the Crooked River development.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks portions of the report of Wilbur A. Dexheimer, Commissioner of Reclamation, on the Crooked River project, which was approved by Secretary of Interior Douglas McKay, and a resolution from the Crook County Farm Bureau, indicating the approval of members of that organization, many of whom own lands under the proposed project.

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

UNITED STATES,
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
BUREAU OF RECLAMATION,
Washington, D. C., March 11, 1955.

The SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR.

SIR: This is my proposed report on the potential Crooked River project, Oregan. It includes the accompanying February 12, 1953, report of the Regional Director, Boise, Idaho.

The physical plan presented in the regional director's report remains essentially unchanged. New information on costs, allocation of costs, and on repayment has been developed since completion of the regional director's report and is presented in an attachment to this letter.

The Crooked River project surrounds and is adjacent to the town of Pineville in Crook County of central Oregon. It would utilize the water resources of Ochoco Creek and the Crooked River, a tributary of the Deschutes River. A stable irrigation water supply would be provided for 9,990 acres of dry land and 10,220 acres of land now inadequately irrigated. These areas include 7,230 new acres and 7,660 presently inadequately irrigated acres within the Ochoco irrigation district and 5,320 acres of nondistrict land of which 2,760 would be classed as dry land and 2,560 as inadequately irrigated. In addition, 51,200 acre-feet of water annually would be available for future use on other acreage in the Deschutes River Basin. Flood control, drainage, recreation, and fish and wildlife benefits also would result from construction of the project works. Preservation and propagation of fish and wildlife are included among project purposes.

Normal annual precipitation for the project area is a little over 9 inches, about half of which falls from April through October. This semiarid condition restricts the agricultural use of land without irrigation. Since agriculture is one of the two main industries of the area it is most important that it be strengthened and expanded to assure an adequate economy especially if the other industry, lumbering, remains static or declines. Also, the project would afford a number of part-time farming opportunities for workers employed in local industries.

Frequently, as a result of rapid melting of snow, agricultural bottom lands and part of Prineville and its surrounding area are flooded and sometimes damaged seriously. The recently rehabilitated Ochoco Reservoir and the proposed Prineville Reservoir when operated in conjunction with each other would develop the available water resources for irrigation and would provide significant control of the floodwaters of Ochoco Creek and the Crooked River. Proposed drainage would greatly improve agricultural bottom lands.

The local people, recognizing these problems, have shown a great deal of interest in securing additional irrigation water and protection from spring floods, and are favorable to a Federal project. Construction of the project is economically justified in that the evaluated annual benefits exceed the estimated annual costs by the ratio of better than 2 to 1 based on a 50-year period of analysis. This benefit-cost ratio is based on the use of all water made available by the project. Considering direct benefits only, the ratio would be 1.25 to 1.

* * * * *

The estimated cost, based on October 1954 prices, of the new facilities that would

actually be constructed is $6,339,000. This amount includes $200,000 which represents costs of investigations up to the estimated date of initial construction and $570,000 for drainage costs which reflect an increase of $312,000 over the amount shown in the regional director's report. The new and additional annual operation, maintenance and replacement costs which would be necessary as a result of the new works are estimated at about $38,800.

* * * * *

Tentative allocations of the $6,598,000 based upon the separable costs—remaining benefits method, are as follows: reimbursable-irrigation $5,903,000; nonreimbursable-flood control $653,000. Specific costs, which would also be considered nonreimbursable, allocated to fish and wildlife and recreation are respectively $29,000 and $13,000. The latter amount is the cost of minimum recreation facilities at Prineville Reservoir which I recommend be constructed by the Federal Government on a nonreimbursable basis provided that a responsible State or local agency agrees to operate and maintain the completed facilities.

* * * * *

The annual amortization capacity of the Ochoco irrigation district lands is approximately $39,600. This is the net amount available for repayment purposes after deducting the annual operation, maintenance, and replacement costs of $45,600, which includes about $19,100 for existing works, from the annual payment capacity. In 50 years the water users could return $1,980,000. This would repay the cost of the bonds, cost of Ochoco Dam rehabilitation, and $1,363,000 toward the cost of new works and the Cove Powerplant installation. This would leave unpaid a balance of $2,171,000 of the costs allocated to the Ochoco irrigation district lands.

The annual repayment ability or amortization capacity of nondistrict lands is estimated to be about $15,500 which is more than adequate to repay the $515,000 allocated to these lands in 50 years.

Investigations to date indicate that the potential uses of water in the Deschutes River Basin far exceed available supply. The excess water of the Crooked River project could be used in several localities within the basin and full development of the Prineville Reservoir site is considered fully justified.

For purposes of demonstrating repayment it was assumed that the excess water would be utilized by lands of the north unit of the Deschutes project. A pumping plant at the point on the Crooked River where the north unit main canal crosses, via a flume, would be necessary to furnish Crooked River water to the canal for delivery to the north unit lands. Such pumping plant would not actually be constructed as part of the Crooked River project but its estimated cost of $777,000 is utilized in the studies to derive the total reimbursable cost that would be involved in applying the excess water to the north unit lands.

The total cost ($2,631,000) would be the sum of the project cost ($1,854,000) allocated to deferred acreage and the $777,000 for the flume crossing pumping plant. Water users on the north unit could repay $1,198,000 in 50 years in addition to meeting necessary additional annual O. M. & R. costs of $37,500 leaving an unpaid balance of $1,433,000. It is emphasized that the north unit lands are used for demonstrative purposes only and it is not intended to imply that the excess water would be committed to such lands.

The $2,171,000 balance for the Ochoco irrigation district lands and the $1,433,000 balance for the north unit lands, which are beyond the repayment ability of the respective water users, could be repaid by utilizing net surplus power revenues from one of the Federal dams on the Columbia River under provisions similar to those applicable to the Foster Creek division, Chief Joseph irrigation project, as authorized by act of July 27, 1954 (68 Stat. 568). It is estimated that it would take only about 123 days (74 days for the district lands and 49 days for the nonproject lands) for the net surplus power revenues of The Dalles project to repay these costs. With this aid all project costs allocated to the Ochoco irrigation district lands would be repaid within a 50-year period. Also, the costs allocated to lands to utilize the excess project water could be returned in 50 years after such water is put to beneficial use. I recommend, therefore, that the Crooked River project be authorized on the basis that net surplus power revenues from The Dalles project of the Corps of Engineers be utilized to return the reimbursable costs beyond the water users' ability to repay.

* * * * *

I recommend that you approve and adopt this report as your proposed report on the Crooked River project and that you authorize me, in your behalf, to transmit copies to the States of the Columbia River Basin and to the Secretary of the Army in accordance with requirements of the Flood Control Act of 1944 (58 Stat. 887), to the State of Oregon for the views and recommendations of the head of the agency exercising administration over the wildlife resources of the State in accordance with provisions of the act of August 14, 1946 (60 Stat. 1080), and to other interested Federal agencies for their comments.

Sincerely yours,

W. A. DEXHEIMER,
Commissioner.

CROOK COUNTY FARM BUREAU,
Prineville, Oreg., May 13, 1955.

Hon. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER,
United States Senate.

MY DEAR MR. NEUBERGER: The Crook County Farm Bureau requests that favorable legislative action be enacted to authorize the Crooked River project, providing the final Bureau of Reclamation Crooked River project report contains the approximate below outlined provisions. We submit our recently enacted resolutions as follows:

"Whereas the possibility for early authorization of the Crooked River project seems possible, it appears reasonable that we, who own lands under this proposed project should make known our attitude.

"We would favor a contract under the following approximate conditions:

"Proposed dam to furnish all the irrigation water necessary to adequately irrigate all the irrigable lands under the proposed dam.

"The original plans to provide adequate facilities for doing this.

"The Ochoco project: The Ochoco Irrigation District management to continue with board of directors and manager as is now operated.

"Annual yearly repayment, including operation and maintenance, not to exceed approximately $5.72 per acre per year.

"A sliding scale repayment contract, with less payment in poor income years. Farmers paying within their ability to pay, but not to exceed the approximate $5.72 per acre per year. Payments to be for a period of 50 years, after which revenues from the Dalles Dam be applied to pay the balance.

"Lands now receiving Crooked River water—

"To retain their project's identities, water rights, and present methods of distribution and operation if they so choose.

"To purchase Crooked River stored water on a sliding-scale contract at a cost not to exceed approximately $3.19 per acre per year.

"New lands not receiving either Ochoco or Crooked River water: To be included wherever economically feasible under a sliding scale repayment contract with the repayment period of 50 years, as shown above.

"Upstream rights and uses: The principles as outlined in the Bureau of Reclamation Crooked River report of February 1953, recognizing upstream water rights and potential requirements must be retained in line with the policy of looking toward ultimate basin development."

CROOK COUNTY FARM BUREAU,
By ELDRED BREESE, *Secretary.*

HELLS CANYON DAM ON OREGON-IDAHO BORDER NEEDED BY NORTHWEST

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, the recent ruling by the Federal Power Commissioner examiner to turn over a portion of the Hells Canyon stretch of the Snake River to Idaho Power Co. has alarmed one of America's leading newspapers, the St. Louis Post-Dispatch.

I ask unanimous consent that a very cogent editorial from the Post-Dispatch of May 9, 1955, be printed in the body of the RECORD for the information of the Senate and the general public.

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

HELLS CANYON'S NEW LOOK

The results of a year's hearings are in, and they give Secretary McKay ample cause for an agonizing reappraisal of his duty at Hells Canyon.

This waterpower site on the Snake River, a tributary of the Columbia, on the Idaho-Oregon border, is one of the richest remaining undeveloped in the Nation. It is situated in a region which has been held back by inadequate supplies of electric power, and which needs its waterpower potential developed to the maximum.

A high dam at Hells Canyon to achieve maximum development there was planned by the Reclamation Bureau of the Department of the Interior until Mr. McKay became Secretary. He then announced that he was relinquishing the site in favor of the Idaho Power Co. That private utility had applied to build two low dams, Brownlee and Hells Canyon, along the same stretch of river, with the possibility of building a third, Oxbow, at some later date.

It is this three-dam system whose merits a Federal Power Commission examiner has gone into, and compared with the originally proposed Bureau of Reclamation project, in hearings extending over a year.

Examiner William J. Costello now concludes in effect that the Federal project would be preferable if it were going to be built, but that it is not going to be built and therefore the Idaho power dam project is preferable.

On this line of reasoning, Henry Ford's plan for private exploitation of Muscle Shoals would have been preferable to TVA. But is it the FPC's job to estimate the political prospects of controversial projects? The real question for the FPC to decide is whether this finding follows the mandate laid by Congress upon the FPC to issue licenses only for projects best adapted to a comprehensive plan for improving or developing a waterway.

Of the three dams in the proposed Idaho Power System, the examiner recommends that the FPC license only Brownlee. FPC's legal staff had earlier recommended licensing of all three projects. Examiner Costello says the cost of producing power would be raised to more than 6 mills a kilowatt-hour if Ox-

bow and Hells Canyon were added to the Brownlee project. No market could reasonably be predicted for the power at so high a price, he says, and construction of the second and third dams is therefore "clearly not in the public interest." This despite the fact that "there is a crying need for firm-power additions in the Northwest."

Secretary McKay himself 2 years ago observed that the Northwest was "critically short of power." Arguing that the Idaho Power Co. project could begin overcoming that shortage sooner than the public project, he contended that the power generated at 3 low dams would be 87 percent of that generated at 1 high dam.

Now, however, Idaho Power's 3 low dams have shrunk to 1 low dam. And if only Brownlee Dam were built, in accordance with the examiner's recommendations, the amount of power realized from the Hells Canyon stretch of the Snake River would be only 40 percent of what 1 high-public dam would supply. If Brownlee were built, moreover, it would forever foreclose the high dam, by standing in the area which the latter's reservoir would have to occupy.

Is the Pacific Northwest—is the Nation—going to be content with less than halfway development of the rich and much-needed power potential at Hells Canyon?

Now that the allegations of fact on which Secretary McKay sought to justify his relinquishment of the site no longer apply, will the Secretary reinstate the Federal project, or will he insist on an extravagant waste of over half the usefulness of this great natural resource?

CONSIDERATION OF CONFERENCE REPORT ON THE TREASURY-POST OFFICE APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I should like to inform the Senate that the conferees on the Treasury-Post Office appropriation bill are meeting; and I understand that it is quite possible that the conference report will be ready for consideration by the Senate either on tomorrow, Friday, or Monday. A conference report of course is a highly privileged matter; and I wish to state for the RECORD that it will be my purpose to notify the minority leader whenever the conference report is ready; and if the report is a unanimous one, I am sure he will concur in having it brought promptly before the Senate.

So I should like to have the Members of the Senate on notice that the Senate will consider the conference report on either the first or the second calendar day the Senate is in session, following today.

Mr. President, if there is nothing further to come before the Senate at this time——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HUMPHREY in the chair). The present occupant of the chair knows of nothing.

RECESS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Then, Mr. President, in accordance with the order previously entered, I move that the Senate now stand in recess.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 17 minutes) the Senate took a recess, the recess being, under the order previously entered, until tomorrow, Friday, May 20, 1955, at 12 o'clock noon.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate May 19 (legislative day of May 2), 1955:

UNITED STATES ATTORNEY

William C. Farmer, of Kansas, to be United States attorney for the district of Kansas for the term of 4 years.

COAST AND GEODETIC SURVEY

Marvin B. Miller to be ensign in the Coast and Geodetic Survey, effective May 12, 1955, subject to qualifications provided by law.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, MAY 19, 1955

The House met at 10 o'clock a. m.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, unto whom we are daily compelled and constrained to bring our finite minds and fallible judgments, and our sinful hearts to be pardoned and purified, may we enter upon the tasks of the day with confidence and courage.

Grant that in this time of darkness and shadows, when we wish that we might be able to see more clearly the events impending, may we surrender ourselves solely and supremely to the leading of Thy Spirit.

Inspire us with new ventures of faith and larger vistas of outlook as we labor together to break down the barriers that divide mankind and seek to build not only a world that is safe for democracy but a democracy that is safe for the world.

Help us to believe in the coming of a new social order, made nobler by the suffering and sacrifice and wiser by its folly and stupidity.

Hear us in Christ's name. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. PATMAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 15 minutes today, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered.

ACTION OF STATE MEDICAL ASSOCIATION OF SOUTH DAKOTA ON POLIO VACCINE

Mr. BERRY. 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 South Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, the medical associations of the 47 other States would do well to follow the example of the State medical association of South Dakota, who have pledged to the people of South Dakota and to the Nation that no needy child in that State will go without polio vaccine, whether the Federal Government intervenes or not.

A telegram addressed to me under date of May 18, 1955, from Dr. A. W. Spiry, president, and John C. Foster, secretary of the SDMA, reads as follows:

No needy child in South Dakota will go without polio vaccine, whether Federal Government intervenes or not. Our doctors always have and will continue to care for all patients and needs. Polio hysteria is sometimes greater cause for alarm than polio itself. We urge careful consideration of procedure as to how Federal funds are allocated to needy.

Mr. Speaker, I submit to you and to the membership of this Congress that this is a challenge to the medical associations of the other States. I hope they will follow the leadership of South Dakota.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 66]

Albert	Dondero	Macdonald
Avery	Doyle	Miller, N. Y.
Ayres	Eberharter	Morgan
Barrett	Edmondson	Morrison
Boggs	Fjare	Moulder
Bolton,	Gamble	Mumma
Frances P.	Gathings	O'Konski
Bolton,	Gray	Pillion
Oliver P.	Gregory	Reed, N. Y.
Buckley	Hébert	Scherer
Burleson	Herlong	Short
Canfield	Heselton	Tollefson
Celler	Hillings	Walter
Christopher	Kearney	Williams, N. Y.
Colmer	Kearns	
Dingell	Lesinski	

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 391 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

NATIONAL RESERVE PLAN

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 5297) to provide for the strengthening of the Reserve forces, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 5297, with Mr. TRIMBLE in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. When the Committee rose on yesterday, section 3 of the bill had been read.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. VINSON: On page 3, line 4, after the period, strike out all

of the following language down to and including the word "years" in line 24, page 5, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"Persons having an obligated period of service under this act shall perform such duties as may be prescribed by the Secretary of the Army, the Secretary of the Navy, or the Secretary of the Air Force (or the Secretary of the Treasury with respect to the U. S. Coast Guard) for satisfactory performance of that service obligation. However, any person while subject to such reserve obligation who in good faith becomes a regular or duly ordained minister of religion or a student preparing therefor, as defined in sections 6 (g) and 16 (g) of this act, shall, at his request, not be required to serve on active training and service or active duty for training or inactive duty training while in such status. In addition to their obligation to perform the duties provided for in this act such persons shall be subject to such orders, directives, and regulations relating to their administration (including the rendering of prescribed reports on personal status) as may be prescribed by the Secretary of the Army, the Secretary of the Navy, or the Secretary of the Air Force (or the Secretary of the Treasury with respect to the U. S. Coast Guard). This subsection does not prevent any person, while in a reserve component of the Armed Forces, from being ordered or called to active duty in such armed force. The appropriate Secretary of a military department, with the approval of the Secretary of Defense (and the Secretary of the Treasury with respect to the Coast Guard when it is not operating as a service in the Navy) may provide, by regulations which shall be as uniform as practicable, for the release of any person from active training and service or active duty for training in the Armed Forces before serving the period of active training and service or active duty for training for which he was enlisted, appointed, or inducted. The amendment made by this amendatory act does not change or revoke any reserve obligation imposed on any person under this section before the enactment of this amendatory act.

"No person who, after the enactment of the National Reserve Plan is inducted into, or initially enlisted or appointed in, the Armed Forces, including reserve components thereof, shall at any time be assigned for duty at any installation located in a foreign country with which (at such time) the United States has in effect a treaty or international agreement containing provisions permitting such country to exercise in any way jurisdiction over American personnel stationed within its boundaries.

"(2) Section 6 (c) (2) (A) is amended to read as follows:

"'Until July 1, 1959, any person herein described may, within quotas fixed by the President with the advice of the Secretary of Defense and the Joint Chiefs of Staff, enlist in the Army National Guard of a State, Territory, or the District of Columbia, or the Air National Guard of a State, Territory, or the District of Columbia, or in the Reserve or in any unit of the Reserve of any armed force. Under such regulations as may be prescribed by the Secretary of the Army, Secretary of the Navy, or the Secretary of the Air Force (or the Secretary of the Treasury with respect to the U. S. Coast Guard), any person who has not been ordered to report for induction under this act may be enlisted to serve on active duty for training and service in the Armed Forces and in a reserve component for a total of 8 years; any person who is under the age of 19 years and who has not received notice to report for induction under this act may be enlisted to serve on active duty for training and in a reserve component for a total of 8 years'."

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of this amendment is to take out of the bill the two amendments that were agreed to yesterday, offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. POWELL].

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. First of all, is not this amendment designed to take out the language in the bill to which the gentleman from New York objected?

Mr. VINSON. I am going to call attention to that right now.

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. BARDEN. The gentleman says the primary purpose is to knock out an amendment that this House put in the bill yesterday?

Mr. VINSON. The purpose that will be accomplished by this amendment will be to eliminate two amendments offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. POWELL].

Mr. BARDEN. Maybe it would be in order, then, since we have a full Chamber of Members here, for us to reconsider my amendment, and we will chew on that a while.

Mr. VINSON. I thank the gentleman for that parliamentary inquiry, but I must proceed.

The amendment removes the two amendments proposed by the gentleman from New York [Mr. POWELL] and adopted yesterday. It is also an additional elimination of the authority of the Department of Defense to involuntarily assign a man to a National Guard unit from the Reserve. My amendment includes, however, the amendment proposed by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BOW].

Why do I do this? At the outset the gentleman from New York said:

I am loathe to introduce this amendment, but it so happens that, on page 3 of this bill, there has been written in some language, from line 4 through line 12, which compels me to do this.

He stated yesterday that if that language had not been in the bill he would not have offered his amendment. I am therefore offering to take that language out, so I think the gentleman has no grounds for complaint because the language which he criticizes will not be in there. I think, however, it is highly important that we all understand the legal effect of the amendment by the gentleman from New York. We all know that when amendments are offered we try to get as much information about the effect of the amendments as possible. A short time after this amendment was offered yesterday the Committee rose. We went into conference with the Department of Defense, its legal advisers, and the Assistant Secretary, to analyze exactly what these amendments did. They prepared and submitted to me this morning a brief analysis of exactly what would be accomplished by the Powell amendment.

Bear this in mind, you have two amendments offered by the gentleman from New York. One is on page 3 of the bill. That amendment would prevent the Department of Defense from transferring a reservist to a National Guard unit when a governor of a State had requested such transfer.

The second amendment offered by the gentleman from New York is on page 5. That amendment provided that any State, Territory, District National Guard, or National Guard or Reserve unit shall not exclude or segregate any person on the basis of race, creed, color, or national origin. There you have two amendments dealing with entirely different subject matters. Let us analyze them.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Georgia has expired.

(By unanimous consent Mr. VINSON was allowed to proceed for 5 additional minutes.)

Mr. VINSON. The first amendment prevents the transfer of any reservist having a Reserve obligation to the National Guard in any State in which the National Guard excludes or segregates any person on the basis of race, creed, color, or national origin. Therefore—now listen to this, because it applies to every State in the Union—therefore, even though a governor has failed to recruit enough men for his guard and requests the transfer of reservists to fill up his guard, this amendment would prevent the Department of Defense from transferring any reservists to the National Guard.

It is true that even though that State's National Guard already had integrated units to which a person could be transferred, transfers would be prohibited if there is still only one segregated unit remaining in the entire State. That is the accomplishment of the first limitation of the amendment. Let us see the second.

The second amendment relates to enlistments. It prevents enlistment of anyone in any National Guard units so long as any guard unit in the State remains segregated.

Bear in mind that throughout the Nation there are a great many integrated units in different States, and in those same States there are some segregated units. By this amendment no one could enlist in the National Guard in that State. All of us know that in certain States some integration has already taken place. This amendment would prevent all further input in the National Guard either by transfer or on a voluntary enlistment basis if there were 1 unit or indeed 1 person who was subjected to segregation in the unit in the State.

That is the effect of the gentleman's amendment, and that is the reason why we would accomplish what he sought to obtain when he offered his amendment to language which was objectionable to him. He said if it were not in the bill he would not offer his amendment. I think he can see the weaknesses of his second amendment.

I am asking the Committee to adopt this amendment which will have parliamentary effect of taking the objectionable language out of the bill and, having done so, deleting the Powell amendments.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, as you have already heard during the course of the debate, the great Committee on the Armed Services has spent weeks and weeks in the development of the pending legislation. It was reported by that committee by a vote of 31 to 5 with 1 voting present, which indicates a very high degree of unanimity of opinion.

We have carried along to this point in the consideration of the matter. Many of us are anxious that the legislation go on to passage. I know how the game is played around here. Sometimes if we are against a measure, anything that makes it more unpalatable is approved. I would want to exempt from any such category, certainly in this particular instance, the gentleman from New York [Mr. POWELL] who offered these amendments in the first place, because, in my experience with him here I have never seen him resort to any sort of trick maneuvers for the purpose of defeating legislation. It may well be that he is against this legislation, but I would not want to impute to him in any degree a desire to kill the legislation by offering something in which he did not wholeheartedly believe.

I have checked around enough to be completely convinced that if this solution of the difficulty as advocated by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON] is not adopted, and if these amendments should stay in the bill as they were tentatively adopted in the Committee of the Whole yesterday, it would mean the defeat of, or the recommittal of this legislation. So we are confronted with a very practical situation.

I would like to say, and I imagine he would permit me, as I have already said to the gentleman from New York, the adoption of the amendment presently before us represents for the gentleman from New York a victory in respect to his position.

The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON] referred to the opening paragraph of the statement of the gentleman from New York yesterday. There is a further paragraph which I would like to read because I think it shows his attitude:

> If this language stays in the bill—

That is the language which was quoted and which this amendment takes out—

> without my amendment, it will mean that the governors of States where there are now segregated National Guard units—and there are segregated National Guard units in 21 States—will be able to force into the National Guards of their States Jim Crow and segregated battalions, regiments, companies, or whatever the unit might be. There is no language in this bill that will prevent this from occurring.

In other words, again, and I think very properly, the gentleman from New York makes the point that by the language to which he objected on page 3 of the bill and which the pending amendment takes out, the Federal Government intervenes with compulsion to force men into the National Guard units upon certification by the governor or request by the governor or other State authority. Of course, that is a departure from our original concept of the National Guard. The National Guard has come down from the old military State militia. In many places they still refer to the guard as the State militia. But it has been on a voluntary basis. So I think the gentleman from New York was on very sound ground when he urged the necessity of his amendment, the first part of his amendment, insofar as it qualifies the language originally placed in the bill.

The second part of the amendment does not fall within that category because there it refers not only to the original situation but to the completely voluntary enlistments in the several States. As the gentleman from Georgia pointed out, probably it is so broad as to practically wreck the guard in many of the States where integration has progressed by great leaps and bounds but where there is yet some small bit of segregation left.

Now, as the gentleman from New York pointed out, tremendous strides have been made in our Government with respect to integration. Tremendous strides have been made in the National Guard units. I say that is all to the good. Our Army now, under Executive orders, is integrated.

The only reason I rise at this time is to try to point out that what is here sought to be done is fair. The gentleman from Georgia puts first among the objectives of his amendment the elimination of the two Powell amendments. But, I think the first objective of his pending amendment is to take out the language to which objection was originally raised—and I think very properly—and then, of course, that language, being the basis for the offering of the amendments in the first place, the necessity for the amendments is no longer with us, because the objectionable language will be removed by this pending amendment.

As the gentleman from Georgia pointed out, the so-called Bow amendment is retained in the bill. Now, I did not vote for the Bow amendment. I know there are many ideas about it, but in any event this legislation will go to the other body if it is adopted here. Of course, if it is not, that is the end of it, but certainly any adjustments that would need to be made could there be considered.

Mr. Chairman, the thing that I do not want to happen is that this bill be recommitted or rejected so that this whole program that has been so carefully worked out by the committee, so carefully gone over by the Members of the Committee of the Whole, and, I think, a clear majority believing in the program, wanting to have it adopted—I just do not want the legislation to fail at this point, and that is the reason I have risen in support of this amendment. I sincerely hope that this amendment which is now pending will be adopted and that we can go on with the passage of the legislation.

Mr. FORRESTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALLECK. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. FORRESTER. I think it is fine that we do have a gentleman who says he understands his way around. It so happens that I do not. Maybe I am slowly learning. But, regardless of that, I have a vote that will be riding upon one question which I want to ask the gentleman to answer for me, and that question is: If the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON] is adopted, will States' rights be protected and the governors of all of our 48 States have control over their militia and their National Guard as provided by the Constitution and the laws of this country; is that correct? I do not intend to surrender a single State's rights.

Mr. HALLECK. Well, if the Vinson amendment is approved, the guard will continue to be on a voluntary basis and will be operated as the people in the State determine, subject only, of course, to other considerations that are involved.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, I will answer the gentleman's question. The answer to the question asked by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. FORRESTER] is in the affirmative. If this amendment is agreed to, then the National Guard enlistment control remains just like it is under the law today. It covers it all. There is no doubt about it.

Mr. WINSTEAD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word and ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. WINSTEAD. Mr. Chairman, it appears to me from the debate on this subject yesterday, the various amendments that were offered, the strong support that many of them received though not accepted, that the membership of this House must be thinking along the lines of a bill that I offered in the early stages of the subcommittee hearings which, in my opinion, is by far the best suggestion to provide a real Reserve program in view of present problems.

May I say to you that I attended every session of the subcommittee. I almost became obnoxious, I am sure, to the military leaders and to certain members of our subcommittee who disagreed with my opinion. The simplest way, in my opinion, to eliminate this confusion about yesterday's amendments would be to adopt H. R. 4848 as a substitute for this bill, and then we will have no controversy about it. There are, at the desk, copies of H. R. 4848 over on my right and also over on my left.

H. R. 4848 would reduce the present 8 obligation to 6 years. Those enlisting in the active forces for 3 or more years would completely fulfill their obligation at the end of their active service. There is no requirement that prior-service personnel shall participate in an active Reserve program, although it is provided that those who do so can materially shorten their remaining military obligation. I am hopeful that the military departments would institute other inducements to persuade prior-service personnel to participate in Reserve programs.

Other than prior-service personnel who volunteered to serve in active units

of the Reserve, the Reserves would be composed of young men who voluntarily enlisted therein with the agreement that they would be ordered to active duty for basic training for a period not less than 4 months. I used 4 months in my bill rather than 6 months, since the normal recruit-training period of all services is from 11 to 13 weeks, that more persons could be trained in the same period, and that this period would better fit into educational programs. If the military services believe this period should be longer, I would have no objection. At the end of 5 years' satisfactory service in the Reserves an individual would have fulfilled his military obligation. Young men would be authorized to enter the Reserves in this manner up until they received an order to report for induction, and the only limitations on the numbers would be up to the limit of the appropriations provided.

The remainder of the bill generally follows the bill under consideration.

It seems to me that the advantages of my bill are these:

First. The military obligation provided better fits present manpower and draft conditions.

Second. It adheres to our traditional volunteer system.

Third. Young men can fulfill their military obligation in shorter periods of time.

Fourth. More persons will be trained than under H. R. 5297.

As I stated earlier, I have no pride of authorship in my bill, and would be willing to make such revisions as deemed advisable.

I have enough faith in the young men of the Nation to believe that with the right inducements, they will volunteer to perform their fair share of the military obligation. If after a trial this system does not produce sufficient members for our Reserves, I would be willing to support legislation which would provide for the induction into the Reserves. It seems to me that there is more equity in inducting a person with no previous military experience into a Reserve force than there is in requiring prior service personnel to participate in Reserve training.

H. R. 4848 would eliminate the compulsion of 45 days against a prior service man.

Let me tell you about the subcommittee action to show you that we were not unanimous on all of these provisions in the Committee bill.

Even though I did not fully agree with all the provisions, I voted for the Committee bill in both the subcommittee and in the full committee. The full committee did adopt an amendment to the subcommittee bill that permitted the President of the United States to call, without congressional approval, 1 million reservists. My bill does not provide that.

My bill will largely take care of the objective of the amendment offered by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BARDEN]. The amendment offered by Mr. ROOSEVELT of California, called for 4 years, but that could impair the regular enlistment of the Navy and Air Force in their regular establishments and in their Reserve program. But H. R. 4848 requires 5 years instead of 8, and there is no compulsion.

I have heard a lot of talk about the Committee on Armed Services. I never fought harder in my life for 8 weeks, trying to eliminate what I considered undesirable features of the original bill, as submitted by the Pentagon; which I am sure the membership of this House would not approve. Universal Military Training under proper provisions, could be much better than compulsion in the original bill, which would compel probably 60 to 75 percent of the youth to serve 8 or 10 years while the remainder go free with no service whatsoever.

I submit to you that the way to eliminate and correct the amendments that were adopted yesterday and to meet the objectives of many who supported other amendments, would be to adopt H. R. 4848, my bill, as a substitute for the pending measure, send it to the Senate, for the further consideration of that body. I believe they will agree. If they do this Congress will pass a sound bill which will provide a real Reserve program, which is so greatly needed at this time.

I want to tell you about the differences of opinion on our subcommittee. I admire the chairman and those who shared his views. But I was equally strong in my views. I wanted no compulsion in this bill. I believe there was probably only one vote against that general objective. But when the second bill was written, compulsion on the trainee for 6 months was left out, but the 45-day compulsion on prior servicemen, irrespective of our agreement, was written into the bill. The motion of the chairman of the subcommittee to provide compulsion on the 6 months' trainee lost by a tie vote of 6 to 6. On our motion to take from the bill the 45-day compulsion, we lost that 6 to 6. But if that had been eliminated in the second draft, as previously agreed, the motion to reinstate it would have also lost by the same vote.

May I say that General Walsh of the National Guard Bureau stated that the National Guard not only agrees with the principles of H. R. 4848, but they believe it to be in the interests of the Nation.

Under our cross-examination, it was admitted before our committee by Regular Army and Regular Air Force officials that the strongest arm of our Reserve program for the Army and Air Force is the National Guard and the Air National Guard.

If you start weakening, or interfering with the National Guard of this country you will wreck the strongest Reserve we have at the present time for the Army and the Air Force. No legislation passed can replace the strength of our National Guard. Not only that but Reserves and Reserve programs are dependent upon public support. You cannot have public support on any measure which weakens the National Guard.

I submit to you that somebody will argue that my proposition will provide too many young men. I leave it in the hands of the military itself to set the ceiling. According to General Hershey's testimony before our committee, we have approximately 1,500,000 young men in this country subject to I–A classification today. We will have approximately 1 million each year for the next 4 years. We have sufficient manpower.

Let us make this Reserve program attractive. Give the boys 4 months' training, and I say to you many of them will go from that to the Regular Establishment, just as they go from the National Guard today to the Regular Establishment. Approximately 30,000 men a year go from the National Guard after they receive that training into the Regular Military Establishment.

H. R. 4848, irrespective of what or anyone says will, in my opinion, furnish the necessary number of reservists, encourage young men with special abilities to go into the Regular Military Forces and reduce the number of draftees needed.

Mr. WILSON of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WINSTEAD. I yield.

Mr. WILSON of California. The gentleman said this bill would wreck the National Guard?

Mr. WINSTEAD. I do not say the pending bill will wreck the National Guard, but the gentleman knows and I know there has been a move on foot from the Pentagon and high places for many years to federalize the National Guard. If you can come in here and start fooling with an established concern that has been in the hands of the States for all these years, and you saw the vote yesterday, you can talk all you want to but you will find there is not a governor in the United States of America who would not oppose the Federal Government's interference with the National Guard.

Mr. WILSON of California. Does the gentleman think the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia wrecks or in any way interferes with the National Guard?

Mr. WINSTEAD. No; but the amendments adopted yesterday do.

Mr. VINSON. My amendment eliminates the language to which the gentleman from New York offered an amendment. If the language is eliminated, then there is no need nor necessity for the amendment. My amendment preserves the National Guard just as they are under the law today, does it not?

Mr. WINSTEAD. I take the gentleman's word for it. I will vote for his amendment. My substitute I know will do it and improve the bill considerably in many other respects.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

Mr. WINSTEAD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. I object, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I should like to see if we can reach some agreement as to the time for debate on this amendment. We all understand the amendment. I desire to have the gen-

tleman from Louisiana the chairman of the subcommittee [Mr. BROOKS] speak on the amendment, and, of course, we want the gentleman from New York [Mr. POWELL] to speak on it. I want the gentleman from New York to have at least 10 minutes.

Mr. DIES. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Chairman, may I ask the gentleman if he will explain the necessity for the original language, and what happens to the bill by its elimination?

Mr. VINSON. That will all be explained. That is what I am trying to do. I explained the whole thing. If the Committee will bear with me, let us get a little agreement on the time.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment close in 40 minutes.

Mr. SAYLOR. I object, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 1 hour.

Mr. REECE of Tennessee. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Chairman, did I correctly understand the gentleman from Georgia to state that the gentleman from New York was to have 10 minutes?

Mr. VINSON. I hope he will have at least 10 minutes.

Mr. REECE of Tennessee. That should be understood.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that in that hour the gentleman from New York [Mr. POWELL] may have 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Georgia asks unanimous consent that all debate on the Vinson amendment and all amendments thereto be limited to 1 hour, and that the gentleman from New York [Mr. POWELL] be allowed 10 minutes of that time. Is there objection?

Mr. THOMSON of Wyoming. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, for some time I have had on the desk an amendment to the bill which affects the last language of this amendment. If I understand correctly, unless my amendment is acted on before the Vinson amendment is acted on, and should the Vinson amendment carry, I would be precluded from offering it. Is that correct?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I do not think even the members of the committee understand this amendment. I would like to know how much time each man would have under the proposed request.

The CHAIRMAN. At the moment the Chair cannot say.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I ask for the regular order, to see if there is objection to the request.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on the so-called Vinson amendment and all amendments thereto be limited to 1 hour, and that the gentleman from New York [Mr. POWELL] shall have 10 minutes of that hour.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. I believe a matter of that kind can be handled only by unanimous consent.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. VINSON. I withdraw that part.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Georgia moves that all debate on the Vinson amendment and all amendments thereto be limited to 1 hour.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MARTIN. The gentleman from New York [Mr. POWELL] already has 5 minutes in his own right, as I understand.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is correct.

The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Georgia.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Will the committee have the right to close the debate?

The CHAIRMAN. The committee has the right to close the debate, especially under the rule.

The gentleman from New York is recognized for 5 minutes in his own right.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Chairman, I want to tell the stark, cold, naked truth, about the issue before us. The effort of the distinguished chairman, my friend from Georgia [Mr. VINSON], to get support for his amendment has but one objective, to destroy the action the Committee took yesterday; that is all, nothing else. And the reason why, as I was told all yesterday evening, last night, and this morning is because if the action of this House yesterday stands, then UMT or the reservist bill will not be passed.

Why? I ask. I am told by my friends on both sides of the aisle, by my friends in the White House, that if this action which the Committee took yesterday stands there will be a large group of men and women of this body who would vote for this bill but who will not, men and women who believe their sectional point of view is more important than the national loyalty.

Then I was asked, and it was mentioned on the floor by my distinguished friend from Indiana, Mr. HALLECK, that I have been opposed to UMT through the years and that probably this is a gimmick of mine to destroy the bill. Probably he did not say exactly that, but I mention it because it has been said to me off the floor.

I want to say, Mr. Chairman, to the membership that if the amendment they adopted yesterday stands I will vote for the reservist bill. I will vote for the UMT bill even though it is against my conscience and against my spiritual belief, so that no one can say that I used the amendment of yesterday as a gimmick to destroy this bill. I am putting my patriotism up against your patriotism. My patriotism is influenced by my spiritual belief. That is why I have been against the reservist program all along, with my colleague from Missouri [Mr. SHORT]. Are you willing to put your patriotism upon the same high level that I put mine?

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POWELL. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. I am sure the gentleman, as he said, listened to me when I said very clearly that he was not using this as a gimmick, that he was not doing it as a gimmick. I believe that. I did not say that to gain any advantage. I actually, and sincerely believe that.

Mr. POWELL. I agree with the gentleman. We both came to the same conclusion based upon the same statement, that is correct, but there are others here that might think I have introduced this amendment in order to destroy the bill. At great expense to my conscience, I will vote for the reservist bill if the amendments stand.

Now, my esteemed friend from Georgia [Mr. VINSON] has brought forward this new amendment and he states that it is to eliminate my amendments. That is what it is for, to eliminate the language that my amendments applied to. He said that I said I would not have introduced the amendment if the language was not in the bill. That is not true. I have introduced amendments of this nature for 12 years, and all during this century other Members have introduced amendments of this nature. I will continue to do so to the best of my ability when I think it is correct.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to say also that the statement the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON] read to you analyzing my amendment was a statement prepared by the Department of Defense. The Department of Defense is going to prepare a statement one way—their way. You cannot blame them, but nevertheless that is true. Now, my amendment does not say that if a State segregates in one unit and integrates in others that they are a State operating on a segregated pattern. My amendment does not say that.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

(By unanimous consent, the time allotted Messrs. BROWNSON, SAYLOR, and DAWSON of Illinois was yielded to Mr. POWELL.)

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Chairman, my amendment of yesterday provides that any State, Territorial, or District National Guard or Air National Guard that excludes or segregates any person on the basis of race, creed, color, or national origin shall not have the power to go into the Reserve and take men out of the Reserve and put them in the National Guard. That is the amendment.

Under the language here the National Guard has the power to go into the Reserve and put men in their National Guard, whether it is segregated or integrated. I say by my amendment they cannot do it as long as they are segregated, and that is all.

Mr. Chairman, that is not only my position; that is the position that 126 Members of this House took yesterday voting on the basis of their conscience.

The issue of patriotism was raised yesterday, and that is the issue we raise again today. The question I asked yesterday afternoon was: Is sectionalism more important than national loyalty?

You know, all the years that Negro men marched in Jim Crow regiments, and sailed in Jim Crow ships, and fought in Jim Crow branches of our Armed Forces, the question of patriotism was never questioned. When George Washington's ragged troops of the Continental Army marched across the snows of Valley Forge you will find the bleeding footprints of Negro men who marched with them in that Army. They were segregated, but their patriotism was not in doubt. And later when Black Jack Pershing went after Pancho Villa in Mexico, Negroes rode in segregated artillery units by his side. Their patriotism was not questioned even though they were Jim Crowed. When Teddy Roosevelt went up San Juan Hill, Negroes were by his side fighting and dying in the Spanish-American War. Call the roll of World War I and World War II. They were there. Second-class citizens, but dying the same as anyone else. They never questioned their loyalty. In all the years since Benedict Arnold until recent days, not a Negro has ever been convicted of being a fifth columnist, a subversive, or agent against our Government. Our patriotism is up here, clear, untarnished, for anyone to see. Now that the world is changing, now that the world is in ferment, now that the idea of democracy must stand up against a sea of communism or we all go down, they come now and raise the queston of patriotism. I say that the only patriotism is the patriotism of loyalty to the Stars and Stripes, regardless of whether you come from Mississippi or Maine, regardless of what color your skin is or what God you believe in or do not believe in; one loyalty, one Nation, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all. That is the United States of America.

So, my friends, I ask you to support what you did yesterday, to continue giving witness as men and women, not as puppets, but as individual men and women, giving bold witness in this hour when the acids of criticism by our friends and our enemies are being poured on the United States, realizing that only an America of pure, unalloyed metal will be able to stand up against these acids and that no test of metals of discrimination or segregation will stand up in this testing time. This is the moment of truth toward which we have been marching since the days of our forefathers who fought at the bridge at Lexington and Concord. The hour of decision has come. It is here now. The days that you can waste are gone. Blows must be struck now, and when a blow is struck for freedom, there courses through the chests and hearts a joy prophetic from East to West, and slaves wherever they cower feel the souls within them climb.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the time allotted me be yielded to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BROOKS].

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. THOMSON].

Mr. THOMSON of Wyoming. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. THOMSON of Wyoming as an amendment to the amendment offered by Mr. VINSON: In the last clause of the amendment after "any person who" strike out "is under the age of 19" and insert in lieu thereof "has satisfactorily completed high school or has reached the age of 19 years and is under the age of 20."

Mr. THOMSON of Wyoming. Mr. Chairman, I do not intend to review the why or wherefore but I well appreciate the advisability and desirability of an adequate and well-trained Reserve force.

With five Thompsons in the House, I knew that eventually there would be confusion. Since the speech of the gentleman from New Jersey, I have had some telegrams congratulating me on my opposition to the bill. I think I should set the record straight.

I intend to support the bill. I have doubts as to several features of the bill. I am willing to accept these features on faith. This amendment is, however, as I believe, required to put the bill in acceptable form.

The bill without the amendment provides:

Any person who is under the age of 19 years and who has not received notice to report for induction under this act may be enlisted to serve on active duty for training and in a Reserve component for a total of 8 years.

The theory of this 6-month training program as I have heard it explained is to provide for a voluntary Reserve program. The 6-month program is therefore made so attractive as to encourage individuals to volunteer. We also limit the number who can be accepted. I am advised that selection will most probably be on a basis of first come, first served.

If the clause just read is retained in the bill in that form, the Members of the House are placing themselves on record as encouraging our young men to quit high school to enter the program. I do not believe this to be the position of a majority of the House and have therefore submitted the amendment.

The tendency in our States is to require a child to be 6 years of age before he can enter the first grade. Such a child cannot possibly finish high school until he is 17¾ years of age. Most will be over 18. Statistics bear this out. The vast majority are over 18 before graduation, and a substantial portion are over 19. By providing that a person must be under 19 to enlist in this program, we are saying to the large segment who do not finish high school until after they are past the age of 19, "You must quit high school if you wish to participate in this attractive program." By limiting the number who can enter the program, we are encouraging the vast majority who are over 18 before they graduate from high school to interrupt their education.

This would produce a very bad result. Experience proves the vast majority who quit high school to enter the service do not go back to school. If they did go back I believe difficult problems would develop. By the time these young men return to school at the beginning of the next school year, they would be a year older. They would have been absent in the Army, and to a large extent on their own. They would enter school with young people approximately 14 years of age who are just beginning high school. This, we all realize, would not be a desirable situation.

This amendment, if adopted, would cause the section to read:

Any person who has satisfactorily completed high school or has reached the age of 19 years and who is under the age of 20 years and who has not received notice to report for induction under this act may be enlisted to serve on active duty for training and in a reserve component for a total of 8 years.

This would mean that any boy could enter the program after his graduation from high school. If he quit high school for other reasons, he could enlist at 19. The program would remain open to him until he reached 20 years, thus preventing the person who does not graduate until 19 from being precluded without interrupting his high-school education.

The only arguments I have heard against my proposed amendment are two. The first is that the boy must have his parents consent if he enters the program before reaching the age of 18 years. The fact is that unless this amendment is adopted, this House will still be in the position of encouraging the boy to seek his parents consent, and furthermore, of encouraging the parents to give their consent.

The second argument is that the services will discourage boys from enlisting before they have finished high school. I have never been one to believe that any legislative body can justify poor legislation on the hope that it will be administered so as to prevent undesirable results. By adopting this amendment, this House will make sure that our youth are encouraged to finish high school.

From my experience in the Army and in the Reserve program, I believe that this amendment is in the best interests of the service and the Reserve program. By the 6-month program provided in this act we expect a man to qualify himself as a well-trained reservist with only 6 months' active duty, followed by a 2-hour drill period once a week. Certainly, if we encourage men to complete high school before they enter this program, they will be better qualified to assimilate the material and we will have better Reserve units. I urge the adoption of this amendment.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMSON of Wyoming. I yield.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I have consulted with the chairman of the subcommittee and consulted with the staff. I do not see much harm in this amendment, and so far as I am concerned per-

sonally, we are willing to accept the gentleman's amendment.

Mr. THOMSON of Wyoming. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Chairman, I express my appreciation to the gentleman from Georgia and the members of the committee for their acceptance of this amendment.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. MADDEN yielded the time allotted to him to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DAWSON].)

(By unanimous consent, Mr. O'HARA of Illinois yielded the time allotted to him to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DAWSON].)

Mr. FORRESTER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. FORRESTER. Mr. Chairman, early yesterday afternoon I stood on the floor of this House and said that I had decided to support this pending bill, as brought out by the committee. I made that statement, believing that this bill would bolster our Reserve forces and our defense, and that, although there were things in the bill that I did not like, I was of the opinion that the good outweighed the bad. I was convinced that no politics was in the bill, and that the committee bill reflected the committee's desire to do the best job it could under the circumstances and was working for America.

Late yesterday afternoon I was surprised and shocked over an amendment that this House accepted. That amendment cut the heart out of the defense idea and theory of States rights. The thought had never occurred to me that this House would consent, or think of consenting, to the depriving of the governors' powers in their respective States to control the State militia or National Guard, but the House did that very thing.

My State will never agree to surrender the right of our governor to control the militia and National Guard willingly. I doubt that the people of the other 47 States will willingly agree to any such movement. Anyway, it is my duty and privilege, as one of my State's servants, to retain that right, if possible. Freedom can, and has been, lost through legislation and by centralization more often than on the battlefield.

If that amendment remains in the bill, then the bill becomes one that I have not endorsed and will not endorse, and I will vote in favor of recommittal, and if the bill is not recommitted I will vote against the bill.

I assure you, however, that when the exigencies are such that this House wants a Reserve bill without surrender of States rights, I can be counted on to support that kind of legislation.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BRAY].

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Chairman, we are confronted with the proposition of legislating from the floor and in a technical bill such as this, this procedure is very impractical. This matter was studied by the committee for 7 long weeks, practically every day and often 2 sessions a day. I only missed 1 of these many sessions. I want a good bill. This bill is already defective, but this amendment will make it worse.

Everyone recognizes that the National Guard is the really strong operating Reserve that we have today. It is not perfect, but it is good and getting better.

This bill provided two methods whereby a person could become a member of the guard, either he could take the 6 months' training before becoming a member, or if a veteran, he could volunteer or by compulsion become a member. There is great doubt that many will be willing to take the 6-month method. This amendment before us prevents the assignment of veterans by the Army into the National Guard. Today a man can enlist in the guard. If this bill is passed he must take 6 months' training before becoming a member of the guard. So this amendment will further cut the strength of the National Guard.

I raised the question of this bill depleting the guard time after time, and the head of the National Guard Association met with us for many hours in regard to that very question. In order to take care of this situation the proponents of this bill promised that the Army would give the guard sufficient men to keep the units up to strength.

Two days ago in debate on this bill, while I was speaking, I stated that I had serious doubts that the National Guard could get sufficient enlistments if the enlistees were forced to take this 6 months' training; the gentleman from Louisiana, the chairman of the subcommittee, stated that the Army would transfer the veterans to the guard to keep up their strength. This amendment before us would prevent such transfers.

The pending amendment takes away that opportunity. I am against this amendment because it will certainly take away any opportunity the guard has to get men by that method.

Before this matter is voted on, before the committee adopts this amendment the Armed Services Committee should go into consultation with officials of the National Guard and the National Guard Association. We met many hours on this very question. Yet today here, in a moment, we are changing the whole plan.

I believe I understand this bill as well as anyone on the floor of this House. I do not know how this is going to affect the guard, but I know it will affect them adversely.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Indiana has expired.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the time allotted to me be yielded to Mr. BRAY.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. GROSS. If the gentleman will yield, the gentleman has made a very important statement. I obtained 2½ minutes of this time in order to address a question to the chairman of the House Committee on Armed Services, to ascertain if it was not true that the amendment he has just offered here would seriously and adversely affect the National Guard by virtue of the fact that it would eliminate assignments into the National Guard, which would then have to compete for men that it could not possibly get under the 6-month-enlistment provision in the bil' he wants to put over. It is my opinion that the gentleman from Georgia would now settle for the enacting clause in this bill in order to get something over to the Senate.

Mr. BRAY. I do not want to comment on that because I have the highest respect and regard for the gentleman from Georgia, but I will say that if this bill does not already ruin the guard this clause certainly will give it the final blow.

Mr. GROSS. This clause certainly will do the job.

Mr. BRAY. This matter could be recommitted to the Armed Services Committee, and if certain people outside of the Congress would stop interfering we could work out a good Reserve bill that would give us a good Reserve. That is something I have been interested in personally and directly since I was 18 years old.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BRAY. I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. RIVERS. Does the gentleman make the statement that the Vinson amendment ruins the National Guard?

Mr. BRAY. I certainly do, and for this reason: First, we have taken away the ordinary method of enlistment in the guard. It has been a job to keep the guard up to enlisted strength. We have been able to do it because young men were willing to enlist in the National Guard. However, this bill adds 6 months' training before a youth can be a member of the National Guard. The proponents of the bill said we could take care of that by the Army's assigning members to the guard. How can they make this assignment if this amendment is passed? I believe it needs close study, and it can only be studied in committee, not on the floor.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BRAY. I yield to my distinguished chairman, the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. VINSON. Does not the gentleman know that the only thing with reference to the National Guard my amendment does is to prohibit involuntary assignment? Does he not also know it preserves the National Guard enlistment and controls just as they are today?

Mr. BRAY. No, that is not the case. It does exactly the opposite of that. Today a man can enlist in the National Guard. If this bill becomes law, he cannot do so. Today a boy between 18 and 19½ can go down and enlist in the National Guard, but under this bill he cannot. He must serve 6 months before he can become a guardsman. This 6 months' training at that age will take a year out of his life.

Mr. WINSTEAD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BRAY. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. WINSTEAD. Is it not true the only reason the National Guard gets him

in is because the captains locally go out to the boys and sell them on the job and get them in the National Guard?

Mr. BRAY. The way it is done today is that the captains in the National Guard companies or batteries go into the homes and the schools and talk to the young men, and they sign up. If you pass this bill into law, that will not be possible, because then the boy will have to take 6 months' training before he can become a member of the guard.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Maine [Mr. NELSON].

Mr. NELSON. Mr. Chairman, I believe the issues on this bill have been discussed pretty thoroughly. I asked for this time just to ask the chairman of the committee or the subcommittee a couple of questions in the hope I might be able to clarify the matter.

Under the provisions of the Vinson amendment, can any of the volunteers be assigned to the National Guard?

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. The provisions of the bill, as amended, will permit a man to enlist in the National Guard under the 6-month plan. He would not be assigned to the National Guard. He would enlist in the guard under the 6-month plan and be trained.

Mr. NELSON. Does the gentleman mean by that that a man would enlist for 6 months' training designating the National Guard as his choice?

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. That is correct.

Mr. NELSON. Does the Vinson amendment restore to the National Guard the incentive to people to enlist by being deferred from the draft?

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. It does. It still preserves the guard as an independent organization under the States, but permits the individual to select the guard, if he wishes to enlist in it. Then he goes into service operating under the 6-month training plan, if he enlists in it.

Mr. NELSON. So that under the Vinson amendment, anyone who enlists in the National Guard and does not go in under this plan for 6 months' training, does not get any deferment from the draft?

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. He is not draft proof, if that is what the gentleman's question is.

Mr. NELSON. In other words, he can be called up at any time.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. No, no. Under the 6-month training plan.

Mr. NELSON. I qualified my question, if the gentleman from Louisiana will permit me—I said, any man who enlists in the National Guard not under the 6-month plan is subject to the draft.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. We take out the provisions of the law that permit the guard to enlist individuals without prior training and protect them from the draft.

Mr. NELSON. So that the only way a man can now enlist in the National Guard, if he is to be deferred from the draft, is to go in under the 6-month training plan.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. He can go in under the 6-month plan and he would be deferred, and also under the 2-year plan of enlistment.

Mr. NELSON. So the only men that the National Guard can get is if a man enlists for 6 months' training designating the National Guard as his choice?

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Plus any enlistments under the 2-year plan, which the guard now has available.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RIVERS].

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Chairman, as some of you may have heard, I am a member of the Committee on Armed Services. I have not spoken on this bill or attempted to speak. The reason I am in favor of the Vinson amendment is that it attempts to save what is left of the National Guard. I do not know whether you are impatient with the Constitution of the United States. To those of you who want to kill this bill, I say I am not talking to you. And I am not talking to those who get goose bumps when ADAM CLAYTON POWELL gets up in the well of the House and makes a speech. I am not talking to you people. I am addressing my remarks to those who still believe that those powers which are not delegated to the Central Government were retained in the States. That is my position. Among those powers was the sanctity of the National Guard and the sovereignty of the several States. That is my position, for which I do not apologize. I have not tried to speak here, and what I say will pass over you so fast, it will make your head swim. But what you do here, somebody somewhere is going to remember. That is my position. What have the National Guards of the several States done that you should do this to them? That is the question I pose to you. Wherein have they been unpatriotic? I know the question has been put to you. There comes a time in the life of every man and of every nation when a decision must be made. That is the question I ask you today. What have the National Guards at home done that you want to gut them here today under the guise of the Powell amendment? That is the question you have to resolve. I want to tell you here and now, the National Guard was here before any Member of this Congress from the several States. You do not have the right, I submit here, to summarily pass over that fine outfit and under the guise of the Powell ultimatum strip them lock, stock, and barrel of their sacred mission. What about a disaster in your State? Does the Central Government send soldiers to your States? They cannot do that and they do not do that. The National Guard serves many missions and among them was service in the last war. Wherein was there a National Guard unit more highly decorated than the Oklahoma Guard, for instance? You do not have the right here and now to do this to the National Guard. The Vinson amendment attempts to save what is left of it. You do not have the right to gut and hang, draw and quarter what is left of that great patriotic organization known as the National Guard.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentlewoman from Illinois [Mrs. CHURCH] is recognized for 2½ minutes.

Mrs. CHURCH. Mr. Chairman, if even the distinguished gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RIVERS] as a member of the Committee on Armed Services admits that he is confused about this bill, perhaps there will be justifiable sympathy for me when I say that I am also confused. I think indeed that 95 percent of the Members present are confused about the details or the actual plan embodied in this newly presented amendment on which we are about to vote.

I would say to the gentleman from South Carolina, however, that I am one of those who always listens attentively and with respect to the gentleman from New York and to his proposed amendments. I think indeed that the fact that this Member was able to rise at Bandung and proclaim that although his grandparents were slaves, he himself has risen to be a Member of Congress, is something glorious to think about. This equality of opportunity, so uniquely American, is one of our greatest national assets.

I have just two points to make. I do not know—nor does anyone else—exactly what the Vinson amendment will do, but I know very well what the 126 people in the Committee, of which I was one, who voted yesterday for the Powell amendment, meant to do. They meant to say to this country and to the world that the freedom we talk about, the freedom we are spending billions of dollars over the world to uphold, the freedom we are now enjoying in our way of life, the freedom which you say we must now protect by inducting into 8 years of military service the whole youth of this country—that such freedom is real and not just on paper; and that such freedom permits no second-class citizenship. That is what the Powell amendment says to the House.

I would like to add in the 2½ minutes allotted to me that I have little regard for the effort to force a decision on legislation, in the midst of such confusion. Perhaps it would be a good thing to recommit this bill to the Committee on Armed Services and get necessary protection for the National Guard at the same time that we are still insisting on American principles. I am one of those who would want no weakening, through legislation or otherwise, of our National Guard.

I am not moved by the argument that it is so necessary to get a bill out today that to do it we must give up everything we stand for, waive our principles, deny our beliefs. No legislation in the world is that important, and no plan can ever succeed if in its purpose and entity it denies the basic principles that underlie the life, the happiness, and the safety of every single person in this country.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Utah [Mr. DIXON] is recognized.

Mr. DIXON. Mr. Chairman, I asked for time to support the Thomson amendment. I just want to thank the committee for including this amendment in their recommendations.

If the bill is recommitted I hope this amendment will be included also. This amendment encourages every American

youth to take advantage of his birthright and that is the right to finish high school. It embodies the policy and exact idea which I proposed on the floor of the House Tuesday. I like Herbert Hoover's statement that "the United States has only one-sixth of the population of the world, yet we have 40 percent of the college graduates. Therein lies America's might, and let no one, Delilahlike, shear us of that strength."

At the outset let me state that I shall vote for H. R. 5297 because it is a real contribution to our military program. The amendment of my colleague from Wyoming will make the bill still stronger.

The offer of 6 months' active service instead of the present provision of 2 years to the boy who enlists will be very attractive and according to America's high-school principals, there will be a rush into it. They favor encouraging all high-school graduates to enter the program, but they oppose the provision which induces boys who have not graduated to interrupt their education to enlist.

The Thomson amendment provides that a high-school graduate may enlist at any time between 17 years and 20 years of age, but a non-high-school graduate must wait until he is 19 years of age to enlist.

Under H. R. 5297 any boy over 17 may enlist provided the quota of 100 million to 250 million has not been filled. There will be 660,000 boys graduate from high school this year, only 7 percent of whom are under 17 years of age, and 30 percent are under 18 years of age. This means that 70 percent would have been eligible to enlist before they had completed high school.

Now suppose one of these 17-year-old boys who has not completed high school enlists this June. His 6 months' stint will be finished in December. If he lives in a metropolitan area possibly he could enter high school at midyear, but in most areas there is no midyear entering class, and no midyear graduation classes. This boy would then have to go to work or loaf until fall. If he goes to work, which is likely, the chances are that he will stay at his work and become obligated for a car, and will not return to school.

A representative of the Defense Department told me yesterday that the Department of Defense will make it a policy to discourage all men from enlisting in the Reserve, which enlistment would interrupt their high-school work.

Furthermore, I was told that the Defense Department wants the boys to complete high school before entering the service. The Defense Department, however, will accept the boys for enlistment if H. R. 5297 is passed, other things being equal, in the order of the date of their application.

According to the representative, the Defense Department will counsel non-high-school graduates to wait until they have graduated. If that is their policy, which is a commendable policy, why not put that policy into effect by supporting the Thomson amendment? If the Thomson amendment prevails the Defense Department will not be faced with the embarrassing situation of advising boys against enlisting when the Reserve plan itself offers them such inducement to enlist.

Again it is said that non-high-school graduates over 17 will be deterred from enlisting because they will be required to receive their parents' consent. I do not think so much of this argument because parents have their problems just the same as do Congressmen. If Congress through the national Reserve plan holds out such a strong inducement to non-high-school graduates to enlist, Congress will be placing all parents who have educational plans for their boys in a most embarrassing position. After a parent has ingrained patriotism, as all good parents will do, it is difficult to say "No" to their boy when he wants to enlist, especially if the boy proved to the parent that at a particular time he will be accepted while if he waits the quota will be filled, and he will not be accepted, and as a consequence will have to serve 2 years instead of 6 months.

A democracy is characterized quite largely by the fact that those who rule are sensitive to the feelings and needs of those who obey. I was the first one to advocate on the floor of the House the idea embodied in the Thomson amendment. In my opinion it is our obligation to support the Thomson amendment.

First, because I think it will prevent the disruption of the educational career of the majority of our high-school boys;

Second, it will prevent the parents from being placed in an embarrassing position;

Third, it will strengthen the Armed Forces by providing them with more high-school graduates;

Fourth, it will induce the boys to complete their high school in order to be eligible to enlist rather than offer a premium to the boy who quits high school before graduation;

Fifth, it will secure the unqualified support of all of the high-school principals in America, whereas the unamended bill will be only reluctantly accepted, if not violently opposed.

In conclusion, Herbert Hoover struck the keynote of America's power when he said:

> The United States has only one-sixth of the world's population; yet the United States has 40 percent of all the college graduates. Therein lies America's strength. Let no man shear her Delilah-like this strength.

I am for a strong America. I am of the opinion that H. R. 5297 is a splendid measure and shall support it under any circumstances, but that section which permits 17-year-old non-high-school graduates to enlist will shear us of some of our power.

It should be amended to hold them in school until they have completed their high-school education.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. JOHNSON].

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Chairman, in my opinion, it is rather unfortunate that whenever we inject a racial issue into our proceedings it generates a great deal of heat. Honestly and frankly, I have no feeling against any human being, no matter what his color or origin may be. Perhaps that is something not to be bragged about, and it is not said to make people believe that I am more solicitous of the underdog than others. However, I lived as a boy and I live now in a community where there exists none of that kind of feeling. We mingle with Chinese, Negroes, and others of varying colors and races and get along with all of them.

Mr. Chairman, it has been stated here several times that the National Guard will be ruined if this bill is enacted into law. But nothing could be further from the truth. General Walsh, Director of the National Guard Association in Washington, agrees to this bill and agrees to the longer training period beyond the 4 months' period, 8 months in all. The adjutant general of the State of California, General Jones, wired me that he wants this bill passed. The chief of the National Guard of the State of New Jersey was present at our hearings and agreed that this bill is a good one.

Mr. Chairman, it must be realized that in a bill that is as complicated as this one there are bound to be differences of opinion. I think we have found the middle ground which will result in our having a very strong Reserve system There was no acrimony in our subcommittee. We talked these matters over frankly and we tried to arrive at what would be the best kind of a bill to report. That resulted in the bill that we bring to you today. Most of the members of the Committee on Armed Services have had experience in warfare, too, so they know what they are talking about when the subject of national defense is being discussed. We believe that this bill is the best we could get under the circumstances.

If this bill is recommitted, perhaps the committee may improve it. I do not know about that, but I rather doubt it. There are so many and diverse opinions that unanimity of opinion could not be secured on any one issue. I should like to repeat that this bill does not by any manner or means ruin or injure the National Guard of the United States.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DAWSON].

Mr. DAWSON of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I am for universal military training. I have always been for it. In World War I replacements were sent up to the front lines consisting of young boys who had been called to duty from civilian life, boys who had not even had practice on the rifle range. It was criminal. We should learn a lesson from that experience.

Mr. Chairman, living in a troubled world as we do today we would not be smart if we did not prepare ourselves to meet any emergency. I wish that I possessed the eloquence of the gentlewoman from Illinois who addressed you just a few moments ago so that I might call your attention to the real issues at stake here.

On yesterday you did the American thing. You did the big thing. You refused to recognize second-class citizenship in that military establishment, and

today my distinguished friend, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON], whom I love, tells you frankly that the purpose of his amendment is to do away with the Powell amendments of yesterday, which did not keep any governor from having a National Guard but prescribed that there should not be segregation in the National Guard. Why should there be? Why should not a black boy join the National Guard in any State? When are you going to stop distinguishing between citizens first class and citizens second class? Certainly the place to begin to remove that distinction, and to make the Constitution that some have talked of here today a real thing, a living thing, is right here on the floor of the Congress. Certainly the Vinson amendment should be defeated. It should be defeated for the very reason he gave why he introduced it, and that was to do away with the effect of the Powell amendments.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DAWSON of Illinois. I am always glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. VINSON. The reason I offered it was prompted by the first utterance of the gentleman from New York in which he was complaining about the language. He said this:

> I am loath to introduce these amendments, but it so happens that on page 3 of this bill there has been written in some language from line 4 to line 12 which compels me to do so.

Now, I have sought to take that language out, and the taking out of the language is in accordance with the wishes of the gentleman from New York. Therefore, there is no necessity for his amendments.

Mr. DAWSON of Illinois. I appreciate the words of my distinguished friend, but he misinterprets the opening statement made by the gentleman from New York. I, too, am loath to ever have to stand in the well of this House and ever raise a question of discrimination between American citizens because of race, because it should not be done here. But, whenever the occasion arises to do it, then those who feel it most keenly, those who do it have to do it because of the consciences within them and the patriotism within them as they rise to answer. Otherwise they would remain silent.

Now, there is no question about what is sought to be done here. There is no question about why the Vinson amendment is introduced here today. The Vinson amendment is introduced here today to do but one thing, and he stated it, as I said in the beginning, to undo what you did yesterday. What has occurred since yesterday that you have changed your mind? Yesterday you passed certain amendments, and in order to do away with your action of yesterday, you have this hurried provision which is brought here today. Who dictated it? Did the Pentagon dictate it? Since when are the Members of Congress bound by the dictation of the Pentagon? Why, that is a prerogative we, the Congress, occupy in this Nation in the scheme of things. We are a check on the executive departments when they go beyond their boundaries where the rights of people are concerned. I am asking you to do the decent thing today. I am asking you in the light of the spirit that prompted you yesterday, I am asking you in the light of the Constitution that you have sworn to uphold, to defeat the Vinson amendment.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I offer a preferential motion.

The Clerk read the motion, as follows:

> Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan moves that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with the recommendation that the enacting clause be stricken.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I hear that the President of the United States intends to meet with top officials of other nations, including those who represent Communist Russia. If the President can do that—and I know of no objection, if the interests of our Nation are safeguarded—I know of no reason why the Members of the House should not try to get together, talk over their differences, and if we are to have a bill similar to the one which was introduced, bring out a Powell-Vinson bill.

It is perfectly obvious that there is a wide divergence of opinion here as to what should go into this bill. That old theory that a bill brought out by the Committee on Armed Services cannot be improved upon has been disproved by the fact that today we have the Vinson amendment, which I assume is intended to at least modify the Powell amendments which we adopted yesterday, and if possible make it acceptable to the States rights advocates. Apparently—and, of course, I can only judge by what I hear and see—apparently the Vinson amendment will be voted down. It is my understanding—I did not eavesdrop, but I heard this, sitting in the House, that if the Vinson amendment is voted down and the Powell amendments stay in the bill, then the Committee will be asked to rise and postpone action.

This bill has been before us for 3 days. It was long in the committee. Some know it is not what it seems to be. Some are sure a bill will not come out of committee unless it carries the foundation of UMT as desired by the Army.

The gentleman who opposed the bill most vigorously, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHORT], had to leave on other business; he had made a prior commitment. He relied upon statements of the leadership that the bill would be disposed of yesterday. But as we are in such wide disagreement, why should not the Committee rise now, strike out the enacting clause, let the bill go back to the Committee on Armed Services, where perhaps the gentleman from New York [Mr. POWELL], and the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON] can get together and bring in a bill which will protect the well-being of our future taxpayers and the Nation which a majority may support? Why is not that a sensible, practical way of handling this situation? It seems to me that is the obvious thing to do. The Vinson amendment apparently will be rejected, the Powell amendment is in the bill, and will today remain there. There are sufficient votes to kill the bill as it is now written.

In order to save time—get a bill which will receive the approval of the House.

If this motion to rise and strike the enacting clause is voted down my opinion is that the Vinson amendment will be voted down, and then the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON] will make a motion that the Committee rise. That motion prevailing, as it probably will, consideration of the measure will probably be postponed indefinitely and until pressure has secured the votes necessary to give the Pentagon what it desires—regardless of the wishes of our constituents.

Why not take the obvious, constructive, short way?

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the motion.

Mr. Chairman, I want to state that I regret to find myself in disagreement with the Congresswoman from Illinois [Mrs. CHURCH] in her recommendation that this bill be recommitted. The Committee on Armed Services has spent hours, days, and weeks on this bill. There is not any question that we need an alert Reserve Corps in our national defense setup. We need a program to build up the Reserve Corps. Regardless of what your opinion may be on the Powell amendment or the Vinson amendment, I sincerely hope that you have the courage of your convictions to stand up and vote one way or the other and meet this issue at this time so that this proposed National Reserve legislation can be considered.

I know you have all heard from the folks back home, pro and con, for and against. Many of you are trying to find a way out and the way out, I fully realize, would be to recommit the bill so that it would not be necessary to take a position on this legislation. You are all anxious for some development which will relieve you from taking a definite stand one way or the other.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GAVIN. I yield.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. I want to commend the gentleman for his remarks. I want to advise the House of Representatives that the Reserves need some legislative help and need it badly. If the House wants to shirk its responsibility and let our guards down, it is up to them.

Mr. GAVIN. Why, certainly. What are we going to do? If we do not build up the Reserve Corps and we are suddenly catapulted into another emergency, then we are going to ask that the boys who did the combat fighting in World War II and the boys who did the combat fighting in Korea be called back again, to move in and take over another job. They should be relieved of the responsibility and the National Reserve Corps be built up into an alert, hard hitting, well-trained Reserve to meet any demands if an emergency should arise.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GAVIN. I yield.

Mr. MASON. The question before the House is whether to strike out the en-

acting clause. That is not the question the gentleman is discussing.

Mr. GAVIN. It will produce the same result. You will reach the same objective. It may be a different technique, but the results will be the same.

If the motion to strike out all after the enacting clause carries, that would kill the bill. It would have to be reconsidered by the committee; and completely new legislation from the beginning would have to be considered by the committee.

The committee would have to start all over again. And many are hoping that it will never see daylight again because of the fact you do not wish to take a position on this legislation because of the thinking of the folks back home. You are trying to find a way out, so that you can reconcile your conscience and are hoping that no action will be taken on this bill today.

It would be a grave mistake to send this bill back to the committee. With the critical and chaotic conditions in the world today it would be a grave mistake to recommit it. I say now is the time to have the courage of your convictions, to stand on principle and vote your convictions. You are going to be given the opportunity to be so recorded, as to whether you are for a Reserve bill or you are against a Reserve bill. If this bill is passed today it will go to conference. If it goes to conference between the House and Senate the differences may be ironed out, and in any event you would be given another opportunity to vote on it before any final action is taken on the passage of the bill.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GAVIN. I gladly yield to my very good and able friend, who has spent hours on this proposed legislation.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. It might be well to state again, what was mentioned during debate yesterday, that as a subcommittee we sat for 8 weeks, morning, afternoon, and evening, listening to 115 witnesses, who filled 2,500 printed pages with testimony. The subcommittee chairman asked those present, "Does anyone present wish to make a statement?" And no one accepted the offer. In addition, the chairman of the subcommittee came to the floor of the House and invited interested Members to appear before our committee and only 2 or 3 Members appeared.

Mr. GAVIN. Not alone any Member of the House but any organization that desired to be heard was given the opportunity to present their views when the bill was under consideration.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GAVIN. I yield.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Let me remind the House, too, that practically every patriotic organization of any consequence has come before the committee and endorsed this bill. Every one of the military Reserve organizations has endorsed the bill. The American Legion has endorsed the bill. So many other organizations have endorsed the bill that you could not count them here in the limited time the gentleman has.

Mr. GAVIN. What you are trying to do here today is to find a way out, to relieve yourselves of the responsibility of taking a position. Therefore, I sincerely hope there will be no further attempts to recommit the bill.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. May I just correct the RECORD to show that I did appear before the subcommittee and the printed report of the committee will so show.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman does not state a point of order.

The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] that the enacting clause be stricken out.

The motion was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DIGGS].

Mr. DIGGS. Mr. Chairman, I certainly take no pleasure in airing here on the floor of the Congress of the United States the discrepancies which exist between what we preach and what we practice in this great country of ours. Such discussions give comfort to the enemies of democracy and alienate many of our present and potential friends. History has proven, however, that the improvement of intergroup relationships and recognition of the equality of all men has been principally fostered by the periodic enactment of legislative mandates.

We have arrived at such a period today as we stand on the threshold of a basic change in our National Guard and Armed Forces Reserve system. It is appropriate, therefore, that we give favorable consideration to the proposal of my distinguished colleague from New York [Mr. POWELL] that segregation and discrimination in said units be eliminated. Involved in this deliberation is not only the moral issue of human equality as exemplified in the Constitution and the Ten Commandments, but the practical issue of winning the war for the minds of men.

The matter which has culminated before us today represents the last stage in the long historical struggle for integration in the armed services. I know of no better description of this problem than that which appeared in a recent series of articles in the Pittsburgh Courier, one of America's leading weekly newspapers, which pointed out dramatically the partnership in prejudice which exists between the Federal Government and the National Guard and Armed Forces Reserve units. These articles, which were written by the able correspondent, A. M. Rivera, Jr., state that the National Guard is the South's ace in the hole to defeat the effect of the United States Supreme Court's order to banish racial segregation in education, as reflected in ex-Governor Talmadge's, of Georgia, threatened such use of troops. We have just passed the appropriation bill for the Defense Department, which calls for the allocation of huge sums of Federal money to support the National Guard, even though in the South, where two-thirds of the Nation's 15 million Negroes live, the guard will remain lily white by law and custom.

A typical Southern State, the article points out, is North Carolina, where Negroes are denied training and membership in the guard by a 1917 State statute, which reads:

> The white and colored militia shall be separately enrolled, and shall never be compelled to serve in the same organization. No organization of colored troops shall be permitted where white troops are available, and while permitted to be organized, colored troops shall be under command of white officers.

For the fiscal year 1954, 13 Southern States, which deliberately and systematically exclude Negroes from the National Guard and the Air National Guard received $10,749,231.38 directly appropriated from the Federal Government for the operation of the National Guard and Air National Guard. These States participated and received benefits in another $25 million which was not appropriated as to States.

The article further points out that—

> The denial of Negroes means much more than a chance to parade down main street whistling Dixie with a group of white lads. The denial means:
>
> (1) The loss of an opportunity to choose from a list of 450 technical courses; (2) the loss of a chance to learn many new skills; (3) young men of draft age are denied a chance to start their military training while they are still going to school and living at home; (4) they lose the opportunity to earn extra income while training with the guard; (5) the rejection of Negro veterans with Reserve obligations means that they must serve the required full Reserve status, while white veterans may cut this time by as much as 2 years by serving in the National Guard; and (6) Negroes lose valuable retirement benefits.
>
> The most significant loss appears to be the denial of unlimited educational opportunities to Negroes. According to the recruiting literature of the service, guardsmen are privileged to attend Regular Army and Air Force technical schools with pay. Many of the 450 technical courses may be taken through correspondence. These courses can mean a better job with better pay in civilian life because they increase technical skills and earning power. They cover a wide variety of fields, from personnel administration to radio, radar, and motor mechanics. Guardsmen pay no tuition and earn while they learn.

The denial of a chance to qualify for these technical courses penalizes the region which needs most to upgrade all of its human resources and points up the high cost of segregation to the Nation.

In view of all these facts, Mr. Chairman, I strongly urge the members of the Committee to reject the amendment offered by the distinguished chairman of the Armed Services Committee, Mr. VINSON, of Georgia, which, by his own admission, is designed to preserve one of the most flagrantly undemocratic practices in America.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. DAVIS].

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to yield the time allotted to me to Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. DODD].

Mr. DODD. Mr. Chairman, I ask for this time in order to ask a question of the chairman of the committee. I am not clear about this amendment. One thing I want to be more clear about, entirely clear, is this: Does the amendment in any respect affect the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BOW] that was carried yesterday?

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. No, it includes it. It is reproduced in the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BROOKS] to close debate.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, I think it might be well in the closing moments of this debate to go back to the fundamental matter to be voted upon here in a few minutes. When my colleague from New York introduced his 2 amendments yesterday, or perhaps the 1 amendment in 2 parts, as has been said here already, he began his remarks by referring to certain objectionable words in the bill now before you. Those objectionable words are shown on page 3 beginning at line 4 of the bill, H. R. 5297, of which you have a copy. The objectionable part of the bill to which he referred begins with the statement:

> When recruitment efforts by the several States procure less than the necessary numbers and quality of volunteer personnel, and upon request or approval of the Governor or other appropriate authority of a State, Territory, or the District of Columbia, such a person may be transferred to the Army National Guard or Air National Guard of such State, Territory, or the District of Columbia and shall serve therein for the remainder of the period which he is required to serve under this paragraph or under section 6 (c) (2) (A).

When I studied his remarks after the conclusion of our debate yesterday and the adjournment of the House, I made up my mind that what he had in mind was that this part of the bill which permitted the Federal Government to assign to the National Guard men who had been trained was objectionable to him unless there were certain provisos. Frankly, if the guard can operate without any Federal assignments, I would rather see the guard operate without any Federal assignments. I think of the National Guard as a great and glorious organization. It is an organization that has participated in every one of our wars since the War of 1812. It has a magnificent record behind it and we are all proud of it.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. The gentleman was a member of the National Guard in World War I. I was a member of the National Guard 15 years after World War I ended. Does the gentleman know of any single adjutant general in the United States of America who does not favor this bill?

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. The National Guard Association endorsed the bill. You will find it in the printed record on the last page where I asked everyone sitting around the table in the subcommittee and I asked each one whether or not he favored the bill. Those men had made a study of the bill—not for 1 day or 1 hour but for weeks and months. They were in favor of the bill, including General Walsh who was there and who headed the National Guard Association organization.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiania. I yield.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Is it not true that General Walsh read the bill paragraph by paragraph with the committee? In many instances he offered suggestions which the subcommittee accepted in an effort to protect the interest of the National Guard.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. He did that.

Mr. LONG. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. I yield to my colleague from Louisiana.

Mr. LONG. I just wonder if the gentleman has heard from the National Guard on the Vinson amendment, which has been proposed to us here this morning.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. I will ask the gentleman whether he has made an inquiry as to this matter? I have not had time to do so and such action would involve contact with people from distant areas.

Mr. LONG. The gentleman will not find any expression of approval from the National Guard in the record of the hearings with reference to the Vinson amendment, and that is what the gentleman is talking about.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. They were interrogated regarding the bill as it was presented to the Congress.

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. I yield.

Mr. MEADER. I wish to ask the gentleman whether or not the effect of the Vinson amendment in removing certain language from the bill would have a tendency to weaken the National Guard in that it would deprive them of one source of recruits. Is that correct?

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. It depends on the way you look at it. It would put the guard back on its own as a State institution and put it in a position where they would have to go out and continue to fight to enlist their membership. The easy way for the guard would be for the Federal Government to draft personnel into the Federal service and assign them to the guard.

I myself much prefer to have the guard as an organization resting on its own merits, its own history, and its own patriotic background. With that it can go out into the highways and the byways, into the villages and hamlets and recruit its own membership on a voluntary basis. I think the record of the National Guard is such that it can do that, and under the Vinson amendment we will simply strike out that portion of the bill which permits the Federal Government to assign troops from the Federal service to the guard. We then would let the guard go on its own and enlist its own personnel on a voluntary basis, and if a young man down in your State or in my State wishes to enlist in the guard he will not have to come to Washington and ask permission to do it, he will do it on his own. I do not have any objection to it, and the guard will go ahead, make its enlistments, fill up its ranks, and carry on as it has done for the 165 years of this country's history.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. FORD. I think the record should show that at least for the past 3 years when the National Guard has had a volunteer program the guard has reached their authorized limits. In fact the National Guard has repeatedly asked for additional funds to bring in more than was originally permitted them by the Department of the Army under authorized strength.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Witnesses testified before the committee that the guard now has 350,000 members, and the authorized strength as allowed by the Appropriations Committee is for 375,000. The guard will reach that number, 375,000, before the end of this fiscal year. If that is the case then the guard is all right on a purely voluntary basis and does not need any Federal assignments.

Another situation is that the governors of none of the States want the Government of the United States to tell them how to handle the National Guard. That applies to the State of New York and it applies likewise to the State of California and every other State in the Union. I, for one, am in favor of the governors of the States managing their own guard.

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for the completion of the question I asked before?

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. For the completion of the question, yes.

Mr. MEADER. Would not the adoption of this amendment make the voluntary recruitment program of the National Guard more difficult?

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. It would put them on their own, as I said. This does not hurt voluntary enlistment. In case they would not get voluntary enlistment, this bill as originally written would permit the transfer from Federal training to the National Guard.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Louisiana has expired. All time on this amendment has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON] as amended by the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. THOMSON].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. VINSON) there were—ayes 116, noes 143.

Messrs. VINSON of Georgia and WILLIAMS of Mississippi demanded tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana and Mr. POWELL.

The Committee again divided; and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 143, noes 167.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. LANE. Mr. Chairman, this is a question where we try to eat our cake and have it too.

It would be folly not to have a well-trained and well-disciplined Reserve in this fast-moving age when a major war could explode at any moment, and we would not be given a year's grace in which to train millions of civilians into an effective fighting force.

At the same time, we must consider the American people's opposition to anything resembling universal military training with the regimentation it would impose on all young men.

How to reconcile these positions is most difficult.

We recall the men who served long and gallantly in World War II, and, having done their duty, returned to civilian life to resume their careers, to marry, and raise their families. When they were called back for double duty in the Korean war there was much resentment, and rightly so, when they thought of others around their age who had never given 1 day of military service to defend their country.

To correct this inequality, it is necessary that practically all young men be required to give some service. If, because of inability to measure up to physical or mental standards, or because of a family hardship, or because they are engaged in essential occupations, nevertheless they could be trained on a part-time basis. In the event of war, the best of them would add to the strength of our fighting units. The rest could serve in support. Even during World War II, we had millions of men in uniform who never saw combat but were essential in supporting roles, even though many of them never left this country. This is the type of service that every young man should be able to give his country in the event of war, no matter what his limitations, or reasons for deferment may be. For these purposes, every man who may ever wear a uniform, needs a basic military training in fundamentals, and in discipline.

From Regulars to Ready Reserve to Standby Reserve, there is a need and a place for many, in diminishing order of importance, but nonetheless necessary.

As on any team, we must have replacements, and, in the parlance of baseball, "a good bench" of relief pitchers and pinch hitters and substitute fielders and coaches.

As Gen. Matthew B. Ridgway, Chief of Staff of the United States Army, testified on February 9 of this year, quoting from the report of the National Security Training Commission:

> During the period of July 1, 1946, to July 1, 1953, there was built up a group of 1,600,000 physically qualified young men whose ages came within the draft law, who saw no service and incurred and have no Reserve obligation.

This put all the burden on the Regulars, the "retreads" and the draftees, which was a dangerous imbalance from the viewpoint of national security, and was manifestly unfair to those who did serve.

Under this bill, all available young men will not be reached.

Human nature being what it is, the Regulars who put in 20 or more years of service as volunteers, are carrying the ball for those who have no sense of any obligation to their country. But this is not enough for our national security, even with the help of draftees who are on active duty for 2 years.

If we are going to have a Reserve, it should start with qualified young men from 17 to 19, restricted to once-a-week armory drills and instruction plus 2 weeks field training each summer over a long period and in lieu of 2 or more years of active service.

We are trying our best to put this on a voluntary basis, with the prospect of being called up for 2 years active duty by selective service as an inducement. But, no matter how you figure this out, some will be trained as Reserves, while others will completely evade service of any kind whatsoever.

This is unjust to Regulars, draftees, volunteers, for the Reserve, and men with prior service.

Perhaps we should have supplementary legislation to provide that any man, otherwise qualified, who has never had any kind of military service, should, up to the age of 50, be required to give some time to our national security, perhaps in a part-time civilian defense work. But that, too, would be compulsion.

Coming back to this National Reserve plan, which involves youngsters in their last year of high school, or just a year or 2 out of high, we are faced with problems that are of much concern to their parents.

Six months' active duty at that age subjects them to influences which they are not ready to cope with. Perhaps a civilian advisory board composed of parents, clergymen, and educators, could assist the Army in working out a program to protect the moral welfare of these teen-agers.

Frankly, I would much prefer maintaining the prestrength of our Armed Forces; supplemented by a voluntary Reserve program, providing safeguards against arbitrary call up, and one that is based upon realistic training with adequate pay.

By giving the program prestige and building up pride in its members, I believe we can make it succeed on a voluntary basis.

And eliminate the objections that H. R. 5297 in its present form is universal military training in disguise.

We need a genuine Reserve, but without coercion.

I believe that this bill should first be amended to make it attractive to teen-agers, so that they will want to join because they have confidence in it.

Considering all factors, this is the American way to meet the issue. I am sure that our younger men will respond, if we provide them with the right incentives.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan and Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana.

The Committee divided; and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 161, noes 124.

So the motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. TRIMBLE, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 5297) to provide for the strengthening of the Reserve forces, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Miller, 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 May 5, 1955:

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

H. R. 4647. An act to amend the rice marketing quota provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended; and

H. J. Res. 107. Joint resolution to permit the United States of America to release reversionary rights in a thirty-six and seven hundred and fifty-nine one-thousandths acre tract to the Vineland School District of the county of Kern, State of California.

On May 13, 1955:

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. 1816. An act to declare the tidewaters in the waterway (in which is located Fort Point Channel and South Bay) above the easterly side of the highway bridge over Fort Point Channel at Dorchester Avenue in the city of Boston nonnavigable tidewaters; and

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.

On May 19, 1955:

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

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.

PANAMA CANAL COMPANY AND CANAL ZONE GOVERNMENT

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 Merchant Marine and Fisheries:

To the Congress of the United States:

I transmit herewith, for the information of the Congress, the third annual reports of the Panama Canal Company

and the Canal Zone Government for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1954.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *May 19, 1955.*

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE APPROPRIATION BILL, 1956

Mr. PRESTON, from the Committee on Appropriations, reported the bill (H. R. 6367) making appropriations for the Department of Commerce and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 603), which was read a first and second time, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union and ordered to be printed.

Mr. TABER reserved all points of order on the bill.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. FEIGHAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 20 minutes today, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, and to revise and extend his remarks.

AGRICULTURAL PRICE SUPPORTS

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Speaker, on May 5, 1955, during debate on H. R. 12, the farm price-support bill, I read into the RECORD an exchange of correspondence between Gov. G. Mennen Williams, of the State of Michigan, and myself, appearing on page 5775 of the RECORD. I pointed out that the Governor had an inaccurate understanding of the underlying facts and reasons in arriving at his position on this Federal question.

Subsequently, Mr. Speaker, the Jackson Citizen Patriot, of Jackson, Mich., in my district, took me to task for my naivete in thinking that Governor Williams would be influenced by facts and logic. The editorial was in the form of an open letter to me which I insert at this point in the RECORD.

IT'S NO GOOD, GEORGE

An open letter to Representative GEORGE MEADER, who represents the Jackson district in Congress:

"DEAR CONGRESSMAN: You're too subtle, GEORGE.

"Your phrasing is clever and the point is clear. But if you think any of the Democratic farm bloc spokesmen, much less our own Governor Williams, are going to be deterred by words, you've got another think coming.

"We're speaking, of course, of your own recent letter to Governor Williams in reply to one he sent to you. The Governor was prodding for action on the Democrat-backed bill to reestablish rigid 90 percent of parity price supports for farm products, and he made the statement that agricultural income in Michigan has dropped as a result of the administration-backed program for flexible supports.

"You caught him up neatly, that's for sure. The Governor was trapped with his facts down, but like the now historic case where he claimed credit for balancing Michigan's budget when actually he refused to sign the bill that raised the money to do that and, in fact, used some pretty bitter language about what a lousy law it was, little things like facts simply don't bother our Soapy.

"With him it's words that count, the more of them the better.

"Take this farm bill business. He said the Republican flexible-support plan was to blame for the decline in farm prices.

"You showed him that this program hasn't even taken effect yet.

"He went on to argue about the price of milk to Michigan dairymen, and again charged the dirty old Republicans with being responsible for a decline.

"You showed him how that, too, occurred before the Republican bill ever took effect, that since the GOP system governing dairy supports was put into practice, the price actually has risen.

"And, like we said back a ways, your final paragraph was a pretty biting bit of phraseology, one that's even worth repeating. 'Since you have undertaken to instruct the Michigan congressional delegation on this most important Federal problem,' you wrote Soapy, 'I suggest that you take the additional time from your difficult and manifold duties as Michigan's Governor to make the necessary factual inquiries and policy decisions which would render your advice helpful rather than misleading.'

"That's real clever, but we'll be happy to put up odds that not only Governor Williams but a good many other rigid-price-support boys will be making at least one more speech using the same arguments he did in his letter.

"Fact is, he probably didn't even read your reply.

"Now don't ask us what you should have done—we're stumped, we confess. He never pays any attention to our corrections either, though heaven knows he sure reads the ones where we say he's right. Maybe you could organize a nonpartisan committee to study the whole problem. We've got at least 10 committees studying every other issue before the city, State, and Nation—so why not this?"

ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES IN THE TREASURY DEPARTMENT

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 1727) to authorize certain administrative expenses in the Treasury Department, and for other purposes. This bill is identical with H. R. 5877, which was unanimously reported by the Committee on Ways and Means.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

Mr. JENKINS. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, and I shall not object.

S. 1727 provides basic statutory authority for certain administrative functions of the Department of the Treasury which have been authorized from year to year in appropriation acts. The bill will simplify the appropriation procedure, and I understand that the Committee on Appropriations has suggested the enactment of the basic authority provided in this bill. The bill is identical to H. R. 5877, which was reported unanimously by the Committee on Ways and Means.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection and agree to the matter offered by the distinguished gentleman from Tennessee.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury may make the following expenditures:

(a) Expenditures for arms and ammunition required by civilian employees of the Department of the Treasury in the performance of their official duties.

(b) Expenditures to reimburse Federal Reserve banks and branches for necessary expenses for services performed as Government depositaries and as fiscal agents of the United States.

(c) Expenditures not to exceed $10,000 per annum for services or information looking toward the apprehension of narcotic law violators who are fugitives from justice.

SEC. 2. The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized to accept services without compensation in connection with the program for the sale of United States public-debt obligations.

SEC. 3. Section 10 of the Second Liberty Bond Act, as amended (40 Stat. 292; U. S. C., title 31, sec. 760), is amended by adding at the end thereof the following sentence: "During any period for which a definite appropriation has been made for expenses for which this section makes an indefinite appropriation, the definite appropriation shall be available under the terms of this section and the indefinite appropriation shall not be available for obligation.".

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. 5877) was laid on the table.

Mr. COOPER. 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 Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, S. 1727 is identical to H. R. 5877. The latter bill was unanimously reported by the Committee on Ways and Means on May 9, 1955.

S. 1727 was favorably reported by the Senate Committee on Government Operations on May 5, 1955, and passed by the Senate on May 9, 1955. In view of the fact that the 2 bills are identical, and in the interest of parliamentary convenience, I have presented to the House for favorable consideration S. 1727, and requested that H. R. 5877 be laid on the table.

The purpose of this legislation is to provide basic statutory authority for certain functions of the Department of the Treasury which have in the past been authorized from year to year in Treasury Department appropriation acts. These legislative provisions that have been annually included in the appropriation acts for the Treasury Department might be subject to points of order that might be raised with respect to an appropriation bill authorizing such functions. The Committee on Ways and Means was informed that the House Committee on Appropriations had suggested that the

Treasury Department obtain the basic authority provided in this legislation.

Enactment of this legislation is recommended to the Congress by the Department of the Treasury and by the Bureau of the Budget.

The functions authorized in S. 1727 relate to administrative practices in the Treasury Department. These functions include the procurement of arms and ammunition necessary to carry out the Treasury Department's law-enforcement activities, reimbursement of Federal Reserve banks for fiscal services, informer rewards in regard to narcotic-law violations, acceptance of volunteer services for savings-bond promotion, and financing public-debt operations.

PROCUREMENT OF ARMS AND AMMUNITION

Subsection 1 (a) of S. 1727 would authorize expenditures for arms and ammunition required by civilian employees of the Treasury Department in the performance of their official duties. Provisions in the Treasury Department appropriation acts relating to the various Treasury enforcement agencies have for many years made appropriations available for such purchases. The procurement of arms and ammunition is necessary for these enforcement agencies in carrying out their law-enforcement functions. The inclusion of the reference to arms and ammunition in appropriation language has been necessary because of a requirement in the act of March 3, 1879, as amended—title 50, United States Code, page 61—that procurement of arms and ammunition by executive agencies be from the Army, unless it is shown that the Army cannot meet the need for such items. Experience has shown that the Army does not usually have the type of arms and ammunition required for law enforcement. Thus, arms and ammunition needed for law enforcement by the Treasury can be obtained more expeditiously and at the same or less cost through purchase in the open market or through contract with the Federal Bureau of Investigation, rather than by clearing each request through the Army.

REIMBURSEMENT OF FEDERAL RESERVE BANKS FOR FISCAL SERVICES

Subsection 1 (b) would authorize expenditures to reimburse Federal Reserve banks and branches for necessary expenses for services performed as Government depositaries and as fiscal agents of the United States. Language in Treasury Department appropriation acts for constituent units of the fiscal service have authorized the payment of expenses of Federal Reserve banks incident to the deposit of withheld taxes, expenses on account of public-debt transactions for the account of the Secretary of the Treasury, and expenses for the verification and destruction of unfit United States paper currency. While section 15 of the Federal Reserve Act—title 12, United States Code, section 391—authorizes Federal Reserve banks to act as Government depositaries and fiscal agents, no provision is made for reimbursing the banks for rendering such services, and subsection 1 (b) would provide permanent authority for reimbursement of expenses of the foregoing nature.

INFORMER REWARDS IN REGARD TO NARCOTIC-LAW VIOLATIONS

Subsection 1 (c) would authorize expenditures of not to exceed $10,000 per annum for services or information looking toward the apprehension of narcotic-law violators who are fugitives from justice. Language of this nature has appeared for many years in the Bureau of Narcotics appropriation. These funds have been used for the payment of rewards to informers and the authority has served a very useful purpose in the apprehension of notorious narcotic-law violators who are fugitives from justice.

ACCEPTANCE OF VOLUNTEER SERVICES FOR SAVINGS-BOND PROMOTION

Section 2 would authorize the acceptance of services without compensation in connection with the Treasury Department program for the sale of United States public-debt obligations. This authority has appeared in the Bureau of the Public Debt appropriation and has been utilized to accept the services of volunteers in connection with the savings-bond program. The provision has been necessary because of the prohibition contained in section 3679 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (31 U. S. C. 665 (b)), against the acceptance of voluntary services, except in cases of emergency, involving the safety of human life or the protection of property. The success of the savings-bond program has depended primarily on the unstinting effort of thousands of volunteers throughout the country.

FINANCING PUBLIC-DEBT OPERATIONS

Section 3 would provide that during any period for which a definite appropriation has been made for expenses under section 10 of the Second Liberty Bond Act, as amended (31 U. S. C. 760), the indefinite appropriation under that section shall not be available for obligation. Section 10 of the Second Liberty Bond Act appropriates a certain percentage of the amount of obligations issued under the act for the payment of necessary expenses connected with any operations under it. That provision in effect constitutes a permanent indefinite appropriation. However, the Congress has for many years appropriated a definite dollar amount for expenses of public-debt operations, in lieu of the indefinite appropriation, and section 3 of the bill would continue the present practice of providing a definite dollar amount for this purpose.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members desiring to do so may extend their remarks at this point in the RECORD on the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

SUSPENSION OF DUTIES AND IMPORT TAXES ON METAL SCRAP

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 5223) to continue until the close of June 30, 1956, the suspension of duties and import taxes on metal scrap, and for other purposes, which was unanimously reported by the Committee on Ways and Means.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I shall not, I wish to ask the indulgence of the House to read a short statement.

Mr. Speaker, H. R. 5223 merely continues the existing exemption of metal scrap from import duties and taxes until June 30, 1956. As has similar legislation in the past, the bill contains the proviso that the suspension shall not apply to lead scrap or to zinc scrap.

This bill was reported unanimously by the Committee on Ways and Means. I would also like the record to show that the substance of this bill was first introduced by the gentlewoman from Illinois [Mrs. CHURCH] on February 2, 1955, as H. R. 3412. The same bill, H. R. 3932, was also introduced on February 10, 1955, by the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. PATTERSON].

Mr. Speaker, I may state at this time that all members of the committee on the Republican side favor this legislation.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the first sentence of section 2 of the act of September 30, 1950 (Public Law 869, 81st Cong.), is hereby amended by striking out "June 30, 1955" and inserting in lieu thereof "June 30, 1956": *Provided*, That this act shall not apply to lead scrap or zinc scrap (other than zinc scrap purchased under a written contract entered into before July 1, 1955).

SEC. 2. The amendment made by the first section of this act shall not be construed to affect in any way the application of Public Law 38, 82d Congress, to copper scrap.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 7, after "scrap", strike out the remainder of the bill.

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.

Mr. COOPER. 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 Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, H. R. 5223 would continue through June 30, 1956, the present suspension of duties and import taxes on metal scrap, with provision for the exclusion from the suspension of lead scrap and zinc scrap. The present suspension of these duties and import taxes is scheduled to terminate on June 30, 1955.

These duties and import taxes have generally been suspended by the Congress since 1942, except for a brief period at the end of 1949 and at the beginning of 1950.

Therefore, the enactment of H. R. 5223 will result in the continued suspension until June 30, 1956, of the duties and taxes on those types of metal scrap

presently exempted from duties and taxes under Public Law 869 of the 81st Congress, as amended, with the additional exclusion of all zinc scrap. The rates of duty and import taxes on the principal types of ferrous and nonferrous metal scrap, the suspension of which will be continued by the bill, are set forth on page 2 of the report of the Committee on Ways and Means—House Report No. 545—accompanying this legislation.

For some years following World War II, United States imports of metal scrap were many times greater than in prewar years. After 1949 imports of iron and steel scrap and after 1950 scrap of most of the nonferrous metals declined sharply. In the period 1952–54, only in the case of aluminum have imports of scrap represented over 1 percent of total domestic consumption in any year of the metals on which the duties and taxes would be suspended by this bill.

The fact that there have regularly been significant United States exports of scrap of the nonferrous metals as well as of iron and steel scrap would indicate that even when the duties are suspended, the United States is not likely to provide a distinctly better outlet than foreign countries for scrap metals originating abroad.

The interested executive departments supported the enactment of this legislation. The Department of Commerce in reporting to the Committee on Ways and Means in favor of the enactment of H. R. 5223 stated that the commodities on which the duties and taxes would be suspended are in short supply.

The Committee on Ways and Means amendment strikes out the language in parentheses which reads as follows: "(other than zinc scrap purchased under a written contract entered into before July 1, 1955)."

The Committee on Ways and Means was advised that the exception provided for in the parenthetical language is no longer necessary.

This amendment means that under H. R. 5223 lead scrap will continue to be excluded from the suspension and zinc scrap will be completely excluded from the suspension.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members who so desire may extend their remarks at this point in the RECORD on this bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

PRIVILEGE OF FREE ENTRY OF GIFTS PURCHASED ABROAD BY MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 5559) to make permanent the existing privilege of free importation of gifts from members of the Armed Forces of the United States on duty abroad. This bill was reported unanimously by the Committee on Ways and Means.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I shall not, I ask the privilege of the House to read a short statement.

Mr. Speaker, H. R. 5559 provides for the free importation of gifts from members of the Armed Forces on duty abroad. Similar legislation has been provided continuously since 1942 through periodic renewals of this privilege on a temporary basis. The pending legislation makes this privilege permanent.

The bill was reported by the unanimous vote of the Committee on Ways and Means.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 2 of the act of December 5, 1942, entitled "An act to accord free entry to bona fide gifts from members of the Armed Forces of the United States on duty abroad," as amended (U. S. C., title 50 App., sec. 847), is hereby repealed.

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.

Mr. COOPER. 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 Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, H. R. 5559 would make permanent the temporary privilege which has been available continuously since 1942 to members of the Armed Forces on duty abroad which allows for the entry of so much of any shipment of bona fide gifts as does not exceed $50 in value without the payment of import taxes and customs duties.

This legislation was introduced at the request of the Department of Defense following clearance by the Bureau of the Budget.

The act of December 5, 1942 (Public Law 790, 77th Cong.), as amended, provides the basic authority for this free entry privilege.

The Department of Defense in urging the enactment of this legislation expressed the opinion that favorable consideration of this legislation would make a definite contribution to the morale of our Armed Forces. It is extremely important to a serviceman on a tour of duty overseas that he be able to send small gifts and remembrances from the region in which he is serving to his family and friends in this country. If such articles were made subject to duty the administrative problems involved in sending gifts home would serve to discourage this practice.

In view of the continued presence in many parts of the world of members of the Armed Forces of the United States, the Committee on Ways and Means is of the opinion that the free entry privileges for the specified gifts should be made permanent. Permanent legislation would also relieve the Department of Defense from having to request, and the Congress from having to enact, periodic extensions of the free-entry privileges.

During the consideration of this legislation in executive session, the Committee on Ways and Means was assured that the legislation is safeguarded from abuse not only by the restrictions contained in the act, but also by appropriate regulations issued by the Department of the Treasury and the Department of Defense.

The committee was also advised by the Bureau of Customs that the Bureau has encountered no serious administrative difficulties in administering this law.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members of the House who desire to do so may extend their remarks at this point in the RECORD on this bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON MINES AND MINING OF THE COMMITTEE ON THE INTERIOR

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Mines and Mining of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs may be permitted to sit during general debate in the session of the House this afternoon.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA APPROPRIATIONS, 1956

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 6239) making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of said District for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, and for other purposes.

Pending that motion, I ask unanimous consent that general debate thereon be limited to not to exceed 2½ hours, one-half of the time to be controlled by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. WILSON] and the other half by myself.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 67]

Albert	Boggs	Burleson
Andrews	Bolton, Oliver P.	Byrnes, Wis.
Avery	Buckley	Canfield
Ayres	Burdick	Christopher
Barrett		Colmer

Dondero	Hosmer	Osmers
Donovan	Ikard	Pilcher
Doyle	Kearney	Pillion
Eberharter	Knutson	Powell
Edmondson	McCarthy	Preston
Engle	McDowell	Reed, N. Y.
Fjare	Madden	Rogers, Colo.
Gathings	Mollohan	Rutherford
Gregory	Morgan	Scherer
Griffiths	Morrison	Short
Hays, Ohio	Moulder	Thomson, Wyo.
Hébert	Mumma	Thornberry
Herlong	Norblad	Tollefson
Heselton	Norrell	Utt
Hillings	O'Konski	Walter

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 373 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Foreign Affairs may sit during general debate while the House is in session the rest of this week and next week.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA APPROPRIATIONS, 1956

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. RABAUT].

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 6239, with Mr. FORAND in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 25 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, we are talking of the District of Columbia appropriation bill for the fiscal year 1956. The subcommittee first had this bill before it on April 14. The committee was faithful to its task, and I pay tribute to my colleagues for their diligent work, to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. PASSMAN], the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. NATCHER], to the ranking Republican Member, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. WILSON], to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. JAMES], and to our colleague from Illinois, Mr. VURSELL, for the 2 days that he substituted on the committee. The hearings comprise some 800 pages. There were two evening sessions in the caucus room of the Old House Office Building that there might be extended to the people of the District an opportunity to be heard.

Mr. KEARNS. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present to hear this important legislation.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count. [After counting.] One hundred and seven Members are present; a quorum.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, as I said, we had between 70 and 80 people from the District testify in 2 evening sessions, and we proceeded with those evening sessions under the 5-minute rule. I personally received in excess of 175 letters and many, many invitations to social functions in the District, which regretfully I declined. Over and above that, the press of the District suddenly discovered the presence of the members of the subcommittee in Congress. They wrote items about us that at times made us smile and at other times caused us to frown.

As one who was elected to this body back in 1934 I have learned to take criticism in its stride. Regardless of what is done, you never can satisfy everyone. It is well to proceed according to your duty as you see it.

If you will take up the report on this bill you will find on the opening page that the committee has approved $163,547,509 for the operation of the government of the District of Columbia, and that includes $34,306,500 for capital outlay.

This is a decrease of $4,225,290 in the amount of appropriations for fiscal 1955 and $8,857,791 under the budget estimate.

Federal funds represent approximately 11.5 percent of the total budget, and the District's share is 88.5 percent. However, the Congress has responsibility for the fiscal management of the District of Columbia and as the "keeper of the purse" is compelled to state that fiscal irresponsibility seems to be the keynote of the 1956 budget.

The budget presented to the Congress is $4,632,501 above the 1955 appropriation, but still does not include the customary reserve of $1 million for supplemental estimates which are normally presented later in the fiscal year.

One or both of my colleagues will touch upon the real estate assessment problem in the District of Columbia. The committee obtained ads from the local papers offering certain property for sale and, correspondingly, has checked the assessed valuations of those properties, and those figures are available to any Member who is interested in the problem.

It is the feeling of the committee that the District of Columbia is "dragging its feet" as far as its own needs are concerned, sort of basking in the sunlight of the reflected glory of the Federal Government.

I would like to say a word about the reduced Federal payment. The committee recommended for 1956 $16 million, which is $4 million under the budget estimate of $20 million which was the figure appropriated last year. All kinds of statements have been expressed in the press, and by individuals about this $20 million figure, that it should be raised to even a larger sum—I read in one instance $40 million. So there is nothing stationary about this sum of $20 million. When a suggestion is made that it should be raised that is all right, but when the Federal payment is lowered then the committee or Congress welches on its responsibility. That was the word, I think, I read. That fund of $20 million is no different from other authorizations by this body for projects in the individual districts of the Members of this House.

As of today there are over $3 billion of authorized Federal projects; however, the Congress has not appropriated any funds for either planning or construction. Where does this authorization differ from that? It does not differ from it one iota. So there is every right of the Congress to give shock treatment to the patient to bring him out of his lethargy and to the consideration of that which is best for it, namely, to look after its own assessments.

In the District there is very little of a debt service charge. I think it amounts to approximately one-tenth of 1 percent. Consider the debt service in your respective cities, counties, and States in its relationship to the spending dollar. In Detroit it is 10 cents out of every dollar. In this city, thanks to the wise guidance of the Congress of the United States throughout the years, this debt service is approximately one-tenth of 1 percent.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise, and on that I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the chairman appointed as tellers Mr. PASSMAN and Mr. GROSS.

The Committee divided; and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 1, noes 102.

So the motion was rejected.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I do not know whether it is the popularity or the unpopularity of the speaker or the unpopularity or the popularity of the subject that is causing all these interruptions in my address.

But, it has been reported in the Washington newspapers that the District of Columbia functions will be seriously curtailed as a result of this committee's action. There are 28 departments, only 9 of which are below the 1955 appropriations. Of the 9 that are below 5 are above the 1955 appropriations after deduction of nonrecurring items of expense. Of the other 4 that are below the 1955 appropriations 1 is in the amount of $339; another is $2,589. The Department of Occupations and Professions is $24,000 below, but they have an unobligated balance of $10,000. Civil Defense is the largest item below, but that is not a clear item to the committee.

There were certain increases made over and above those recommended by the Commissioners of the District. I am happy to announce that for the public schools we gave 21 teachers, at $96,810, for handicapped children; for the Public Welfare Department, we allowed 37 social workers in the amount of $129,500, to apprehend the "galloping pappies" who leave their families here and take off for other parts and let the District pick up the check for $2,700,000. Some of this money that is used for these neglected families can be regained if we can apprehend these fathers who fail to recognize their own responsibilities.

We have an amendment we are going to submit today for an increase of $354,271 which will still leave the item, however, $432,000 below the 1956 estimate.

We said something in the committee report concerning the markets—the

eastern market and the western market. Those markets represent an annual loss to the District. Originally they were established so that the farmers of the area could come in and use 60 stalls. The latest report is that they use about six stalls in the markets daily. One of the chainstores thought of going into the market, if the committee would approve an item for air conditioning and a new heating system. The District of Columbia has to get out of the landlord business. We have people who want to pay taxes and who want to stay in the landlord business. Therefore, the committee recommended the sale of the markets. But if those people occupying the markets at the present time want to pay a just rent for what it will cost to keep the markets going and to fix them as they should be, and that they will not be an operating deficit for the District, we are very favorable to the markets being retained, but only in so much as they will pay their way. I hope nobody will quarrel with that.

With reference to capital outlay, we have approved urgently needed items; new schools, children's center buildings, and highways. We deferred some of the highways around the Capitol, for those we must have some action by Congress; we need a law.

We deleted the proposed Potomac River bridge. We cannot appropriate money when they do not know whether they want a bridge or a tunnel. I suggested that they make up their minds and the committee would be here to listen to them. We are favorable to giving them access to Virginia. Virginia gets a lot of benefits from the District. It has grown to be a great State close to the District line and in other areas. But we are not going to approve a bridge if we do not know whether the item will call for $38 million or $7 million. The committee has to know. As long as I have served on the Committee on Appropriations, which dates from the beginning of my service, that committee has never acted when in doubt. That is the teaching that I received under both the distinguished chairmen of the committee, Mr. CANNON and Mr. TABER.

I think the items we have approved for the District will enable them to proceed in an orderly way with their capital-outlay program.

What are the benefits that they receive in the Federal District? What would the respective towns of the various Members offer if you were to go home and say to your people, "The Federal Government wants to move and is considering moving to your town; what is your bid?"

I tell you that you would see some colossal figures submitted. You would see some colossal offerings, if your cities were bidding for the District of Columbia.

In the first place, the annual volume of the tourist trade is estimated by the Board of Trade of the District of Columbia at $250 million a year. The monthly Federal payroll is somewhere between $86 and $99 million, or $1,092,000,000 a year.

This is some town. Federal projects are forever springing up here, but to know what we have done, just look about you and see the beauty of this city. What other city has a Rock Creek Park running right through the center of the town? What other city has Washington's Monument, the Lincoln Memorial? I do not want to mention everything, it would take me too long, but what other city has in excess of 60 parks? What other city has seen the national labor unions coming to its doors and building their central offices in this town, and has seen industry with its top representatives here for no other reason than that this is the site of the Federal Government?

Yes, right now we have in the making a new Senate Office Building costing $22 million, a new House Office Building of comparable size and I presume of comparable price, and a new addition to the Capitol costing probably $7 or $8 million, all necessary, but built right here in the District of Columbia.

If the new Federal pay raise goes into effect, the increase is estimated to amount to $1 million a day. What percentage of that money will come into the economy of the District of Columbia?

This is a nice town, but every time something is done is it a reason for a new increase in the Federal contribution. They do not go together at all. One is an allocation.

Mr. Chairman, there are always those here that meet with others. We have many parties here now, attended by many Members of both bodies.

I found I had so many invitations I did not take any of them. I did not want to have any pressure. Sometimes the pressure is great, and it is so nice and it is under such splendid circumstances that it is very difficult to say no.

No one wants to do anything unjust. It would be my prayer not to do an injustice to a soul. This is a great city. It is a city I have had the pleasure of serving actively in for a long time, and I am now in my 10th term. But we also have our responsibility to the districts from which we come, for every part of America is intertwined in the District of Columbia.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RABAUT. I yield.

Mr. SPRINGER. If I may, I would like to ask two questions of the gentleman for information only because I think the Members would like to be informed on them. It is my understanding that later today there will be an amendment offered which would add approximately $4 million to the present appropriation. Could the gentleman inform the membership as to what that money would be used for?

Mr. RABAUT. It is just a part of the Federal fund. The income of the District of Columbia comes from several sources.

Mr. SPRINGER. It was my understanding that $4 million was to be added to the appropriation.

Mr. RABAUT. No; if there is going to be an amendment for $4 million, I do not know what it would be for except that it might be to return the $4 million that the committee cut from the Federal payment to the District.

Mr. SPRINGER. Would the gentleman explain what that $4 million cut was? What services was that $4 million cut off of?

Mr. RABAUT. That $4 million reduction was in the general revenues the District of Columbia had and whatever uses they put all of the money to that they take into the District of Columbia fund—just like the money the District itself receives.

Mr. SPRINGER. In other words, there is no specific assignment of that $4 million to any particular service?

Mr. RABAUT. No. The money just goes to the District of Columbia.

Mr. HARRIS. Is it not true that you are talking about the Federal contribution?

Mr. RABAUT. Yes.

Mr. HARRIS. And that the $4 million reduction was from the Federal contribution? The budget requested $20 million of Federal contribution and, as I understand it, the action of the committee was to provide $16 million of Federal contribution.

Mr. SPRINGER. And the District may use that $4 million and decide what service it should be used for as it sees fit?

Mr. HARRIS. That is the point I wanted to raise and inquire about of the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee. The $16 million recommended for Federal contribution would go into the general fund, is that not true?

Mr. RABAUT. Correct, that is true.

Mr. HARRIS. The capital improvement under the Public Works Act of 1954 comes from the general fund, does it not?

Mr. RABAUT. That is correct.

Mr. HARRIS. The thing that disturbs me about the action, and which I would like to have cleared up, referring to the bill the Congress passed providing for the public works program of 1954, at which time $20 million was authorized, which was an increase of about $9 million. I proposed an amendment at that time to that legislation of the $20 million increase, making $11 million authorized for Federal contribution, that so much of the aggregate annual payment by the United States appropriated under this article to the credit of the general fund, as is in excess of $13 million shall be available for capital outlay only. In other words, we were increasing taxes at that time and increasing the Federal contribution for one purpose principally although there were some other purposes. If the gentleman would take more time to clear this point up, I wish he would because I think it is important, in other words, that any amount over $13 million which was appropriated from the general fund had to be used for capital outlay. As I construe the action of the committee, the $4 million reduction or cut from the Federal fund here must then result in taking that from the capital outlay, and it would come from the funds that are supposed to build schools and provide for certain other capital outlays here in the District of Columbia.

Mr. RABAUT. As to the schools we have allowed the full request for new construction and we have allowed practically everything they have asked for

except these two highway projects around the Capitol here and the Potomac River bridge. The bridge is a separate item.

Mr. HARRIS. But the highway fund is separate from the other, the capital outlay fund, which this applies to.

Mr. RABAUT. Is it the gentleman's idea to let the District drag its own feet as to getting its own funds? This is a shock treatment for the District of Columbia to wake up and start getting something and doing something on their own.

Mr. HARRIS. Certainly, I appreciate that, but the point I want to clear up in my mind today, and if I can get the information, it would be very helpful to me because I am fearful that in view of the provisions of section 2 of the public works bill of 1954, it would result in taking the $4 million from our capital outlay which comes out of the general fund which is for our schools and things of that kind. The highway moneys are in a separate fund.

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RABAUT. I yield.

Mr. PASSMAN. The report reads as follows: "which includes $34,306,500 for capital outlay."

The $4 million would come from the general fund and could be offset by some economy in the District government.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield on that question?

Mr. RABAUT. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TABER. Here is the picture as I see it and I think it should be understood: The District of Columbia is appropriated certain funds in this bill. It is the obligation of the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to raise by taxation the amount necessary to provide that money—after the Federal contribution which is given by the Congress—through the income taxes and other taxes that are receivable. That is the fiscal picture with which we are confronted.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for another question?

Mr. RABAUT. My personal time has expired and the committee time is all allotted.

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman from Michigan 2 minutes.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RABAUT. I yield.

Mr. SPRINGER. There has been a great deal of comment lately both in the newspapers and by Members of Congress on the question of whether or not property within the District of Columbia is being properly assessed. I know that subject has been before the committee. Would the gentleman inform the House as to the feeling of the committee on that particular point at this time?

Mr. RABAUT. Yes; I will give a few examples. That is the best answer I can give. Then I will ask the gentleman what his thought is.

We took the newspaper advertisements of property for sale, took the asking price of representative properties and then got the assessed valuation on those properties with the following results: On one the asking price was $20,000, the assessment $7,000. On one the asking price was $41,000, the assessment $15,000. Asking price $16,000, assessment $8,000. Asking price $29,000, assessment $12,000. Asking price $15,000, assessment $5,000. You can go all the way down. On the last one the asking price is $10,000 and the assessment $4,000.

Mr. SPRINGER. May I point out to the gentleman that I happen to know what assessments are in Montgomery County, Md., adjoining the District. They are considerably higher than in the District of Columbia. I am not trying to find fault or point out what should be done, but may I ask if the committee is making any recommendation to the District as to what should be done in the matter?

Mr. RABAUT. The committee is doing just one thing to the District: We are curtailing the Federal funds to the District with the idea that they will recognize some of their own responsibility.

Mr. SPRINGER. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, when I came to Congress, in 1941, one of the first men I called on was John Nance Garner, of Texas. I found Mr. Garner sitting in the middle of his office floor in a swivel chair sorting papers. He had them stacked all around him. After visiting for a while, he said: "Well, young man, let me tell you one thing: To get along well over here just sit back and listen." He said, "You know when you are not learning you are not listening."

So I have followed that policy this year in committee and in the House, and I do not intend to have too much to say today.

First, I would like to compliment our distinguished chairman, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. RABAUT], on his grasp of the problems of the District government in so short a time; also other members of the committee for their diligent efforts on the bill we have before us at this time.

I have had the pleasure, and I say so in all sincerity, of serving on the District Appropriations Subcommittee for several years. I served under one of the greatest men in the House of Representatives and one of the finest men I ever knew as chairman of that committee, Joe Bates, of Kentucky. While Joe Bates was from the Democratic side of the House during the liberal days, I never knew a man more conservative with the taxpayers' money than he. There were many times when we on our side suggested that we would like to have 2 or 3 Joe Bateses. There were times when I felt maybe Mr. Bates was a little too conservative, especially in view of the fact that the District was growing. We were going through a war period, and the problems of the District were increasing in proportion as the population increased. It was during times when the needs of the District had to be set aside and laid aside because of the war effort. After the war was over, of course, we had quite a backlog of projects and a backlog of work to do, and we proceeded to try to bring the District up to proper standards.

I inherited the chairmanship of the District Subcommittee on Appropriations during the last Congress. I am very much interested in the Nation's Capital, our Nation's Capital. Our Capital City belongs to the State of Indiana, the State of Kentucky, the State of Michigan, and the other States, and not to the people of the District. I am proud of it, and God forbid the day may ever come when we relinquish our authority over the District of Columbia. I shall never be a party to giving so-called home rule to the District of Columbia.

However, along with the authority that I am demanding, I think I owe it to the people of the District of Columbia to accept responsibility commensurate with that authority. We in the House of Representatives demand the authority to control the District of Columbia. We are holding on to that authority but I think along with that authority we owe it to the people to exercise responsibility commensurate with that authority and to see that the District of Columbia is adequately financed and adequately cared for.

We might say that our position in the District of Columbia is somewhat of a necessary evil; we have to hang on to that authority, but we must be willing to exercise the responsibility that goes with it. Two years ago I visited with the distinguished chairman of the Appropriations Committee at that time, the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] and I suggested at that time that perhaps the Congress needed a man to represent the Congress, a man of the city-manager type to act as liaison man between the legislative, the Appropriations Committees of the House, and the District Commissioners, to work with the budget directors and department heads for the District, to go out and make investigations and to report back to us. I can think only of a man with the city-manager type of qualifications to do that. If we had such a man to report directly and to be responsible directly to us, we would be in better position to decide what the needs of the District of Columbia are.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. There are officials representing the District of Columbia government, are there not?

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. We do not have the type of person I am referring to.

Mr. GROSS. Is the gentleman saying the present officials are incompetent?

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. I did not say any such thing.

Mr. GROSS. Why then a city manager?

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I do not yield any further.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count. [After counting.] One hundred

and twelve Members are present, a quorum.

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, may I proceed? While serving as chairman of this Subcommittee on Appropriations I made a very sincere effort to get out and study the problems of the District as they were presented to us by the various department heads. I do not hesitate to admit that I found some legpulling in many instances. While I want them to have the facilities necessary to give our children as fine an education as anywhere in the land, I also expect them to use those facilities as economically and as wisely as we use them in other places. In some instances I found where they were a little selfish in the use of those facilities. However, we did, on the whole, last year, give the District of Columbia more money than they had ever had before to help bring them up to date with their plant facilities and other departments of government. Now, they are not getting as much this year. I do not think that necessarily means that their government should fall apart in any way. I think the committee weighed and evaluated their needs pretty carefully. We did not give them as much as they wanted, but I believe with the proper type of economy they will be able to get along.

The growth in the public schools has been tremendous. We have increased the appropriations over the past years by a considerable amount for school facilities—a little less than last year but still much more than they had prior to that.

Recreation department. I am a great believer in giving boys and girls plenty of ripe apples so that they will not be inclined to eat green ones. I do think we have a lot more recreational facilities in the District of Columbia for children than are being utilized, and that may be because we are not providing for adequate supervision.

Police department. The police department has done a marvelous job under the appropriations we have given them. There has been a 23 percent decrease in the number of serious crimes committed in the District of Columbia since 1954 while it has been growing in most other places. We gave them money to carry on and they have used it wisely.

Fire department. We gave them practically what they asked for.

Veterans' Service Center got the same as last year.

Office of Civil Defense, which has never come before us with a clear-cut issue, was cut as usual.

Mr. Chairman, I am not going to take more of the Committee's time now.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 26 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. PASSMAN].

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Chairman, this is my first year as a member of the Subcommittee on Appropriations handling funds for the Government of the District of Columbia.

A member of the Appropriations Committee who has not been privileged to serve under the very able chairman of this subcommittee, the distinguished gentleman from Michigan [Mr. RABAUT] has indeed missed something worthwhile. Mr. RABAUT is an able legislator; he is devoted to his work and goes into minute detail on every item regardless of how insignificant it may appear on the surface.

My distinguished friend from Indiana, the former chairman [Mr. WILSON], is also a tireless worker who understands the problems of the District. All of my colleagues on this subcommittee are hard workers and are attentive to their difficult assignments.

After working with and observing the sincerity of my colleagues of the District Subcommittee on Appropriations, I am thoroughly convinced that the members of the subcommittee exert every effort to satisfy the citizens of the District of Columbia, and this is especially true on account of the citizens' nonvoting status. I doubt if there is a congressional district in the Nation that gets better representation in the Congress than the District of Columbia.

Mr. Chairman, in my opinion, the appropriation bill now under consideration is a good bill. I believe the budget request could have reasonably been reduced more than the committee has reduced it. For the fiscal year 1947, my first year in the Congress, the Congress appropriated only $72,584,000 to operate the District government. The United States contributed $8 million of the amount. In the bill before you, your committee has recommended $166,547,000, with the United States contribution to be $16 million. In other words, in a period of 9 years, the annual appropriation for the District government has more than doubled. Yet, we still are not satisfying all of the citizens of the District of Columbia, neither are we satisfying all Members of the House with this greatly increased appropriation.

Some will argue that the increased budget was brought about by the suspension of capital outlay during World War II. It is true that capital outlay was greatly curtailed during World War II, but may I point out that the largest appropriation made for the operation of the District of Columbia government prior to World War II, including capital outlay, was only $43,136,000. For details see page 22 of the hearings.

Mr. Chairman, the trend not only for the District of Columbia government, but also for the many Federal agencies, is to spend, spend, spend. When, if ever, will the Congress call a halt to this wild spending spree that appears to be completely out from under control?

Is it not true that in this day of uneasy peace, but in a period of great prosperity, we are continuing to spend, year in and year out, far in excess of our very high revenues? Where, may I ask, will such a policy lead us?

Now, with respect to the United States Government's contribution to the District of Columbia. The Congress was appropriating United States funds for the District of Columbia before I came to Congress and, in all probability, will be doing so long after I leave the Congress. Even so, I have my own opinion on the subject, therefore may I comment briefly in relation thereto.

The District of Columbia, according to information furnished to me, has the highest per capita income of any city of the Nation. Prosperity in the District is flourishing. This high per capita income and prosperity is a reality only because the National Government is domiciled here. If it were left up to me, the Federal Government would not contribute one dime of the taxpayers' money to the District of Columbia government until such time as legislation is enacted placing the District tax rates on a par with tax rates in many other cities of the Nation.

Is it not true that with few exceptions, if any, when the Federal Government gets ready to build a new building or a new military installation, almost every State and community starts clamoring to get the installation in their community?

A few years ago, the Congress authorized an air base for Monroe, La. Before the sun set, I received an urgent call to return to Monroe for the purpose of meeting with the business people of that city. Upon my arrival in Monroe, we called a meeting of the businessmen and in one day we raised in excess of a quarter of a million dollars to be used to purchase the land needed for the air base. After the purchase, we made the Air Force a present of the land so as to get them to locate the installation in Monroe. This gesture was termed patriotism. Also, it may well have been a desire for profits. To say the least, to hear a cash register ring is sweet music to a businessman. Do you know of any group of businessmen in the District of Columbia who have purchased land and made the Government a present of it so as to get a new building located in the District?

Mr. KEARNS. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise, and on that I ask for tellers.

Mr. KEARNS. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. KEARNS. Does that supersede my point of order?

The CHAIRMAN. It does. The motion to rise does not require a quorum.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. RABAUT and Mr. KEARNS.

The Committee divided; and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 1, noes 73.

So the motion was rejected.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. This motion does not require a quorum. However, the gentleman has made a point of order that a quorum is not present and the Chair will count. [After counting.] One hundred and five Members are present, a quorum.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. PASSMAN].

Mr. KEARNS. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Louisiana yield for that purpose?

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Chairman, I refuse to yield at this time.

When I was assigned to the Subcommittee on Appropriations for the District of Columbia, I was warned to be careful about what I had to say. It was pointed out that if I advocated equalization of taxes, not only would the citizens of the District of Columbia be critical of my recommendations, but that the local press would tear me apart. I did not heed the advice because I wanted facts brought out in the open, and I am still determined to bring them out in the open, regardless of how hard the local press attempts to discredit my work.

It was somewhat amusing to observe that only a few hours after I pointed out the difference in the tax structure in the District compared to that of many other cities, the press jumped on me with both feet. One local paper accused me of being sanctimonious, using the derogatary definition. The editorial was headed "Hot Air." A subsequent editorial was captioned "Hog Wash." Another paper did a very poor job in attempting to discredit my statistics. In my opinion, the local press makes it very difficult for the Congress to do the best job for the citizens of the District because their misrepresentation confuses the District citizens.

Mr. KEARNS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PASSMAN. I yield.

Mr. KEARNS. Does the gentleman not feel that more Members in Congress should be here to listen to the discussion on this important legislation?

Mr. PASSMAN. Inasmuch as this is not national legislation, and inasmuch as we have three times the number of Members present this afternon that we have had in prior years, I am elated at the large number present who are listening.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PASSMAN. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I agree with the gentleman that this may not be national legislation, but the dollars that we are appropriating come from the Nation at large.

Mr. PASSMAN. The gentleman is absolutely correct.

I would like to have one good and substantial reason why the taxpayers of the 48 States should contribute to the citizens of the District of Columbia until these citizens with the highest per capita income of any city in the Nation, through legislation, bring their tax burden up to a par with that of other cities of this Nation.

Regardless of the opinion, the analysis and the abuse of the press, I state that my analysis is substantially correct, that the citizens of the District of Columbia are bearing a much lower tax burden than citizens of many other cities of the Nation. I am not going to use a lot of high-falluting, misleading statistics, rather I shall be factual in comparing the District tax program in specific instances with that of other cities.

First, let us consider Los Angeles, Calif. The total ad valorem tax is $6.74 per $100 per year against $2.20 for the District of Columbia. According to my mathematics, the Los Angeles citizens pay three times as much ad valorem. Furthermore, in Los Angeles, personal property includes household furniture, stocks of goods, warehouse and manufactured stocks. On everything that is subject to ownership they pay an ad valorem of $6.74 per $100 per year against $2 per $100 per year in the District, which is almost 4 times what they pay in the District.

I spoke with the mayor of San Francisco who stated that the ad valorem tax on real and personal property in that city was $6.85 per $100 per year. Is this not more than 3 times as much as the ad valorem tax in the District of Columbia?

Furthermore, the mayor told me that his constituents pay a 3 percent California sales tax plus a one-half cent use tax. Is this not almost double what they pay in the District of Columbia?

I spoke with the county commissioner of Sacramento, Calif., and he stated that the citizens of that city pay $8.10 per $100 per year ad valorem tax. Is that not almost 4 times as much as the citizens of the District pay? These citizens also pay a 50 percent higher sales tax.

Let us consider Grand Junction, Colo. The ad valorem tax is $6.85 per $100 per year. Is this not slightly more than 3 times what the citizens of the District pay?

Inquiry would surely reveal that these are typical of prevailing tax rates in most cities of the country.

For further illustration, let us consider the city of New Orleans, La. The real and personal property tax is $4.10 per $100 per year. Is that not almost double what the citizens of the District pay? In addition, in the city of New Orleans, there is a very high occupational tax, in many instances almost equal to the real property tax.

Let us take my hometown of Monroe, La. On May 11, in a special election, the property tax was again increased. We are now paying ad valorem tax of $4.75 per $100 per year on real and personal property. Is that not more than double what the citizens of the District are paying, with my constituents in Monroe having a much lower per capita income?

My constituents pay 8 cents State tax on a package of cigarettes against 2 cents per package in the District of Columbia. Is that not exactly 4 times higher? My constituents pay $10 tax on a barrel of beer against $1.25 in the District of Columbia. Is that not eight times what the citizens of the District pay?

Mr. Chairman, in considering taxes in the District of Columbia, we must keep in mind that it is a single tax. As a citizen of Monroe, when I pay my city tax, I have not discharged my duties as a taxpayer because I must then pay the county and State tax. For a clear-cut example, may I cite the following:

Louisiana is a State with a small, or average population. Listen to this: In 1954, after the citizens of towns and cities in my State paid their city and county taxes, they then paid to the State $272,609,000 in taxes. So, I say again, why should the citizens of the District of Columbia who enjoy the highest per capita income of any city of the Nation not pay a tax on a par with many other cities of the Nation?

Mr. KEARNS. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count. [After counting.] Eighty-eight Members are present, not a quorum. The Clerk will call the roll.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 68]

Albert	Fallon	Mollohan
Andrews	Fascell	Morgan
Anfuso	Fernandez	Morrison
Avery	Fjare	Moulder
Ayres	Gathings	Mumma
Barden	Gregory	Norblad
Blatnik	Gubser	O'Konski
Boggs	Hays, Ark.	Pillion
Bolton, Oliver P.	Hays, Ohio	Powell
	Hébert	Preston
Buckley	Heselton	Reece, Tenn.
Burleson	Hill	Reed, N. Y.
Byrnes, Wis.	Hillings	Riehlman
Canfield	Holifield	Rogers, Colo.
Celler	Hosmer	Scherer
Chase	Jackson	Shelley
Chiperfield	Kearney	Short
Cole	Kelly, N. Y.	Taylor
Colmer	Kilburn	Tollefson
Dingell	Kirwan	Utt
Dondero	Krueger	Van Zandt
Doyle	McDowell	Walter
Eberharter	McVey	Watts
Edmondson	Miller, N. Y.	Wolverton

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. FORAND, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 6239) and finding itself without a quorum, he had directed the roll to be called when 360 Members responded to their names, a quorum, and he submitted herewith the names of the absentees to be spread upon the Journal.

The Committee resumed its sitting.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise. It is obvious that a filibuster is on. It will save time if the Committee rises.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. PASSMAN] has the floor. Does the gentleman from Louisiana yield for that purpose?

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Chairman, I decline to yield at this time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. PASSMAN] has 7 minutes remaining.

The gentleman is recognized.

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Chairman, here is one for the book. In the District of Columbia, if a citizen or a Congressman wants to know the assessment on personal property, such as inventories, manufactured goods or plant equipment, he would have to get a court order permitting access to the information. I bet it would make a good story if some of us

were given the right to have a look at the assessment on the inventory of many of the Washington merchants.

Now, Mr. Chairman, in all fairness to the people of the State of Louisiana, and its hundreds of fine public officials, I must answer the very unfair, slanderous, and largely impertinent editorial which appeared in the Washington Daily News under date of Monday, May 2, 1955.

If the Members of this body and the citizens of the District of Columbia want to know just how far this paper goes to misrepresent facts, please listen to the following very carefully:

Charge 1. I quote verbatim from the editorial:

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.

I give you the certified facts as follows:

Estimated retail sales volume for fiscal year ending June 30, 1954, $3,172,957,000.

Amount of sales tax paid into the State of Louisiana for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1954, $63,458,000.

Charge 2. I quote verbatim from the editorial:

Louisiana has a State income tax which the majority of its citizens simply ignore. No real attempt is made to collect it.

I give you the certified facts:

Number of citizens filing a State income tax form in Louisiana in 1954, 135,126, of which 59,201 were taxable returns. In addition, 8,430 were filed by nonresident individuals.

Furthermore, the Louisiana income-tax law is copied after the Federal income-tax law; also, there is a reciprocal agreement between the Federal Government and the State of Louisiana that all citizens paying Federal income tax must file a copy of their Federal returns with the State returns.

The total State income tax paid by the citizens of Louisiana in 1954 was $17,027,000.

For the information of the Washington Daily News, may I state that the tax collector of the State of Louisiana is none other than the Honorable Rufus W. Fontenot, who was in Federal service for 22 years and was Federal collector of internal revenue for the State of Louisiana for a period of 10 years. I might further add that we have a modern tax-collecting system that is being copied by many other States and cities of the Nation.

May I say that assessments in the State of Louisiana have increased by 70 percent during the past 10 years. May I further point out that most property in the District of Columbia is not assessed at anywhere near its true value. Much of the property carries the same low assessment that it carried 20 years ago.

Charge 3. I quote verbatim from the editorial:

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.

I give you the certified facts:

The levee boards of the State of Louisiana, numbering 21, are out of our most essential segments of government. How do they function? The Governor appoints the levee board members and they are men of high caliber from all walks of life—bankers, ministers, farmers, and businessmen. The New Orleans Levee Board is responsible for 109 miles of levees, 26 miles of which are main-line levees along the Mississippi River. The board also maintains the Bohemia spillway. The levee board is charged with maintenance of local drainage canals and repairs. In 1954 the New Orleans Levee Board spent $300,000 for new levees, and in 1955 will spend $1 million for new levees. Furthermore, the maintenance costs of the New Orleans Levee Board for levees will for many years run into hundreds of thousands of dollars per year.

Charge 4. I quote verbatim from the editorial:

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.

I give you the certified facts:

In the years 1950, 1951, 1952, 1953, and 1954, the citizens of Louisiana paid into the Federal Government $2,340,000,000. What did the total Federal grants made to the State during the same period amount to? Only $780 million.

For the year 1954, the citizens of Louisiana paid to the Federal Government $544,661,000, and the total grants and aid amounted to only $124,548,000.

Now, may I point out to the editorial writer of the Washington Daily News that the information I have furnished to refute his slanderous charges is certified, and it may be verified by contacting the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress. Or he may send me his name and address, and I will furnish him with certified copies of the information which I have obtained from officials of the State of Louisiana.

Before I form a definite opinion of the character of the personnel of the Washington Daily News, I shall wait and see whether or not that newspaper publishes these facts, and retracts the untrue statements made in the editorial.

But regardless of its attitude, I shall continue working in my own way to be helpful to the citizens of the District. I am going to say what I want to say as long as I believe I am correct. And may I say here and now that if the local press will approach the problems of the District with an open mind, as I intend to, then we can work together for the benefit of the District. I have no desire to quarrel with the press, but on the other hand, I must be frank and say that I am not going to be bluffed or swayed by anything that the local press may have to say about me or my committee.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I do not wish to speak in a vein of criticism, but rather to discuss another matter that should have the attention of the legislative committee, and which has a direct bearing on revenues that the District Government is being deprived of. It is a matter with which I have had much experience, and that is the need for legitimate finance companies in a community. I have been reliably informed that on account of what I shall refer to as an antiquated law of the District of Columbia, there is only one legitimate small-loan finance company operating in the District. There are five companies that refer to themselves as automobile finance companies; 1 listed as financing home improvements, 1 insurance company making some types of loans; and 2 discount companies.

Now, here is a peculiar situation brought about by an antiquated law. On the perimeter of the District there are 151 legitimate finance companies, and I am reliably informed that they make approximately 89 percent of all loans made to citizens of the District of Columbia—banks excluded, as they do not cater to small loans.

It would be most interesting if Members of the Congress would cross the District line and see these legitimate finance companies in operation and observe the many modern appliance stores located in the vicinity.

If you have laws in all, or at least a majority, of the 48 States authorizing finance companies to handle personal and installment loans, why would it not be sound for the District of Columbia?

If these 151 finance companies on the perimeter of the District should be allowed to operate in the District, think of the additional personnel who would be employed in the District; think of the additional profits that would be derived from income taxes of the companies, and occupational or privilege taxes. Furthermore, think of the millions of dollars in sales of appliances and automobiles that would go to District businesses. Now, by the absence of legitimate automobile finance companies and small loan finance companies, here is what the citizens of the District must contend with.

Scattered all over the District are pawnbroker exchanges. Licenses issued to these exchanges list them as dealers in secondhand merchandise. I am reliably informed that there are 542 such licenses in effect, 70 of them doing business as pawnbroker exchanges. The license fee is only $50 per year, and I am informed that some of these operations do an annual volume of millions.

Let us discuss the interest rates that they charge and how they handle the loans to get around the law. When you go into one of these so-called pawnbroker exchanges, they take title to the article you offer as security. They sell it back to you in 15 days and charge 25 percent interest. This interest rate amounts to approximately 650 percent per year.

In one other section of the city there are stores which offer bargain rates. It

is only 10 percent each 15 days, or approximately 120 percent per year.

In practically every place where merchants have goods to sell on terms they are very clever in ascertaining whether you are a cash buyer or a credit buyer. On a used automobile, if you are a cash buyer, the price may be $500, but if they suspect that you are a credit buyer, the same automobile may have the retail price of $800.

I say to you, Mr. Chairman, and without fear of successful contradiction, that a deplorable condition exists in the District of Columbia on account of the absence of legitimate small loan and automobile finance companies. This condition is brought about by the antiquated law limiting the maximum amount of interest that can be charged, an interest rate so low that legitimate finance companies handling household appliances and automobiles or small loans cannot operate profitably, and the same is true on personal or moral loans.

This can be corrected only by legislation, and I am of the opinion that when the facts are made known, the legislative committee will recommend legislation to correct this injustice to the taxpaying citizens and the workers of the District of Columbia.

Mr. Chairman, I have tried to function as a member of this subcommittee according to my understanding of my responsibilities. I hope that the House will approve the committee's recommendations, taking into account that the committee held extensive hearings and deliberated at length with the Commissioners and other members of the Appropriations Committee before making the recommendations for your consideration.

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KEARNS].

Mr. KEARNS. Mr. Chairman, it is not my intention in any way to prolong this legislation, I am sure. However, I do wish to pay my respects and to pay my tribute to the members of this Subcommittee on Appropriations. I think they have done an outstanding job, because, after all, they cannot appropriate more money than they have to appropriate. They have considered the financial situation of the Federal city here very carefully. I think they have combed through this legislation in a very, very meticulous way, and I think they are all to be congratulated that they are so minded.

I would like to remind the committee today, however, that this is the seat of the Federal Government of the United States. This is the one and only Federal city in the United States of America. It is my opinion that each and every Member of Congress certainly has a responsibility toward the District of Columbia where we have the privilege of sitting under this great dome in this Capitol. And, I would like to pay tribute to the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. MCMILLAN], chairman of the Committee on the District of Columbia, and the ranking minority member, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SIMPSON], and then I will relinquish the balance of my time.

I do not feel that we can let the District of Columbia down at this time. I feel certain that we have legislation pending before the Committee on the District of Columbia that will increase the revenues here to a degree whereby we can guarantee our Commissioners and those who are running this great District of ours that they will have the money available. I would like to say that I think we should support the amendment that will be offered by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH], and let the Federal seat of our great Government survive financially. I know that every person who dwells here will be most appreciative, and I can assure you also that we will do everything in our power in the Committee on the District of Columbia to try to get extra revenue to meet the demands.

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. HYDE].

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Chairman, it seems that we are engaged today in what might be called an annual hassle, as to how much money the Federal Government should contribute toward the upkeep of its Capital. I, like the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KEARNS], have a very high regard for the members of this committee and believe that they are sincere in what they have done. But quite often people do things sincerely but may be mistaken in what they are doing. One impression I think should be corrected. The argument is made—and I am afraid it is rather a specious one—about how much other cities in the Nation would be willing to pay to have the large Federal establishments that are here in Washington, D. C. It is probably true that many, if not all of them, would like to have those establishments that are here. But it must be borne in mind that this is not a city which existed here and which then the Federal Government decided they would put their Federal establishments in. This city was actually created by the Founding Fathers who created the Constitution of the United States. Later it was provided for by acts of Congress. The territory was here before there was any Federal establishment here at all. In those days, as all of the Members know, the Government was at one time in New York and at another time in Philadelphia. So this city itself is a creation of the Federal Government. The Federal Government is not here by virtue of having been given to the city or of having given the Federal establishments to the city. That argument is specious, I submit. It is specious to argue that because the establishments are here the city should be so glad to have them that it should not ask the Government for anything.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HYDE. I yield.

Mr. RABAUT. There are a number of things that are surprising here in the District. The Statue of Freedom on the dome of the Capitol has its back toward the city. It was expected by those who erected the building that the city would be built in front of the statue, whereas the city developed behind the statue. So many surprising things have happened here over a period of years.

Mr. HYDE. The way the Statue of Freedom faces may be one of the few mistakes that the grand founders and planners of this city originally made. That mistake was probably made by the people who moved here, and after they got here moved out toward the west instead of toward the east, as L'Enfant and others expected when they placed the Statue of Freedom on the dome.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HYDE. I yield.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I was just wondering, if our good friend from Michigan, Mr. RABAUT, would let us have what we ought to have in this bill, we might have enough money to turn the statue around.

Mr. HYDE. We well might. It would almost seem that not only has the Statue of Freedom turned its back on the city but the chairman of the committee has temporarily turned his back on the city, too.

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HYDE. I yield.

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. I wonder if the Statue of Freedom perhaps is not looking to the entire country for a little consideration once in a while.

Mr. HYDE. However the Statue of Freedom faces, and for whatever reason it may be facing that way, we here today are faced with a little more practical problem than the direction in which the statue is facing.

I grant that the assessments in the District, as the chairman of the committee has said, are not what they should be. I recognize the great need for reassessment, but is not that a fault common to most every city and county in the United States? There is hardly a community in the United States where the real estate assessments are realistic and fair and what they should be. I am sure there is no one on this floor who will claim that they are. The mistake that the governing fathers of the District have made in that respect is a mistake that has been made in almost all communities.

There is one fact I would like to point out to the committee. Your chairman has told you that the Federal funds provided in this bill are approximately 11.5 percent of the budget. Approximately 50 years or more ago the percentage of the Federal Government's contribution was approximately 50 percent. In that 50 years the extent of the Federal holdings and their value has increased so greatly that it is unnecessary to call it to the attention of the Members of the House.

One of the reasons why the Federal Government should certainly come closer to the proportionate payment that was made in those days is the protection that these growing Federal establishments need. It must be recognized that the police protection, fire protection, streets, roads, water, sewage, drainage, and other things that are provided for the benefit of this huge Federal establishment here have to be provided out of the District of Columbia budget.

The gentleman from Louisiana mentioned the staggering total of the amount being appropriated here for the District. I do not know whether many Members of the House are aware of the fact that all of this amount that is in the budget for the District except the seventeen-some-odd-million dollars that are in this bill by way of Federal contributions comes from the taxpayers of the District of Columbia. Under the method by which our fiscal affairs are handled here, the taxes from the District of Columbia go into the Treasury, into the general fund. All we are doing here is appropriating back the money that is paid in taxes.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. NATCHER], my colleague on the committee.

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Chairman, the Subcommittee on the District of Columbia of the Appropriations Committee once again brings to the floor of the House for your approval the annual District of Columbia appropriation bill for the fiscal year 1956.

I have enjoyed my assignment to this particular subcommittee, and, at this time, desire to express my deep appreciation to the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, the able and distinguished gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON], for giving me the opportunity of serving on this subcommittee.

It has been a pleasure working with our subcommittee chairman, the distinguished gentleman from Michigan [Mr. RABAUT], and the other members of this committee, the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. PASSMAN], the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. WILSON], and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. JAMES].

We were ably assisted by Francis Merrell and Homer Skarin, our executive secretaries.

Mr. Chairman, the problems confronting the District of Columbia are serious and must be squarely faced. The city of Washington is today one of the great cities in the world, and, as our capital respect. Every Member of Congress of the United States should take pride in the advancement and accomplishments of our capital city.

The District of Columbia has changed considerably since April 15, 1791, when the cornerstone for the District of Columbia was laid on Jones Point, which, by the way, is now a part of the State of Virginia, by the first commissioners, Daniel Carroll and Dr. David Stuart, and Maj. Andrew Ellicott, the surveyor.

The District of Columbia is financed out of five separate funds—a general fund, a highway fund, a water fund, a motor-vehicle parking fund, and a sanitary-sewerage fund.

The District of Columbia appropriations bill for the fiscal year 1956 contains a Federal contribution of $16 million to the general fund, $1,302,000 to the water fund, and $590,700 to the sanitary-sewerage-works fund, making a total Federal payment of $17,892,700. The District's Appropriations Act of 1955 contained a total Federal contribution of $21,890,000. Twenty million dollars of the Federal payment in 1955 to the District of Columbia was for the general fund, $1,298,000 was for the water fund, and $592,000 was for the sanitary-sewerage-works fund.

The District of Columbia Appropriations Act for 1956 provides for operating expenses in the sum of $132,241,009. The budget estimates for 1956 call for the sum of $134,925,600, and the District of Columbia Appropriations Act of 1955 provided for a total operating-expense appropriation of $130,347,299. The bill before us today calls for an increase in appropriations for operating expenses in the sum of $1,893,710 over the 1955 appropriations and $2,684,591 less than the 1956 estimates. The total of $132,241,009 is composed of the following items: Executive Office $300,000; Department of General Administration, $3,021,850; Office of Corporation Council, $427,000; compensation and retirement-fund expenses, $9,936,000; regulatory agencies, $958,000; Department of Occupations and Professions, $240,000; public schools, $27,996,810; Public Library, $1,620,000; Recreation Department, $1,678,000; Metropolitan Police, $12,781,000; Fire Department, $6,257,900; Veterans' Service Center, $90,000; Office of Civil Defense, $75,000; Department of Vocational Rehabilitation, $140,000; courts, $3,300,000; Department of Public Health, $23,492,000; Department of Corrections, $4,520,000; Department of Public Welfare, $9,245,729; Department of Buildings and Grounds, $1,687,000; Office of Surveyor, $148,920; Department of Licenses and Inspections, $1,482,000; Department of Highways, $5,876,000; Department of Vehicles and Traffic, $1,094,000; Motor Vehicle Parking Agency, $350,000; Department of Sanitary Engineering, $10,255,000; Washington aqueduct, $2,120,000; National Guard, $115,800; National Capital Parks, $2,389,000; National Zoological Park, $645,000.

For capital outlay the bill before you contains a total of $34,306,500. This amount plus the total for operating expenses of $132,241,009 makes the amount recommended in this bill total $166,547,509.

The District of Columbia program will be financed by the Federal contribution and payments of $17,892,700; Federal loan authorizations of $9,700,000; District of Columbia revenue amounting to $137,933,000; and surplus from fiscal year 1955 and prior years of $7,313,818 for a grand total of $172,739,518. The estimated surplus as of June 30, 1956, will be $6,192,009 and with this amount deducted from the $172,739,518 results in the amount recommended in the present bill of $166,547,509.

The 1950 census shows the population of our Capital City to be 802,178. The present-day population probably exceeds 830,000. Here we have the ninth largest city in the United States, and it has the highest per capita income of any city in the world. Our hearings began on April 14, 1955, and subsequent thereto, from time to time, we received information to the effect that notwithstanding the fact that in certain areas of the District permanent schools could not be built fast enough to take care of the increased school population, which in October of last year totaled 115,430, residents were rapidly moving out of the District with this fact evidenced by a drop in automobile registrations amounting to some 10,000. However, just before we completed our hearings on this bill one of the newspapers carried an article stating that Washington had not lost 10,000 automobile registrations, as was reported approximately a month prior thereto, but actually had gained 2,222 over last year. According to the traffic director, this was simply an accumulation of errors which caused the erroneous registration figure.

During our hearings statements were made that the Federal Government owned and controlled so much of the land in the District that additional duties should be placed upon the Federal Treasury. In one instance we were informed that the Federal Government owned and controlled 58 percent of the real estate in the District of Columbia. I discovered, upon investigating this matter through the General Services Administration, that the General Services Administration's report on Federal real property shows 11,297 acres of land owned by the Federal Government in the District of Columbia, or 28.9 percent of the total 39,040 acres in the District. This information was obtained by me from the Comptroller of General Services Administration on April 25, 1955.

It is now agreed by the District officials that the real-estate assessments should be brought up to date and the local press has recently pointed out that several untapped sources of tax revenue previously closed by Congress should be reexamined and reopened; that the city tax rate amounted to $22 per thousand; that the income-tax laws of the District provided for an exemption of $4,000 for each taxpayer, and that said $4,000 exemption should probably be lowered. Title 47, section 1567a of the District of Columbia Code, provides for the $4,000 income-tax exemption. Title 47, section 501a of the District of Columbia Code, provides that the rate of taxation on real property in the District of Columbia shall not be less than $22 per thousand of the assessed value of such property.

Public Law 364, passed during the 2d session of the 83d Congress, authorizes an annual payment by the United States to the District of Columbia in an amount not exceeding $20 million. We find this provision set forth in title 47, section 2501b. The question has been raised recently as to whether or not this law should be amended increasing the amount of the authorization to be able to meet the present emergency confronting the District of Columbia. The budget under investigation is in balance, but with all the requests for additional governmental functions and improvements, plus a contemplated pay increase for the District of Columbia employees, this budget may be several million dollars out of balance before the end of fiscal year 1956.

In the year 1922 the total appropriations for the District of Columbia amounted to $22,977,411.07. The District's share was $13,784,647.70, and the share of the United States was $9,192,763.37. Here we have a Federal contribution of 40 percent of the total. In the year 1946 the United States share

amounted to 9.2 percent of the total of $64,728,422.75. The District's share during this particular year amounted to $58,728,422.75 and the United States share amounted to $6 million. From 1922 to 1955 the lowest amount contributed by the United States was $4,539,295, which took place in the year 1935. Here we have the United States share amounting to 13.11 percent of the total. In 1947 the total appropriations amounted to $72,548,313.66, with the District's share being $64,584,313.66 and the United States share amounting to $8 million, or 11.2 percent of the total. In 1948 the percentage of the United States share was 13.46 percent; in 1949 it amounted to 12.79 percent; in 1950 it amounted to 11.19 percent; in 1953 it amounted to 8.80 percent; in 1954 it amounted to 8.52 percent; and in 1955 it amounted to 14.44 percent with the total appropriations amounting to $138,498,386. The District of Columbia's share amounted to $118,498,386, the share of the United States jumping up to the total amount of the authorization as provided for under Public Law 364, which was $20 million. From 1922 to 1955 the Federal contribution to the District of Columbia has ranged from $4,539,295 to the maximum authorized under the present law of $20 million.

Mr. Chairman, at this time I want to call the attention of the Members of the House to the present assessment situation here in the District of Columbia. Under the District of Columbia Code, title 47, section 713, the law provides that real estate shall be listed and assessed at not less than the full and true value thereof. That is the law in the District of Columbia.

Our investigation discloses the absolute necessity of a thorough and immediate study of the tax structure of the District of Columbia. As a result of our hearings, we find that a reassessment of all real estate in the District of Columbia should be made as soon as possible. A reassessment of the real property in the District does not necessarily mean that more revenue will be raised, but it does mean that many inequities will be removed. Those property owners assessed too high will be decreased accordingly and those property owners whose property is not properly assessed will have same assessed accordingly.

When we started our hearings on the District of Columbia appropriations I made inquiry the first day of the President of the Board of Commissioners, Mr. Spencer, as to the true condition concerning real estate assessments here in the District of Columbia. My question was answered by the assessor of the District, who stated that there were many areas of the District which had not been reassessed for 20, 25, or 30 years. This may be found on page 30 of the hearings. Further inquiry was made of the assessor as to how long it would take to equalize the real-property assessments in the District, and in answer to this question the assessor stated that to properly equalize the entire District of Columbia it would take up to 10 years. This question and answer may also be found on page 30 of the hearings. The assessor informed our committee that in the year 1929 there were 3 assistant assessors for the District, and in that year the number was increased to 5. This same number was authorized down to and including October 1, 1951, when the present assessor assumed the duties of his office. Here we have the assessor stating that since he was not satisfied with the conditions he found concerning real-estate assessments, he advocated an increase in the staff of assistant assessors, with the Commissioners going along with this suggestion, which was accepted by the Congress, thereby resulting in the number of assistant assessors being raised to seven in the year 1954. Notwithstanding the authorization for an increase of 2 assistant assessors, the assessor testified that positions of at least 5 assistant assessors were filled. This testimony may be found on page 36 of the hearings. Last year three additional assistant assessors were requested, and same were approved by the Congress. Here we have authorization for 10 assistant assessors, but the assessor testified that only 8 positions were filled, and that this is the situation as it stands today. It was pointed out to the committee that the residence restriction of 5 years in the District has hampered the assessor in filling these vacancies, and I call this matter to the attention of the Legislative Committee on the District of Columbia. Our examination further discloses the fact that the assessor has a total of 257 employees in his office. Notwithstanding the fact that 257 employees are employed in the assessor's office and authorization has heretofore been granted for 10 assistant assessors, we still need a complete reassessment of real property in the District of Columbia. A request was made for 3 additional assistant assessors, and in order to make every effort in securing a reassessment of the real property in the District, our committee now recommends that 3 additional assistant assessors be authorized. This brings the total to 13 assistant assessors. Under this setup the assessor is of the opinion that within a period of 10 years proper reassessment of all real estate can be made in the District of Columbia. The city's need for more revenue is acute, and the current inequities should be remedied as soon as possible, and a period of from 5 to 10 years is simply too long a time to wait for the proper adjustment of the real-estate assessments in the District.

As I have heretofore stated, a general reappraisal of real estate is not to provide in every instance a means for increasing the revenue, but is sound procedure to be used in correcting inequities due to wide price variations in order to equalize to a reasonable degree the real estate tax burden of the property owners of the District. You might be interested in knowing that the District of Columbia was forced to condemn certain property for schools within the past few years and it was found that the court awards amounted to 200 percent and 300 percent of the assessed value of the improved property, with an average of 250 percent. The following examples indicate the trend:

Site for the Dunbar school acquired in 1952

Square 554	Assessed value	Court award
Lot 44	$4,230	$12,000
Lot 83	6,507	17,000
Lot 84	4,317	15,000
Lot 85	4,317	12,000
Lot 814	4,793	11,500
Lot 147	3,881	12,500
Lot 815	3,810	14,000
Lot 820	2,756	7,000
Lot 853	4,230	12,000

Site for the Van Ness School acquired in 1954

Square north of 853	Assessed value	Court award
Lot 13	$2,375	$8,000
Lot 14	2,203	6,900
Lots 23-26, inclusive	14,818	33,000
Lots 5-9, inclusive	9,354	27,000

An examination of the assessment records in the District of Columbia certainly does not give you a true picture of the new housing activity for the period 1946 to 1954. The United States Department of Labor Statistics has furnished me with the following information concerning new housing activity. In Washington, D. C., in the year 1946 we had 4,000 new dwelling units; in 1947 we had 4,303 new units; in 1950 we had 4,857 new units; in 1951 we had 4,494 new units; in 1952 we had 4,761 new units; in 1953 we had 5,384 new units, and in 1954 we had 2,984 new units. The District of Columbia as pointed out heretofore under the 1950 census had a total population of 802,178. By way of comparison Boston, Mass., with a population in 1950 of 801,444 had 1,023 new housing units in the year 1946; 975 new housing units in 1947; 1,642 new housing units in 1948; 1,598 new housing units in 1949; 2,353 new housing units in 1950; 3,686 new housing units in 1951; 1,390 new housing units in 1952; 1,273 new housing units in 1953; and 647 new housing units in 1954.

During our investigation concerning the reassessment of real property in the District of Columbia, I was informed that the Division of Audits of the United States General Accounting Office made an audit of the real-estate tax revenue of the District of Columbia and on January 20, 1955, delivered a copy of the report to the President of the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia. The transmittal letter accompanying the report provides as follows:

Our audit of the real-estate tax revenues of the District of Columbia has disclosed a situation which we believe is of such importance as to merit prompt consideration and action. Our findings are summarized below and, together with our recommendations, are presented in greater detail in the accompanying report.

There have been no general overall reappraisals of real properties within the District as required by law (44 Stat. 834) since 1940, and it is entirely possible that such reappraisals have never been made. The purpose of the general reappraisal is not to provide the means for increasing general real-estate tax revenues as a whole, but is to

correct inequities due to wide price variations in order to equalize to a reasonable degree the real-estate tax burden of the individual property owners. District officials have attempted at various times to equalize assessments through the reassessment of limited areas, the application of an arbitrary adjustment on all new or reappraised properties, and a general increase in assessed valuation of improvements only. Such adjustments have tended to confuse and to amplify the discrepancies.

Perhaps the principal reason for the District's failure to perform periodic general reappraisals was the lack of adequate property description and valuation records upon which such reappraisals could be based. It is impracticable to perform periodic general reappraisals through physical inspections alone, and records of this type, together with definite written policies with respect to valuations, are therefore essential for the periodic equalization of assessments and for their reconstruction and verification in connection with appeals.

We realize that the present situation resulted from the failure, over a period of years, to develop adequate records and policies, and is becoming more difficult with the growth of the District, and the rapid changes in economic conditions. We believe that further delay in establishing the basic records and definite assessment policies will serve only to increase the problems.

We should like very much to receive your comments on the enclosed report. Members of my staff will be available for consultation at your convenience if you desire.

Sincerely yours,

ROBERT L. LONG,
Director of Audits.

On pages 463–466 of the hearings we find Mr. Spencer, the President of the Board of Commissioners, testifying that, in his opinion, the present law should be changed removing the residence restriction of 5 years for District assessors, and he quite frankly stated that the assessor's proposal for a reassessment program continuing over a 10-year period was not sound.

In my opinion, Mr. Chairman, Samuel Spencer, President of the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia, R. F. Camalier, District Commissioner, and Brigadier General Lane, Engineer Commissioner of the District, are all conscientious public servants, and are attempting to carry out the duties of their offices in such a way as to make our Capital City a model city, and one of which we can all be proud. These men are all well-qualified for their present positions. I have not met the new Commissioner who, within the near future, will take Mr. Camalier's place, but I presume that he, too, is well qualified for the position of Commissioner of the District of Columbia. It is true that as a result of our hearings we found the assessment system in the District obsolete and totally inadequate and other matters were brought to the attention of the Commissioners which should be corrected at the present time, but this certainly does not mean that all of the blame should be placed upon the present Commissioners. Their attention is now called to the defects in the tax structure of the District, and I for one believe that immediate action will be taken to solve these problems. These men should receive the full support of the Congress of the United States and the citizens of the District of Columbia.

We recommend an appropriation of $12,781,000 for the Metropolitan Police Department. This is a net increase of $23,480 over last year, and only $24,520 less than budget estimates for 1956. The Metropolitan Police Force has an authorized strength of 2,278 men, and as of the present time 2,250 men are employed. This is an alltime high. According to the FBI the number of crimes in every category, except one, declined in the District of Columbia in 1954 despite a continuing rising trend throughout the Nation. The total number of serious crimes committed in the District during the past 12 months numbered 19,115, a decrease of 22.3 percent under the peak of serious crime reached in January 1953, and a decrease of 3.8 percent under the lowest crime rate existent prior to 1954. Upon being questioned concerning the further reduction of crime in the District, Maj. Robert V. Murray, Chief of Police, informed me that, in his opinion, such reduction would necessitate the employment of some 200 to 300 additional officers. He further stated that it has been proven time and time again that the best deterrent to crime is a uniformed policeman out on the street where he can be seen. I certainly agree with this statement. At the time of our hearings we called attention to the use of one-man patrol cars which are now in use in Kansas City, Los Angeles, New York, Philadelphia, and Baltimore. Major Murray informs our committee that the use of 1-man patrol cars should be given consideration at the present time for use in the residential and noncongested sections of the District. A further study will be given this suggestion. In my opinion, Major Murray and the police department generally are doing a fine job and should be commended by the Congress of the United States and the citizens of the District of Columbia.

Juvenile delinquency is one of the serious problems confronting the law-enforcement section of the District of Columbia government. In the year 1950 the Juvenile Court record shows 3,836 juvenile complaints; for 1951, the record shows 3,373 complaints; in 1952 the record shows 4,427 complaints; in 1953 the record shows 5,351 complaints; and in 1954 the record shows 5,514 complaints.

In addition to receiving testimony from the District of Columbia officials, our committee held night sessions at which time citizens of the District were heard. Representatives of parent-teacher associations, civic organizations, and other organizations interested in the welfare of the District appeared. We were informed that special teachers were required at the present time for slow-learning, emotionally disturbed, and severely retarded children. Budget proposals submitted to our committee failed to include an appropriation for such teachers. I sincerely believe that superior and average students unnecessarily suffer, and their learning process is retarded when they are placed in the same classroom with children falling into the categories listed above. A thorough investigation of this matter was made, and in the proposed budget for 1956 we incorporated the sum of $96,810 for 21 additional teachers, with 9 of said teachers for atypical children, 4 for speech correction, 2 for visiting instruction corps, 4 for remedial reading, and 2 for mentally retarded children.

Before we place additional tax burdens on the residents of the District, a thorough study should be made of the present tax structure. I sincerely believe that the United States should pay its fair share of the cost of maintaining our Capital City. We now have a sales tax in the District of Columbia, and with a $4,000 income-tax exemption allowed it would be unjust for the Congress of the United States to further burden the residents of the District with a payroll tax. A payroll tax should come as the last resort.

Notwithstanding the fact that the problems confronting our Capital City are serious and require thorough study and immediate action, they will be successfully solved as the result of the complete cooperation of the District officials, the citizens of the District, and the Congress of the United States.

Mr. Chairman, our committee recommends this bill to the Members of the House.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I ask for recognition in order to propound an inquiry of my colleague, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. WILSON]. Would the gentleman be in a position to yield some time to me?

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman from Michigan 25 minutes.

Mr. RABAUT. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, could he advise some of us as to how much longer the general debate will continue?

Mr. RABAUT. I have two more speakers who will consume about 20 minutes.

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, at the present time I have two requests for time, for 5 minutes each, and a tentative request for an additional 5 minutes.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I thank both gentlemen.

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. ROBSION].

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, each year when we consider the appropriation bill for the District of Columbia many people get all worked up about it. It seems to me we often overlook some of the fundamentals that are involved. Too often the people of the District of Columbia feel that the Congress is interfering with their business. They forget that this city was established for the benefit of the Federal Government and not necessarily for the benefit of the people who are fortunate enough to be living here at the time. They forget that every man and woman who pays Federal taxes in this country contributes something to the upkeep of Washington. They forget that we have in this city the best streets, the best parks—it is the best city in the United States, as it should

be. And to a considerable extent it is such a beautiful city because of what the taxpayers of Louisville, Ky., and of other States over the years have done to make it so.

I personally favor, and I believe that most of the Members of this Congress favor, adequate Federal participation; although at times there may be honest disagreement as to what that should be. But may I point out today that it takes something more than money to make a wonderful city; because if it took only money, you would not have so many people moving out of this city into nearby areas. You would not have persons coming here to take Government positions, looking around and saying, "No, I do not think I want to raise my family in the city; let us look at some other place in this area."

There is something else that must be considered in addition to money. My personal experience in this city goes back some 35 or 36 years. I regret to say that I have witnessed a tremendous deterioration in the Capital of the Nation, even though we have spent millions and millions of dollars to make it the finest city in the country. Although we are trying to restore a few small areas, at the same time great sections of this city are rapidly becoming slum areas. Why? Buildings do not make slums; people make slums.

Over the years, somehow or other, we have attracted a great many of the wrong kind of people to the Capital, the shrine of the Nation. You may inquire, What do you mean the wrong kind of people? It is obvious. The wrong kind of people to whom I refer are those who do not recognize the responsibilities which go with residence in the Capital of the Nation and do not behave themselves and do not take care of their property.

I am very happy to say that there has been considerable progress made in reversing the trend in the last 2 years. For example, 2 years ago Washington was one of the most lawless cities of the country, and while the crime rate nationally during the past 2 years has increased by 8 percent, it has dropped 24 percent in Washington. You have new governmental leadership in Washington, and they are not going to put up with a lot of foolishness such as occurred in the Capital of the Nation during the last 15 or 20 years.

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. I yield.

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. I concur in what the gentleman says, and I compliment the Police Department of the city of Washington on the fine job it has done over the last 2 years in creating the figures to which the gentleman has referred.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. I thank the gentleman. I agree that the credit for this must go to the chief of police, Robert Murray, the courts, and all of the other officials who are connected with law enforcement.

I read in the paper where some of the businessmen of this town are not satisfied that this city and its people have the greatest per capita income in the United States. They want more. They want to attract additional business here so our streets and bridges will be even more inadequate and it will cost even more money in the future. Why cannot they be satisfied with the present size of the city and try to improve it instead of creating new problems just to make more money? I should think they would be satisfied, being businessmen in an area that has the highest per capita income in the United States.

The people of Washington should realize that we in the Congress do have an interest in this city. We are trying to work with them to make this the finest city in the world. We ask only that they behave themselves, take care of their property, pay their fair share of the cost of operating the city, and show some appreciation for the opportunity of living in a beautiful city where the tax rate is $2.20, whereas in Louisville it is $4.05 per $100 on real estate.

May I also point out the differences in the rate of assessment. My property here is assessed from 75 to 80 percent of its marketable value, while in Louisville my property is assessed at 50 percent of its market value. For that reason, I do not have the advantage of the low tax rate in the District of Columbia. The assessment rate is very important in addition to the tax rate.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. RABAUT. Some here are overassessed. There is no fairness in the assessment.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. That is right.

Mr. RABAUT. That is the point I am trying to bring out. I am very glad the gentleman mentions it.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. I want to raise one more point.

In every city, including this one, you have a great many persons who make their money in the city and spend it in the other areas in which they live. We took care of that in Louisville by putting on those persons, as well as the other folks who live there, what we call an occupational tax. If persons who work in Washington are going to use the city streets; if they are going to use the various facilities and the opportunities to make money in Washington, and prefer to live in Maryland and Virginia, let them pay at least a part of the cost of the upkeep of the District of Columbia.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that we have to go through this about once every year, and we always have the same story. It is a little difficult to get along with. I happen to be a member of the District of Columbia Committee. I live close to the District and I have always been interested in Washington. It is more or less my home city. So with some inconvenience to myself, I remained on the District of Columbia Committee, and at the same time I am chairman of the finance subcommittee of the District Committee. Last year, my colleague, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. O'HARA], was chairman of the subcommittee on fiscal affairs. In other words, it became our duty to find the sources of taxation for the people of the District. It is the duty of the Committee on Appropriations to appropriate the necessary money. I do not think the people of Washington ought to be unmindful of the long hours, the diligent and sincere work that was put in by the District of Columbia subcommittee on appropriations. It is not a pleasant task to have to sit in the committee room and many of these gentlemen come from a long distance away where they have no local interest in Washington, and the only reason they put in their time and energy on this is as a patriotic duty to try to have a fine capital city here for all of the people in the United States.

Certainly, as one of those very much interested in Washington, I appreciate their efforts, even when I find it necessary to disagree, as I sometimes but very seldom do. I do not think we can settle all of the problems of the District of Columbia in an appropriation bill. So my only purpose in talking to you this afternoon is that I think the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. O'HARA], who is chairman of the committee to which I am going to refer, and I, who served as ranking member on that committee, can remind this House of some of the things that may have been overlooked, and which I am sure have been overlooked. I expect to offer an amendment, and, if I do, someone else will to restore the budget figure of $20 million to this appropriation bill, which would be a raise of $4 million over and above what the committee did. I want to tell you the reasons why I am going to do that. I think the Members who are here who know me know that I have not been a wild spender in my record here. I have generally been on the side of cutting appropriations, but I think I can point out to the House that this is not the right thing to do by telling you the circumstances by which this $20 million got into the budget this year and how it got into the budget last year. It became apparent to everybody that this city was deteriorating. The water system of this city was in critical shape. The sewer system was in bad shape. You needed, as every other community needs, schools—many of them. You needed many public works that are essential to any city and which should be the pride of the District of Columbia and of the Congress which rules the District of Columbia. So this subcommittee, of which the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. O'HARA] was chairman, that is the legislative Committee on the District of Columbia, you understand, sat down with a similar committee of the other body and for weeks and months that joint committee of the Senate and the House undertook to find sources of revenue which would bring this city up to what it should be and to halt this deterioration of the city. We did not do what the District Commissioners asked us to do. We did not push this burden off on the Federal Government. But what we did was to find sources of taxation to meet what

was needed, to match a reasonable increase in the funds of the District for capital improvements.

Now do not forget about capital improvements because that is what this is all about. We found those sources of revenue. Many of them did not suit the people of Washington. They would protest against nearly every one of them. But, we said we thought the District of Columbia ought to raise $10 million more and that the Federal contribution ought to be increased by $9 million during the time that these capital improvements were under construction. And that was done. That committee brought that bill back to the House and we submitted to you here in the House just a year ago in this very Chamber, and every Member of the House had a chance to vote for it or vote against it, and we explained to you just what it did do, that we were, so to speak, making a bargain as between the people of Washington and the Federal Government, and that we proposed to impose $10 million of those additional taxes and we increased taxes on nearly every sort of property in the District.

In return for that we were going to propose an additional sum of $9 million in the Federal budget, and every Member of this House had the opportunity to stand on his legs and say: "No, I do not think we ought to do that." But that bill was passed and the Congress agreed to that bargain, yet not 3 months elapsed before an appropriation bill came in here in defiance of what the Congress had done in the past 90 days with a cut of this same $4 million.

We appeal to the fairness of the Members of the House. Congress imposed these taxes upon the people of Washington on the condition named in the bill, and the House had accepted the bill, we had voted for it, yet here in 90 days the effort was made to repudiate it. All I am saying, Mr. Chairman, is that I would like for you to consider those circumstances.

Nobody will undertake to dispute the statements which I have just made. Is that the proper thing to do? Do you think it is the right thing to do, for this House to enter into that sort of bargain which is entirely different from other authorizations? Because here is an authorization conditioned upon the imposition of taxes of an equal amount on the District of Columbia, and they have paid those taxes. Now, we are just asking that if you do not think that is the right way to meet our obligation that you stand up and vote for the amendment which I propose to offer to restore the budget amount to this bill.

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I yield.

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. I would like to suggest to my colleague that we increased the taxes upon the residents of the District of Columbia by $15 million annually and increased the contribution by the Federal Government, as the gentleman said, an additional $9 million.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I am glad to be corrected because I did not have the exact figure in mind. This committee did a great deal of work, but our committee was unanimous and the Senate committee was unanimous, and as far as I can recall this House was unanimous in feeling that the scheme we had worked out was a proper and honest scheme by which this city could be saved from further deterioration in its essential facilities.

Now, you hear a lot of talk about the people of the District of Columbia and their government; the people should do this and the people should do that; that the people should run the government. The fact is that they do not run this government; they are run by this government. There are bills pending over in the committee now, for instance, to raise the salaries of the school teachers—something that probably should be done. We have just passed a bill in this House raising the salary by a substantial amount of every judge, district judges, appeals court judges, municipal judges, every judge in this District. It costs a lot of money. Did the people of Washington do that themselves? Oh, no; we did it to them. They have to pay whatever you say they shall pay, and then we are expected to raise taxes here, and we have been doing that.

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Gladly.

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. I want to compliment the gentleman on an excellent statement, as usual; and I want to associate myself with everything he has said. I am familiar with the actions of the joint committee. It was a very thorough study of the whole fiscal situation here in the District and I certainly will support the amendment the gentleman is going to offer.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I thank the gentleman, because he is a member of the Committee on the District of Columbia, a very valuable member and has put in a great deal of time and study on this very question.

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. O'HARA].

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, it is always pleasant to follow my good friend the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH], with whom I have been associated here for many years. Perhaps we have both been considered rather conservative when it comes to the matter of appropriations. I want to say to you that we had this tremendous problem that was facing the District and the deterioration which was obvious and which was the responsibility of the Congress to make every attempt to correct. It involved not only schools, but it involved the health of the people of Washington, it involved transportation, it involved every avenue which we use and which we oftentimes think so little about.

The Joint Fiscal Affairs Committee of the Senate and House, as the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH] said, spent many, many days going over this problem. The Commissioners recommended a public-works program of slightly in excess of $305 million to be spread over a period of 10 years. There were some pretty bitter criticisms of our committee when we rewrote the proposals. We did not accept that which was requested as a Federal payment. We cut it down. We increased it $9 million to a $20 million annual Federal appropriation. Our colleague, the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HARRIS] offered an amendment which earmarked a certain proportion of those funds which would have to be used on the long term public-works program for the improvement of our Capital City.

Let me say that I share also the highest respect for the gentlemen who sit on the fiscal appropriations subcommittee for the District of Columbia. Sometimes our good friends in the newspaper field do their good intentions no good in some of their criticisms of people who have earnestly tried to do a good job. I think it is unfortunate sometimes that some things are said and it is also unfortunate that some things are written, because even though I differ with their views in connection with one particular phase of this bill, I recognize it is the responsibility and the duty of this fiscal affairs subcommittee to carefully go over item by item the justifications for the amounts requested in this bill.

It is a rather anomalous situation when you come to think of the District of Columbia. We are charged as the governing body. We pass on what they are going to spend. The total budget for the District of Columbia this year is less than the cost of the aircraft carrier *Forrestal*. Frankly, Mr. Chairman, I say to you that this $4 million cut is going to create a very serious situation so far as the entire program of the District of Columbia is concerned. May I say that you will find there were some errors in certain figures and that instead of there being any surplus there will be a deficiency. I want to say to you very frankly that I think it will be most disastrous to eliminate this $4 million. Certainly I want to make it as strong as I can that I think we should support, on both sides of the aisle, the amendment which will be offered by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH] to restore that $4 million cut.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to say something that has not been brought out here but which was referred to by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH]. Last year, when a small surplus was left over, it was obvious there were going to be possible other emergencies, and there were, one of which totaled over $1 million of additional cost imposed on the District of Columbia for St. Elizabeths Hospital. There are bound to be increases in salaries of the various employees of the government of the District during the course of this year. Frankly, the legislative committee has a tremendous problem in trying to arrive at finding other taxes. I do not think anyone enjoys voting for taxes or increasing taxes upon people. I certainly do not. I did not last year. But it had to be done. I do not think it is going to break the Federal Government if we put back in the $4 million which are so badly needed for the operation of your Capital and my Capital in the District of Columbia, which is a city in itself, a little State, a small area of which 42 percent is occupied by the Federal Government.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may desire.

Mr. Chairman, this is another situation where people are for economy but not when they are interested in a project. How does this project differ from projects all over this country where there have been authorizations to the extent of $3 billion and no funds have been allowed to date for either planning or construction? If you want to put money in here, why not put money in every place where they are demanding it? Is it because there is no interest there, or is it because all the interest centers here?

The gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH] said something about sewers. In this bill there is $2 million above that appropriated in 1955 for sewers. Under the $20 million, out of that there is $7 million for capital outlay. Under the $16 million there is $5.5 million for capital outlay, and there is $1.5 million held back for the bridge because there is no decision as to building it.

Now, you can appropriate anything you want, but I see no reason for encouraging the District of Columbia year after year in its government when it fails itself to do the work it should do to pull its own self out of the mud by the bootstraps. We talk about increased expenses. Is there any reason that every time the District of Columbia has an increase in expenses that there should be a corresponding increase in the Federal grant? None whatever. As a matter of fact, some of the very money that the Federal Government spends results in a shot in the arm for the District of Columbia. For instance, the new proposed pay raise will bring $1 million a day into the Federal pay scale, and a certain percentage of that will go into the District of Columbia. I cannot go along with the idea that every time the District of Columbia needs something the Federal Government has got to jump.

It is high time that the District of Columbia, as a city of its size, should take cognizance of its own responsibility. I say the Federal Government should make some sort of a contribution, but I am of the opinion that it might be of a diminishing nature from this time on.

Another thing: The District of Columbia inherits some of its expenses from adjacent territory where payments to those in need are much below what they are in the District of Columbia. If I were down and out I would move to the District, too, because I would want to keep body and soul together.

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RABAUT. I yield.

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. Of course, I am not criticizing the gentleman for the uncertainty of the bridge situation. I agree there was uncertainty there, and I agree with the gentleman that it is the duty of the Subcommittee on Appropriations for the District to see that there is justification made for all these items. But the gentleman well knows that if we keep whittling away, as has been done here, on the Federal contribution to the public works program, soon we are not going to have any; that is very obvious.

Mr. RABAUT. That is not a new argument.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RABAUT. I yield.

Mr. TABER. I would like to call attention to one fact, if I may. I have in my hand the authorization bill passed a year ago which provided $9 million. It says:

> For the fiscal year 1955 and for each fiscal year thereafter there is hereby authorized, to be appropriated in addition to the sums appropriated under section 1 of this article, an annual payment by the United States for defraying the expenses of the Government of the District of Columbia in the sum of $9 million.

That is no contract, no agreement. It is simply an authorization, and the amount of the appropriation has to be determined after hearings and after the situation has been evaluated.

Mr. RABAUT. And the amount that is really in question is $1,500,000.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina, the chairman of the legislative Committee on the District of Columbia [Mr. MCMILLAN].

Mr. MCMILLAN. Mr. Chairman, I have listened wth great interest to this debate this afternoon. I want to take this time to congratulate the distinguished chairman of this Subcommittee on Appropriations for the fine work he and his committee have done in the past few weeks in threshing out this difficult problem of making appropriations for the District of Columbia.

I have been a member of the District of Columbia Committee for 17 years. This is the third time I have been chairman. Never has there been a subcommittee on appropriations that has cooperated with the legislative committee as well as the present subcommittee.

The main trouble with the District of Columbia is that they have been spending millions and millions of dollars without authorization. I think this committee has made a thorough check to see that the funds that are to be spent from here on out are authorized by the proper committee of this House. Millions of dollars have been squandered in the District of Columbia in the past 15 years which no committee authorized.

I take great pleasure in congratulating this committee on its fine work. I know all about the opposition last year to the $9 million. I was one that voted for that $9 million, making the appropriation for the Federal Government $20 million, but I did not say I would vote that amount forever. I do not think the District of Columbia has done its part towards collecting taxes on improved property or getting funds where they should to help operate this city.

I can give one instance. Just last year I made an effort to secure legislation permitting an oil company to rebuild a filling station, which would at least give the District of Columbia $1,000 more income by improving that one building. No; they rejected that. I can think of numerous other similar occasions where they could have collected revenue if certain people in the District had cooperated with the House District Committee. And I don't mean the Commissioners.

We are receiving cooperation from this committee and I am going to back them to the limit. I regret very much that I find myself in disagreement with some of the members of my committee, but this is a free country and everyone can vote according to his conscience.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MCMILLAN. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. HARRIS. The gentleman referred to the Authorization Act of 1954.

Mr. MCMILLAN. That is correct.

Mr. HARRIS. May I refer to the question I asked the distinguished chairman of this committee a moment ago with reference to the language of the bill which was read by the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER]. However, he failed to mention the proviso that followed, and that is the part that disturbs me and which has not been cleared up yet. It states:

> *Provided*, That so much of the aggregate annual payment by the United States appropriated under this article to the credit of the general fund as is in excess of $13 million shall be available for capital outlay only.

In other words, $13 million of the $16 million of the Federal funds appropriated here to the general fund is going for the expenses of the District of Columbia.

The theory behind the additional $9 million was to provide this 10-year capital-outlay program. I was one member of that committee who insisted on the limitation that if it went beyond $13 million of Federal funds, the additional amount would have to be for capital improvements. On that basis there was $7 million that could be reached, up to the $20 million. You have reduced the capital-outlay program of the 10-year program, which means schools, and we need rooms for 13,000 additional students in the District of Columbia to meet these needs in the 10-year program. If the gentleman can explain to me how that works, it will clarify my mind.

Mr. RABAUT. If the gentleman will yield, I refer the gentleman to line 7 on page 2 of the bill in which this bill itself specifically earmarks $5½ million to be available for capital outlay only. That is the bill we are writing today. That supersedes the authorization before.

Mr. MCMILLAN. Here in the District of Columbia we have a multi-billion-dollar payroll. If you give that payroll to my State, I guarantee you we will give the United States Government $120 million a year rather than asking a grant of $28,000. I get rather tired of hearing people complain about what the Federal Government is receiving out of the District of Columbia. Believe me, one of these days there will be a time when there will be a settlement with the taxpayers throughout the country as to whether they will pay a dime toward the District when we are making a payroll available here to the people of $3 or $4 billion a year.

At the present time, the Committee on Appropriations contemplated an appropriation of $150 million for building in the District of Columbia. I have been trying to get a post-office building for my district for 17 years and I have been unable to get one. We just recently completed an $18 million courthouse in the District of Columbia. I do not think a Member here has been able to have a public building erected in his district in the past 15 years, at least not since World War II, to my knowledge. I am glad to have the opportunity to get up here and say a word in support of this grand Committee on Appropriations that has worked morning, noon, and night. I know personally that they have worked until 11 o'clock several evenings trying to solve this problem. I know also that they have had roadblocks thrown in their way by certain people. I have had them thrown in my way as chairman of the legislative Committee on the District of Columbia. But I am glad to see that they came through with flying colors and have brought you a bill which, I think, will take care of the District's affairs. Before this session of the Congress is out, we expect to pass a small-loan bill and several other bills which, I think, will assist the District in securing additional funds.

I want to congratulate the District Commissioners for trying to cooperate with my committee and the subcommittee on fiscal affairs. I also think they have a fine Chief of Police, but I do think we should call to his attention that they should discontinue placing tickets on these school buses and other cars of people visiting the District. These people go back home and get a subpena or a warrant is served on them to come back to Washington and face court proceedings just because they overparked a few minutes. I think we will straighten that situation out in my committee.

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BROYHILL].

Mr. BROYHILL. Mr. Chairman, since we have been talking for the last 30 or 35 minutes about an amendment to be offered rather than an amendment which is now before us for our consideration, I would like to rise in support of that amendment, the amendment which I understand will be offered by my friend, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH] to increase the Federal payment to the District of Columbia from $16 million to $20 million. Of course, I doubt that anything I say here will be anything that has not been mentioned before, but if it is repetition, it serves to emphasize the importance of this matter. This is a perennial argument and a perennial disagreement as to what the so-called contribution or gift or subsidy of the Federal Government to the District of Columbia should be. We have argued a great deal here or rather discussed a great deal whether or not the citizens of the District of Columbia were paying their proper share of the taxes and whether the tax laws are being properly enforced and whether the assessments are being properly levied and whether the tax-collecting procedures are being properly conducted. Well, if those things are not being handled properly, it is still the responsibility of the Congress to see that they are carried out properly. It is our responsibility to see that the citizens of the District of Columbia pay their fair share of the taxes. Yet, by the same token, that does not excuse the Federal Government or the Congress of the United States from their responsibility to pay their share of the cost of financing our Nation's Capital. The Members of this body who have had experience in managing local governments and the fiscal affairs of local communities know that you have to obtain a large portion of their revenue to finance that community from industry in that community. The revenue derived from the taxing of homes and local business will not support the community. We must derive a part of the revenue from industry. The base from which we receive that payroll in the community, namely, industry must pay its share of that burden just like the citizens of Louisville no doubt receive a certain amount of revenue from Churchill Downs operating there. No doubt they pay taxes. Here in the District of Columbia you must understand that the Federal property amounts to between 40 and 50 percent of our assessed valuation, and the base from which that payroll comes is off of the tax rolls entirely. Certainly, we must have industry in every community, and that includes the Federal Government here in the District of Columbia, and they should pay a portion of the operating expenses of that community. The Federal Government is the only exception I know of.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROYHILL. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TABER. I wonder if the gentleman feels that the same rule should be applied to all those communities in my territory where Federal activities take up over 50 percent of the assessable property?

Mr. BROYHILL. I most certainly do. I do not mean national parks, wasteland or desert, but wherever the Federal Government is actually operating an industry or creating a payroll I think they should make some return to the community.

In one of my communities across the river one-sixth of the assessed value is owned by the Federal Government.

Mr. KEARNS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROYHILL. I yield.

Mr. KEARNS. I have great respect for the gentleman from Virginia and his knowledge of this whole situation in the District of Columbia. Will the gentleman admit that even though he comes from Virginia——

Mr. BROYHILL. I admit I come from Virginia, yes.

Mr. KEARNS. Does not the gentleman feel that his first obligation is to the United States of America and also that we as Members of Congress are dedicated to the Federal city where we have the privilege to sit as a legislative body?

Mr. BROYHILL. I most certainly do. It is our responsibility to see that the activities of the Nation's Capital are properly carried out and properly financed. We recognized that last year, recognized that the Capital facilities here in the District of Columbia had deteriorated and that something had to be done, and we did something about it. We consider this as the Nation's Capital and the best interest of all the people of the Nation requires that the city be well managed. That is why we passed the public works bill.

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield briefly?

Mr. BROYHILL. I yield.

Mr. PASSMAN. Is it not true that in most communities where the Government is planning to spend money the businessmen will actually raise the money, buy the land and make the Government a present of it just to get the payroll in their community?

Mr. BROYHILL. That is true. There must be a proper ratio between taxes from industry and from real estate and incomes, and we do not have a proper ratio here in the District of Columbia.

The gentleman from New York was reading from the legislative bill. Of course, in making this agreement last year the Congress of the United States was not making an agreement with the citizens of the District of Columbia; the Congress was the judge, the jury, the prosecuting attorney, and the defense attorney. They agreed with themselves that they would increase the Federal appropriation by $9 million, but at the same time they agreed they would place an additional tax upon all citizens of the District of Columbia without their consent, a tax of $15 million. Now, call it welshing, or reneging, or whatnot, last year within 3 months and again now a year later we refused and are refusing to live up to our obligation, certainly making it exasperating for the people of the District of Columbia who likewise have their responsibility to carry out in this program.

I hope you will vote this amendment out by an overwhelming majority and put a stop to this foolishness in years to come.

Mr. KEARNS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROYHILL. I yield.

Mr. KEARNS. The distinguished gentleman is a member of the Committee on the District of Columbia. How does he feel we can get additional revenue whereby to meet this need?

Mr. BROYHILL. I have no objection whatever to raising the revenue needed. The Federal Government should pay its proportionate share. As I said before, they own about 50 percent of the assessed value of the District of Columbia.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the gentleman from Indiana if he has any further requests for time.

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. I have no further requests for time.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I just want to close by saying that those who

wish to add this $4 million should think of the following facts:

The estimated annual volume of business, an estimate by the Board of Trade, from tourist groups alone in the District of Columbia, is $250 million.

The annual average Federal payroll in the District of Columbia is $1,092,000,000.

Federal projects in the District of Columbia in the course of construction or planning—these are the new ones giving you an idea of the impetus in trade that the Federal Government causes to the District of Columbia are as follows:

The Senate Office Building, $22 million; a similar building for the House of Representatives; the east front of the Capitol, seven or eight million dollars; the new Jones Point development, $14 million; and all of the other buildings that are planned here. Then there is the new Teamsters' Building, $3,400,000, that is being built here for no other reason than that this is the seat of the Federal Government, and they want to give $4 million on top of that. You would think the District was struggling.

Mr. Chairman, I ask that the Clerk read the bill for amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. There being no further requests for time, the Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That there are appropriated for the District of Columbia for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, out of (1) the general fund of the District of Columbia (unless otherwise herein specifically provided), hereinafter known as the general fund, such fund being composed of the revenues of the District of Columbia other than those applied by law to special funds, and $16,000,000, which is hereby appropriated for the purpose out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated (to be advanced July 1, 1955, and of which $5,500,000 shall be available for capital outlay only), (2) the highway fund (when designated as payable therefrom), established by law (D. C. Code, title 47, ch. 19), (3) the water fund (when designated as payable therefrom), established by law (D. C. Code, title 43, ch. 15), and $1,302,000, which is hereby appropriated for the purpose out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated (to be advanced July 1, 1955), (4) the sanitary sewage works fund (when designated as payable therefrom), established by law (Public Law 364, 83d Cong.), and $590,700, which is hereby appropriated for the purpose out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated (to be advanced July 1, 1955), and (5) the motor vehicle parking fund (when designated as payable therefrom), established by law (D. C. Code, title 40, ch. 8), sums as follows:

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SMITH of Virginia: On page 2, line 4, strike out "$16,000,000" and insert "$20,000,000"; and on page 2, line 7, strike out "$5,500,000" and insert "$7,000,000."

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, the hour is getting late and I do not want to consume any more time than is necessary to call your attention to the fact that this is the amendment which I discussed in general debate just a little bit ago.

The purpose of the amendment is to restore the appropriation to the amount recommended in the budget and to the amount of last year's appropriation, to the amount authorized by the public works bill for the District of Columbia.

I again think I must emphasize, because it apparently did not get over to my good friend from Michigan, the difference between this kind of an authorization and an ordinary authorization of which there are many billions of dollars outstanding. Let me emphasize to you again that this authorization bill came in yesterday after thorough consideration by the District of Columbia Fiscal Affairs Committee, by the full Committee, acquiesced in by the distinguished chairman of that Committee, presented by the distinguished chairman of that Committee and passed by this House. There is a difference between that authorization and the usual authorization, in that that authorization carried with it also an obligation which we imposed upon the taxpayers of the District of Columbia to increase their taxes $15 million a year, which has been done. So that the taxpayers of the District of Columbia have been required by this Congress to put $15 million a year in the pot on condition that the Federal Government by your pledge was going to put $9 million additional in the pot. The District of Columbia has put theirs in.

Now, the Congress is asked to repudiate what we did a year ago. That is the story, that is the way it is. It is up to you whether we are going to carry out this contract or bargain which in all propriety we made with the people of the District of Columbia under which we raised their taxes $15 million a year with the understanding and the authorization that it would be matched by $9 million from the Government.

Do we stand by our bargain or do we repudiate it?

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 25 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, first off, I just want to call the attention of my friends—and all of those who have spoken on this bill so far have been my friends—to the language of the bill that made this authorization, and after I have read it, I wonder if any one of them would imagine that it was a contract. This is section (b) on page 13 of that law:

If in any fiscal year or years a deficiency exists between the amount appropriated and the amount of $20 million authorized by this article to be appropriated, additional appropriations are authorized for subsequent fiscal years to pay such deficiency or deficiencies.

Do you suppose they would have put that in if it had been a contract to pay $20 million a year? We all know they would not and that there was no contract and that this is an authorization permitting the Committee on Appropriations to go over the job and see what they think is the right thing to do.

Now, all over this land of ours there are military installations; there are other Federal public buildings and activities, and the fact of the matter is that in a great many of those communities they take up, as they do in one particular town in my territory, more than 50 percent of the assessed valuation of the whole town. We cannot get and we cannot expect to get an appropriation from the Federal Government for the activities that the town has to maintain. It has to be borne by a heavy local tax rate.

What is the picture here in Washington? In almost every community in this land the tax rate is something in the neighborhood of $40 to $50 a thousand or $4 to $5 a hundred on real estate. Now, the tax rate here in the District of Columbia is $2.22 a hundred or about half of what it is in other places. On top of that there is the question of assessments. If we are to believe the stories concerning the sales, reference to which has been made here, assessments here are on the basis of about 30 percent of value. In my own community I bought a lot for $1,125 a year ago. This year it is already assessed for $1,260, or 10 percent above what I paid for it. I figure I paid every dollar it was worth. That is a sample of the way the assessment picture runs.

In other words, out in our home territories, assessments are well up toward 100 percent. Here in Washington they run 30 percent and 35 percent. What is the right thing for us to do? That is the problem that confronts us. It is not a question of any contract, because there is no contract.

I hope that this amendment will be rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. REUSS].

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Chairman, I support the proposal to add to the Federal contribution to the District budget.

The gentleman from Virginia has pointed out that Congress has a moral commitment, made last year, to appropriate $20 million instead of the $16 million recommended by the Committee on Appropriations.

But even without such a commitment, we ought to restore this $4 million. Because unless this is restored, and unless some of the $8,857,791 cut from the budget estimate of expenditures is restored, essential services will be denied. May I cite two examples:

First. The committee deleted funds that would have provided for the hiring of 14 clerks for elementary school administrators, clerks who could relieve harried school administrators of much detail work and free them to perform the kind of creative supervisory work for which they were trained. Today there are some 89 elementary schools in the District, and only 63 clerks. This means that in at least 26 of the District schools the principal has no regular clerical help whatsoever.

Second. Another example of what the cut in Federal contribution to the District will mean may be found in the paring down of the budget requests for building repair funds. The District

public-school administrators originally asked for a $559,000 increase to provide for building upkeep. The Budget Bureau trimmed this figure down to $200,000. The House committee further reduced this figure to an increase of $55,000. At the present time there is $1,100,000 in the building-maintenance fund. District officials estimate that this amount will suffice for 8 months out of the 12-month period. What all of this means is that building maintenance on an $85-million plant will have to be slowed down so that, for example, buildings which should be painted every 5 years for best service can now be painted only once every 7 years. Both of these illustrations would seem to be extensions of the pennywise pound-foolish approach.

The $20 million figure—the $16 million recommended plus an additional $4 million—is not something plucked out of the air. It is a recognition that the District of Columbia, as the Nation's Capital, cannot raise the funds it needs out of its own tax base, for reasons that are inherent in the nature of the Capital District.

First, unlike any other great city in America, a great proportion, something like 42.8 percent of the total, of District of Columbia land and improvements are tax free because they are owned by the Government. If subjected to real estate taxes at the regular rate, this would yield the District an additional $20 million annually; if business taxes in addition to the real estate tax are included, it would yield approximately $40 million annually. The existence of tax-free embassies and other foreign and charitable establishments further narrows the tax base.

But this is not all. Zoning restrictions, and the fact that annexation is impossible, rule out skyscrapers and industrial establishments which could have added millions to the District's tax base. And the nature of Federal employment means that hundreds of thousands of District residents and workers maintain their domicile elsewhere and thus escape in large measure all District taxation, although they add to the District's burdens.

To all this, there must be added the millions of additional costs to the District by reason of being the Nation's Capital. To maintain the trees that line our broad avenues costs $325,000 this year; the national zoo which the District pays for costs another $650,000.

If the cost to the District of being the Federal Capital could be computed, payments by Congress could be justified at the rate of not $20 million a year, not $40 million, but several times that figure. For years Congress attempted a 50–50 sharing of the burdens of District government. If this were done in 1956, Congress would be asked to contribute one-half of $175 million, or $87 million. In the last 25 years preceding 1955, the share Congress has been willing to contribute to the District has steadily declined from 40 percent in 1922 to 8.52 percent in 1954.

In the 1955 fiscal year, Congress adopted a policy of contributing $20 million annually, some improvement over what has gone before. This practice should be continued.

In the light of all this, what are the committee's grounds for wielding the ax on the District budget? Largely, according to the report, because the District officials have been found guilty of fiscal irresponsibility and a lackadaisical attitude toward tapping additional sources of revenue. I shall not attempt to pass judgment on whether these charges are justified. But even if they are, we of the Congress should not take out our wrath on the 802,000 citizens of the District. These citizens, if they lived in any other city in America, could go to the polls at the next election and turn out of office any officials who had proved to be irresponsible or lackadaisical.

But in Washington, the Capital City of the land of the free, the people cannot. And they cannot because we, the Congress, will not let them. Let us not punish the 802,000 citizens for a world they never made. Let us not condemn them because of the acts or omissions of commissioners they did not commission.

Mr. KEARNS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REUSS. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. KEARNS. Does the distinguished gentleman believe this should be the site of the Federal Government and that we as Members of the Congress have that responsibility?

Mr. REUSS. Yes, I think that is entirely true.

Mr. KEARNS. I thank the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KEARNS].

Mr. KEARNS. Mr. Chairman, I support the amendment offered by our distinguished colleague from Virginia [Mr. SMITH]. Today we are not referring to him as chairman of the Committee on Rules, we are referring to him as a member of the Committee on the District of Columbia, Washington, D. C. In the years I have been privileged to serve on the committee with HOWARD SMITH he has made a contribution that is out of this world to the District of Columbia.

Mr. VELDE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEARNS. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. VELDE. I also will support the amendment offered by the distinguished gentleman from Virginia, our good friend [Mr. SMITH]. I feel that it has real merit. We do owe the responsibility the gentleman from Pennsylvania mentioned. We Members of Congress also receive some of the benefits that derive from this type of program.

Mr. KEARNS. I thank the gentleman.

May I say to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] and the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] that this is no reflection on the Committee on Appropriations. As I have said before, I feel that we on the District Committee can enact legislation to make up this deficit. I think the Appropriations Subcommittee and their distinguished chairman, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. RABAUT], and the gentleman from Indiana, EARL WILSON, the ranking minority member, did a commendable job. All I want to happen here today is that we acknowledge and respect the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH] to restore the full District budget, and then let us, the members of the District Committee, work out the problem of enacting legislation to produce the revenue needed for the Federal city.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HARRIS].

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, I regret to find myself in opposition to the distinguished chairman and other Members of the Subcommittee on Appropriations for the District of Columbia, and his fine colleagues, the members of that committee. It is a very rare thing that you find me on the floor of the House disagreeing with the work of the Appropriations Committee, because I realize your difficult task.

I recall that the first year I came to Congress the annual budget of the District of Columbia was about $50 million. Now, as you notice here, it runs into a lot of money, $175 million, which means that your task has become more difficult and complicated each year.

I think the committee have done a good job, as you always do, and as you should, in scrutinizing the budget and the fiscal affairs of the District of Columbia. I regret that I do not agree with the distinguished chairman of our legislative committee. Ordinarily, we see eye to eye on matters affecting the District of Columbia.

I was a member of the fiscal affairs subcommittee which, after lengthy hearings, brought about the 1954 public works bill. We went into the tax problems of the District and we labored long in an effort to bring about increased taxes to meet these needs. When it came to the question of the Federal contribution, we had extensive discussions in approving a $305 million public-works program which was needed in the District of Columbia and that was for schools and various other things.

Yet, here it is proposed to reduce the Federal payment by $4 million; we reduce the capital outlay by that amount, which provides for schools and other needed public-works buildings for the District of Columbia.

I have inquired of both the chairman of this Subcommittee on Appropriations and the chairman of our Legislative Committee for an explanation of the effect of this reduction on capital expenditures. I have not received yet a satisfactory explanation.

When we increased the taxes on the people of the District of Columbia by $15 million per year under the public works program and tax adjustment of 1954, we increased the Federal contribution from $11 million to $20 million. Experience had shown and it is understandable that the city officials meet administrative expenses of the District out of the general fund first. Capital outlays or construction programs follow with what might be left. Realizing this, I took the position that if we were to increase the Federal contribution that most of it should apply

to capital construction so badly needed to meet actual requirements of the District. This means schools, and how badly we need additional school facilities. As I said before, 13,000 students need additional school facilities. This means libraries, parks, recreation, and so forth.

Consequently, I was responsible for an amendment which provided that the first $13 million of Federal contribution could be utilized for administrative expenses of the District. That was an increase of only $2 million heretofore authorized and appropriated. All above $13 million up to the authorized $20 million had to go for needed capital expenditures.

Now you would reduce the budget request of $20 million to $16 million.

Of course, the District Commissioners are going to use $13 million of that for expenses in the operation of the District government. Therefore, under the provisions of the law, you leave only $3 million that can be spent for new and needed construction. I repeat, this reduction applies to needed new construction for schoolroom facilities, and so forth.

Now, had you made the reduction apply to the $13 million available for expenses of the District, I would not be complaining, because I think it could work out.

I invite you to visit some of these schools. I have been there. I would like to show you some of the conditions and you would have a feeling of shame, as I did, that your Nation's Capital was so derelict in providing for the kind of facilities for our children that they should have in so many instances.

Now, the committee says that you have $5,500,000 for capital outlays. This means the total capital outlay. A little over $4 million is provided for our schools. Under the proviso that I previously referred to, the amount above $13 million that must go for capital outlay must be matched.

Now, this means, as I interpret that, you cannot even spend all of the $16 million that you appropriate here for Federal contribution. Therefore the action of the committee in actuality is to make available even a lesser amount than the $16 million.

I do not quarrel with the continuing controversy as to how much Federal contribution should be appropriated for the District budget. That is a matter which the Appropriations Committee, I think, should rightfully inquire into and determine. My disappointment is that your action here does not go to that point, but, in my opinion, to the faith and credit which this Congress gave for these needed capital programs. I say we did commit ourselves to this needed long-term program, and it is our duty and responsibility to carry it out. Let us not lose faith with those on whom we imposed higher taxes for a specific and needed program.

This amendment should be adopted.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. O'HARA].

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered by my good friend and colleague, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH]. I call your attention to the fact I think, perhaps, my distinguished friend from New York and I could at least prepare a record of some kind so that the same arguments which we made last year would not have to be repeated this year. I do think in fairness that we had exactly the same argument this year that we had last year. We had the same old arguments about the assessed valuations. We had the old argument that there was not any commitment. In calling attention, as our distinguished friend from New York did, to the language of the bill, I think being a member of the legislative committee, if he wants an interpretation of that language, I can give him an interpretation. Subsection (b) was written in in the event the public works program reached the point where the money appropriated could not be used. There was no question about it. It was not a situation with an "if" in it. Now that is my interpretation of the language as a member of the legislative committee.

I am going to say to you very frankly here today, and I especially call this to the attention of my good friend, the gentleman from Michigan, the chairman of the subcommittee, that you are going to find yourself in a very sorry situation so far as the fiscal affairs of the District of Columbia are concerned before the adjournment of this Congress.

I am to say to you, as my friend, the gentleman from Arkansas said, these $4 million come out of your public works program. There cannot be any question about it. If you do not want these schools and these additions which are so badly needed in the District, then you might as well know that you could not more effectively cut them off in any other way than by doing exactly what you are doing. I am sorry to say we have to come here year after year and fight over this little sum of $4 million when we can spend billions and billions of dollars all over the world, which we do not know whether we get a dime's worth of good out of, and yet people think they get a great deal of satisfaction from it. But when you bring it home to our Nation's Capital, why then it is another story.

I say to you again, and I hate to be repetitious, that you have here in this little area of the District of Columbia which under our Constitution we are charged with managing, a situation where 42 percent of the taxable area is owned by the Federal Government and, therefore, not assessable for tax purposes. I do not think it is going to break the Federal Government, I think their contribution on an area basis is terribly low, and it is to be regretted that each year we have to come in and fuss and stew over whether it will be $8 million or $11 million or $15 million or $20 million. It is unfortunate.

I, too, urge the House to support the amendment which has been offered by the gentleman from Virginia.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. PASSMAN] is recognized.

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Chairman, it is not often I indulge in debate in the House. It is a rather difficult assignment to be on the District Subcommittee, but I think it should again be pointed out at the expense of being repetitious that not only do you have a very low assessment on real estate in the city of Washington, and on inventories and on personal property, but you also have one of the lowest ad valorem tax rates of any city in the country.

I think the able gentleman from New York brought out the fact that the assessment here is about 50 percent of what it is in many cities in his State and the ad valorem tax is less than half.

It is my understanding that under the law the Commissioners are directed to raise tax rates to offset any operating deficit. May I again direct to the attention of the committee that your committee is recommending $166 million to operate the city government for fiscal year 1956.

If you will refer to page 22 of the hearings you will observe that this appropriation has mushroomed each year since the end of World War II. I believe after looking at the facts that you will feel the committee has done a good job in recommending funds. You do have a very wealthy city, great prosperity, and the greatest per capita income of any city in the Nation. So I think that by making this small cut it will prove to be an impetus to encourage the Commissioners to raise taxes to offset any deficit.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. PASSMAN. I yield.

Mr. TABER. Is it not true that the District Commissioners are directed by the statute—not authorized, but directed—to levy a tax upon real estate sufficient to meet the requirements that are set up in the budget that is presented to us and that we appropriate for?

Mr. PASSMAN. That is my understanding. You know and I know they are not doing it and they are not going to do it as long as this Congress appropriates funds out of the United States Treasury.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. WILSON] is recognized.

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman——

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, the surest road to favorable publicity to social advancement here in Washington is to do what the local newspapers say should be done. The Members of the House are an alien group in a hostile land. There is no question about that. We who are sent here by the people of our districts are tolerated—hardly welcome. The editors of the papers seem to know more about what the Members should know, what they should think, what they should do than either the Members themselves or the people who send them here. There is no question about that. Not if you follow the editorials closely. The Members of the House do not need to do any thinking, do not need to give any consideration to anything that is coming up in the House. All we need do is to read

the editorials in the local papers and you cannot go wrong—in their opinion—that is—if you take their views.

No doubt they mean well, have superior intelligence, better information—or have they?

If I understand the situation, certainly, none of them were ever elected to represent the people, they just come along and tell the people's Representatives what to do on almost every issue. And if the Members do not follow their views—well, he gets a scolding—and sometimes abuse. The payroll here in Washington is a constant one; there are no closing of factories, few are laid off, once in a while, one and then if it is a Federal employee there is a howl that goes to high heaven that would make even the stars weep. This city is fortunate. The average income here is higher than in any other city of the country, yet they are always crying, always squawking, ridiculing the dumb Congressman from the sticks. But they will accept our money for merchandise and service. And the gentleman from Virginia gets more for his district and his State and city than anyone else unless it be another gentleman from the same State, Mr. BROYHILL—and that is proper, and I refer to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH], my good friend, Mr. SMITH, Judge SMITH. He has boosted the appropriations for the city and the price of milk sold by his dairymen over there in Virginia for as long as I have been here. And that is for 20 years. Higher prices for the milk purchased by Washington people—more money for city folk so they can buy more milk.

I am not critical. I just admire his ability, but that is no reason to add this $4 million to this bill.

Not only do they, the people of the city and District, have that payroll from sums contributed by everyone in the country, but they have these hundreds of thousands of visitors who come here and leave their dollars—more than a few in number. They charge our visitors plenty. That money all goes into the District here. Not only that, but when a schoolboy comes down from Michigan these local boys beat him up and he is sent to the hospital. Of course that is exceptional, a gross exaggeration of what some seem to feel toward Congressmen when we do not follow their wishes. Now I get from the papers that the authorities intend to let the boys off on a charge of simple assault and battery, although they admit facts which show they are thieves or robbers and cowards. They might well be taken into the woodshed. That is the Washington way.

Why, with all those blessings which come to the people who live here, with the valuation of the real estate as has been shown here by speaker after speaker, the valuation of the real estate down all the time as compared with the valuation of the real estate back home, we should go ahead and give them more and more money every year, I cannot understand.

The Appropriations Committee says so much. Some on the District Committee demand more. Why not follow the Committee on Appropriations?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. RABAUT].

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, in answer to the gentleman from Arkansas, I refer to page 2, line 7 of the bill which contains the following language: "of which $5,500,000 shall be available for capital outlay only." That supersedes the law to which the gentleman refers.

Regarding the $4 million item, the reduction in capital outlay is $1,500,000. That is exactly the allotment made this year for the bridge we held up because they cannot decide whether it is to be a bridge or tunnel. Out of the general fund it is $2,500,000. The two figures added together make $4 million.

The District got all of the schools it requested, it got an increase in the amount of money over 1955 for the sewers, it got teachers in excess of the request that was made by the Commissioners for the children that needed teachers. The amount of $4 million, if allowed, will give the general fund an excess of over $3 million. Now, if you want to hand to the District that much money and take it away from projects in other parts of the country, all right, for, after all, there is a limit even to the expenditures of the United States Government.

I hope that the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH] will be defeated.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. SMITH of Virginia) there were—ayes 59, noes 71.

Mr. KEARNS. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. SMITH of Virginia and Mr. RABAUT.

The committee again divided, and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 85, noes 86.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the bill be dispensed with and that the bill be open to amendment at any point.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I offer a committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment offered by Mr. RABAUT: On page 19, line 21, strike out "$9,245,729" and insert "$9,600,000."

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, to explain the purpose of this amendment, which comes under Public Welfare, it is for the purpose of keeping the grants at the present level.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I think our colleagues made a mistake in turning down the amendment providing for an increased appropriation for the District. I understand a motion will be made to recommit the bill.

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. The gentleman is not speaking on the amendment.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. My request was to be recognized and I was recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman must confine his remarks to the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair understood that the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. MILLER] asked for recognition to speak on the amendment.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Then I shall speak on the amendment, Mr. Chairman.

This amendment, of course, is for old-age assistance, to add some additional funds for that purpose. If old-age assistance is going to be provided, more funds will be needed.

I have been on the Committee for the District of Columbia for 11 out of the 13 years that I have been here. If we are going to treat the old people in the District as they should be treated, additional money will have to be provided. These people do not have a vote here in the District of Columbia. They have no way of voting on these appropriations. Members of the House are their councilmen, their mayor. We act to raise the pay of their judges, to provide compensation for the old folks, for the widows and children, and others who would qualify under this amendment. Unless we furnish the money the assistance cannot be provided.

That process applies all through and affects the matter of raising the money for old-age assistance and other activities. It makes no difference whether the money is raised through the Assessor's Office or not. Perhaps some of the assessments have not been right.

In my own city, part of the money collected on cigarette and gasoline taxes is funneled into old-age assistance. I have thought that in the District perhaps another 1-cent tax on gasoline or a raise in the tax on cigarettes or perhaps a slightly larger sales tax might be advisable. Such money could be funneled into the old-age assistance fund. It might be the answer to get sufficient funds to do some of this more important work.

I hope that a motion will be made to recommit and the amendment that was voted down by a margin of one vote will be favorably acted on so that we may give the District the amount of money that this Congress last year promised to them.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the next committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment offered by Mr. RABAUT: On page 42, line 15, after *"Provided"*, insert a comma.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, this is just a perfecting amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BROYHILL. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BROYHILL: On page 8, line 18, strike out "$27,996,810" and insert in lieu thereof "$28,264,309."

Mr. BROYHILL. Mr. Chairman, this amendment increases the amount in this section by an amount of $267,499, which is distributed in the following manner: $81,199 for 18 additional special teaching positions for remedial special work for retarded children; $41,300 for 14 additional clerks for elementary schools; and $145,000 for increasing the funds for repairs and maintenance in the schools.

I know it would be a great deal better to offer this amendment in three separate parts, but for parliamentary expediency I have grouped them together. However, they all have to do with increasing the amount of the appropriation for school facilities in order to bring them up to the absolute minimum requirements, the amount requested by the Superintendent of Schools and also by the Commissioners.

As to the $81,199 for special teaching positions, I would like to commend the committee for appropriating sufficient funds for 21 additional teachers. The School Board has requested 50 additional teaching positions. The committee restored 21. However, this amendment asks for 18 more, making a total of 39 additional teaching positions for the special teachers of retarded children.

It is completely unfair to the other students in the school as well as the retarded children to attempt to keep both groups in the same classes. I understand many of these elementary classes have 46 students, and it is almost impossible for the teachers to give the necessary attention to those who are unable to keep up with the average students in the class. Any efforts to drop back and take care of the retarded students would necessarily hold back the progress of the entire class. I think the subcommittee will agree that permitting the 21 additional positions would have a great deal to do with preventing juvenile delinquency in the future.

As far as the 14 additional clerks are concerned, of the 89 elementary schools in the District of Columbia 63 have clerks at this time. We are asking for 14 clerks, 1 for each of 14 schools. Actually, if these clerks are not installed, the clerical work, which I understand is very extensive, for many of these elementary schools have 1,300 students, will have to be performed by the principals and the teachers themselves, thereby taking their time away from the duties they are supposed to perform.

As far as the $145,000 additional for maintenance is concerned, the Superintendent of Schools asked for $1,600,000, approximately 2 percent of the total value of the school buildings here in the District of Columbia, which I understand is approximately $86 million. The District of Columbia Commissioners cut down that amount. They asked for $200,000 more than what had been granted over the period of the last few years, but the subcommittee cut that amount down to $55,000. This amount is merely bringing the appropriation for maintenance and repairs up to the amount the Commissioners originally asked.

Again, if that amount is not appropriated for maintenance and repairs, I do not believe it will save anything in the long run; in fact, it is something like being pennywise and pound foolish. We are going to have to maintain and repair these buildings, we are going to have to keep them up. If we do not do it sufficiently, as time goes on it will cost a great deal more in the long run.

I have here some examples, getting back to the special teachers that are needed, of some of the conditions which exist in the District of Columbia schools today.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the pending amendment close in 5 minutes, and I ask to be recognized for the 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, with all respect to the gentleman from Virginia, on the item of repairs and maintenance, the amount in the bill was $1,100,700. We added $55,000 bringing it to a total of $1,155,700. So much for that.

The committee expressed its great interest in deficient children of every kind. We provided money in this bill which was not even allowed by the Commissioners of the District of Columbia. We do not want to be outdone in our generosity to the District, but I want to tell you exactly, and I think you will all be interested in knowing what we have accomplished. We allowed the amount of $96,810 for 21 additional teachers. That is 9 positions for teachers of atypical children, 9 positions for teachers for speech correction and 2 positions for the visiting instruction corps and 4 positions for remedial reading and 2 positions for the mentally retarded children. We did not approve 3 positions for music classes as much as I like music, as all of you know, nor 3 positions for the art classes. And also there were 5 positions for the science classes. I feel that the committee has done well in its study of this problem, and that we are making progress in trying to help where help is needed. We want them to show what progress is going to be made with the expenditure of roughly $100,000.

Mr. Chairman, I ask for a vote on the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BROYHILL].

The amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any further amendments? If not, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. RABAUT].

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to, and that the bill, as amended, do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. FORAND, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 6239) making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of said District for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, and for other purposes, had directed him to report the bill back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill, as amended, do pass.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill and all amendments thereto to final passage.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en gross.

The question is on the amendments.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I am opposed as to the size of the Federal contribution, Mr. Speaker. It is too much, in my opinion. I am opposed to the bill, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman a member of this committee?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I am a member of the full Committee on Appropriations, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. KEARNS. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the District Committee of Washington, D. C., I have a motion for recommital on the bill.

The SPEAKER. If the gentleman from Minnesota is a member of the Committee on Appropriations his motion would take precedence.

Mr. KEARNS. Mr. Speaker——

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman from Pennsylvania rise?

Mr. KEARNS. As representing the District Committee may I have the privilege of collaborating with the gentleman in the motion?

The SPEAKER. Debate is out of order. The Clerk will report the motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN moves to recommit the bill to the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the motion to recommit.

The previous question was ordered.

The motion to recommit was rejected.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. KEARNS. Mr. Speaker, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were refused.

The bill was passed; and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members who have spoken on the bill may have 5 days within which to revise and extend their remarks and that all Members may within that period extend their remarks on the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

SECOND URGENT DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATION ACT, 1955

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Appropriations, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of House Joint Resolution 310, making additional appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1955, and for other purposes.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I wonder if the gentleman would explain the bill.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, this resolution is in the nature of an urgent deficiency appropriation. It provides additional funds for two agencies, one the so-called Hoover Commission in the amount of $263,475, and the other the Veterans' Administration in the amount of $25 million for readjustment benefits. These two agencies find themselves without funds which must be provided before the next payday, and for that reason we have combined them and introduced this as a joint resolution. The Congress in S. 1763 has just extended the life of the Hoover Commission to June 30, 1955, with additional 90 days in which to wind up its business. The $25 million is required to meet an unanticipated increase in the number of veterans in training.

I yield to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS].

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, the veterans' item is one about which I think no one will have the slightest trouble. It is for education and training. We gave them one deficiency in March for $155 million. Unfortunately, there was an increase in enrollment. The month of May is the largest month for enrollments during the whole calendar year. They sent a budget estimate over for $28 million. We figured every angle, and could not figure they needed any more than $19,600,000; but since this is a no-year appropriation and it will go over until next year if the money is not used, and it is a debt that we have to pay, the committee recommended $25 million.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. GARY].

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York has the floor under a reservation of objection.

Mr. TABER. I will yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Speaker, with regard to the item for the Hoover Commission, this House just a few days ago extended the life of the Hoover Commission for 30 days. It would have expired on May 30. We extended it to June 30 and gave them 90 days to liquidate after that expiration date. For this additional month and the 90 days' liquidation period they asked for $263,475. The committee, however, put language in the bill tying this appropriation up with the authorization of the House so that the appropriation will expire with the Commission on June 30 plus the 90 days for liquidation.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, what is this all about?

Mr. GARY. This is for the investigations by the Hoover Commission.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. An investigation of the Hoover Commission?

Mr. GARY. The Hoover Commission has been making studies for the past year. The House acted on a bill just a short time ago extending their expiration date for making such investigations, which would have been on May 30. They asked for additional time, they were given 30 days additional time by this House and now to meet that action of the House they need these additional funds.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. The Hoover Commission needs more money to do some more investigating or the House is investigating the Hoover Commission?

Mr. GARY. The Hoover Commission is asking for these funds to complete its investigations and its reports.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the House joint resolution, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That the following sums are appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to supply additional appropriations (this act may be cited as the "Second Urgent Deficiency Appropriation Act, 1955") for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1955, and for other purposes, namely:

INDEPENDENT OFFICES

Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government

Salaries and Expenses

For an additional amount for "Salaries and expenses," to complete the operations of the Commission as provided by Public Law — (S. 1763), 84th Congress, $263,475.

Veterans' Administration

For an additional amount for "Readjustment benefits," $25 million, to remain available until expended.

The House joint resolution 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.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. DAWSON of Utah (at the request of Mr. MARTIN) was given permission to address the House for 30 minutes on Monday next.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM FOR NEXT WEEK

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, may I ask our distinguished majority leader what the program will be for next week?

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, in response to the inquiry of my friend from Massachusetts, Monday is District day. There are five bills on the calendar: S. 727, the judges salary bill, H. R. 6063, to amend the District of Columbia Traffic Act, H. R. 191, election of delegates to political conventions, H. R. 2406, to exempt gift taxes without District of Columbia, and H. R. 3908 to regulate fares for the transportation of school children.

On Tuesday we will take up H. R. 6367, the Department of Commerce appropriation bill for 1956, consideration to continue until final action on the bill.

For Wednesday, Thursday and Friday: House Resolution 244, Select Committee White County Bridge Commission, H. R. 2851, the agricultural farm commodity bill, which is a relief measure and H. R. 5881, involving the Federal reclamation law.

There is the usual reservation that conference reports may be brought up at any time and any further program will be announced later.

DISPENSING WITH CALENDAR WEDNESDAY

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order on Calendar Wednesday of next week be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL MONDAY NEXT

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, on yesterday the gentleman from Massachusetts said that if we finished the conscription bill and the District of Columbia appropriation bill he would then ask unanimous consent that the House adjourn until Monday next. I do not believe we have finished the conscription bill this afternoon. Can the gentleman tell us whether that could not be brought up tomorrow and action on it completed tomorrow?

Mr. McCORMACK. The answer to the gentleman's inquiry is that the bill is not coming up tomorrow and will not come up next week. That is a matter for the chairman, to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the

Whole House on the State of the Union. There is no such intention. So, that is a situation I have no control over. I am keeping my promise so far as the business of the week is concerned, and the business of the week has been completed.

Mr. GROSS. I think we all came in here this morning at 10 o'clock under the unanimous-consent agreement yesterday to come in at 10 o'clock this morning to finish that bill, and in 2 days we have been running up the bill and down again and wasting all kinds of time doing that very thing.

Mr. McCORMACK. I am not going to get into any discussion with the gentleman from Iowa, because that would be unnecessary and would serve neither one of us any good. The fact is that the Committee rose. That was the action of the Committee of the Whole. And there is going to be no motion made to go back into the Committee of the Whole next week. That is the answer to the gentleman's inquiry. So far as the gentleman from Massachusetts is concerned, there is no more business for the remainder of the week.

Mr. GROSS. I was in hopes that the gentleman would say that this bill could be brought up tomorrow and be disposed of. It was brought up under the assumption it was urgently needed.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman from Massachusetts has no control over that situation.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman from Massachusetts has no control over the programing of legislation?

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman from Massachusetts announces the program after consultation with chairmen of committees on bills that are reported out and where rules are in order, but the gentleman from Massachusetts has no control over a committee that is considering a bill and resolving itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill. My friend from Iowa knows that is so, so why argue about it? I say the gentleman from Massachusetts has no control over that, and that is a correct statement.

Mr. GROSS. I hope the bill can be brought in and disposed of. I withdraw my reservation of objection, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, my motives are pure, I want to assure the gentleman from Massachusetts, and my intentions innocent.

Mr. McCORMACK. I am glad my friend said that.

Mr. GROSS. Does the gentleman imply that my motives were not pure?

Mr. McCORMACK. He does. I do not.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I am just seeking information and it is this: Can the gentleman tell us whether that bill that we were considering yesterday and earlier today will come up next week?

Mr. McCORMACK. No, it will not.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I thank the gentleman. I withdraw my reservation of objection, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Banking and Currency may have until midnight Saturday night to file reports on H. R. 6227, H. R. 619, H. R. 5512, and S. 755.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE ON THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the District of Columbia may have until midnight tomorrow to file certain reports.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

REPRESENTATIVE HOLIFIELD ASKS PRESIDENT TO EXPLAIN ADMINISTRATION POLICY DILEMMA

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include as part of my remarks two tables listing names of organizations which have approved the subject of my remarks and to include certain tables pertaining to that subject.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I wish to propound a number of significant questions which require answers from the highest level of the administration.

They are questions important to all of us. They involve matters bearing upon our national economy. They are directly associated with policies enunciated by President Eisenhower.

Mr. Speaker, the administration has created a crossroads which has brought about an unhappy situation, especially unhappy for the White House policymakers.

At this crossroads there are two signs. Pointing to one road is a sign which says: "Go this way to lower price supports and decreased acreage allotments for farmers."

Pointing to the other road is a sign: "Go this way to spend billions for two reclamation projects which will grow more farm products to be supported."

As far as I can determine, the administration has not yet achieved the miracle of going in two directions at the same time.

And I should like Mr. Eisenhower to explain if he expects Congress to achieve such a feat in formulating legislation that will benefit the national economy.

Here we are confronted with two conflicting policies, both endorsed by the President. One policy calls for sharp reductions in farm-price supports and a decrease in agricultural acreage. The other policy calls for spending enormous sums of public money to build two extremely costly desert reclamation projects which would produce more farm products to be supported by the Nation's taxpayers.

I feel sure that the administration leaders realize they have created a dilemma that can lead to serious difficulties for them. I also feel that the Nation is entitled to an explanation as to how this conflict is to be resolved.

I wish to make it plain that my remarks must not be construed as an attack on all reclamation policies. I am attempting to understand the program of the administration, which is my business, and I am also striving to make these issues clear to the American people.

I believe it is the right of every farmer, all of whom will be injured by such a conflict, to demand an explanation. Equally it is to the advantage of every Federal taxpayer in our cities to ask how the administration expects him to travel simultaneously along two different roads.

SUPPORT PROGRAM

The administration's present program provides for flexible price supports on a scale ranging from 75 to 90 percent of parity. Acreage allotments have been drastically curtailed.

Ostensibly this program was devised by administration policy makers with the hope of decreasing the enormous surplus of agricultural products which now bulge our warehouses throughout the country. The flood from the farms continues to pour in on the Commodity Credit Corporation, which informs me that as of February 28, 1955, their total assets amounted to $7,096,490,858.

I do not know whether they are assets or not.

But I do know that almost daily we read of desperate attempts by the Department of Agriculture to find ways and means of disposing of some of this gigantic hoard of food and fiber. Scheme after scheme is devised in the hope of relieving the taxpayer of this gigantic burden.

It costs the Government about three-quarters of a million dollars a day to store these mountains of grains, cottons, fats, and dairy products. Acreages are being restricted and parity levels lowered. With few insignificant exceptions it can not even be given away or sold at below market prices, and what has been done so far has not permitted the taxpayers to escape heavy losses.

A MILLION NEW ACRES

Now let us look at another program of the administration. It has given its blessing to the proposed multi-billion-dollar upper Colorado River project and to the proposed Fryingpan-Arkansas project, both in the States of the upper Colorado River Basin—Utah, Colorado, Wyoming, and New Mexico.

Together these two projects would provide irrigation water for approximately a million acres of land. That

means that a million acres of dry and mountainous land in these States would grow some kind of crops.

The cost of bringing water to these arid lands would run as high as $5,000 an acre, and the subsidy which the taxpayers of the United States would be forced to provide for these two projects would be at least $4.5 billion, and possibly much more.

Here are two brief tables based on Bureau of Reclamation reports to House and Senate Interior Committees on these two projects:

Upper Colorado River storage project

Estimated initial construction cost	$1,600,000,000
Hidden subsidy cost to taxpayers	$4,000,000,000
Subsidy cost per acre	$5,000
Subsidy cost per 150-acre farm	$750,000
Number of 150-acre farms	5,066
Number of acres to receive water	760,000

Fryingpan-Arkansas project

Estimated initial construction cost	[1] $156,541,000
Hidden subsidy cost to taxpayers	$500,000,000
Subsidy cost per acre	$1,600
Subsidy cost per 160-acre farm	$256,000
Number of 160-acre farms	1,900
Number of acres to receive water	309,000

[1] The Reclamation Bureau's construction estimates on this project have been revised several times; repayment periods have been changed; power rates have been changed. The above construction estimate is entirely unrealistic. One item alone will illustrate this: Involved are several score miles of open canals at an altitude of seven to ten thousand feet. Engineers have testified that these canals will have to be covered, to prevent them from freezing and to operate them efficiently, and the Bureau of Reclamation has admitted that to cover the canals and make conduits out of them would cost an additional $64 million. That very thing had to be done on the Colorado-Big Thompson project, greatly increasing construction costs, and Congress was obliged to appropriate additional money. Adding $64 million for the covered conduits would increase the estimated construction cost of the Fryingpan project to more than $200 million. In such case, repayment periods would have to be lengthened, and subsidy costs would greatly increase.

Now, the matter to which I am directing my remarks is this conflict between two promulgated policies of the administration, policies endorsed and vigorously supported by President Eisenhower.

In 1954, the President signed the agricultural act which cut price supports. Acreage allotments were decreased. In 1954, the President endorsed the proposed upper Colorado River project in a statement to the press issued at the White House. In September 1954, the President wrote to Senator BENNETT again placing his stamp of approval on the project. Then in his State of the Union message delivered on January 6 of this year, the President urged approval of the upper Colorado River development.

All during this period, the Chief Executive had given his unqualified endorsement to Secretary Benson's proposals and the decreasing of price supports and the curtailment of acreage allotments on supported crops.

Also, all during this period—and continuing to the present time—Secretary McKay had been traveling through the land voicing his approval of, and asking support for, the upper Colorado River project and the Fryingpan-Arkansas project. The Bureau of Reclamation sent experts to testify before congressional committees in favor of both projects.

Here, indeed, we have a strange situation. We have two programs, both advertised as being designed to aid the economy of the Nation, and each in direct conflict with the other.

With one hand the administration is cutting price supports and decreasing acreage allotments. With the other hand the administration is asking Congress for billions of dollars to grow more crops to be supported and to increase agricultural acreage.

WHAT KIND OF CROPS?

Among the crops now being supported by the Nation's taxpayers are the following: Corn; cotton; wheat; butter; oats; butter oil; cheese; milk, dried; wool; rye; barley; beans, dry; cottonseed oil; grain sorghum; seeds, hay, and pasture; soybeans.

The upper Colorado River project and the Fryingpan-Arkansas project would supply irrigation water for more than a million acres of land. In the light of the present discussion, it is very important to consider what crops would be grown on this land.

For this information, I turned to the reports of the Bureau of Reclamation, which is so ardently supporting the projects before Congress.

FRYINGPAN GROWS SUPPORTED CROPS

The Bureau has this to say about the kind of crops that would be grown on the Fryingpan-Arkansas project—House Document No. 187, 83d Congress, 1st session, July 1953:

> The principal irrigated crops are alfalfa, corn, grain, sorghum, sugar beets, barley, wheat, truck crops, and dry beans. Dairying and poultry raising are enterprises near market outlets.

Of the principal crops which the Bureau says the Fryingpan project would grow, corn, grain, sorghum, barley, wheat, and dry beans are now supported. Sugar beets are under the restriction program of the Sugar Act of 1951, and the price is held up to a desired level. What are called proportionate shares are established by the Secretary of Agriculture. Thus, if more sugar-beet land is brought into production, shares of all others must be decreased accordingly.

A few days ago—April 18, 1955—during debate in the Senate on the upper Colorado River project bill, S. 500, Senator WATKINS, of Utah, said to Senator DOUGLAS, of Illinois:

> Does the Senator from Illinois realize that the agricultural crops produced on lands under irrigation in projects such as the ones sought to be authorized by means of this bill are not the types that are in surplus supply?

UPPER COLORADO CROPS SUPPORTED

There seems to be some difference of opinion between Senator WATKINS and the Bureau of Reclamation. For information about the kind of crops which the upper Colorado River project would produce, I again turn to the official reports of the Bureau.

In the upper Colorado River bill—S. 500—recently approved by the Senate, there are 6 proposed storage and power dams and 34 participating irrigation projects.

Now before the House are five upper Colorado River project bills—H. R. 3383, H. R. 270, H. R. 2836, H. R. 3384, and H. R. 4488. They contain between 13 and 34 participating irrigation projects.

From Reclamation Bureau reports, I have compiled a table showing the type of crops which would be grown on each of the 34 proposed projects, and whether or not they are supported crops.

The table follows:

Name of project	Acres to be irrigated	Crops to be grown	Crops supported
La Barge	7,970	Hay	
		Small grains	Yes.
		Pasture	
		Dairy cows	Yes.
		Sheep	Yes.
Seedskadee	60,720	Dairy cows	Yes.
		Sheep	Yes.
		Hay	
		Pasture	
		Small grains	Yes.
Lyman	40,600	Hay	
		Pasture	
		Small grains	Yes.
		Dairy cows	Yes.
		Beef cattle	
Silt	7,300	Alfalfa	
		Small grains	Yes.
		Sugar beets	Yes.
		Potatoes	
		Dairy cows	Yes.
		Beef cattle	
		Sheep	Yes.
Smith Fork	10,430	Hay	
		Small grains	Yes.
		Pasture	
		Dairy cows	Yes.
		Beef cattle	
Paonia	17,040	Grain	Yes.
		Fruit	
		Dairy cows	Yes.
		Beef cattle	
Florida	18,950	Dairy cows	Yes.
		Beef cattle	
		Small grains	Yes.
		Alfalfa	
Pine River	15,150	Dairy cows	Yes.
		Beef cattle	
		Hay	
		Small grains	Yes.
Emery County	24,080	Alfalfa	
		Grains	Yes.
		Beef cattle	
		Dairy cows	Yes.
		Fruit	
		Sheep	Yes.
Central Utah	60,380	Alfalfa	
		Grain	Yes.
		Fruit	
		Sugar beets	Yes.
		Dairy cows	Yes.
		Beef cattle	
		Sheep	Yes.
Hammond	3,670	Alfalfa	
		Grains	Yes.
		Beans	Yes.
		Fruit	
		Dairy cows	Yes.
		Sheep	Yes.
Eden	20,200	Hay	
		Pasture	
		Dairy cows	Yes.
		Sheep	Yes.
		Beef cattle	
Gooseberry	16,400	Alfalfa	
		Pasture	
		Grain	Yes.
		Dairy cows	Yes.
		Beef cattle	
		Sheep	Yes.
Navaho	137,240	Alfalfa	
		Grains	Yes.
		Pasture	
		Fruit	
		Vegetables	
		Dairy cows	Yes.
		Sheep	Yes.
San Juan-Chama	225,000	Alfalfa	
		Grains	Yes.
		Pasture	
		Dairy cows	Yes.
		Sheep	Yes.

Name of project	Acres to be irrigated	Crops to be grown	Crops supported
Rabbit Ear	19,190	Hay	
		Pasture	
		Small grains	Yes.
		Beef cattle	
		Sheep	Yes.
		Dairy cows	Yes.
Troublesome	13,640	Hay	
		Pasture	
		Small grains	Yes.
		Beef cattle	
		Sheep	Yes.
		Dairy cows	Yes.
West Divide	65,610	Alfalfa	
		Small grains	Yes.
		Pasture	
		Beef cattle	
		Sheep	Yes.
		Dairy cows	Yes.
Savery-Pot Hook	31,610	Alfalfa	
		Small grains	Yes.
		Pasture	
		Dairy cows	Yes.
		Sheep	Yes.
Dolores	66,000	Alfalfa	
		Small grains	Yes.
		Pasture	
		Beans	Yes.
		Dairy cows	Yes.
		Beef cattle	
Sublette	84,000	Hay	
		Pasture	
		Small grains	Yes.
		Beef cattle	
		Sheep	Yes.
Fruitgrowers	3,850	Alfalfa	
		Grain	Yes.
		Fruit	
		Dairy cows	Yes.
		Beef cattle	
Bostwick Park	6,870	Hay	
		Pasture	
		Beef cattle	
		Sheep	Yes.
Dallas Creek	21,940	Alfalfa	
		Small grains	Yes.
		Pasture	
		Beef cattle	
		Dairy cows	Yes.
		Sheep	Yes.
East River	2,750	Hay	
		Pasture	
		Beef cattle	
		Dairy cows	Yes.
		Sheep	Yes.
Fruitland Mesa	19,400	Hay	
		Pasture	
		Small grains	Yes.
		Beef cattle	
		Sheep	Yes.
		Dairy cows	Yes.
Grand Mesa	25,300	Alfalfa	
		Small grains	Yes.
		Pasture	
		Fruit	
		Dairy cows	Yes.
		Beef cattle	
		Sheep	Yes.
Ohio Creek	16,910	Hay	
		Pasture	
		Small grains	Yes.
		Beef cattle	
		Sheep	Yes.
Tomichi Creek	27,580	Hay	
		Pasture	
		Small grains	Yes.
		Beef cattle	
		Sheep	Yes.
		Dairy cows	Yes.
Battlement Mesa	6,830	Hay	
		Pasture	
		Small grains	Yes.
		Beef cattle	
		Sheep	Yes.
		Dairy cows	Yes.
Bluestone	10,875	Alfalfa	
		Grain	Yes.
		Vegetables	
		Fruit	
		Sugar beets	Yes.
		Beef cattle	
		Sheep	Yes.
		Dairy cows	Yes.
Eagle Divide	10,875	Hay	
		Pasture	
		Small grains	Yes.
		Beef cattle	
		Sheep	Yes.
		Dairy cows	Yes.
Parshall	27,510	Hay	
		Pasture	
		Small grains	Yes.
		Beef cattle	
		Sheep	Yes.
		Dairy cows	Yes.
Woody Creek	2,965	Hay	
		Pasture	
		Small grains	Yes.
		Beef cattle	
		Sheep	Yes.
		Dairy cows	Yes.

SUPPORTED PROJECT CROPS

An analysis of the above table on the principal crops to be produced on these projects shows:

Thirty-one out of the thirty-four projects would grow grains. On February 28, 1955, the Federal Government owned or had agreed to purchase 2,147,000,000 bushels of surplus major grains valued at $4,332,000,000.

Thirty-one out of thirty-four projects would produce dairy products. Latest figures show the Federal Government owned 391 million pounds of surplus butter valued at $254 million; 417 million pounds of surplus cheese valued at $168 million, and 212 million pounds of surplus dried milk valued at $34 million.

Twenty-seven out of thirty-four projects would grow sheep to produce wool. The Federal Government owned in February of this year 147 million pounds of surplus wool valued at $99 million.

Every one of these irrigation crops would produce hay and pasture. Five thousand dollars an acre is somewhat expensive for grasslands, especially grasslands lying at altitudes up to 7,000 feet, some of which suffers from frost the year round.

The point is, that the administration is asking that the taxpayers of the Nation be forced to cough up this enormous amount of money to bring into production at an almost unbelievable cost these arid lands to grow more surplus crops, and if not surplus crops, then more grasslands for cows to graze on and produce more butter, cheese, and milk to add to the towering piles of surpluses.

In the very States where the administration is proposing to build these unneeded and unjustified irrigation projects, agricultural acreage for other farmers has been restricted.

This year we have seen the spectacle of farmers on Federal irrigation projects in the West coming to Washington to protest the acreage restrictions. Under their present acreage allotments, these farmers say, they cannot earn enough money to meet their annual payments to the Government for the projects. This has happened in a number of places, notably in the immense Columbia Basin project of Washington with regard to sugarbeets, and in the Wellton-Mohawk project of *Arizona*, with regard to cotton.

What was the administration's answer to these farmers? It was: no more acreage.

The sugarbeet acreage is strictly limited and set, as I pointed out. In February of this year the Federal Government owned 8,500,000 bales of surplus cotton valued at $1,487,000,000, and enough cottonseed oil to flood out all the irrigation projects in the West.

Well, the administration set the acreage limitations and the support prices for these projects. Now the administration is faced with the problem of getting its money out of them. If the farmers cannot raise enough cash crops to meet payments for irrigation water and other annual project expenses, how are they to make their payments to the Government?

In the face of this situation, the administration is asking Congress to approve the upper Colorado River project and the Fryingpan-Arkansas project to grow more agricultural surpluses.

HARM TO PRESENT MARKETS

Nobody knows what we are going to do with all the butter we have hoarded away. But here we have the administration trying to bring greater injury to what markets we have. Butter from the Midwest, for instance, is shipped to the other parts of the country. Yet, the ad- Rocky Mountain areas, as well as to ministration wants to create a new and greater butter production in the Rocky Mountain area with these projects, thus cutting down the chances of the Midwest producers to sell their product.

Mr. Speaker, I wish the administration would solve this dilemma. I wish that President Eisenhower would explain to us his reasons for lowering price supports, cutting acreage allotments, and at the same time asking Congress to approve two projects in the upper Colorado River Basin which would grow more surplus crops at enormous cost to the taxpayers.

The income of farmers has decreased, yet the administration is attempting to grow more agricultural products which can only aid in cutting farm income more.

I would like to have the Chief Executive tell the Nation how he reconciles these two policies—if he can.

The following Government bodies and organizations in California are officially on record in opposition to the Fryingpan-Arkansas project, S. 300 and H. R. 412:

1. Imperial Irrigation District.
2. Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Engineers.
3. Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen.
4. Order of Railway Conductors and Brakemen.
5. Brotherhood of Railway Clerks.
6. Brotherhood of Railway Carmen of America.
7. Brotherhood of Maintenance of Way Employees.
8. Order of Railroad Telegraphers.
9. Brotherhood of Railroad Signalmen of America.
10. Sheet Metal Workers International Association.
11. Railway Employees Department—AFL.
12. Colorado River Board of California.
13. Metropolitan Water District of Southern California.
14. Department of Water and Power of the City of Los Angeles.
15. Anaheim City Council.
16. Anaheim Chamber of Commerce.
17. Calexico City Council.
18. El Centro City Council.
19. El Centro Chamber of Commerce.
20. Holtville City Council.
21. Holtville Chamber of Commerce.
22. Imperial City Council.
23. Imperial County Board of Supervisors.
24. Imperial County Farmer Bureau.
25. American Legion, District 22, San Diego and Imperial Counties.
26. Burbank City Council.
27. Chula Vista City Council.
28. Chula Vista Chamber of Commerce.
29. Otay Municipal Water District.
30. San Ysidro Chamber of Commerce.
31. Property Owners Association of California.
32. Glendale City Council.
33. Hemet City Council.
34. Hemet Chamber of Commerce.
35. Los Angeles City Council.
36. Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors.

37. Los Angeles Central Labor Council.
38. Orange County Board of Supervisors.
39. San Diego City Council.
40. San Diego County Water Authority.
41. Rainbow Municipal Water District, San Diego County.
42. San Bernardino County Board of Supervisors.
43. San Marino City Council.
44. Agricultural Council of California.
45. Calavo Growers of California, Los Angeles, Calif.
46. Calcot, Ltd., Bakersfield, Calif.
47. California Almond Growers Exchange, Sacramento, Calif.
48. California Asparagus Growers Association, Stockton, Calif.
49. California Beet Growers Association, Ltd., Stockton, Calif.
50. California Canning Peach Association, San Francisco, Calif.
51. California Cattle Feeder's Association, Los Angeles, Calif.
52. California Cattlemen's Association, San Francisco, Calif.
53. California Date Growers Association, Indio, Calif.
54. California Fig Institute, Fresno, Calif.
55. California Fruit Exchange, Sacramento, Calif.
56. California Lima Bean Growers Association, Oxnard, Calif.
57. California Planting Cotton Seed Distributors, Bakersfield, Calif.
58. California Prune & Apricot Growers Association, San Jose, Calif.
59. California Turkey Growers Association, San Francisco, Calif.
60. California Vegetable Growers, Santa Barbara, Calif.
61. California Wool Growers Association, San Francisco, Calif.
62. Central California Berry Growers Association, San Jose, Calif.
63. Challenge Cream & Butter Association, Los Angeles, Calif.
64. Consolidated Milk Producers for San Francisco, San Francisco, Calif.
65. Farmers Cooperative Exchange, Inc., Santa Cruz, Calif.
66. Farmers' Rice Growers Cooperative, San Francisco, Calif.
67. Fontana Producers Egg & Supply Co., Fontana, Calif.
68. Hayward Poultry Producers Association, Hayward, Calif.
69. Imperial Grain Growers, Inc., Brawley, Calif.
70. Milk Producers Association of Central California, Modesto, Calif.
71. Poultrymen's Cooperative Association of Southern California, Los Angeles, Calif.
72. Poultry Producers of Central California, San Francisco, Calif.
73. Qualitee Dairy Products Association, San Diego, Calif.
74. Ranchers Cotton Oil, Fresno, Calif.
75. Rice Growers Association of California, Sacramento, Calif.
76. San Diego Cooperative Poultry Association, San Diego, Calif.
77. San Joaquin Valley Poultry Producers Association, Fresno, Calif.
78. Sebastopol Apple Growers' Union, Sebastopol, Calif.
79. Sunkist Growers, Inc., Los Angeles, Calif.
80. Sun-Maid Raisin Growers of California, Fresno, Calif.
81. Tri-Valley Packing Association, San Francisco, Calif.
82. Turlock Cooperative Growers, Modesto, Calif.
83. Coachella Valley County Water District.
84. Brawley City Council.
85. Brawley Chamber of Commerce.
86. City of Calipatria.
87. Calipatria Chamber of Commerce.
88. City of Beverly Hills.
89. Westmorland City Council.
90. San Jacinto City Council.
91. Torrance City Council.
92. Costa Mesa City Council.
93. Laguna Beach City Council.
94. City of Chino.
95. City of Compton.
96. Newport Beach City Council.
97. County Supervisors Association of California.
98. City of Fontana.
99. City of Fullerton.
100. City of Long Beach.
101. City of Ontario.
102. City of Pomona.
103. Santa Monica City Council.
104. Upland City Council.
105. Citizens Public Expenditures Survey, Inc., Albany, N. Y.
106. Oklahoma Public Expenditures Council.
107. Whittier City Council.
108. City of Gardena, Calif.
109. City of Lakewood, Calif.
110. City Council of the City of El Segundo, Calif.
111. Seal Beach City Council, Calif.
112. City of La Habra, Calif.
113. National Avenue Businessmen's Association, Chula Vista, Calif.
114. South Bay Irrigation District, Chula Vista, Calif.
115. City Council of Oceanside, Calif.
116. City Council of City of Escondido, Calif.
117. Escondido Chamber of Commerce.
118. City Council of the City of National City, Calif.
119. National City Chamber of Commerce.
120. La Mesa Chamber of Commerce.
121. City Council of the City of Manhattan Beach.
122. City Council of the City of Lynwood.
123. Fullerton Chamber of Commerce.
124. City Council of the City of El Cajon.
125. El Cajon Valley Chamber of Commerce.
126. Santee Chamber of Commerce.
127. California Taxpayers Association.
128. City Council of the City of San Clements, Calif.
129. City Council of the City of Brea.
130. City Council of the City of Claremont.
131. City Council of the City of Signal Hill, Calif.
132. City Council of the City of Coachella.
133. San Jacinto Valley Chamber of Commerce.
134. City Council of the City of Maywood.
135. Oceanside Chamber of Commerce.
136. City of Huntington Park.
137. Carlsbad Chamber of Commerce.
138. City Council of the City of Buena Park.
139. City Council of the City of Indio.
140. Lemon Grove Chamber of Commerce.
141. Carlsbad City Council.
142. Long Beach Chamber of Commerce.
143. City of South Gate.
144. City Council of the City of Glendora.
145. City Council of the City of Vernon.
146. City Council of the City of Placentia.
147. City of Huntington Beach.
148. City Council of the City of Culver City.
149. City Council of the City of Perris.
150. City Council of the City of Tustin.
151. City of Redondo Beach.
152. City Council of the City of La Verne.
153. Chula Vista Downtown Third Avenue Businessmen's Association.
154. City Council of the City of Corona.
155. City of Inglewood.
156. Montrose Chamber of Commerce.
157. Lincoln Avenue Water Company.
158. Rubio Canon Land and Water Association.
159. Crescenta Valley County Water District.
160. Foothill Municipal Water District.
161. City of Bell.
162. City Council of City of Elsinore.
163. City Council of City of Hermosa Beach.
164. City of Montebello.
165. City Council of City of Orange.
166. Thermal Chamber of Commerce.
167. Board of Directors of Western Municipal Water District of Riverside County, California.
168. Pomona Chamber of Commerce.
169. City of Hawthorne.
170. City of Palos Verdes Estates.
171. City of Riverside, Calif.
172. Lakeside Chamber of Commerce.
173. The Mountain Water Co. of La Crescenta.
174. La Crescenta Chamber of Commerce.
175. La Mesa City Council.

MAY 16, 1955.

The following government bodies and organizations are officially on record in opposition to the upper Colorado River project, S. 500 and H. R. 270:

1. Engineers Joint Council.
2. American Society of Civil Engineers.
3. American Institute of Mining and Metallurgical Engineers.
4. The American Society of Mechanical Engineers.
5. The American Water Works Association.
6. American Institute of Electrical Engineers.
7. The Society of Naval Architects and Marine Engineers.
8. American Society for Engineering Education.
9. American Institute of Chemical Engineers.
10. Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Engineers.
11. Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen.
12. Order of Railway Conductors and Brakemen.
13. Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers.
14. Brotherhood of Railway Clerks.
15. Brotherhood of Railway Carmen of America.
16. Brotherhood of Maintenance of Way Employees.
17. Order of Railroad Telegraphers.
18. Brotherhood of Railroad Signalmen of America.
19. Sheet Metal Workers International Association.
20. Railway Employees Department—AFL.
21. American Public Power Association.
22. Izaak Walton League.
23. National Parks Association.
24. The Wilderness Society.
25. Sierra Club.
26. The American Planning and Civic Association.
27. Wildlife Management Institute.
28. Colorado River Board of California.
29. Imperial Irrigation District.
30. Metropolitan Water District of Southern California.
31. Wildlife Management Institute.
32. Los Angeles City Council.
33. Department of Water and Power of the City of Los Angeles.
34. Anaheim City Council.
35. Anaheim Chamber of Commerce.
36. Calexico City Council.
37. Calexico Chamber of Commerce.
38. El Centro City Council.
39. El Centro Chamber of Commerce.
40. Holtville City Council.
41. Holtville Chamber of Commerce.
42. Imperial City Council.
43. Imperial County Board of Supervisors.
44. Imperial County Farm Bureau.
45. American Legion, District 22, San Diego and Imperial Counties.
46. Burbank City Council.
47. Los Angeles Clearing House Association.
48. Chula Vista City Council.
49. Chula Vista Chamber of Commerce.
50. Otay Municipal Water District.
52. San Ysidro Chamber of Commerce.
52. Property Owners Association of California.
53. California State Grange.

54. Glendale City Council.
55. Hemet City Council.
56. Hemet Chamber of Commerce.
57. Los Angeles City Council.
58. Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors.
59. Los Angeles Central Labor Council.
60. Orange County Board of Supervisors.
61. Pasadena Board of Directors.
62. Riverside County Board of Supervisors.
63. Santa Ana City Council.
64. San Diego County Board of Supervisors.
65. San Diego City Council.
66. San Diego County Water Authority.
67. Rainbow Municipal Water District, San Diego County.
68. San Bernadino County Board of Supervisors.
69. San Marino City Council.
70. Agricultural Council of California.
71. Calavo Growers of California, Los Angeles, Calif.
72. Calcot, Ltd., Bakersfield. Calif.
73. California Almond Growers Exchange, Sacramento, Calif.
74. California Asparagus Growers Association, Stockton, Calif.
75. California Beet Growers Association, Ltd., Stockton, Calif.
76. California Canning Peach Association, San Francisco, Calif.
77. California Cattle Feeder's Association, Los Angeles, Calif.
78. California Cattlemen's Association, San Francisco, Calif.
79. California Date Growers Association, Indio, Calif.
80. California Fig Institute, Fresno, Calif.
81. California Fruit Exchange, Sacramento, Calif.
82. California Lima Bean Growers Association, Oxnard, Calif.
83. California Planting Cotton Seed Distributors, Bakersfield, Calif.
84. California Prune and Apricot Growers Association, San Jose, Calif.
85. California Turkey Growers Association, San Francisco, Calif.
86. California Vegetable Growers, Santa Barbara, Calif.
87. California Wool Growers Association, San Francisco, Calif.
88. Central California Berry Growers Association, San Jose, Calif.
89. Challenge Cream and Butter Association, Los Angeles, Calif.
90. Consolidated Milk Producers for San Francisco, San Francisco, Calif.
91. Farmers Cooperative Exchange, Inc., Santa Cruz, Calif.
92. Farmers' Rice Growers Cooperative, San Francisco, Calif.
93. Fontana Producers Egg and Supply Co., Fontana, Calif.
94. Hayward Poultry Producers Association, Hayward, Calif.
95. Imperial Grain Growers, Inc.. Brawley, Calif.
96. Milk Producers Association of Central California, Modesto, Calif.
97. Poultrymen's Cooperative Association of Southern California, Los Angeles, Calif.
98. Poultry Producers of Central California, San Francisco, Calif.
99. Qualitee Dairy Products Association, San Diego, Calif.
100. Ranchers Cotton Oil, Fresno, Calif.
101. Rice Growers Association of California, Sacramento, Calif.
102. San Diego Cooperative Poultry Association, San Diego, Calif.
103. La Mesa City Council.
104. Pomona Valley Municipal Water District.
105. San Joaquin Valley Poultry Producers Association, Fresno, Calif.
106. Sebastopol Apple Growers' Union, Sebastopol, Calif.
107. Sunkist Growers, Inc., Los Angeles, Calif.
108. Sun-Maid Raisin Growers of California, Fresno, Calif.
109. Tri-Valley Packing Association, San Francisco, Calif.
110. Turlock Cooperative Growers, Modesto, Calif.
111. Coachella Valley County Water District.
112. California State Chamber of Commerce.
113. Brawley City Council.
114. Brawley Chamber of Commerce.
115. City of Calipatria.
116. Calipatria Chamber of Commerce.
117. City of Beverly Hills.
118. Westmorland City Council.
119. San Jacinto City Council.
120. Torrance City Council.
121. Costa Mesa City Council.
122. Laguna Beach City Council.
123. City of Chino.
124. City of Compton.
125. Newport Beach City Council.
126. County Supervisors Association of California.
127. City of Fontana.
128. City of Fullerton.
129. City of Long Beach.
130. City of Ontario.
131. Parris City Council.
132. City of Pomona.
133. Santa Monica City Council.
134. Upland City Council.
135. California Academy of Sciences.
136. Citizens' Public Expenditures Survey, Inc., Albany, N. Y.
137. Oklahoma Public Expenditures Council.
138. Whittier City Council.
139. City of Gardena, Calif.
140. City of Lakewood, Calif.
141. City Council of the City of El Segunda, Calif.
142. Seal Beach City Council, California.
143. City of La Habra, Calif.
144. National Avenue Businessmen's Association, Chula Vista, Calif.
145. South Bay Irrigation District, Chula Vista, Calif.
146. City Council of Oceanside, Calif.
147. City Council of City of Escondido, Calif.
148. Escondido Chamber of Commerce.
149. City Council of the City of National City, Calif.
150. National City Chamber of Commerce.
151. La Mesa Chamber of Commerce.
152. City Council of the City of Manhattan Beach.
153. City Council of the City of Lynwood.
154. Fullerton Chamber of Commerce.
155. City Council of the City of El Cajon.
156. El Cajon Valley Chamber of Commerce.
157. Santee Chamber of Commerce.
158. California Taxpayers Association.
159. City Council of the City of San Clements, Calif.
160. City Council of the City of Brea.
161. City Council of the City of Claremont.
162. City Council of the City of Signal Hill, Calif.
163. City Council of the City of Coachella.
164. San Jacinto Valley Chamber of Commerce.
165. City Council of the City of Maywood.
166. Oceanside Chamber of Commerce.
167. City of Huntington Park.
168. Carlsbad Chamber of Commerce.
169. City Council of the City of Buena Park.
170. City Council of the City of Indio.
171. Lemon Grove Chamber of Commerce.
172. Carlsbad City Council.
173. Long Beach Chamber of Commerce.
174. City of South Gate.
175. City Council of the City of Glendora.
176. City Council of the City of Vernon.
177. City Council of the City of Placentia.
178. City of Huntington Beach.
179. City Council of the City of Culver City.
180. City Council of the City of Perris.
181. City Council of the City of Tustin.
182. City of Redondo Beach.
183. City Council of the City of La Verne.
184. Chula Vista Downtown Third Avenue Businessmen's Association.
185. City Council of the City of Corona.
186. City of Inglewood.
187. Montrose Chamber of Commerce.
188. Lincoln Avenue Water Co.
189. Rubio Canon Land & Water Association.
190. Crescenta Valley County Water District.
191. Foothill Municipal Water District.
192. City of Bell.
193. City Council of City of Elsimore.
194. City Council of City of Hermosa Beach.
195. City of Montebello.
196. City Council of City of Orange.
197. Thermal Chamber of Commerce.
198. Board of directors of Western Municipal Water District of Riverside County, Calif.
199. Pomona Chamber of Commerce.
200. City of Hawthorne.
201. City of Palos Verdes Estates.
202. City of Riverside, Calif.
203. Lakeside Chamber of Commerce.
204. The Mountain Water Company of La Crescenta.
205. La Crescenta Chamber of Commerce.

MAY 16, 1955.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Does the gentleman support these administration-supported reclamation projects?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. No; I am not in support of these reclamation projects.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. What particular reclamation projects is the gentleman opposed to?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Specifically, the administration has given its blessing to the proposed multi-million-dollar upper Colorado River project.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Is that the Echo Dam?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Also to the proposed Fryingpan-Arkansas project, both in the States of the upper Colorado River Basin, Utah, Colorado, Wyoming, and New Mexico, and they comprise 6 storage dams and 33 reclamation projects, as passed by the other body in the bill S. 500. It does include, I might say, the Echo Park Dam, along with these other projects. It is because I believe that there is a conflict in the administration policy in advocating price supports and a decrease in acreage allotments and, at the same time, advocating projects which will bring into existence over a million acres of agricultural land at an estimated cost of $5,000 an acre that I am asking for this explanation of the conflicting policy.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I agree with the gentleman, that is inconsistent. Personally, I cannot understand it, either, but that is only a continuation of the policy which the two previous administrations had supported for years.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I will say to the gentleman that there are certain differences.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Differences in administration, I will admit.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. If the gentleman will read my remarks tomorrow, he will see those differences.

Mr. GROSS. I certainly agree with the gentleman that they cannot have it both ways.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. BAILEY. Are not those projects the gentleman enumerated the projects they used in their log-rolling tactics to get votes for the St. Lawrence Seaway?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. The gentleman will not get from me response to a question like that, because I will not impute log rolling to any Member.

Mr. BAILEY. I did on the floor of the House, and I have no apology.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I am not here for that purpose.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. The gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. BAILEY] said something about there being logrolling on it. He stated there was logrolling. I understood from the statement of the gentleman who had that agricultural bill here, the chairman, Mr. COOLEY, that there was no logrolling. I agree with the gentleman from California that logrolling is a most reprehensible practice.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Of course, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] put words in the mouth of the gentleman from California because I did not say anything about such an accusation being reprehensible. I will let the gentleman from West Virginia stand behind his own words. But I did not say that the remarks of the gentleman or the practice was reprehensible.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Those are my words, perhaps, I was not referring to the statement of the gentleman from West Virginia as being reprehensible but expressing an opinion that the practice of logrolling or the trading of votes was reprehensible, and I should not have used them in reference to the gentleman from West Virginia. I was referring to the practice to which he referred, but did I understand that the gentleman from California does approve of polite, effective logrolling?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. The gentleman from California is not speaking on that subject at this time.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. The gentleman declines to answer, then?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I decline to answer.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Fifth amendment or first?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I decline to answer the gentleman. Under the rules of the House I would not want to impugn the motives of one of my colleagues.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I am just asking for his own.

Mr. DIXON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I yield to the gentleman from Utah.

Mr. DIXON. I am only a freshman in Congress but if I can obtain some time on the floor I should like to address myself to this question of whether the President's position is inconsistent on this matter of surplus.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I am sure that the gentleman, although a freshman, has the full right to every prerogative of the House that any other Member of the House has, and I will look forward with a great deal of anticipation to his remarks. I hope the gentleman will study my speech, which I planned to put into the RECORD at this point in order to save the time of the House. However, if there seems to be enough interest involved I will ask the forbearance of the Members and will proceed and give the whole speech.

Mr. DIXON. I thank the gentleman. I will study it during the week end.

Mr. GROSS. If the gentleman will yield, I too shall look forward with anticipation to the remarks of the gentleman from Utah as to how you can increase agricultural production in the West and decrease it in the Middle West.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I think there is a conflict here and I am sure that my remarks on this subject will create interest in the minds of Members of the House who are friends of agriculture and friends of reclamation, but who want to see a balanced program in both instances.

At this time, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend the balance of my remarks at this point.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, before the gentleman yields the floor, will he permit me to answer the short question asked by the gentleman from Iowa?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I will be very glad to yield to the gentleman for any courtesy he may wish to accord the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. It is my deep desire to be courteous to him and to explain that the difficulty which he seems to think exists does not exist at all. He asked how are you going to increase acreage in the Midwest and increase it in the West. It is simple. All you do is cut down the acreage on the Midwest farmers and put in reclamation projects with Federal money in the Far West. That is the way you do it.

Mr. GROSS. If the gentleman will yield, I was not aware that I asked the gentleman a question. I thought I had made an observation.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I think the gentleman did make an observation.

Mr. Speaker, as long as there is so much interest in this matter, I would like to say here are 2 brief tables which I will have included in my remarks which are based on the Bureau of Reclamation reports to the House and Senate Interior committtees on these 2 projects. And when I say these 2 projects, I am speaking in a broad sense because I am speaking of projects contained in Senate bill (S. 500) which includes 6 storage dams and 33 or 34, I am not sure which, reclamation projects. But the estimated initial construction costs of the upper Colorado River storage project is $1.6 billion. Hidden subsidy costs to the taxpayers is $4 billion. Subsidy costs per acre is estimated to be around $5,000. Subsidy costs for a 150-acre farm with this formula would be $750,000 and the number of 150-acre farms which would be comprised would amount to 5,066. The number of acres to receive water would be around 750,000 acres.

In the Frying Pan-Arkansas project, the estimated initial construction cost is $156,541,000. Hidden subsidy costs to the taxpayers is $500 million. Subsidy cost per acre is $1,600. Subsidy cost per 160-acre farm is $256,000 and the number of 160-acre farms is 1,900. The number of acres to receive water under these projects amounts to 309,000.

Mr. HAGEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I yield.

Mr. HAGEN. The gentleman referred to 6 storage dams. Did the administration recommend those or are they the ones which were added by the Members of the other body.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. They include the ones which were contained in the Senate bill, as it passed the other body. The original recommendation, as I understand it, and the gentleman will correct me if I am wrong, was for 2 storage dams and for 11 reclamation and irrigation projects. As I understand it, the Members of the other body passed by a very large vote a bill which contained 4 additional storage dams and something like 22 or 23 additional reclamation projects.

Mr. HAGEN. If I may ask the gentleman another question—did any representative of the executive branch of the Government or of the Bureau of Reclamation appear before the House committee and oppose the inclusion of these additional dams and projects?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. As far as I know, they have not. I would not be able to speak with authority because I have not examined the hearings of the House. Some of them have taken place within the last few days and some of them have not been printed as yet, as I understand it. Would the gentleman enlighten me on that point, if he has some knowledge with reference to that?

Mr. HAGEN. I do not have any knowledge, but I was going to ask would it not be fair to say that if they failed to appear before the House committee after the action by the other body, they impliedly endorsed all of these projects?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. That, of course, is the position I would take, that if there was no objection by the administration, and I know of no objection, when the bill was under consideration in the other body, on the additional projects which were placed in the legislation, and if there has been no objection by the administration before the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee of the House, then I would assume that the administration must be behind this program.

Mr. HAGEN. If that is true, that means there has been a change of position on the part of the administration since their original recommendation to the Congress.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. It would seem to me that there would be an enlargement or a more comprehensive position taken by the administration.

Mr. HAGEN. Does the gentleman know any reason for that?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. No; I have no knowledge on that point.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. BOYKIN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 hour on Tuesday next, on the life and character of the late Honorable Pete Jarman.

THE RECIPROCAL TRADE PROGRAM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. BAILEY] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, once more I feel I would be remiss in my duty if I failed to remind my colleagues in the House of the many pitfalls and the inherent danger in the extension and enlargement of our trade policies contained in H R. 1, as amended by the United States Senate and now in conference.

I am reminded of the old saying "He who laughs last laughs the loudest." I am not shedding crocodile tears when I say my heart goes out to my Democratic floor leadership that labored so diligently for H. R. 1. Their injured pride and loss of dignity is something to behold when they are told by the White House that their idol among the Internationalists shows signs of returning to good old American doctrine by favoring the Senate version of this legislation.

It is true, Mr. Speaker, that the other body did go part way toward removing the rank discrimination against some American producers. Their version is a decided improvement over the House version. I insist they did not go far enough. The so-called compromise on oil imports is both vague and meaningless. Their failure to adequately safeguard the decisions of the Tariff Commission from interference from the State Department and the President is indeed regretable.

As an outright opponent of H. R. 1, what the other body did might well be considered a victory in defeat for those of my colleagues who joined me in opposing the Cooper bill on the floor of the House. I am not quite so gullible. We got little if any relief for small industries harassed by mounting foreign imports.

The most significant things in what the Senate did was to block the object surrender by the House of the constitutional authority of Congress to control and regulate trade and tariffs. Outside the field of national security, the Senate and the House, under the Senate version, will still be the final arbiter of the Tariff Commission's findings.

May I say, in all frankness to colleagues who support my views on our trade policies, I shall vote for the Senate proposals. I do this solely because it is the lesser of the two evils. The basic differences are still unresolved and I shall vote to recommit the amended legislation and if this fails I shall vote "no" on final passage.

If the situation we face, which involves a stable American economy with profits for capital and jobs for our workers were not so serious, I could well get a chuckle out of the spectacle of one native-born Texan pulling, not only the rug but the whole carpet out from under another native-born Texan.

I have no desire to suggest to the distinguished gentleman from Tennessee, chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, a solution to our present predicament. I might remind him that Davy Crockett, idol of all Tennesseans, once "patched a crack in our Liberty Bell."

My continued opposition to this unfair trade policy stems from many sources. The major one being the danger inherent in a policy that makes every American producer a pawn in the game of international politics with the State Department playing our hand. Seldom do we win any of the jackpots for America.

As an evidence of the rooking we are getting in what is supposed to be a reciprocal policy, let me read into the RECORD a total of 40 separate instances of rank discrimination by other nations, most of whom are members of the General Agreements on Trade and Treaties at Geneva.

These are taken from the Foreign Commerce Weekly and cover the 6-month period from November 1954 through April 1955. They follow:

[November 29, 1954]

SOUTH AFRICA ADDS NEW TEXTILE DUTIES

The Union of South Africa has imposed additional import duties on specified textile items.

[November 29, 1954]

IRELAND RAISES DUTY ON WOVEN LABELS

Ireland on December 24, 1954, increased the full rate of customs duty on imports of woven labels from 33⅓ percent to 60 percent ad valorem and the preferential duty on imports from the United Kingdom and Canada from 33⅓ percent to 40 percent ad valorem.

Printed labels remain dutiable at 33⅓ percent ad valorem upon importation from any country, and labels which form part of another article remain exempt from duty.

[December 27, 1954]

ITALY LEVIES NEW TAX ON IMPORTED GOODS

The Italian Government has levied a new tax, ranging from 1 percent to 4 percent ad valorem, c. i. f., on imports of a variety of commodities, payable wher the goods clear customs in Italy.

This tax is in addition to the general turnover and transactions tax (IGE), which is also payable at importation and which remains at its former rate—usually 3 percent ad valorem, c. i. f.

The new tax in effect since August 20, is called a compensatory import tax.

[December 27, 1954]

IRELAND SETS QUOTAS FOR VARIOUS IMPORTS

The Irish Government will permit import under global quotas in 1955 of the following goods in the quantities shown:

Completely or substantially assembled mechanically propelled vehicles, 26.

Road vehicle bodies or road vehicle body shells not attached to chassis, 50.

Motor vehicle chassis without body or shell attached, 50.

Motor car chassis with bodies or body shells attached, 64.

Motor car body balloons, 10.

Leather footwear, 20,000 pairs.

Rubberproofed clothing, 1,000 articles.

Women's felt hats, caps, hoods, and shapes, 20,000 articles.

Metal screws with slotted heads, and tapered threads, 20,000 gross in January 1–June 30, 1955.

[November 29, 1954]

COLOMBIAN DUTIES UP ON COTTON IMPORTS

In an effort to reduce cotton imports to a minimum the Colombian Government on November 17 provided for increased duties on raw cotton, cotton yarns, and cotton thread.

[February 14, 1955]

GUATEMALA IMPOSES GASOLINE IMPORT DUTY

The Guatemalan Government has imposed a new import duty of $0.10 per gallon or fraction thereof on all gasoline and naphthas imported under tariff item No. 335-2-0-2. Products under this item number formerly were duty free.

[November 1, 1954]

LEBANON REVISES CUSTOMS DUTIES ON ANIMAL GLUE

The Lebanon High Council of Customs has increased the customs duty on animal glue with a view to protecting the domestic glue production. Rates on casein glue, which is not produced in Lebanon, have been reduced.

[November 5, 1954]

PERU RAISES IMPORT DUTIES ON PHONOGRAPH RECORDS

Peruvian import duties on phonograph records have been increased heavily, and the tariff item has been subdivided, by a supreme resolution published October 15, to become effective 90 days thereafter.

[November 5, 1954]

INDIA RAISES DUTIES, LIBERALIZES QUOTAS

Increased rates of duty and more liberal quotas characterize the Indian Government's new policy of regulating imports by tariffs rather than quotas.

Higher import duties became effective September 11 on 27 commodities. Of principal interest to United States exporters are the following old and new rates, respectively, with percentages representing ad valorem rates.

[November 5, 1954]

COLOMBIA RESTRICTS IMPORTS—TAXES UP

Severe import restrictions were imposed in Colombia and the issuance of import licenses was tightened by decree No. 3077, of October 23.

Group II imports, on the prohibited list prior to its abolishment on February 19 (Foreign Commerce Weekly, March 15, 1954, p. 14) and since then subject to a 40-percent ad valorem import tax, now are subject to an 80-percent import tax, in addition to the regular 3-percent stamp tax, making a total of 83 percent.

[December 6, 1954]

LEBANON INCREASES IMPORT DUTIES ON COTTON CLOTH

The Lebanese import duties on pure cotton cloth were raised on December 21, 1954, by 7.69 percent to 20 percent according to its weight by square meter.

[January 31, 1955]

VARIOUS AUSTRALIAN IMPORT DUTIES RAISED

A number of Austrialian customs tariffs were changed effective October 29, 1954, as announced by the Minister for Trade and Customs.

Increases in import duty rates range from 5 to 20 percent for British preferential, 2½ to 20 percent for most-favored nations, and 2½ to 27½ percent under the general tariff.

Principal items affected by these increases are:

Cotton cord tire fabric; viscose rayon tire yarn, cord, and fabric; hand and breast drills; carpenters' braces; forged table, dessert, grill, or steak knives; forged carving knives, forks, and steels; plain safety pins; methyl chloride; plastics of the styrene type; and wristlet watch cases of steel.

[January 31, 1955]

PERU RAISES IMPORT DUTIES ON SOME TYPES OF HOSIERY

Peruvian import duties on stockings and socks of silk and synthetic fibers are greatly increased, and a special tariff subitem is created for nylon stockings and socks, by a Supreme resolution published on January 7, to become effective 90 days thereafter.

[January 31, 1955]

CANADA RAISES DUTIES ON SOME UNITED STATES ITEMS

Canadian duties on imports from the United States and other most favored nations of coin-operated soft drink machines designed for vending filled paper cups of cold beverages and power-operated vertical deep-well pumps capable of raising water 30 feet or more have been increased from 7½ percent ad valorem under tariff item No. 427a to 22½ percent under tariff item No. 427 effective from January 27 and 28, respectively.

[December 6, 1954]

MEXICO REVISES IMPORT TARIFF

Import duties for the greater part of the Mexican import tariff have been modified, by a decree published on November 18, apparently for the purpose of incorporating directly into the tariff the 25-percent general duty increase of February 15, 1954.

[February 1955]

MEXICO BANS PRODUCTS FROM SEVERAL STATES

The Mexican Government, because of the existence of the Khapra weevil in the States of California, Arizona, and New Mexico, has established effective January 29, quarantines on import of the following items from those States:

Peas; sorghum; barley; soybeans; nuts; corn; oats, natural or elaborated; wheat; alfalfa and alfalfa seed; castor beans; cottonseed; wool; corn and wheat flour; bread; processed cereals; crackers; processed rice; raisins; dry milk; dry blood; meat scraps; and bags and vehicles used to transport these products.

[February 1955]

PANAMA BANS POWDERED MILK IMPORTS

Panama now prohibits import of powdered whole milk, effective February 11, 1955, under resolution No. 34 of the Panama Office of Price Control of the same date.

Shipments in transit on the effective date are not affected.—Embassy, Panama City.

[February 1C55]

FRANCE MODIFIES VARIOUS IMPORT DUTIES

France has modified its import tariffs on various items, effective January 11.

Duties, previously temporarily suspended, are restored, as follows:

Polyvinyl carbides (polystyrol, etc.), import tariff No. 700 I, 30 percent; unworked axles, straight or crank, and tires, hoops, and centers for wheels, No. 73-16 bis, 18 percent.

[February 1955]

INDIA RAISES TEA DUTY, EXPORT QUOTA

The Indian duty on tea exports has been increased, effective January 7, from 7 annas to 10 annas a pound (1 anna equals U. S. $0.013125).

On the same date an additional allotment of 11 million pounds of tea was released for export, bringing the total amount released since April 1, 1954, to 468.9 million pounds.

A duty of 7 annas a pound had been in effect since October 3, 1954, on which date it was increased from 4 annas.

[February 1955]

CUBA SETS UP IMPORT QUOTAS FOR POTATOES

Cuba has instituted a system of quotas to regulate import of potatoes, for consumption as well as for seed.

The basic annual import quota is established at 680,000 quintals for consumption potatoes and 175,000 quintals for seed potatoes (1 quintal equals 101.43 pounds).

[March 1955]

GERMANY TO TIGHTEN HONEY IMPORT RULES

The Federal German "Ordinance Concerning Honey," of 1930, prohibiting import of honey in which the diastatic ferments are heavily weakened or spoiled, now is expected to be enforced more strictly, as steps have been taken to secure uniformity in interpretation of its provision and in testing methods.

[March 1955]

BRITAIN TO LICENSE UNITED STATES LARD IMPORT

The United Kingdom has made new arrangements for licensing import of lard from all countries, including the United States, the British Government has announced.

Lard originating in and consigned from the sterling area is permitted import freely without licensing.

[March 1955]

RAISES DUTY ON SPARK PLUGS

The Indian import duty on 14 mm. and 18 mm. spark plugs for motorcars, including resistor types, but excluding integrally screened types, has been increased to 95½ percent ad valorem.

The former rate was 31½ percent.

The higher rate of duty does not apply to spark plugs for motorcycles or motorscooters.

[March 1955]

LEBANON RAISES DUTY ON OPTICAL GOODS

Lebanese customs duties on optical glasses, apparatus, and instruments were increased on January 18 by two-thirds.

[March 1955]

JAPAN CHANGES TARIFF STATUS OF MACHINERY

Various items have been deleted from the list of machinery exempt from Japanese customs duties and a duty of 15 percent automatically reimposed thereon; two items have been added to the list; and the tariff terminology of other items eligible for duty-free treatment has been revised.

Also, items removed from the duty-free machinery list by notification No. 1267 of July 31, 1954, were to continue free of duties until January 31, 1955.

These changes in the Japanese duty-free list of machinery were put into effect by Ministry of Finance notification No. 2196, on January 1 of this year.

[March 1955]

LIBYA ESTABLISHES IMPORT SURTAX

A surtax of 5 percent of the regular duty assessed is now imposed on all Libyan imports by a royal decree effective February 25.

The new levy is to support a children's welfare fund set up to finance one free meal for each child attending public school.—Embassy, Tripoli.

[March 1955]

COLOMBIA REQUIRES APPROVAL FOR IMPORTS

Colombia now requires approval by its Ministry of Development for import of raw materials falling under the following tariff clasifications:

83. Oleaginous seeds and fruits, even though crushed or ground: (b) Copra.

109. Fatty acids.

111. Hydrogenated fats and oils.

183. Marble, alabaster, and serpentine, even though sawn in blocks or slabs, in the rough, or trimmed only.

224. Rayon-type caustic soda.

629. Manufactures of stone not elsewhere specified.

[March 1955]

PHILIPPINE TOBACCO IMPORT QUOTA SET

The Philippines has allocated to qualified tobacco manufacturers foreign exchange for import in 1955 of approximately 7 million pounds of Virginia-type leaf tobacco.

This reduction in quota for Virginia-type leaf tobacco from 40 percent of 1950 imports in 1954 to 25 percent in 1955 is made under legislation, Republic Act 1194 of August 25, 1954, designed primarily to foster domestic tobacco growing in the Philippines.

[April 1955]

INDIA RAISES DUTIES ON SUGAR, DYES

The customs duty on sugar imported into India was increased on March 1 to 13 rupees a hundredweight (112 pounds) from a rate of 11 rupees (1 rupee=US$0.21; 1 anna=one-sixteenth of a rupee, or US$0.013125).

On the same date the excise duty on domestic sugar was increased from 3 rupees 12 annas to 5 rupees 10 annas a hundredweight.

Also effective March 1, the Government raised the price of imported sugar by 1 rupee a maund (82.28 pounds).

Import duties have also been increased on a number of dyes, as a result of an Indian Tariff Commission investigation. Acid azo dyes, including acid fast red A; direct azo dyes, including congo red and sulfur black, are now dutiable at 20 percent ad valorem, increased from 12 percent.

[April 1955]

LEBANON BANS IMPORT OF APPLES, CITRUS

Import into Lebanon of apples and citrus fruit of all kinds is now prohibited, effective March 16, by the Lebanese Ministry of Agriculture.

The ban does not, however, affect shipments of apples in transit to Syria.—Embassy, Beirut.

[April 1955]

ECUADOR MAKES MORE IMPORT DUTY CHANGES

Ecuador has further revised its import duties or commodity listings, by decree No. 1558, published October 21 (see Foreign Commerce Weekly, April 19 and October 18, 1954, for previous revisions).

SOME DUTIES INCREASED

Import duties have been substantially increased on some of these items.

[April 1955]

CHANGES, DUTIES, CLASSIFICATIONS

Mexican import duties on wheelbarrow parts have been increased and the tariff classification covering deep-well pumps with nonsubmersible motors has been broadened to include pumps with an interior diameter of up to 610 millimeters, effective April 8, 1955.

[April 1955]

ECUADOR RAISES DUTY ON PASSENGER CARS

Ecuadoran import duties on passenger automobiles have been increased, and the method of assessment and computation of duties has been changed.

[April 1955]

LIBERIA LEVIES SURTAX ON IMPORTS

The Government of Liberia has levied, effective February 11, a 5-percent surtax on the value of all goods and materials imported into the country.

[April 1955]

NEW TAIWAN TARIFF DROPS GATT RATES

The most recent revision of the Republic of China's import tariff, published on January 15, cancels preferential rates for imports of certain commodities from member countries of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade. It also changes duty rates on a number of items.

[May 2, 1955]

DENMARK RAISES COFFEE, TEA DUTIES

Denmark, in order to reduce public consumption and conserve foreign exchange, has sharply increased its import duties, effective March 15, on coffee and tea.

The new duties, in crowns per kilogram, with former rates shown in parentheses, are as follows: Green coffee, 1.87 (0.87); roasted coffee, whole or ground, 2.30 (1.07); coffee extract, 6.25 (2); tea, 2.70 (0.70).

[May 1955]

PAKISTAN ACTS TO AID PLASTICS INDUSTRY

The Government of Pakistan has adopted measures assuring protection to the local plastics industry for 3 years, ending March 1958.

Additional duties have been levied on various plastic items. These and total duties, shown in parentheses, in percent ad valorem, are as follows:

Ceiling roses and pendant holders made mainly or wholly of plastic material, 5 (50).

Switches, excluding switchboards, made mainly or wholly of plastic material, 24 (60).

Plugs and cutouts made mainly or wholly of plastic material, 14 (50).

To assure local industry that existing duties will not be lowered in the next 3 years, the tariff classifications of a number of products have been changed from revenue to protective. These include combs, hair slides, and grips made of plastic material; complete fountain pens; ballpoint pens; bangles made of plastic material; all kinds of brushes; and soapboxes, buttons, and conical tubes made of plastic material.

Other measures have also been taken to assist the industry.

[May 2, 1955]

PHILIPPINES PUTS BAN ON READY-MIXED PAINT

The Central Bank of the Philippines has banned import of ready-mixed paints by canceling allocations of foreign exchange assigned importers of this commodity.

Simultaneously, ready-mixed paints were reclassified by the bank from the nonessential consumer goods category to the unclassified category—a change which in effect suspends imports of the commodity, inasmuch as foreign exchange is not allocated for import of goods in the latter category.

[May 2, 1955]

EL SALVADOR CONTROLS IMPORT OF SACKS

Import into El Salvador of sacks or bags of jute or similar coarse fibers has been made subject to prior approval of the Ministry of Economy.

This action, put into effect by decree No. 2 published on January 25 and effective the same date, was taken as a protection to the domestic henequen bag industry. It is complemented by other provisions establishing ceiling prices and standards of quality for henequen bags of domestic manufacture.—Diario Oficial, January 25, 1955.

In March, the United States Department of Commerce released the United States balance of payments for 1954 which pointed to the continued strong financial position enjoyed by foreign countries in their international trade transactions last year—ATL Topics, March 1955. The United States balance of payments indicated that in 1954 foreign nations had augmented their gold and dollar reserves by $1.7 billion, in addition to the $2.3 billion in gold and dollar assets netted in 1953.

Commenting on the continued foreign dollar and gold accumulations, the Department of Commerce, in its February 1955 issue of Survey of Current Business, stated that the "rise in foreign gold and dollar assets in 1954 as well as during the preceding years accrued mainly to Western Europe. The rising strength in the financial position of nearly all countries in that area facilitated further relaxations of controls on their international transactions and a continued rise in their production and incomes."

Further confirmation of the economic well-being of the Western European community now appears in the recently published sixth annual report of the Organization for European Economic Cooperation—OEEC. Released in two volumes in March, the OEEC report's title, "From Recovery Towards Economic Strength," reflects the optimistic conclusions on the European economy contained therein.

Formed in 1948, the OEEC comprises the following 17 members: Austria, Belgium, Denmark, France, Germany, Greece, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Luxembourg, the Netherlands, Norway, Portugal, Sweden, Switzerland, Turkey, and the United Kingdom. Although not members of OEEC, both the United States and Canada are represented on its committees and participate in its meetings.

Between 1938 and 1954, the volume of Western Europe's exports increased by some 70 percent, while the volume of imports increased by only 12 percent. The growth in volume of imports from the dollar area was similarly moderate, while the volume of exports to the dollar area more than doubled—

The OEEC reports—

Industrial production increased over the period by more than half, and agricultural production by almost 30 percent. The volume of intra-European trade grew even more than production; in 1953 it was half as great again as in 1938. instead of the same, as the recovery program had envisaged; and in 1954, it grew again by more than 10 percent.

Pertinent conclusions on the extent of Western Europe economic recovery as noted in the sixth OEEC report include the following:

On employment:

There has not only been a significant increase in the labor force in member countries since before the war, but in nearly all cases a reduction in unemployment. In many member countries, very high levels of employment have prevailed throughout the whole postwar period.

On productivity:

Between 1938 and 1954, the gross national product of member countries combined rose by 34 percent at constant prices.

On personal savings:

Personal savings have risen appreciably in Western Europe from 1952 onward. This rise reflects both the growth of personal disposable incomes, due partly to lower taxation and higher distribution of corporate profits, and the greater confidence of the public in the stability of money.

On gold and dollar reserves:

The most striking feature of the situation * * * is the magnitude of member countries' gold and dollar receipts in 1953 and 1954. Gold and dollar reserves began to rise as early as the second half of 1952, and the total increase between July 1, 1952, and December 31, 1954, amounted to $4.6 billion. These results certainly exceeded expectations.

According to estimates in the OEEC report, total gold and dollar reserves of OEEC countries amounted to $12.5 billion for the period ending December 1954.

On United States tariff policy:

The height of the tariff rates enacted in 1930 has been drastically reduced—largely by tariff concessions negotiated under the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act of 1934, but also in part by the substantial rise in prices since the original rates were set which has lessened the ad valorem incidence of a number of specific duties. The combined effect of negotiated reductions and of the price rise has been such that the import duties collected in 1952 were only one-fourth of what they would have been under the 1930 tariff on the same amount of dutiable imports. A number of commodities not produced in the United States, or produced in limited quantities—amounting to more than half of the total imports—are duty free.

But the restrictions that remain are still extensive; and they are largely discriminatory. Their main impact is on imports of manufactured goods from the United States and Canada.

I submit, Mr. Speaker, we cannot continue a trade policy so patently unfair to the American producers who are in the export business.

I submit, Mr. Speaker, we cannot continue a trade policy that discriminates so heavily against American producers who are being made bankrupt by their inability to meet foreign imports.

It is my intention to carry on this fight as I have for the past 10 years, to safeguard our economy and preserve the jobs of our workmen.

ALARMING CEMENT SHORTAGE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under special order heretofore entered, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, reports published by the Bureau of Mines, United States Department of the Interior, and by businessmen engaged in the sale and distribution and in the use of cement in construction projects, agree on the point that cement is in short supply and that the prospect is that the situation will become worse before it is relieved.

In the press of May 16, 1955—and I quote from one of the lead articles appearing on the first page of the Journal of Commerce of that date—it is stated:

Cement industry's big expansion program is running a losing race with the increased demand. Cement is in tight supply in several parts of the country, particularly in Texas and Michigan. And the seasonal peak of the demand is yet to come in September and October. * * *

Right now it looks as though the cement industry will be able to ship about 280 million barrels this year, compared with the recordbreaking 274 million barrels shipped last year.

Theoretical capacity at the end of last year was about 293 million barrels, but the industry's actual shipments have never been able to come within about 20 million barrels of capacity, owing to strikes, breakdowns of equipment, and other interruptions. * * *

The construction boom * * * will probably continue for some years to come. And if Congress approves a stepped-up Federal highway program, the need for cement will continue to rise. * * *

The cement makers say they are prepared to expand capacity further if the road program materializes.

A survey of individual producers made by the Bureau of Mines late last year showed that if President Eisenhower's $50 billion, 10-year program were approved by Congress, the cement industry would be ready to increase its capacity to 400 million barrels by 1959, to take care of the demand for cement for highways and other uses.

Now, all of those reports confirm the knowledge I have acquired through my own observations. Cement is in short supply in Texas. The demand is on the increase there, according to a report by the Bureau of Mines for the month of February 1955.

WHAT ABOUT PLANS FOR EXPANSION?

What are the plans for meeting this increased demand? I do not hear of any plans on the part of the leaders of the industry to provide an adequate supply of cement to meet that increasing demand in Texas. Any failure to plan for increasing the supply does not depend upon any lack of raw materials, because a cement-producing plant can be built in almost any part of the United States. In the First Congressional District of Texas, which I am privileged to represent, there are many locations where cement plants could be constructed, particularly in Red River County near Clarksville, and where plentiful available supplies of raw materials can be had.

INDUSTRY FALLING DOWN ON JOB

This shortage of cement and the failure of the leaders of the industry to expand by immediately increasing their productive capacity presents an interesting situation. One would think that with the prospect of an increasing market coupled with other profitable aspects that lie ahead, these leaders of the industry would have so expanded their productive facilities that no shortage of cement would exist today.

AGREEMENT TO PREVENT EXPANSION

Perhaps the situation is little different today from what it was when the Federal Trade Commission investigated the cement industry a few years ago. In the course of its proceeding against the Cement Institute and most of the manufacturers of Portland cement in this country, the Commission found that the leaders of the industry had entered into an agreement to avoid increases in productive capacity. The Federal Trade Commission found that the leaders of the industry had combined to prevent others from building cement plants. In that connection, I refer to the record of the hearings before Subcommittee No. 1 of the Select Committee on Small Business, House of Representatives, regarding monopolistic and unfair trade practices on November 17, 1948. At page 1119 of the record, there is set forth a portion of the Federal Trade Commission's findings of facts in its proceeding in the Cement Institute case. Included in those findings are the following statements:

At a meeting of the trustees of the Institute on December 7, 1933, it was moved that—"* * * it is the position of this Board that there should not be any increase of productive capacity in any area."

In those findings of the Federal Trade Commission, reference was also made to a public relations expert, Col. John B. Reynolds, who was hired by the leaders of the cement industry to assist them in their campaign to keep new cement plants from being constructed. In that connection, it was stated that Colonel Reynolds had appeared before the Resolutions Committee of the Cement Institute for the purpose of presenting and discussing a resolution, which he had been requested by officials of the National Association of Manufacturers to draft in regard to the policy of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation in extending loans to units of industries already in a state of excess capacity of production. You see, at that time, the leaders of the cement industry were complaining about some price competition that had crept into the industry and they were claiming that their plight was due to the fact that demand had fallen off some and that the Reconstruction Finance Corporation should not lend money to build new plants. According to the findings of the Federal Trade Commission:

The resolutions committee recommended the insertion of a resolution in opposition to "this harmful practice."

Also quoted from page 1121 of the record of the hearings before the House Small Business Committee on November 17, 1948, are the following statements from the findings of the Federal Trade Commission in its Cement Institute case:

On February 11, 1936, the manager of the Washington office of the Portland Cement Association wrote the institute in part:

"Sorry to be delayed in thanking you for the material which you so promptly sent to us regarding the proposed RFC loan to the American Portland Cement Co., at Foreman, Ark."

This and other correspondence in the record indicates that the assistance of the Portland Cement Association, composed largely of members of the institute, was enlisted in the opposition to the completion of the Foreman plant. This plant was not put into operation.

In its findings in the Cement Institute case, the Commission also quoted from a memorandum to the Board of Directors of the TVA, dated February 28, 1934, in which Dr. Morgan, Chairman of the TVA, dealt in detail with a conference he had had with leaders of the Cement Institute. Dr. Morgan had conferred with those leaders for the purpose of listening to their objections to a proposal that TVA build a cement plant. The proposal for building that plant had been made after TVA had long been unable to obtain either competitive or reasonable bids on the cement, which it was purchasing for its building program.

In connection with that conference with leaders of the Cement Institute, Dr. Morgan reported as follows:

The personal impression I received from listening to them is that, in their opinion, uncontrolled price competition in a stable industry will tend to destroy that industry, that some kind of control is necessary for stabilization, and that the cement industry has sought to bring about such control; that the problem is a difficult one and has not been completely worked out, especially in its relation to the public.

MORE CEMENT NOW

A program should be started at once for a substantial increase in cement production. Otherwise, the progress and expansion of our country will be retarded.

We should also consider at least 3 national superhighways, paid for by the Federal Government, from the Atlantic to the Pacific Oceans, and at least 5 such highways north and south. Any debt created for these purposes should not bypass the national debt.

NO TOLL ROADS

Toll roads must not be permitted. It would take 100 years to get rid of them. Besides, they create additional unregulated monopolies within their restricted areas and rights-of-way.

WHOSE CONFERENCE AT THE SUMMIT?—THE RUSSIANS OR FREE PEOPLE?

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FEIGHAN] is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, a good part of our work this week in Congress has been devoted to consideration of the manpower bill. The reason we have given such careful consideration to this measure is that we are alert to the imminent threat of Russian communism. We know that communism has as its unchanging goal the complete domination of the entire world and we are equally certain that there has been no change whatsoever in their objective. Since we must be ever alert for a Russian sneak attack against the United States, I would like to review with you and to analyze some of the events which have taken place in the world during this past week, which have a vital bearing on the need for a realistic and adequate manpower measure.

This week it was announced that Marshal Tito, the Red dictator of Yugoslavia,

would entertain in Belgrade some of the top dictators from the Kremlin. Marshal Bulganin and Khrushchev, the secretary of the Communist Party of Russia, will lead the Russian delegation. While both the Russians and the Tito gang plead that this is just a social visit, it is clear that the purpose of this visit is to tighten the bond between Moscow and Tito, a bond which has never been broken despite the loud protestations of the faker, Tito. For the past several years, I have on many occasions attempted to warn the American people against giving any aid or assistance to Tito because he was and always will be a Russian agent. Over and over again I have said that any aid we give to Tito is nothing more than assisting him to hold the anti-Communist Croatians, Serbs, Slovenes and Montenegrans in the slavery of communism. It will not be long before those who have played a part in giving aid to the Red dictator, Tito, will learn the full folly of their acts. Tito will soon demonstrate openly his unbroken loyalty to the tyrants of the Kremlin.

No doubt you listened to Secretary Dulles and President Eisenhower on the television on Tuesday evening when they discussed the Austrian Treaty and its effects on the prospects of peace. I listened to that program and felt the American people were being misled. The Secretary and the President painted what most people took to mean a very rosy picture on the meaning of the Austrian Treaty as well as showing undue optimism on the future prospects for a just and lasting peace.

I would like to discuss with you some elements of the so-called Austrian Treaty of Independence which were not brought out in the television program by Secretary Dulles and the President on Tuesday night. They failed to tell the American people that the Austrian Treaty, by specific sections of it, legalized the looting by the Russians of over $2 billion from the Austrian people over the past 10 years. While the treaty improperly refers to former German assets in Austria, the facts are that these assets were Austrian assets which were first looted by the Nazis. So now it is a case of the Russians looting what the Nazis originally looted from the Austrian people. In other words it is a clear case of a thief stealing from another thief.

The Austrian Treaty also gives the Russians the right by treaty to continue a blood-drawing operation on the Austrian people for many years to come. It authorizes the Russians to maintain control over certain basic economic enterprises in Austria which indeed comprise a large portion of the economic bloodstream of Austria.

The treaty also authorizes the Russians to maintain colonies on Austrian soil. It allows the Russians to maintain a very large contingent of engineers and economic specialists who, of course, have their families and relatives with them living off the fat of the land.

The very nature of the treaty declares Austria as a neutral state, that is, a nation supposedly with no attachments to either the United States and the rest of the free world or to Russia and its international Communist conspiracy. President Eisenhower has gone out of his way to emphasize that the treaty provides Austria with a neutral status very much like that which Switzerland has maintained over very many years.

I would like to point out for you in connection with the so-called neutral status which is now claimed by the administration for Austria, a few facts which indicate the contrary is likely to be the case in the end. Austria geographically sits in the heart of the Danubian Basin. Because this is true, Austria depends upon the Danube River for its commerce, trade, and a large part of its revenue. But unfortunately the Danube Basin is now occupied mostly by the Communists—for example, Tito and the Communist rump regimes in Hungary, Rumania, Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, and East Germany. Moreover, the Russians have absolute control over all trade and commerce plying the Danube River and reaching any of the river ports in that part of Europe. It is clear to me, therefore, that the Austrian people are economic prisoners of the Russians. It is only a matter of time before the Russians will make the Austrian people their political prisoners. The entire history of the Russian Communist conspiracy bears evidence to that conclusion.

In his press conference this week, President Eisenhower again discussed the prospects of arriving at a modus vivendi with the Russian Communists. In that connection, he stated that trade "is the greatest weapon in the hands of the diplomat." He also states that as long as we are not helping the Communists' war-making powers directly we should keep an open mind on trade with the Russians. What President Eisenhower fails to understand is that trade of any materials and commodities with the Russians is, in fact, trading in war materials. That is so because the Russians regard all types of materials and commodities or trade in all types of materials and commodities as strategic, from their point of view. More specifically, the Russians regard food as one of their most strategic weapons in their never-ending fight against the forces of freedom. For those who doubt this fact, I strongly recommend that they read the story of the Russian manmade famine in the Ukraine in the years 1932–33 in which approximately 5 million patriotic Ukrainians were put to death by starvation by their Russian occupiers. I also suggest that the doubting Thomases look up the facts on the Russian manmade famine in Turkestan during the period between the great wars. As an additional point, I remind President Eisenhower of certain facts he should never forget in connection with the East German uprising against the Russians on June 17, 1953. I ask, Mr. President, Why did the Russians refuse to permit us to distribute badly needed food among the heroic and patriotic people of East Germany, who the whole world knew needed this food? There is only one answer and that is that the Russians have always regarded food as a political weapon—a weapon to subjugate people and a weapon to keep the subjugated in chains. Since the Russians attach such primary significance to commodities such as food, anyone can well understand the importance they would attach to any other types of materials or commodities whether they be in surplus supply in the United States or for whatever reasons may be advanced for developing trade with the Kremlin.

There has also been a great deal of talk here in Washington during the past week about the conference at the summit. Secretary of State Dulles has informed us of the likelihood of this conference taking place late in the forthcoming summer. Here again the administration has misled the American people into believing that it is possible to do business with the Russian Communists, and that a conference of this type holds possibilities of developing a formula for a just and lasting peace. The entire record of any type of conference with the Russians as well as any treaties or pacts entered into with the Russians indicate that both conferences and treaties are used by Russians simply as weapons to attain the never-changing goal of world domination which motivates the Kremlin. No honest and well-informed person can dispute my statement. President Truman recognized these to be the facts and consequently took the position that if the Russians had anything to contribute to the goal of peace and freedom, they knew where Washington was and he was willing to see them in this connection at any time. The Republican administration is certainly doing an all-out job to prove the wisdom of Truman's policy with respect to the Russians.

If President Eisenhower feels he has to have a meeting with the Russians at which he may possibly meet his old friend, Zhukov, I would strongly suggest the following as guidance for that conference:

First, we must regard such a conference as nothing more than an opportunity for us to spell out for the entire world what we stand for and what we stand against. In this connection, we should make it clear that we stand for the rights of all nations, large and small, to national self-determination, and the natural rights of all people to the basic freedoms. We should make it equally clear that we stand unqualifiedly against any form of colonialism or imperialism and in particular, we will never acquiesce to the new Russian colonialism which is being carried out under the camouflage of Communist imperialism.

Secondly, a logical follow-up to this first condition, we must demand that the Communist-enslaved non-Russian nations be permitted to determine their own destiny by the use of free elections, including multiple political parties, the secret ballot, together with international supervision to guard these basic requirements. If we fail to do otherwise, the good people of Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, Czechia, Slovakia, Hungary, Rumania, Bulgaria, Albania,

Ukraine, Byelorussia, Georgia, Turkestan, Idel-Ural, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Cossackia, and Russia will look upon any United States participation in a conference at the so-called summit as the failure of the last great hope of mankind and a sellout of all those moral and political principles which the United States has stood for during the 179 years of our national existence.

Thirdly, the Russians must agree to dismantling and completely removing the Iron Curtain which they have constructed from the Baltic Sea to the Pacific Ocean. They must remove the minefields, the barbed wire, the vicious dogs, the special squads of machine-gunners, and all other unnatural barriers which the Russians have concocted in order to divide the world into separate parts. The Russians must agree without reservation that the Iron Curtain is the basic obstacle to true peace and freedom.

Fourthly, we must abide by the proven principle of "open covenants openly arrived at." There can be no secret understandings reached at such a conference. To insure against this possibility, the administration should avoid being party to any joint communique being issued from such a conference because the constant Russian demand for unanimity would mean that any joint communique would serve primarily the Kremlin interests. President Eisenhower would be wise to issue his own communique, on a day-to-day basis. covering developments and any successes or failures that might come out of such a conference.

If the administration does engage in such a conference as is now contemplated and if it does act within the spirit of these recommendations, I would have no reservations on our entering into such a conference because the possibility of a sell-out will have been eliminated. Moreover, such a formula as I have here outlined would assure us an outstanding success in putting across to all the people of the world those principles for which we stand and those evils we are dedicated to fight against. Such a victory as would be ours by pursuing the course of action I strongly urge, would provide a badly needed stimulant and well-deserved encouragement for the forces of freedom which exist in every nation of the world today.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan (at the request of Mr. MARTIN), for 1 week, on account of official business.

Mr. MORGAN (at the request of Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania), on account of official business.

Mr. FALLON, from May 19 to 24, on account of official business.

Mr. EDMONDSON, from May 19 to 31, on account of official business.

Mr. FJARE (at the request of Mr. ARENDS), indefinitely, on account of official business in district.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. REUSS and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. MCDOWELL in two instances.

Mr. SCHWENGEL and to include the text of an amendment at that point in the RECORD following the vote on the Barden amendment.

Mr. WILLIS.

Mr. DINGELL.

Mr. ANFUSO (at the request of Mr. MCCORMACK) and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. ABBITT (at the request of Mr. MCCORMACK) and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. PELLY and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. PRICE.

Mr. PATMAN in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

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. 211. Joint resolution to confer jurisdiction on the Attorney General to determine the eligibility of certain aliens to benefit under section 6 of the Refugee Relief Act of 1953, as amended.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, bills of the House of the following titles:

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

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

H. R. 1328. An act for the relief of Nicholas John Manticas, Anne Francis Manticas, Mary Manticas, and John Manticas.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 54 minutes p. m.), pursuant to its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, May 23, 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:

818. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a proposed supplemental appropriation for the fiscal year 1955 in the amount of $28 million for the Veterans' Administration (H. Doc. No. 168); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

819. A letter from the Secretary of the Air Force, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to equalize certain retirement benefits for members of the uniformed services, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

820. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the audit of the Bureau of Land Management, Department of the Interior, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1954, 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.

821. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Trade Commission, transmitting the report of the Federal Trade Commission on the study made pursuant to its resolution of October 21, 1954, entitled "Corporate Mergers and Acquisitions"; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. ENGLE: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H. R. 4663. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Trinity River division, Central Valley project, California, under Federal reclamation laws; with amendment (Rept. No. 602). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. PRESTON: Committee on Appropriations. H. R. 6367. A bill making appropriations for the Department of Commerce and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 603). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. DAWSON of Illinois: Committee on Government Operations. H. R. 6295. A bill to amend section 3 of the Travel Expense Act of 1949, as amended, to provide an increased maximum per diem allowance for subsistence and travel expenses, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 604). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. CANNON: Committee on Appropriations. House Joint Resolution 310. Joint resolution making additional appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1955, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 605). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. WILLIS:

H. R. 6366. A bill to revise, codify, and enact into law title 10 of the United States Code, entitled "Armed Forces," and title 32 of the United States Code, entitled "National Guard"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PRESTON:

H. R. 6367. A bill making appropriations for the Department of Commerce and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. ANFUSO:

H. R. 6368. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide that certain individuals who become blind shall be deemed to have reached retirement age; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BAILEY:

H. R. 6369. A bill to provide for the conveyance to the city of Clarksburg, W. Va., of certain property which was donated for use in connection with a veterans' hospital, and which is not being so used; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. CARNAHAN:

H. R. 6370. A bill to provide for the establishment of the Foreign Affairs Strategic Advisory Board; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BELL:

H. R. 6371. A bill to provide that the price at which feed and seed is furnished under the drought program shall not exceed the price at which it is sold abroad under programs for developing foreign trade; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. ENGLE:

H. R. 6372. A bill to amend the act of July 31, 1947 (61 Stat. 681), and the mining laws to provide for multiple use of the surface of the same tracts of the public lands, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 6373. A bill to amend the Domestic Minerals Program Extension Act of 1953 in order to extend the programs to encourage the discovery, development, and production of certain domestic minerals; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. FERNANDEZ:

H. R. 6374. A bill to repeal legislation relating to the Gallup-Durango Highway and the Gallup-Window Rock Highway at the Navaho Indian Reservation; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. GARMATZ:

H. R. 6375. A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Army to cause a preliminary examination and survey in the interest of eliminating the water chestnut; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mrs. GREEN of Oregon:

H. R. 6376. A bill to provide for the hospitalization and care of the mentally ill of Alaska, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. GUBSER:

H. R. 6377. A bill to adjust the rates of basic compensation of certain officers and employees of the Federal Government; to authorize the President to establish the maximum number of positions under section 505 of the Classification Act of 1949, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. KILDAY:

H. R. 6378. A bill to amend the act of July 15, 1940, pertaining to emergency officers' retirement benefits; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. MILLER of Maryland:

H. R. 6379. A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Army to cause a preliminary examination and survey in the interest of eliminating the water chestnut; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. MOSS:

H. R. 6380. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Air Force to grant a perpetual easement to the Wheatland Water District, California, for establishment of a dam and reservoir, to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. PRIEST:

H. R. 6381. A bill to amend the act of March 3, 1901 (31 Stat. 1449), as amended, to incorporate in the Organic Act of the National Bureau of Standards the authority to use the working capital fund, and to permit certain improvements in fiscal practices; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. RICHARDS:

H. R. 6382. A bill to amend the International Claims Settlement Act of 1949, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. RODINO:

H. R. 6383. A bill to amend the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 to provide for more effective evaluation of the fiscal requirements of the executive agencies of the Government of the United States; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. SMITH of Mississippi:

H. R. 6384. A bill to increase the amount of articles acquired abroad by residents of the United States which may be brought into the country without payment of duty; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CANNON:

H. J. Res. 310. Joint resolution making additional appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1955, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. HAYS of Ohio:

H. Con. Res. 127. Concurrent resolution relative to inviting Spain to become a member of NATO; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By Mrs. CHURCH: Senate Resolution No. 52 of the 69th General Assembly, State of Illinois, adding their approval to the endorsement of President Eisenhower's proposed highway program by Governor Stratton; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts: Memorial of the House of Representatives of the General Court of Massachusetts, to oppose legislation to remove the power of the Federal Power Commission to fix the rate of natural gas shipped in interstate commerce; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Missouri, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to appropriate money for the furtherance of the Southwestern Power Administration, and to enact any and all laws consistent with the public power policy of the United States to make power available to all who need and demand it; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to extend the provisions of the Agricultural Act of 1954, as it relates to the special school milk program, to the Territory of Hawaii; 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. ANFUSO:

H. R. 6385. A bill for the relief of Dr. Husham Mofakham Payan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BAILEY:

H. R. 6386. A bill for the relief of Stephanos J. Cotsoradis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DAVIDSON:

H. R. 6387. A bill for the relief of Maria Gounari; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DOLLINGER:

H. R. 6388. A bill for the relief of Benjamin Bursztyn, Mrs. Czarma Bursztyn, and Ber Bursztyn; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FASCELL:

H. R. 6389. A bill for the relief of Gordon Victor Currie and his wife, Evelyn Edith Currie; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. GREEN of Oregon:

H. R. 6390. A bill for the relief of Koriku Kato; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 6391. A bill for the relief of Yee Loy Foo, also known as Loy Foo Yee, or Ted Yee; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JENNINGS:

H. R. 6392. A bill for the relief of the last three surviving members of the Confederate States Army; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KING of California:

H. R. 6393. A bill for the relief of Clare F. Young; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LANE:

H. R. 6394. A bill for the relief of Filippo Alcolino; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 6395. A bill for the relief of Thomas W. Bevans and others; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McCORMACK:

H. R. 6396. A bill for the relief of Valerie Anne Peterson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McDONOUGH:

H. R. 6397. A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Zbigniew Blichewicz; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MILLER of California:

H. R. 6398. A bill for the relief of George Petrolekas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SIKES:

H. R. 6399. A bill for the relief of the last three surviving members of the Confederate States Army; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SMITH of Mississippi:

H. R. 6400. A bill for the relief of Oscar O. Wolfe, Jr., et al.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. VINSON:

H. R. 6401. A bill for the relief of Georgia Kaolin Co.; 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:

280. By Mr. HORAN: Petition of 145 residents of the State of Washington urging the exercising of the powers of Congress to get alcoholic beverage advertising off the air and out of the channels of interstate commerce, and thus protect the rights of States to prevent advertising within their borders; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

281. By Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin: Resolution of the Wisconsin State Dental Society adopted by the house of delegates of the Wisconsin society at its meeting in Milwaukee, Wis., on April 26, 1955, urging the President and the Congress to take appropriate steps to carry out the recommendations of the new Hoover Commission; to the Committee on Government Operations.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Opposition by Mayors' Committee to Proposed Legislation to Destroy Federal Regulatory Power Over Interstate Gas Sales

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL H. DOUGLAS
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, May 19, 1955

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, although they have not received much attention in the competition with the well-financed publicity drive of the natural gas producing industry, the activities of the mayors' committee to oppose legislation which would destroy Federal regulatory power over interstate gas sales deserve careful attention of all Members of Congress. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a brief statement which I made for myself and for the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY], in introducing the leaders of this mayors' committee to members of the press yesterday, May 18. I also ask unanimous consent that the original statement of the mayors' committee on the Harris bill and released on April 25, made by Mayor Joseph S. Clark, Jr., of Philadelphia, Pa., on behalf of the committee, rejecting recently reported, so-called compromises, and a list of the members of the mayors' committee, be printed in the RECORD.

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

STATEMENT BY SENATOR PAUL H. DOUGLAS, IN BEHALF OF HIMSELF AND SENATORS HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, ESTES KEFAUVER, AND ALEXANDER WILEY, MAY 18, 1955

The 60 million gas users in America are greatly indebted to the city and State officials who have been leading the drive against exemption legislation that would add hundreds of millions of dollars annually to America's gas bills.

I refer particularly to the mayors' committee to oppose H. R. 4560 and similar exemption bills, under the able leadership of Mayor Joseph S. Clark, Jr., of Philadelphia, Mayor David L. Lawrence, of Pittsburgh, Pa., and Mayor Robert F. Wagner, of New York, the Wisconsin and Michigan officials who carried through the successful battles in the Phillips case to compel the Federal Power Commission to do its regulatory duty, including the Honorable James R. Durfee, chairman of the Wisconsin Public Service Commission, and Hon. James H. Lee, assistant corporation counsel of Detroit, Mich., and the leaders and members of the National Institute of Municipal Law Officers.

These officials have helped to bring the facts in the situation and the growing public concern over exemption proposals to the attention of Congress. They have also helped to inform the public of the big new raid that is being attempted on the consumers' pocketbook.

In the face of the well-financed propaganda drive of the oil and natural gas production industry, the people are fortunate to have such able defenders.

STATEMENT ON BEHALF OF MAYORS' COMMITTEE ON NATURAL GAS, MAY 18, 1955

In fighting to protect the consumer interest on natural gas rates, we believe it is absolutely necessary to retain Federal jurisdiction over the rates charged in the field for the major sources of supply of our interstate pipelines. Otherwise, a continual rise in field prices, such as has already occurred over the past 10 years, and which will certainly be renewed in the absence of effective Federal regulation, will push the consumers' monthly gas bills ever higher and higher.

It is our position that no legislation is presently necessary to permit Federal regulation fair to both consumer and producer. We believe the Federal Power Commission should be given a reasonable opportunity to administer the powers of regulation over the nontransporting producers which the Supreme Court upheld last year.

While there is a great deal of talk on the part of gas and oil industry spokesmen that they want to find a reasonable compromise on the basic issues involved in this matter, we find that all of the so-called compromises put forward by the industry spokesmen would result in stripping the consumer of any effective Federal protection against steady and continuing increases in the field price of gas. All of the compromising would be in one direction—in favor of the producers and against the consumers, for all such compromise proposals call for elimination of direct regulation of producer sales. We reject such compromises.

STATEMENT OF MAYORS' COMMITTEE TO OPPOSE THE HARRIS BILL REMOVING POWER OF FEDERAL POWER COMMISSION TO REGULATE NATURAL GAS SALES BY PRODUCERS

On behalf of the committee, Mayor Joseph S. Clark, Jr., of Philadelphia, made the following statement at the close of an all-day conference held in the Jefferson Room of the Mayflower Hotel:

"This group here today represents most of the natural gas consumers of the United States.

"Representatives of mayors of more than 50 cities having a total population of over 30 million people have been meeting with the chief city attorneys and representatives of mayors of many other cities, large and small. Our purpose has been to organize presentation of the consumers' case against the Harris bill and similar legislation now pending before the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. The purpose of these bills is to remove the authority presently vested in the Federal Power Commission to regulate the price of sales of natural gas by producers and gatherers to pipeline companies which transmit gas to our city borders.

"Protests against this legislation are national in scope. Cities from Oregon to Alabama, from Louisiana to Massachusetts, have joined our committee to oppose this legislation. The interests of all gas consumers require that it be defeated.

"Huge increases in the price of natural gas during the last few years are largely due to the fact that the Federal Power Commission has heretofore failed to exercise the powers given to it by the Natural Gas Act of 1938 as interpreted by the Supreme Court of the United States in the Phillips case. If this legislation passes, the power of the Federal Power Commission to exercise its obvious duty in the consumer interest will be removed. Gas bills all over the country will inevitably increase in an aggregate of hundreds of millions of dollars.

"Experience has amply demonstrated that the unregulated operation of the law of supply and demand with respect to a national resource in as short supply as natural gas, whose ownership is monopolistic in character, results in one thing only: higher prices to consumers and unwarranted profits to the big oil companies of the country who control over a third of the supply of natural gas.

"It is clear that regulation of the profits of pipeline companies and retail distributors of natural gas is not enough. The weak link in the armor of consumer protection is failure to regulate the initial sale from producer or gatherer to pipeline company.

"A priceless national resource such as natural gas affected as it is with a public interest and in increasingly short supply must be subject to effective regulation from wellhead to the tip of the burner if the interest of the average American consumer is to be adequately protected.

"We are accordingly united in our opposition to legislation which would remove this key protection to the consumer which exists in the present law."

MEMBERS OF MAYORS' COMMITTEE TO OPPOSE H. R. 4560 AND SIMILAR EXEMPTION BILLS (CITIES WITH POPULATIONS OVER 100,000)

Philadelphia, Pa., Joseph S. Clark, Jr.
Pittsburgh, Pa., David L. Lawrence.
New York, N. Y., Robert F. Wagner.
Akron, Ohio, Leo Berg.
Baltimore, Md., Thomas D'Alesandro, Jr.
Birmingham, Ala., J. W. Morgan.
Boston, Mass., John B. Hynes.
Bridgeport, Conn., Jasper McLevy.
Buffalo, N. Y., Steven Pankow.
Cambridge, Mass., John J. Foley.
Camden, N. J., George E. Brunner.
Chicago, Ill., Richard J. Daley.
Cincinnati, Ohio, Carl W. Rich.
Cleveland, Ohio, Anthony J. Celebrezze.
Columbus, Ohio, Maynard E. Sensenbrenner.
Denver, Colo., Quigg Newton.
Detroit, Mich., Albert E. Cobo.
Duluth, Minn., George D. Johnson.
Elizabeth, N. J., Nicholas Sylvester LaCorte.
Erie, Pa., Arthur J. Gardner.
Fall River, Mass., John F. Kane.
Flint, Mich., George M. Algoe.
Gary, Ind., Peter Mandich.
Grand Rapids, Mich., George W. Welsh (city manager).
Jersey City, N. J., Bernard Berry.
Kansas City, Kans., Paul F. Mitchum.
Knoxville, Tenn., George R. Dempster.
Louisville, Ky., Andrew Broaddus.
Milwaukee, Wis., Frank P. Zeidler.
Minneapolis, Minn., Eric G. Hoyer.
Montgomery, Ala., W. A. Gayle.
Nashville, Tenn., Ben West.
Newark, N. J., Leo P. Carlin.
New Bedford, Mass., Arthur N. Harriman.
New Haven, Conn., Richard C. Lee.
New Orleans, La., deLesseps S. Morrison.
Paterson, N. J., Lester F. Titus.
Portland, Oreg., Fred L. Peterson.
Providence, R. I., Walter H. Reynolds.
Richmond, Va., Thomas P. Bryan.
Rockford, Ill., Milton Lundstrom.
Sacramento, Calif., H. H. Hendren.
Springfield, Mass., Daniel Brunton.
St. Louis, Mo., Raymond R. Tucker.
St. Paul, Minn., Joseph E. Dillon.
Syracuse, N. Y., Donald H. Mead.
Tampa, Fla., Curtis Hixon.
Toledo, Ohio, Ollie Czelusta.
Utica, N. Y., Boyd E. Golder.
Waterbury, Conn., Raymond E. Snyder.
Yonkers, N. Y., Kristen Kristensen.
Youngstown, Ohio, Frank X. Kryzan.

Winning the Cold War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 19, 1955

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, on Sunday evening, May 15, the distinguished majority leader, the senior Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON], delivered the main address at a dinner honoring Gen. David Sarnoff in New York.

The majority leader directed his remarks not only in tribute to a very distinguished American, General Sarnoff, but also to the great issue of foreign policy and national security. Taking appropriate note of General Sarnoff's recent document concerning a program for winning the cold war, the majority leader stated a philosophy and program which merit the immediate attention of the executive branch of our Government, as well as the attention of the Congress.

I consider the address by the Senator from Texas one of the most important public pronouncements in recent years. It calls for a new dimension in our efforts to check and roll back Communist imperialism, namely, a political offensive directed and guided by competent experts in the field of political strategy and psychology.

The Senator's speech is must reading. It is a priority policy document. It lays the basis for a reevaluation of our national security policy. I commend it to the attention of the Senate.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the address be printed in the RECORD.

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

WINNING THE COLD WAR

(Address by Hon. LYNDON B. JOHNSON, of Texas, at dinner honoring Gen. David Sarnoff, Waldorf Astoria Hotel, New York City, N. Y., May 15, 1955)

General Sarnoff, Mr. Baruch, Mr. Swope, Dr. Bunche, honored guests, in a very real sense we are here tonight to pay tribute to America.

The strength of a country lies in its people. A country that can list Gen. David Sarnoff among its leaders need not fear the future.

It is difficult for me to think of America without General Sarnoff. He is one man who has given as much to his country as he has received.

A DEBT REPAID

He may owe a part of his eminence to the opportunities which this land afforded. But whatever the debt, it has been repaid—unstintingly, ungrudgingly, and with compound interest.

No man feels a greater sense of obligation. And no man is more willing to serve; more eager to sacrifice; more anxious to set aside his personal affairs when duty calls, in war or in peace.

His industrial leadership has been vital in bringing electronics from the laboratory into our daily lives.

His company is almost as fully engaged in defense work as the Defense Department itself.

He has been the adviser of Presidents, and he has never withheld his talent because of partisan motives.

This is the record of a man who has risen to the top through his own unaided efforts. He asked only for opportunity. He supplied his own brains, his own efforts, his own muscles.

THE REAL TEST

I feel humble tonight that I have the privilege of paying tribute to such a man. I feel even more humble because I find myself in the company of some of our greatest Americans.

Here tonight is Herbert Bayard Swope, a towering figure of journalism, and one of the most forceful thinkers of our times; Bernard Baruch, America's financial genius, and adviser to Presidents; Dr. Ralph Bunche, who brought to diplomacy the very finest of the heart and soul of America.

It is the real test of General Sarnoff that such men are not only willing but eager to appear tonight to honor him.

COLD-WAR BLUEPRINT

Over the years, I have drawn freely upon General Sarnoff for ideas. He has never been lacking, never failed to be stimulating. But his greatest effort may be the cold-war blueprint published last Tuesday, a blueprint which has been endorsed in its basic elements by the President.

It points the way to a solution of the greatest problem before our people.

We are living in a great crisis period of freedom. The decisions of the next few years, possibly of the next few months, may decide our fate for centuries.

It is nothing new in history for freedom to be threatened. But the magnitude of the present threat has no precedent.

Never before has there been a time when so many people were mobilized and dedicated to one objective, the overthrow of liberty.

A PARTIAL RESPONSE

In part, we have responded to this threat capably and well. We have constructed a military machine to devastate an attacking enemy. We have built military alliances that, at least since the Paris accords, are strong and enduring.

But in other respects, we are still groping. We have prepared for hot war. But we have failed to grasp the essential nature of the cold war and to form the strategy to conduct it.

Our resources have been mobilized primarily against military aggression. We cannot, and should not, relax such efforts.

But the method of cold war is political aggression, and in this field atomic bombs and jet planes are scant protection.

DEADLY AND DECISIVE

A cold war is just as deadly, just as decisive, as hot war. But it is fought on different battlefields and with different weapons. Even when cold war turns hot, on a local scale, we find the terrifying weapons of modern science almost useless.

Atomic bombs did not shield the free Republic of Korea. Hydrogen warfare did not save Northern Vietnam, and may not save the balance of southeast Asia.

And all the powers of nuclear physics will not recover for freedom the vast territory of China.

THE SOURCE OF POWER

Somewhere along the line, we have forgotten a fundamental. It is that power ultimately rests with the people. Unless we win them to our side, we are lost.

In recent months, we have been preoccupied with the problem of Asia. We have awakened to the fact that this great continent—which many think was humanity's cradle—may also be humanity's grave.

We have argued the military problems of this huge land mass. We have discussed bases and soldiers as though the issue were a tactical exercise at a military war college.

But we did not awaken to the true key to Asiatic victory until the Bandung Conference. It was there that we learned that the ultimate decision will be made by the people themselves.

We discovered that freedom in Asia had friends—and able, forceful leaders. It is to our discredit that we did not know this earlier. It will be to our destruction if we fail to move on their side.

A SNARL OR A SMILE

In recent weeks, the Soviet Union has astounded the world by moving—at least in words—to ease some of the tensions building up to world war III.

We would be soft minded to accept those words at face value. They must be tested to the last degree to determine whether fair words will be backed by fair deeds.

It is possible that they are not in good faith—that they do not want to abandon the threat of military aggression.

But there is an even more subtle possibility. It is that the Communists have decided to ease world tensions so they can concentrate on the purely political struggle at which they are so adept.

Could it be that they have set aside the weapons of hot war—which must be hurled with a snarl—in favor of the weapons of cold war—which can be delivered with a smile?

Could it be that they have decided that nothing can emerge from hydrogen war except the total destruction of both capitalism and communism?

If that is the case, we must be prepared for a full-scale cold war—admittedly more desirable than hot war. We must be as fully armed for the ideological as for the thermonuclear struggle.

THE PRIZE OF VICTORY

We must launch the greatest political offensive in history. And we must mobilize all our people behind it.

The objectives of that offensive should be peace and the preservation of freedom. The only alternatives are hot war and the destruction of liberty.

The prize is the good will of the vast multitude of people not only in Asia but throughout the world who are still uncommitted. They are the great jury who will decide the fate of this planet.

A PLANNED OFFENSIVE

The offensive itself can take many forms.

We must get out in the marketplace of ideas and compete for the minds of men.

We must be ready to help those who will fight for freedom and build for freedom both inside and outside the Iron Curtain.

We must be as fearless in accepting the realities of peace as we should be in accepting the realities of war.

And at no time should we be afraid to explore any step which will bring us closer to peace and dignity.

It is not enough to say that Communists are treacherous. We must demonstrate their treachery by contrast—in deeds—to our own good faith.

It is not enough to say that Communists seek to enslave humanity. We must hold forth an alternative—freedom, not under our rule, but with our help.

It is not enough to say that Communists are driving the world to war. We must show that we are trying to lead the world to peace.

There is nothing new in these ideas. There would be something new if they were carried into action on the necessary scale.

THE FIRST STEP

The first step must be the formation of a general staff for the cold war—a general staff that would have the same role in our political offensive that the Joint Chiefs of Staff would play in a military offensive.

It should be more than just a collection of department heads meeting to discuss their individual problems.

This staff could direct and coordinate the weapons of cold war—diplomatic, economic, propaganda. It could advise the President directly on the many questions upon which he now receives a bewildering number of estimates and advice.

It could help him decide whether Matsu and Quemoy are worth the risk of losing our allies.

It could help him decide the extent to which our country should participate in such meetings as the Bandung Conference.

It could help him to decide when and where we should encourage resistance and how we can help captured people stave off the assault on their minds.

AN OVERBURDENED MAN

These issues are now discussed far too much in a vacuum. The burden of decision is loaded entirely on the shoulders of one man—the President—and he has little help in weighing the many factors against each other.

It may be that atomic and hydrogen war will never come to this earth. We would be foolish to assume that it will not happen. But we would be equally foolish to ignore the other possibility.

Our atomic and hydrogen muscles are strong and growing stronger. But they do not defend against infiltration and political aggression.

MUCH TO PRESERVE

We have much to save, much to preserve. It would be folly if we failed to save and failed to preserve because we had placed our faith in military strength alone.

If David Sarnoff has provided us with a clue to the answer—and I believe he has—he will have demonstrated once again that free men can always conquer tyranny.

From the brains of such men we can always draw vital ideas. This world, which is so precious, can and will be saved, and this Nation will enjoy a new lease on life.

Chemical Progress Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRIS B. McDOWELL, JR.

OF DELAWARE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 19, 1955

Mr. McDOWELL. Mr. Speaker, this week we observe Chemical Progress Week. I would like to congratulate the men and women of the chemical industry whose contributions to the increased standard of living enjoyed by their fellowmen cannot be overestimated. The growth of the manufacture of chemicals and allied products has been phenomenal. Since 1939 it has increased fourfold and is now our sixth largest industry. The development of products and research during the past 25 years has been inspiring.

The welfare of the people of the world is evidenced in many, many dramatic ways through the progress of the chemical industry. Chemicals have made possible the increased production of food at lower costs through the use of fertilizers and insecticides. Better ways of preserving foods through packaging and freezing have been found. The progress of the chemical industry in the field of wearing apparel has helped make the people in America the best dressed in the world. The manmade fibers are in greater and greater use. Its great contribution in the field of medicine is called to our attention through the successful use of antibiotics, drugs, and methods of disease prevention. Modern means of transportation and communication are dependent upon the chemical industry for the parts that make up this technical equipment are made from chemical derivatives. And more and more each day the building materials used in housing America and the world benefit by the genius of the chemical world.

This industry plays a great part in the economy and welfare of my district. Wilmington, Del., often called the chemical capital of the world, is justly proud of such concerns as E. I. du Pont de Nemours, Hercules Powder Co., the Atlas Powder Co., and others. The same 11,000 chemical producers throughout the broad expanse of our Nation are doing their part to make the chemical industry a most important part of our lives.

Chemical Progress Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WATKINS M. ABBITT

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 19, 1955

Mr. ABBITT. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call attention to the fact that this week has been designated by the chemical industry as Chemical Progress Week, which is sponsored by the Manufacturing Chemists' Association in an endeavor to emphasize the importance of this industry to our national welfare.

This week has been emphasized in various parts of the country by the chemical industry and is the second annual observance.

The educational program is being carried out at the community level by people of the industry in plants, laboratories, and sales offices within the communities having chemical industries. This represents the largest single educational program ever attempted by the chemical industry.

I am particularly interested in the observance of this week due to the location within my district of a number of important chemical plants which serve the country by the production of many useful products. Virginia has a particularly eventful history in relation to the chemical industry. The industry is a part of Virginia's heritage. In 1608, the year following the founding of Jamestown, the first chemical plant went into operation in Virginia. This was a glass factory. Virginia's first exports that year included glass, pitch, tar, and potash—all products of the infant chemical industry.

Today the chemical industry in Virginia is one of the most important industrial developments in our State. In 1953 all chemical-industry employers in Virginia gave employment to 42,012 men and women and paid about $175 million in wages and salaries. The industry produced during 1953 chemical products valued at nearly $1 billion. Virginia is ranked ninth among chemical-producing States and gives evidence of continued progress along this line. In November of last year, according to a survey, Virginia during the preceding 12 months had completed $36,400,000 in new chemical construction and had another $38,500,000 worth of construction underway and $13 million more being planned. Today the chemical industry is the Nation's fourth largest in terms of assets; employs approximately 800,000 persons at over 11,000 plant locations; and averages approximately $21 billion in annual sales.

In connection with the observance of Chemical Progress Week, I wish to pay particular tribute to the splendid programs of development in the plants located at Hopewell, Va., which is in my congressional district. The production carried on by the Hercules Powder Co., Continental Can Co., Celanese Corporation of America, and the national aniline division of the Allied Chemical & Dye Corp. is of tremendous value to the economic stability of our State. In addition to the tremendous economic advantages brought about by the employment of more than 5,000 people in the Hopewell area, these plants and their leadership have rendered a commendable service in the way of community relationships in that section of the State. The men and women associated with these firms have not only contributed of their time and effort in the promotion of the industrial development of Virginia, but have also stepped into various other walks of life to make a valuable contribution to the welfare of our people. I feel that their efforts are typical of those put forth by the chemical industry as a whole.

A Regrettable Veto

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MELVIN PRICE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 19, 1955

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, under permission to revise and extend my remarks, I deeply regret the decision of the President to veto the postal pay bill reported by the conference committee and approved by overwhelming vote both in the Senate and the House.

Anyone can take some artificial date and say that, compared with that date, the pay of postal and of other Government workers has been raised adequately, and that an 8.8 percent pay rise now is too much.

Across the past 20 years, however, the pay scales of Government employees, whether postal or classified, have fallen proportionately behind the pay scales of industry and other private employment. It is not just a matter of juggling figures and job descriptions and saying, as the veto message said, that the 8.8

percent bill was not "necessary either from the standpoint of pay for comparable work or from the standpoint of increase in the cost of living."

From the standpoint of maintaining proper relations between the rising scales in private employment and the pay of postal workers, the 8.8 percent bill was fully justified. A 10 percent bill would have been justified, and there are no figures available to the Post Office Department to refute it.

We have often heard the President proclaim as his philosophy the doctrine that the Government should be conservative in economic and fiscal matters but liberal in its attitude toward people. Where was the liberalism, or the liberality if that is the word, toward postal workers, and toward the classified workers of the Federal Government who wait in turn?

I repeat, I regret the veto. I think it was unwise and ungenerous, that it imposes a continuing inequity on postal and classified workers. A philosophy proclaiming itself as liberal toward people is all very well, but it ought to be more than a slogan.

Robinson-Patman Act Amendment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WRIGHT PATMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 19, 1955

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, Members of Congress, I am told, are receiving a lot of letters about H. R. 11 and S. 11, which provides for an amendment to the Robinson-Patman Act.

This bill is now receiving consideration in the Judiciary Committees of both Houses. It is very important that this bill become law at the earliest possible date. Independent business and small businesses in particular need this bill enacted into law more than any other one time at this particular time. It will determine whether many of them stay in business or go out of business.

In the House the following Members are coauthors and cosponsors of the bill: Hon. CARL ALBERT, Oklahoma; Hon. HUGH J. ADDONIZIO, New Jersey; Hon. WAYNE N. ASPINALL, Colorado; Hon. CLEVELAND M. BAILEY, West Virginia; Hon. JOHN A. BLATNIK, Minnesota; Hon. RICHARD BOLLING, Missouri; Hon. OVERTON BROOKS, Louisiana; Hon. USHER BURDICK, North Dakota; Hon. ROBERT C. BYRD, West Virginia; Hon. CLIFFORD DAVIS, Tennessee; Hon. JOHN D. DINGELL, Michigan; Hon. THOMAS J. DODD, Connecticut; Hon. CLYDE DOYLE, California; Hon. HERMAN P. EBERHARTER, Pennsylvania; Hon. JOE L. EVINS, Tennessee; Hon. DANIEL J. FLOOD, Pennsylvania; Hon. SAMUEL N. FRIEDEL, Maryland; Hon. EDWARD A. GARMATZ, Maryland. Hon. DON HAYWORTH, Michigan; Hon. CHET HOLIFIELD, California; Hon. LESTER JOHNSON, Wisconsin; Hon. EUGENE J. KEOGH, New York; Hon. AUGUSTINE B. KELLEY, Pennsylvania; Hon. CECIL R. KING, California; Hon. HENDERSON LANHAM, Georgia; Hon. JOHN LESINSKI, JR., Michigan; Hon. GEORGE S. LONG, Louisiana Hon. EUGENE J. MCCARTHY, Minnesota; Hon. THADDEUS M. MACHROWICZ, Michigan; Hon. DON MAGNUSON, Washington; Hon. LEE METCALF, Montana; Hon. GEORGE MILLER, California; Hon. THOMAS E. MORGAN, Pennsylvania; Hon. JOHN E. MOSS, JR., California; Hon. ABRAHAM J. MULTER, New York; Hon. THOMAS J. O'BRIEN, Illinois; Hon. JAMES G. POLK, Ohio; Hon. ADAM CLAYTON POWELL, JR., New York; Hon. MELVIN PRICE, Illinois; Hon. HENRY S. REUSS, Wisconsin; Hon. GEORGE M. RHODES, Pennsylvania; Hon. KENNETH A. ROBERTS, Alabama; Hon. PETER W. RODINO, JR., New Jersey; Hon. BYRON G. ROGERS, Colorado; Hon. WALTER ROGERS, Texas; Hon. JAMES ROOSEVELT, California; Hon. HARRY R. SHEPPARD, California; Hon. BOB SIKES, Florida; Hon. B. F. SISK, California; Hon. T. A. THOMPSON, Louisiana; Hon. HOMER THORNBERRY, Texas; Hon. HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR., New Jersey; Hon. JOHN BELL WILLIAMS, Mississippi; and Hon. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI, Wisconsin.

In addition, the following Members have introduced bills of their own, identical with H. R. 11: Hon. CHET HOLIFIELD, California, H. R. 2850; Hon. HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, Jr., New Jersey, H. R. 2690; and Hon. JOHN LESINSKI, JR., Michigan, H. R. 2611.

It is my suggestion that any Member who desires to do so may become a coauthor of the bill by allowing his name to be used for that purpose or he may introduce a bill himself.

Insurance Against Blindness Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 19, 1955

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a bill in the House of Representatives which I have entitled the "Insurance Against Blindness Act." The measure seeks to amend title II of the Social Security Act to aid the blind.

Specifically, the bill provides that any individual working in an industry which is covered by old-age and survivors insurance would, upon the onset of blindness, be deemed fully insured and to have reached retirement age. Under these circumstances, a person losing his sight from any cause and in any way while employed in a so-called covered occupation shall be entitled to full benefits and eligible to receive monthly payments under the social security system from the time such blindness occurred.

I am informed that approximately 12,000 persons in the United States go blind each year due to various reasons and causes. This means that under my bill approximately that number of persons would start receiving "insurance against blindness" benefits in any one year. At the same time, it must be emphasized that these payments would not be in the nature of a grant; they would constitute an annuity which the individual bought and paid for, and which would be payable without any restrictions in the event the individual becomes blind. In other words, it would be an insurance proposition similar to that of the individual who is paying premiums toward a paid-up policy.

Under my bill, anyone who has four quarters or more of coverage under the Social Security Act and then becomes blind would be entitled to this insurance. The four quarters need not necessarily be of continuous service in 1 year, but may be acquired over a period of years. Where an individual ceases to be blind and becomes rehabilitated, no benefits shall be paid until he reaches the regular retirement age of 65.

A blinded person, particularly a newly blinded person, should be given every encouragement to become employed and to attempt to become self-sufficient. In order to lend such encouragement, the bill provides that the individual would not lose any benefits under the social-security system due to the earning capacity which he might develop in time.

Mr. Speaker, the proposals contained in my bill have been endorsed by the American Foundation for the Blind and also by the American Association of Workers for the Blind, an organization composed of individuals serving the blind. Miss Helen Keller is associated with the aforementioned foundation as counselor of the Bureau of National and International Relations.

Incidentally, I am sure all my colleagues will be interested to learn that Miss Keller, who is one of the great pioneers in the world for the blind, will be 75 years old on June 27 of this year. She has just completed a long tour throughout the Orient and is known to the whole world as a "good will ambassador" for the cause of the blind.

Mr. Speaker, I can think of no finer birthday greeting and gift to Miss Keller than the adoption of my bill to provide insurance against blindness for those who will be needing it in the years ahead. I urge you to take early and favorable action on this measure.

Revision and Codification of the Military Laws of the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWIN E. WILLIS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 19, 1955

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. Speaker, the bill to revise, codify, and enact title 10 of the United States Code, entitled "Armed Forces," and title 32, entitled "National Guard," H. R. 6366, which I have just introduced, codifies the great bulk of the statutory law dealing with the military aspects of national defense. This bill grew out of a project initiated by the Department of the Army and

launched in March 1948 under the initial leadership of Col. Alfred C. Bowman of the Judge Advocate General's Corps. As part of a larger undertaking began by Congress in 1946 to revise and enact each of the 50 titles of the United States Code, the work has gone forward under the close supervision of the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives and in particular under its Subcommittee on the Revision of the Laws. Of immeasurable help to the Subcommittee on the Revision of the Laws in its work was its Law Revision Counsel, Dr. Charles J. Zinn. The bill has been submitted as an executive proposal of the Department of Defense and has been approved by the Bureau of the Budget.

The proposed text of the new titles is a thorough rearrangement and restatement, in simpler and clearer form, of existing military law of general significance. Perhaps its biggest contribution is to eliminate a great mass of dead, executed, and obsolete law. The result of this codification will be the elimination of countless hours and the great expense which would otherwise continue to be necessary to search and interpret the existing mass of military laws.

However, the bill is not intended to change, in any respect, the substance of the law now in force. All suggested substantive improvements in existing law have been faithfully reserved for future consideration by the particular committees of the Congress which have jurisdiction over the subject matter concerned.

The military codification bill was prepared by a group of very capable legal draftsmen in the Department of Defense. Special, high commendation is owed to the following:

For the Office of the Secretary of Defense: Dr. F. Reed Dickerson, LL. B., Harvard, J. S. D., Columbia, former Assistant Counsel, Office of the Legislative Counsel, House of Representatives, and author of the recent book, Legislative Drafting.

For the Department of the Army: Col. Archibald King, LL. B., Harvard, LL. D., Boston University; Lt. Col. Joseph P. Ramsay, LL. B., Harvard.

For the Department of the Navy: Lt. Col. George M. Lhamon, United States Marine Corps, LL. B., George Washington; Comdr. Enser W. Cole, LL. B., North Carolina, LL. M., George Washington; Comdr. Katherine E. Shilling, LL. B., George Washington; Lt. Comdr. Charles J. Murphy, LL. B., Fordham.

For the Department of the Air Force: Mr. James B. Minor, LL. B., George Washington, former Assistant Counsel, Office of Legislative Counsel of the Senate, former Legislative Counsel, War Assets Administration; Mr. Allan J. Morrison, LL. B., Boston College.

During their long period of intensive and painstaking participation, these attorneys have devoted their efforts exclusively to the preparation of this bill. In this endeavor they received valuable assistance from a number of other attorneys from the three military departments and from the National Guard. Although it is not practicable to mention them all by name at this time, their contribution is gratefully acknowledged.

I certainly hope that this proposed legislation will receive the prompt attention of the Congress.

A Tribute to Dr. Philip A. Traynor, Former Member of Congress and Distinguished Citizen of the State of Delaware, Upon the Occasion of the Celebration of His 81st Birthday

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRIS B. McDOWELL, JR.

OF DELAWARE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 19, 1955

Mr. McDOWELL. Mr. Speaker, it is with a great deal of pride that I join with the members of the Santa Maria Council, Knights of Columbus, Wilmington, Del., in paying tribute to Dr. Philip A. Traynor, a former Member of this great body, on the occasion of his 81st birthday.

Dr. Traynor was born in Wilmington, May 31, 1874. As a youth he gained recognition as an athlete of considerable merit, and rode and trained horses for his father. He was graduated from the University of Pennsylvania with a degree in dental surgery, and has since been a very highly skilled and kindly dentist.

He is the oldest living and continuous member of St. Peter's Cathedral Parish from which he has never moved. He will long be remembered for his unselfish devotion to the poor and in his charity has administered to the dental needs of the schoolchildren of St. Peter's without charge for over 40 years.

He was a member of the Delaware State Militia for 3 years and served in the Spanish-American War.

In 1940 he was elected Representative at Large from Delaware to the 77th Congress. In 1942, seeking reelection, he was defeated. However, in 1944 he was reelected to the 79th Congress, but was again defeated in 1946 for the 80th Congress. Among his many achievements while serving the people of his State was his great effort in securing the passage of a bill for the construction of the Delaware River Bridge. He served on the Post Office and Post Roads Committee and introduced the bill for the first postal increase. During the housing shortage in Washington Dr. Traynor commuted daily from Wilmington and continued to do so in spite of a painful accident in which he suffered a broken shoulder.

Dr. Traynor is considered the father of Columbianism in Delaware, since he signed the Santa Maria charter on December 13, 1896, and thus formed the first council of the Knights of Columbus in Delaware. He is the lone surviving signer of the charter, and his interest in this organization has never faltered. Dr. Traynor is also a 50-year member of the Fraternal Order of Eagles, and is still an active Democrat.

It has been my good fortune to have known Dr. Traynor for a number of years. He has been a good friend and loyal citizen of his State and Nation. As a lifelong and ardent Democrat, he has always given of his time and effort for the best interests of his party; however, he has never allowed his partisanship to becloud his good judgment in supporting legislation in the Congress of the United States that was for the best interests of all of the people. Dr. Traynor was well equipped to use his good judgment when questions of public welfare were to be decided. He has been one of the people, and his life is a living example of dedication to the welfare of his fellowmen.

Protect the Family Farm Now

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY S. REUSS

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 19, 1955

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, the Congresswoman from Minnesota [Mrs. KNUTSON] has recently had published in Better Farming magazine for June 1955, a most interesting and heart-searching article containing the views of farm women around the country who are concerned about the survival of family type farming.

In our attempts in Congress to arrive at a comprehensive farm program that will conserve the best elements of agriculture, uppermost of which is the farm family, I recommend this article Protect the Family Farm Now to the Members of this body.

I also call your attention to a prize-winning letter from Mrs. John Goldmark of Double J Ranch, Okanagan, Wash., which was inspired by the election to Congress of the Farm Woman's Congresswoman and the first woman to sit on the House Agriculture Committee, Mrs. KNUTSON:

FARM WOMEN TELL WHY WE MUST FIGHT TO PROTECT THE FAMILY FARM NOW

(By Representative COYA KNUTSON, Member, House Committee on Agriculture)

The invitation, extended through Better Farming, to the farm women of America to write to me about their problems and their ideas for making farm living a better living, brought a response that has fairly overwhelmed me. Letters have come from farm homes in 45 different States.

I have read all of them. They tell a story I wish every public official and every Member of Congress could know and feel as I do now. The spirit and courage they reflect, the brave struggle to stay in farming during these difficult times, make me prouder than ever that I have the opportunity to represent the farm women of this country. They show clearly why we must take up the fight to protect the family-type farm. Some excerpts from the letters tell all this better than I can.

"I washed today," wrote Mrs. Jerry Urbanek of Lusk, Wyo. "With the aid of an electric washing machine and REA power I washed quickly, but my washing machine is a secondhand model and so ancient that I catch the oil which drips from the motor in a can.

I hold the wringer together with one hand while I feed in the clothes with the other. Dangerous, perhaps, but it will be a long time before I can afford another.

"My husband and I have been farming for 25 years. I do a man's work in the fields because we cannot afford hired labor. We have a capital outlay of $45,000 invested in 900 acres of land, a full set of machinery and 44 head of cattle. Until 2 years ago we were out of debt. Last year we planted 200 acres of grain and harvested enough to get our seed back because of drought. We cut enough hay for our cattle and we're more fortunate than others, who have been buying hay at $40 a ton to keep their foundation stock.

"I like farming, but my husband and I worked 4,800 hours at farm work last year, for which we cannot show 1 cent of remuneration. While we were working we were also wearing out high-priced machinery and receiving less than 2 percent on the capital we had invested. We could have taken the loss of our grain crop without going into debt if the prices of the cattle we sold had been in line with the prices we had to pay for the necessities we bought."

Mrs. John E. Allen, of Mobeetie, Tex., tells of the situation from another angle of farming.

"We have 200 acres, 75 seeded to improved pasture. We raise and put up our own silage, raise our own grain, have a 50-cow herd and raise our own replacements. We are working hard to organize and establish a producer association to protect us against the big handlers. As it is now they can test and weigh our milk any way they like. A number of dairymen have had to take what they could get for their investments and quit. On our own herd we received $2,000 less money in 1954 for more milk shipped than in 1953. But the consumer paid the same price for what he bought, and our feed, groceries, and clothing were even higher."

The same experience is told in a letter from Mrs. Floyd Waldo, Route 3, Winona, in my own State of Minnesota:

"On our farm we produced 65,717 pounds more milk last year and received $204 less. Our costs remained inflexible while our markets were unstable. But consumers have not benefited from this farm price cut."

To this Mrs. Burnis Brigham, route 1, Genesee, Idaho, adds:

"It's bad enough to see farm returns go steadily lower but it's even worse to know that consumers never benefit. * * * Last fall the processors of our grade A milk made a big thing of a cent a quart price reduction—made possible by producers getting that much less. The reduction in our price was very hard for us to absorb but we did feel good that milk would cost townfolk less. In exactly 2 weeks the consumer price went back up, but, of course, the producer price did not. This is the type of price usury that farmers are generally as helpless as babes to cope with."

Another phase of the low-price, high-cost situation is described by Mrs. Mildred Reinhardt, of Palisade, Minn.: "One of the most unjust and disheartening circumstances facing farm women today is the exorbitant cost of establishing and maintaining a laying flock as compared with the infinitesimal net profit eked out from egg sales." What this means is told by Mrs. Waymon Wood, of Spiro, Okla.: "On most small farms, such as ours, the wife takes charge of the laying flock and expects the profits to be her part of the family's spending money. How can she make any spending money when feed costs remain high while eggs go down to from 20 to 30 cents a dozen?" And Mrs. Sara E. Demaree, of Malden, Mo., wrote: "Feed prices remain the same while eggs have gone down, down until farmers feel compelled to sell their flocks, keeping only enough for home consumption. So went the farm woman's income, thereby robbing her of her independence in helping out the family income."

Many, as did Mrs. Reinhardt, blame the indiscriminate grading of eggs, or lack of it, and the costly and backward system of egg distribution. As Mrs. Mary B. Brinson, route 2, Gosport, Ind., wrote: "If we had a good graded egg market, as we do for grade A milk or livestock, I feel that egg prices to farmers would be much better, at least fairer. In our locality all eggs, regardless of how good or bad, bring the same price." Many pointed out that, with the inadequate grading methods in vogue, the dealers stood to reap the profits from better-quality eggs.

How this sometimes affects the farm family's life is told by Mrs. Elmer Whitney, of Oregon, Ill.: "The thing that hurts me most is that many of our rural women are taking town jobs to provide needed requirements of the farm family * * *. In the past farm families have all taken deep interest in mother's poultry and garden because they knew the surplus sold meant a new rug, new clothes, or perhaps a family trip. After continued disappointments, because there was no surplus profit, these ventures have been abandoned. In search for a way to provide these things the wife takes a town job. The brave little family tells her 'We'll do our best to keep things going at home.' But their best falls far short without mother. It can mean a crippled family life and a weakening of family unity, which is a vital and precious part of our way of life."

Oh, so often the letters tell of such sacrifices. One Fountain Run, Ky., farm woman told of traveling 25 miles from home each day to work in a store to help her husband hold their farm. But she added, "I had to give up my job. It was just too much." And, as Mrs. Albert H. Holtz, Route 1, Holden, Mo., wrote: "In our community we have had falling prices, drought, grasshoppers, feed shortages until in nearly every family the husband or wife has had to get an outside job. This makes it difficult to farm efficiently. My husband has worked in town for the past 3 years and I handle all the chores alone. Why do families stay on farms under such circumstances? You would be surprised at how many of our neighbors (and ourselves) have given up much better livelihoods in the city because they believe they can bring up their children better on a farm, and are willing to make the physical sacrifices necessary for this."

The situation is forcing some hard decisions upon many, as this letter from Mrs. Dorothy Biggs, route 1, Potwin, Kans., tells: "I am a Kansas farm wife with 3 children, ages 10, 7, and 3. I think being a homemaker is the most challenging and interesting career any woman can have. But I am facing a crossroad, which I imagine other farm women also face.

"I have much to be thankful for—a good home, a good husband, plenty of food, and the ordinary comforts. But, like many other farm women, I'd like to be able to save a little or purchase a few bonds as I go along to help with the children's higher education that will eventually come. We raise and sell livestock and do make a profit each year; but after taxes, repair and maintenance, insurance, new machinery, and immediate living costs, there is nothing left to save. I work hard, sew, mend and make over garments, can, raise chickens, etc., to help make ends meet. This all takes time and does not leave enough time or energy to help train the children in stronger spiritual lives, which they need now, not later. This work, however, as a farm homemaker I must do.

"The crossroad I mentioned is this: As soon as our youngest is in school, I intend to go to work outside the home. I have had considerable business experience before marriage, plus training and hours for teaching. I would much rather stay in the home doing my own work and be a true homemaker. My choice is not my own, for I want our children to have an opportunity to receive a higher schooling so that sometime they may not be placed in the same position. While I do not want to raise all the funds (if that were possible) I do want to help so that each one can get a start and then they can go on for themselves from there."

The pressure of these conditions means extra burdens on all members of the family, sometimes to the heartache of the parents. This letter from Mrs. Elsie H. Bechtel, Manor Farm, Adams, N. Y., is expressive of that fact: "There is certainly something wrong in Washington and it is good to know that a real farm wife is working on it. * * * The greater part of the income of farmers in this district consists of proceeds from the sale of dairy and poultry products. Everyone in this section is feeling the price squeeze on farmers now.

"Many small farmers and some larger ones around here have been auctioning off their places and are being forced into terrific losses. Others, like ourselves, have had to see their wives go to work and have been forced to put small children to work beyond their years because the income from the place will not bear paying wages to hired labor. Our 11-year-old girl is doing more work than we would like to see her do, but she does it willingly and we don't know what we would do without her. It sounds terrible, like you are dependent on a child, but my husband and I are doing all we can (we have over 50 cows in the barn) and the help she gives us is the difference between being able to go on and quitting. A man does reach a stage where he can't add any more to his burdens."

Scores of other letters tell the same story of struggle and sacrifice, of a determination not to be forced out of farming and a feeling that something is terribly wrong at present. They reveal, too, how little consideration our policymakers have given to farm women and the farm home. They "do not want sympathy," as one after another wrote, only that "after all our labor and expense there will be something left for the needs of the family." Many letters contained useful ideas and suggestions for improving the situation. Some of these will be reported in the pages of Better Farming next month.

A RANCHWOMAN'S REMEDY FOR WHAT AILS AGRICULTURE

OKANOGAN, WASH.

Double J Ranch, February 26, 1955, before noon—temperature, 10 above.

DEAR MRS. KNUTSON: Early this morning, my husband brought in a calf. We were too late. It died, frozen. I then made up my mind that I would, in some way, have to make up the cost of that calf, for it meant a lot to us. Braving a bitter north wind to feed and water the chickens, I came back in the kitchen to drink hot coffee and sat down to see if Better Farming would cheer my heart. It did with news of your election and the possibility of making up for that calf just lost. So while the men are out feeding the cattle and trying to solve the problem of watering them, I will write to you. Water is a touchy problem for most farmers. We had a dry fall, the lake was low, and now the ice has frozen solid and there is no water beneath. I shall not go into this detail as I realize that you cannot legislate about wind and weather.

You can, however, legislate about water, and while I am a firm believer in voluntary associations and agreements, I truly feel that the time is coming when we shall no longer be wealthy enough to be easy and casual about soil and water. I say to myself, we must not only conserve, but increase our water resources and the must is so urgent in my mind that I am no longer tolerant of the man who allows water to flow off his

land in deep gullies, lets his topsoil blow away, overgrazes the grass, cuts down the timber without replenishing the forests, wastes the heritage of this country.

I am a firm believer in the family-size farm not only because I am presently devoted to one but because in the back reaches of my mind (or is it just a romantic notion?) I believe that the type of life and economy typified by the American family farm is a bulwark to the kind of democratic society we wish to preserve. It may be that large corporate farming would fill the Nation's shopping basket, but would it fill the heart of the man who produced it and the man who consumes it? Would a large corporate farm economy assist in making our national economy vigorous, expanding, and democratic? I think the answer is "No." But this question is one which many people, legislators like yourself, must not only answer but must be firm about. If the family-size farm is what we really wish to preserve, then all of our thinking, planning, and agricultural legislation should assist in nurturing and protecting it.

It becomes harder and harder for an individual, while youth and vigor are with him, to "buy in" to many types of farming. This is due to the price of machinery, stock, available land. Unless he falls heir to a farm or money, a young man can seldom enter the field. One of the results is that the old experts in the Department of Agriculture grew up on farms and know their problems. The young experts have no experience outside of books and summer jobs at experiment stations or nurseries. This is not good.

Another result is that, unless a farmer has good luck with weather or outside fortune, he is unable to expand his first holdings. There is nothing like an RFC for the farmer-entrepreneur so that he could extend his investment to meet competition or operate on a more equitable scale. The family-size farm is in competition with large corporate and city-controlled financing. Money made in Hollywood, on Wall Street, or in industry is mighty hard competition for the lone farmer.

I also confess to a great dissatisfaction in thinking of the Halls of Congress being battered down by tobacco men, wheat men, cotton men, peanut vendors and the like. Our agricultural economy must be looked at as a whole—production, distribution, price, freight, advertising, perishables, livestock. Unless economists and right-thinking men sit down and think about the whole future—land, water, products, and the increasing populations of our own country and the world, and our Nation's economy that needs to get out of the "fix" we seem to be in, whether it be parity price or interest rate—it doesn't seem to me that we shall get very far. I do not believe that the top-flight men of farm organizations or of farm production groups should be consulted in building the first basic agricultural policies. They all have special interests and they are there to protect them.

We do need disinterested social economists and planners to grapple with the larger issues at stake. Somewhere along the line the farmer has to grapple with these problems too. He should be able to do so without feeling that he will lose his status in the community because he does not agree with the Secretary of Agriculture or the righteousness of the sugarbeet growers. He should be able to do so without being caught in a vise which is his vote to cut his acreage or get a lower price for his product. He needs straight thinking without pressure. This last item I know is hard, for the American people, including the farmer, are getting to the point where they can't act or react unless the radio and newspapers scream and the face on the screen threatens.

I must go and feed three hungry, cold, tired men a large noon dinner, so I close with these suggestions:

1. The formation of a nonpolitical, non-ax-grinding agricultural planning board. Such a group should look backward as well as forward to see if this country really wants to preserve the family-size farm as part of our national life and livelihood; and if they do, to consider if and how it can be best subsidized and protected, and set up penalties for those who are not interested in doing it in such a way as to conserve our resources.

2. The creation of a Government agency, such as the RFC, to protect the small-size farm from being grabbed by the mortgage holder or corporation; to permit the small farm to grow and expand to the best economical operating capacity; to subsidize the man who wants to enter into the farm business.

3. To get the Department of Agriculture and farm organizations of all types to stop talking so much and scaring people and putting on pressure; to listen for a change and encourage people to think rather than carry a banner.

I feel as if I had been standing on top of a soapbox and now need to get down and put dinner on and see to the children. It was a pleasure to take off time and to write to you.

Sincerely yours,

Mrs. JOHN GOLDMARK.

The Role of the American Merchant Marine in the Atomic Era

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS M. PELLY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 19, 1955

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an address by Hon. Charles S. Thomas, Secretary of the Navy, before the Propeller Club, port of Washington, D. C., as follows:

THE ROLE OF THE AMERICAN MERCHANT MARINE IN THE ATOMIC ERA

(Address by Hon. Charles S. Thomas, Secretary of the Navy, before the Propeller Club, port of Washington, D. C., on the occasion of National Maritime Day, Shoreham Hotel, Washington, D. C., Thursday, May 19, 1955)

I am very grateful for the opportunity of speaking to this audience in anticipation of National Maritime Day. Following closely the observance of Armed Forces Day on May 21, the celebration of National Maritime Day on May 23 is particularly timely and appropriate. For the American merchant marine is as much a part of our defense system as the combat elements of the Armed Forces themselves. Quite accurately, the American merchant marine is referred to as our fourth arm of defense.

There is little doubt that we have come a great distance down the road into the atomic era. We have seen dozens of atomic weapons tested in a variety of forms in all their awesome power. We have seen the first combat naval ship under way on atomic power and progress has been made in the field of atomic propulsion for aircraft.

In the peaceful applications of atomic energy, we are seeing increased use of atomic and nuclear physics in medicine, in research, in science, and in industry. Early this month an agreement between the United States and Turkey was announced whereby we will lease 6 kilograms of uranium to Turkey for the construction of a small-sized reactor which will be used for scientific research activity. We have seen the initial steps taken in our own country and Great Britain to adopt atomic power to industry and commerce, and just a few days ago President Eisenhower made his historic announcement recommending that the American merchant marine have an atom-powered ship.

In this era of bewildering progress, when one advance leapfrogs another, and as science gives us new creations and inventions, we are apt to conclude that everything old is to be replaced. While this is often true, it is not always so. The automobile replaced the buggy, and the electric light the gas lamp; but more often than not, a new development of achievement supplements or improves the old and makes it better, rather than replaces it. For example, we see jet engines supplementing diesel and piston engines. We know now that atomic power will only supplement other types of ship propulsion in selected applications. In these cases, the trend will be to increase the efficiency of our merchant ships rather than replace them.

The advent of the atomic age does not lessen our need for a strong and adequate merchant marine; for it is a fundamental truth that the United States cannot get along without merchant vessels. Without our own ships, we cannot be assured of obtaining the necessary raw materials we need. Without our own ships, we cannot defend ourselves. Without ships, we cannot assist our allies. Without ships, we cannot grow and prosper. The advent of the atom does not alter our dependence upon the need of workaday merchant ships crossing the seven seas. The merchant marine remains as indispensable to our prosperity as it ever was, and fully as important to our defense as the Army, the Navy, the Air Force, or the Marines. It may be said that victory in World War II was assured on the day when our merchant ship construction exceeded our losses.

Our American merchant marine does not serve the interests of just the coastal States and the Great Lakes area. It reaches into every inland pasture, field, factory, and workshop. The farmer in Kansas, Illinois, or Iowa may never have seen an ocean or a merchant ship, but his livelihood is directly related to this Nation's maritime strength. Millions of tons of his products are sent across the seas by ships. The dairy farmer of Wisconsin, Illinois, and Missouri is likewise affected. Ships carry his products around the world. The auto worker in Detroit is also concerned. Ships take overseas millions of dollars worth of the automotive equipment that he makes. More than ever, no segment of our population is self-sufficient and no part of this Nation is unaffected by affairs of the sea. Farmer, laborer, industrialist, stenographer, housewife—whatever the trade, occupation, or livelihood, it is connected to and affected by our maritime industry. Accessibility to foreign markets enriches our lives and supplies our needs.

Living as we do at a time when creature comforts and household labor-saving devices are commonplace, and in a bountiful country which enjoys the highest living standard the world has ever known, it is hard to convince the average American that his country is a "have not" nation. But this fact is nothing new. We were a "have not" nation in 1776 and have been ever since. In colonial days we had to trade to expand and to prosper just as we do now. We were as dependent on the sea then as we are today. We imported most of our metals and many of our luxuries, such as tea, pepper, sugar, spices. As America has grown and prospered, our "have not" status has widened. As recently as 1940, we had lumber and petroleum

to export and we were almost self-sufficient in copper, zinc, and lead. Now we must import all of them in increasing quantities. Advancing science has hastened and enlarged our needs. At one time in our history, iron used to be good enough; then we started adding to it other minerals to make it lighter, stronger, resistant to stain, to heat, to sea water, and vibration. We have alloyed manganese, cobalt, and chromium and other rare metals with steel to make it do more necessary tasks and these special ores must come from abroad.

Thus, the automobile you own is not entirely made in Detroit, but partly in India, from whence we get manganese to make its steel. It is partly made in Bolivia from from whence we get manganese to make its bearings. Your refrigerator and your washing machine are not entirely made in New York or Cleveland but partly in Africa and South America from whence we get many of the raw materials that go into them. Your television set is not entirely made in Schenectady, but partly in Korea and India from whence we get the tungsten and mica.

The list of strategic and critical materials which are essential to our economy numbers 77 items. Yet, of these 77, the United States is sufficient in only 11. As far as our defense production is concerned (and we are still the free world's arsenal), one example will suffice to show how dependent we are on the overseas sources of raw materials which can be supplied in the quantities needed only by ships. Essential to the manufacture of our combatant aircraft are such raw materials as aluminum, chromium, titanium, antimony, tin, cobalt, mica, and tungsten. The largest percentage of these materials must be brought by merchant ships from overseas. Even such prosaic but necessary items such as coffee, sugar, tea, and many vegetable oils must be carried from overseas by ships to our ports.

The atomic age, therefore, has not changed this fundamental fact: that no matter who you are, where you live, or upon what your livelihood depends, your prosperity in peacetime and your security in wartime are definitely related to the oceans and to the merchant ships which cross them to take our products overseas and to bring back essential raw materials. The answer, then, as to why we must have a strong merchant marine in this atomic age is, first, that it is essential to our continuing prosperity; and second, that it is vital to our security in time of war. Thomas Jefferson's conclusion about the American merchant marine is as true today as it was in 1793: "As a branch of industry it is valuable; but as a resource of defense essential."

The United States Navy and the merchant marine have always been inseparably bound together. Since the very beginning of American history, the United States Navy has been closely related to the merchant marine. John Paul Jones was a merchant mariner for 16 years before he became famous in our Continental Navy. Stephen Decatur commenced his naval career as a privateer. The American Navy of the Revolutionary War, in fact, was entirely created from the American merchant marine.

One of our early Congress' first acts was to establish a merchant marine. Our forefathers foresaw that if our country was to grow and to prosper, it was necessary for us to have a first-class merchant marine. Our rugged and talented merchant mariners gave us this with the succession of the fast packets, the legendary New Bedford whalers, and our world-famous Clipper ships.

In every war, the American merchant marine has played a vital and indispensable though, sometimes, an unpublicized role. It has been the vital determinant of whether we fought a war on our homeland or beyond our own shores. This was demonstrated beyond question in World War II when the vital importance of sea transportation as an element in the logistic support of our military forces was so positively shown.

The military movements incident to the recent war in Korea furnish an excellent example of the logistic problems which overseas military operations entail. Every fighting man sent to Korea was accompanied by 5 tons of supplies, and it required 64 pounds of supplies and equipment every day to keep him there. The support of that war involved the sea transportation of 54 million tons of dry cargo and 22 million tons of petroleum products from and within the Korean theater. In the performance of this task the privately operated American merchant marine devoted itself unstintingly and was quick to respond to every demand made upon it. More recently, in Indochina, the American merchant marine participated in the little-publicized Operation Passage to Freedom conducted by the Navy, which involved the evacuation by sea of some 300,000 anti-Communist refugees and 200,000 tons of cargo from North to South Indochina.

Despite the fact that the merchant marine is essential to our personal prosperity in peacetime and vital to our security in wartime, it is unfortunately true that our shipbuilding industry is currently in a distressed condition. Eight-tenths of our present merchant ships will be obsolete in another 10 years. Nine-tenths of them are too slow for wartime use against the modern submarine. We are still short of tanker tonnage sufficient to meet our mobilization needs. There is very little merchant shipping now under construction in our yards. Within the past year the United States has fallen from 7th to 12th amongst shipbuilding nations. Countries such as Belgium, Denmark, Spain, Norway, Germany, Italy, and Japan outbuild us in terms of modern ships. A great many of these foreign-built ships are of the highest quality, having air-conditioning, modern fireproofing, safety equipment, and, in most cases, could comply fully with the high standards traditionally demanded by our United States Coast Guard regulations and the American Bureau of Shipping. It is worthy of comment also that since 1939 13 nations which did not even have merchant fleets have entered the maritime scene. Even landlocked Switzerland now has a 30-ship merchant marine.

We cannot allow our merchant marine to approach disuse and decay on the ground that we can trust to luck and improvise to meet our next emergency as we did both in World War I and World War II. In this atomic age if general war should unfortunately ever occur, despite our patient and intense efforts to prevent it, there will not be time to resurrect a merchant marine. Our survival in a global war will be largely dependent upon the merchant shipping which is available during the critical initial period. It is also my candid opinion that it would be folly for us to depend on the shipping and the shipbuilding facilities of other nations in the event of war. We must have our own American merchant marine, and it must be strong and adequate.

While there are many troubles and problems which beset our maritime industry (and none of them is of quick and easy solution), there have been some recent encouraging developments recently. First of all, the St. Lawrence seaway project has been approved. Since the beginning of this year, seven new shipping lines (unfortunately all of them flying foreign flags) have announced their plans to commence Great Lakes operations. I earnestly hope we may soon learn of similar plans on the part of some of our American-flag operators. Commerce on the St. Lawrence will inevitably increase as the seaway project approaches its completion. I disagree with those who believe this project will mean only a shift of ocean traffic from our coastal areas into the Great Lakes. It is my opinion that this development will not only increase trade into the Great Lakes ports of Duluth, Milwaukee, Chicago, Detroit, Toledo, Buffalo, and Cleveland, but as the years go by it will also increase the overall marine traffic on our seaboards. The seaway, in my opinion, will result in greater trade and traffic for all; and not just for marine traffic, but for railroads and truckers as well.

The second encouraging development has been the Congress' approval of a project to deepen the upper Delaware River above Philadelphia and open it to ocean traffic. This is going to mean a great deal to that great industrial area of the East. It will relieve congestion in Philadelphia Harbor, it will enable full use of the terminals at Camden and Trenton, and it will mean a steady increase and expansion of marine traffic in the Delaware.

A third encouraging factor in our maritime affairs is the vigor and foresight which our Maritime Administration is showing. In conjuncture with industry, they have developed several new designs of merchant ships for the replacement of our aging fleets largely built during World War II. These new designs not only incorporate maximum commercial utility, but at the same time, assure the Department of Defense of the availability of acceptable auxiliary vessels in times of emergency. The Maritime Administration has also been conducting extensive research and development activity in the atomic propulsion field as well as in the field of gas turbines, free piston engines, diesels, and improved steam turbines. These programs being vigorously pursued by our Maritime Administration cannot do other than help our maritime position.

Another encouraging development is, of course, the President's very recent proposal to build an atomic-powered merchant ship. The construction of such a ship has a larger purpose than maritime gain. It will demonstrate to the world in a tangible way that we intend to use the power of the atom for peaceful use and for nothing else, if we have our way. The President mentioned the construction of this atomic merchant ship in these words:

"We have added to the United States program for peaceful uses of atomic energy an atomic-powered merchant ship. * * * The new ship, powered with an atomic reactor, will not require refueling for scores of thousands of miles of operation. Visiting the ports of the world, it will demonstrate to people everywhere this peacetime use of atomic energy, harnessed for the improvement of human living. In part, also, the ship will be an atomic exhibit; carrying to all people practical knowledge of the usefulness of this new science in such fields as medicine, agriculture, and power production."

This first atomic-powered merchant ship will have large exhibit space, and perhaps a large theater, so that as it travels the trade routes of the globe and stops in major ports of the world, it can exhibit our American system of liberty and free enterprise.

Obviously, a great deal of hard work in research and development is necessary before marine atomic power can be produced at a cost equal to power from fossil fuels. A great amount of such work is now being carried on in connection with both military and civilian power projects in atomic energy. As the necessary techniques are developed, they will be applied to merchant shipping exactly as were techniques of using iron and steel for hulls, welding in lieu of riveting, and very high versus low steam pressure. As the United States Navy took the lead in those developments, which were later taken over, modified and used with great success by the merchant marine, so the United States Navy has led and will continue to show the way in marine atomic propulsion.

The first two plants to produce significant quantities of useful atomic energy in the United States were naval developments—the *Nautilus* powerplant and its land-based prototype in Idaho. The technology developed in these plants is being adopted as the basis for the first United States civilian powerplant at Shippingport, Pa., and will be used for the atomic-powered merchant vessel which the President recommended.

As you all know, the Navy has now been operating the atomic-powered submarine *Nautilus* for many weeks and we are very pleased with the progress and the performance which this vessel has shown. We feel that the future of atomic propulsion in the marine field holds immense promise. Our experience and research, of course, will contribute greatly to the building and operation of the atomic-powered merchant ship. The Navy will cooperate fully to assist the American merchant marine to produce and sail this atom peace ship as quickly as possible. No one appreciates better than the American Navy the need for a strong and adequate American merchant marine.

In summary, I believe that the prospects of our maritime affairs in the future are brighter. The American people, when aware of the facts, always act promptly, resolutely, and intelligently, and I am sure they want and will support the strong and adequate American merchant marine for which your Navy had consistently been in the forefront as its stanchest champion.

Price Discrimination Destructive to Small and Independent Business

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WRIGHT PATMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 19, 1955

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, if a small merchant can buy right, he can meet any competition, big or little. The grocery business is about the most competitive business in the United States. If the local groceryman can buy under the same terms and conditions as his competitor across the street, regardless of how big the competitor is, he cannot only remain in business but he can make a good living and a good profit. It is only when the small man is discriminated against that he is injured.

The Robinson-Patman Act provides that a manufacturer or supplier of goods and merchandise to the retail merchant shall not discriminate in price between customers in competition with one another. In other words, a supplier, whether a wholesaler or manufacturer, does not have to select any particular person or firm to sell its goods. The law does not compel a supplier to sell to anyone.

The Robinson-Patman Act, however, provides that the supplier, after selecting two or more customers in an area to retail its products, must treat these customers—the retailers—fairly and not give special privileges to one and deny equal benefits to another.

If a supplier has 2 customers in a town—one is a big customer and the other a little one, being a big retail store and a little retail store—it is all right for the supplier to give the big man a more favorable price representing a difference only in the difference in the cost of manufacture, sale or delivery to the big man. This difference is so small that it is not enough to substantially injure the little man. This difference of cost is recognized in the Robinson-Patman Act, which may be given to the big one over the little one. No one objects to the little difference being given to the big man. That little difference does not injure the little man at all. The injury to the little man comes about by the supplier giving to its big customer a special price or a special discount, which represents a lower price to the big man than is justified by the differences in the cost of manufacture, sale, or delivery. All the Robinson-Patman Act does is to guarantee equality of opportunity among retailers. It guarantees to the little man the right to buy his goods at comparable prices paid by the big man, his competitor. It is a fair law. If properly enforced, it gives the little man and the independent merchant security. It does not take anything away from the big man that should not be taken away from him. No one can condone a rule, which permits a supplier to give a big customer an unfair advantage over its little customer.

I am inserting herewith an editorial from the Colorado Grocer, Denver, Colo., which appeared recently, concerning a speech delivered by Mrs. Marie Kiefer, secretary-manager of the National Association of Retail Grocers. It is as follows:

PRICE DISCRIMINATIONS

Harmful price discriminations in the food industry have reached an alarming state, requiring specific action to stop them before they plunge the industry into the same kind of chaotic and corrupt practices that prevailed in the early 1930's, according to Mrs. Marie Kiefer, secretary-manager of the National Association of Retail Grocers.

Mrs. Kiefer addressed the annual convention of the National Association of Food Brokers on Saturday, February 19, in the Palmer House, Chicago, on the subject of "The Robinson-Patman Act and Food Distribution."

"A few of you in this audience managed to live through those days (before the Robinson-Patman Anti-Discrimination Act was adopted in 1936)," Mrs. Kiefer said. "Those of us who saw the destruction, dishonesty, and discrimination that prevailed will never forget it."

NARGUS spokesman for the Nation's independent food retailers and one of the original and consistent supporters of the Robinson-Patman Act, has come out strongly in support of the "equality of opportunity" bill to strengthen the act for the effectual prevention of harmful price discriminations.

Mrs. Kiefer pointed out that many discriminations today are not direct price preferences. There are all types of promotion schemes which give one group of stores preference in both allowances and facilities over competing retailers," she said. "Free goods for store openings, manpower for stocking shelves, consignment sales, and so on, are very frequently offered on a preferential basis to buyers who have no scruples about making illegal demands on suppliers."

Although the Robinson-Patman Act prohibits discriminations in allowances and facilities, a number of people in the industry either do not know this or else chose to ignore it, Mrs. Kiefer said.

"Let us not underestimate the amount of money involved in discriminations of all kinds," she cautioned. "The public record shows that in 1 year a larger buyer received, in what the court termed 'headquarters allowances,' $6,400,000, which constituted 24.59 percent of their total profits from all operations in that year. These headquarters allowances were the largest single source of profit for that organization."

Mrs. Kiefer continued:

"The overwhelming majority of business people do not desire to stoop to injurious discriminatory and unfair practices, but if the willful few, who choose this way of doing business, are allowed to pursue their evil conduct then many will feel they must adopt similar tactics to meet unfair and unethical competition. If this is permitted, the ethical standards of the industry will sink to the lowest level followed by the most unscrupulous. Two decades of effort to wipe out discriminations and to preserve equality of opportunity for all are now threatened by a resurgence of this old enemy."

The Robinson-Patman Act is now structurally weaker than ever before in its history, Mrs. Kiefer said, citing instances in which the law is not being enforced or has been weakened by judicial and administrative opinion.

In urging support for the equality of opportunity bill, Mrs. Kiefer also stressed the importance of individual responsibility to foster fair competitive opportunities by refusing to countenance harmful practices known to be taking place. She suggested that brokers report known violations to the Federal Trade Commission.

Without brokers and the great advances they have made in expanding their sales volume, the situation in the industry today would be much worse, Mrs. Kiefer said. She asked the brokers to help lead a crusade to recapture the lost territory. "Food brokers can become the greatest constructive force for fair play there is in the industry," she declared.

The Carolina Food Dealer, in a recent editorial, discussed a letter written by the president of the National Association of Retail Grocers to Senator HOMER E. CAPEHART, of Indiana. It is as follows:

NARGUS PRESIDENT SEEKS ROBINSON-PATMAN SUPPORT

Large and small businesses alike have a stake in the battle to preserve the Robinson-Patman law for fair competitive practices, Alvin V. Hokanson, president of the National Association of Retail Grocers, declared in a letter directed to Senator HOMER E. CAPEHART, of Indiana, chairman of the Banking and Currency Committee.

Business, without regard to size, has the important common interest to protect basic individual and economic freedoms, Hokanson said, "for if distribution ever becomes concentrated in the hands of a few powerful corporations, Government control of business will inevitably follow."

Hokanson, who comes from Porter, Ind., wrote to the senior Senator from his home State about his concern to keep open the door of opportunity for more than 350,000 independent food retailers under the free-enterprise system by preserving intact the Robinson-Patman antidiscrimination law.

In describing recurrent attacks upon the Robinson-Patman Act, the NARGUS president stated:

"For the past several years there has been a concerted drive to obtain legislation which would grant large business interests the right to strangle their competitors by getting unfair price discriminations regardless of the competitive effect. Those who are promoting this drive want to make it lawful for a manufacturer to sell the same goods, at the same time, and in the same quantity to a large favored distributor at a low price, while selling to competing smaller distributors at a higher price."

Pointing out that small business believes strongly in the necessity for keeping competition strong and vigorous, Hokanson said: "The competition small business believes in is fair competition as opposed to the 'anything goes' type of contest in which a smaller rival can be crushed without restraint, so long as so-called competitive methods are used to accomplish this purpose."

Since the Robinson-Patman Act was passed, in 1936, Hokanson wrote Senator CAPEHART, its purpose has been to protect competition by encouraging price cuts to small as well as large business. For this reason, he added, it is disturbing to independent distributors that those who are attacking the Robinson-Patman Act are attempting to stigmatize the act as preventing competition, although the act has never prohibited anyone from competing or from meeting competition. "It does require, however, that when a price cut is given to a big mass distributor it also be given on equal terms to merchants who are competing with him," Hokanson said.

He asserted that, in view of the economic issues involved in the current assault on the Robinson-Patman Act, "it is clear that what is at stake is not freedom to compete but elemental justice and equality of opportunity for business, regardless of size. We have seen time and time again that a competitive balance between big business and small business is not possible unless both are on equal footing so that efficiency and not size or financial power will determine success or failure."

It has been fortunate for our economy, Hokanson continued, that the Robinson-Patman Act has helped to keep the field of food distribution open for small firms to enter, prosper and grow.

Resulting from the fact that equality of opportunity has prevailed since the enactment of the Robinson-Patman Act in 1936, consumers have benefited from substantial progress in improved distribution techniques and other advancements, he said, notable among these being the modern self-service supermarket pioneered by independent food retailers.

"The retail food business is one segment of our economy where independent distributors have been given a fair chance to show what they can do and they have 'delivered the goods,'" the NARGUS president declared.

Warning of the threat of persistent efforts to amend the Robinson-Patman Act so as to legalize systematic price discriminations, Hokanson wrote: "If permitted, we will once again return to the two-price system under which a few very large distributors will get a low price from manufacturers while small distributors will be left with a serious competitive disadvantage from which they can never escape."

Hokanson requested Senator CAPEHART's considered opinion on this grave problem. "It is my hope you will agree with me that efforts to legalize injurious price discrimination should be resisted by all who support free competitive enterprise in this country," he concluded.

Michigan Week: Michigan State Society White Pine Tree Planting Southeast Lawn, United States Capitol, May 17, 1955, 9:30 a. m.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 19, 1955

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, buttressed by four lovely Michigan princesses, I have been honored in responding to the commanding invitation from Col. I. D. Brent, the distinguished president of the Michigan State Society, to plant upon these magnificent Capitol Grounds a virile and beautiful white pine sapling of great prospect and future promise. By what right, other than seniority, I was chosen to do the honors on the southeast lawn this morning matters naught. The thing that is important is that Michigan's symbolic tree, the great white pine, was planted here in connection with Michigan Week simultaneously being observed throughout our great State. It is important to note that this sapling is not only symbolic of the great strength, spaciousness and wealth of Michigan, but it is the same white pine at which at one time served as nature's covering for Michigan terrain from the southeast corner to the very tip of the Upper Peninsula some eight or nine hundred miles away. It was this great blanket of wealth-producing vegetation that created some of the greatest, most lasting and prodigiously expansive fortunes which developed and today underlay the great industries centered in Michigan, the Peninsular State.

A brief but significant and hopeful program was laid out surrounding the planting ceremonies, a copy of which I shall attach to these remarks. The program quite properly included an invocation and a benediction, together with the historic Michigan State song which wafted melodiously over the breeze upon the silver tones emanating from the throat of my gifted colleague and friend of the 14 District, Congressman LOUIS RABAUT. All of those assembled for this short but impressive ceremony prayed silently in their hearts that this little white pine tree proffered by a Home State Association would, under these auspicious circumstances, take root, grow great and strong, lifting its head ever higher and higher toward heaven and God to pay its Creator the homage we all owe Him, and that in the far distant future the white pine sapling grown to the unbelievable heights of its mighty possibilities might give inspiration to the wayfarer and the tourist, and cast its comforting shadow in the heat of the summer's day upon the statesmen and lawmakers, whom God grant shall continue successfully to struggle with the problems of our beloved Nation, and to aid in the maintenance and preservation of universal peace throughout the world.

The program follows:

MICHIGAN WEEK: MICHIGAN STATE SOCIETY WHITE PINE TREE PLANTING, SOUTHEAST LAWN, UNITED STATES CAPITOL, MAY 17, 1955, 9:30 A. M.

Music ..... Bolling Air Force Band
Lieutenant Meuser, leader
Invocation ..... Father Quinn
Archdiocese of Washington
Master of ceremonies ..... Col. I. D. Brent
Michigan State Society
Singing ..... Michigan, My Michigan
Hon. LOUIS C. RABAUT, Member of Congress, Grosse Point Park, Mich.
Address ..... Hon. CHARLES E. POTTER
United States Senator, Cheboygan, Mich.
Presentation of white pine tree .....
Hon. PATRICK V. MCNAMARA
United States Senator, Detroit, Mich.
Official pages ..... The Michigan Agricultural Princesses
Planting ..... Hon. JOHN D. DINGELL
Member of Congress, Detroit, Mich.
Acceptance of white pine tree .....
Hon. J. George Stewart
Architect of the Capitol
National Anthem ..... Bolling Air Force Band
Benediction ..... Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D.
Chaplain, United States House of Representatives (University of Michigan, 1908)

SENATE

FRIDAY, MAY 20, 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:

Eternal God, who hast revealed Thyself to the ever-changing lives of men, in the word made flesh which stands fast forever, speak now to our hearts as we wait upon Thee. Remind us of all Thy mercies which have shown forth Thy love in the past, and in that love make us on the holy ground of each present day steadfast and sure. Hold steadily before our eyes that pure will of Thine for us until we learn to choose it above all earthly allurements and the esteem of men. Make our timorous faith more sure, and our high, if bewildered, loyalties firm. Knowing that out of the travail of many a violent age a great birth has come, by Thy providence keep our faith steady, lest for the lack of it we lose what Thou dost intend in this prophetic day. We ask it in the name of that One whose coming broke the ages in two and who is now reverenced and adored while the violent are forgotten. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

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

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, its reading clerk, announced that the House had passed, without amendment, the bill (S. 1727) to authorize certain administrative expenses in the Treasury Department, and for other purposes.