Cantrell, Wayne Edward, 27068A.
Comeau, Paul Theodore, 27070A.
Thomas, John Paul, 26626A.
Reyes, Raymond, Victor, Jr., 27071A.
Harr, Minnis Charles, 24608A.
Probst, Gerald Grahm, 24607A.
×Latham, Edward Gillespie, Jr., 26627A.
Culp, James William, 27072A.
Brumfield, Richard Clayton, 27073A.
Gilk, Frank Edward, 27074A.
Hillebrandt, Leonard Gordon, Jr., 24888A.
Strong, Lowell Martin, 24889A.
×Berkman, William Worrall, 24887A.
Clark, Norman Johnson, 27075A.
×Callaway, Edward Pierce, 24621A.
×Cooper, John Raymond, 24622A.
March, Donald Ross, 24890A.
×Suggs, Jack Wofford, 24891A.
Gale, Mark David, 27076A.
Lambert, Joseph Karl, 27077A.
Hansen, John, 27078A.
Stahl, David Whittingham, 27079A.
Coverdale, Robert Frederick, 27081A.
DeMent, Kenneth Park, 27080A.
×Saunders, James Woodward, Jr., 25369A.
×Bubba, Lawrence Frank, 25368A.
×Killgore, James Alvan, 24623A.
×Carpenter, Robert Thomas, 24625A.
×Branson, Dean Howell, 24893A.
Schultz, Robert Augie, 25644A.
×Stehlin, Joseph Charles, Jr., 25692A.
Crosby, Mary Lavinia, 27083W.
Beverly, Chester Arthur, Jr., 27082A.
Zaworski, Donald Lewis, 24911A.
×Dodson, Jerome Roger, Jr., 24905A.
×James, James Kendall, 24899A.
×Harmer, Torr Wagner, Jr., 24906A.
×Plaster, Larry Egbert, 24896A.
×Henderson, Martin Fick, 24907A.
Allen, Nelson, 24897A.
Allison, Glen Wesley, 24894A.
×Jacobus, Frederick Billings, 24902A.
Schramm, Joseph Vincent, 24908A.
×Sweet, Cyrus Bardeen, 3d, 24910A.
×Boyden, Robert Winfield, 24903A.
×Clay, Ted Norris, 24898A.
×McClelland, James Norman, 24900A.
×McIntire, Daniel Stuart, Jr., 24895A.
Montgomery, Marshall Adam, Jr., 25370A.
×Finnegan, Francis Patrick, Jr., 24901A.
Howard, Joe Ed, 27084A.
Keebaugh, Eldon Lee, 27087A.
Slater, Robert Thomas, 27085A.
Williams, Conrad Ivan, 27086A.
Washburn, Troy Nelson, 24624A.
Mills, Billy James, 24626A.
×Aikman, James Howard, 25372A.
Sprehe, Forrest Dale, 25373A.
Schwartz, Douglas Milton, 27088A.
Barnes, Jere Leigh, 24912A.
Hartman, Sammy Lee, 24913A.
Bird, Ronald Arthur, 27089A.

NURSE

×Schooley, Mildred Francis, 24257W.
×Collavo, LaVerne Martha, 24259W.
×Momrow, Esther Mildred, 24258W.

(NOTE.—Dates of rank of all officers nominated for promotion will be determined by the Secretary of the Air Force.)

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate May 20 (legislative day of May 2), 1955:

THE NORTH ATLANTIC TREATY ORGANIZATION AND EUROPEAN REGIONAL ORGANIZATIONS

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.

IN THE ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

The following-named officer under the provisions of section 504 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947 to be assigned to a position of importance and responsibility designated by the President under subsection (b) of section 504, in rank as follows:

Lt. Gen. Williston Birkhimer Palmer, O12246, Army of the United States (major general, U. S. Army), in the rank of general.

IN THE REGULAR ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

The nominations of Gilbert G. Ackroyd and 748 other officers for promotion in the Regular Army of the United States, under the provisions of sections 502 and 509 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947, which were confirmed today, were received by the Senate on May 5, 1955, and may be found in full in the Senate proceedings of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for that date, under the caption "Nominations," beginning with the name of Gilbert G. Ackroyd, which appears on page 4897, and ending with the name of William J. Winter, Jr., which is shown on page 4900.

IN THE REGULAR AIR FORCE

The nominations of Malcolm H. Sawyer and 427 other officers for appointment in the Regular Air Force, in the grades indicated, which were confirmed today, were received by the Senate on May 11, 1955, and may be found in full in the Senate proceedings of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for that date, under the caption "Nominations," beginning with the name of Malcolm H. Sawyer, which appears on page 5191, and ending with the name of Charles O. Hopingardner, which appears on page 5193.

IN THE NAVY AND IN THE MARINE CORPS

The following groups of nominations for appointment in the Navy or in the Marine Corps, were confirmed today:

The nominations of Ralph J. Grutsch, Jr., and 214 other officers for appointment in the Navy and Marine Corps, were received by the Senate on May 5, 1955, and may be found in the Senate proceedings of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for that date, under the caption "Nominations," beginning with the name of Ralph J. Grutsch, Jr., which appears on page 4900, and ending with the name of Willem Vanhemert, also appearing on page 4900; and

The nominations of Albert L. Abdon and 4,717 other officers for appointment in the Navy and Marine Corps, were received by the Senate on May 13, 1955, and may be found in the Senate proceedings of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for that date, under the caption "Nominations," beginning with the name of Albert L. Abdon, which is shown on page 6330, and ending with the name of Adolph Ziegler, appearing on page 6340.

SENATE

MONDAY, MAY 23, 1955

(Legislative day of Monday, May 2, 1955)

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

Rev. Carl Walter Berner, D. D., pastor of Faith Lutheran Church, Los Angeles, Calif., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, whose name is holy, whose wisdom perfect, and whose love constant, we magnify and praise Thee for the multitude of Thy mercies upon our people—Thy blessings in field and factory, in homes and offices, in church and state.

Most of all do we acknowledge in humble thanksgiving the gift of Thy divine Gospel whereby our hearts and minds are filled with the peace that passeth all understanding.

Enable us in trust and confidence to walk upon that costly bridge built in the grace of our divine Saviour, who resolved the difference between Thy holiness and our unholiness.

Let Thy richest benediction rest upon this assembly and the high purpose which it serves. Endow Thy servants with wisdom, that we may do our work as a stewardship and a divine vocation, so that in all things Thy will be done and Thy work established.

These petitions we ask in the name and to the glory of our divine Saviour, Jesus Christ, who with Thee and the Holy Ghost lives and reigns, one God forever. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Friday, May 20, 1955, was dispensed with.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, which is considering the Salk vaccine problem, be permitted to meet during the session of the Senate today.

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

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

ORDER FOR TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there may be a 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 VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Morning business is in order.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

AMENDMENT OF UNIFORM CODE OF MILITARY JUSTICE

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Uniform Code of Military Justice (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Armed Services.

EMPLOYMENT OF A RETIRED NAVAL OFFICER IN CONNECTION WITH ANTARCTIC EXPEDITIONS

A letter from the Under Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to permit a retired officer of the Navy to be employed in a command status in connection with Antarctic expeditions (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT ON STOCKPILING PROGRAM

A letter from the Director, Office of Defense Mobilization, Executive Office of the President, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the stockpiling program, for the period July 1 to December 31, 1954 (with an

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

accompanying report); to the Committee on Armed Services.

GRANTING OF APPLICATIONS FOR PERMANENT RESIDENCE FILED BY CERTAIN ALIENS

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

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

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

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

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

"Joint Resolution 56

"Joint resolution memorializing Congress to enact legislation deepening the connecting channels in the Great Lakes in order to provide the full benefits of the St. Lawrence Seaway project

"Whereas the United States of America and the Dominion of Canada are now constructing the St. Lawrence Seaway project, scheduled for completion in 1959, which will open the ports of the State of Wisconsin to deep-draft ocean navigation, with great benefits to Wisconsin port communities, to this State, and to the entire Nation; and

"Whereas the St. Lawrence Seaway project will bring 27-foot navigation only to Lake Erie and in order to bring the full benefits of the project to the ports of Lake Huron, Lake Michigan, and Lake Superior, the connecting channels of the Great Lakes in the Detroit River, St. Clair River, St. Mary's River, and the Straits of Mackinac will require deepening and improvement; and

"Whereas the deepening of Great Lakes shipping channels is timely and necessary to permit full utilization of the many large freight carriers which have been placed in service on the Great Lakes in recent years, representing an investment of several hundred million dollars, and which vessels now cannot operate at full capacity due to limitations of depth in connecting channels; and

"Whereas deepening the connecting channels of the Great Lakes will add to the efficiency of lake and ocean shipping and will bring great economic benefit to the commerce of the Great Lakes, the Middle West, and of the entire Nation; and

"Whereas such improvement would be consistent with a worldwide trend toward deep-draft shipping and would be consistent with Federal projects for the deepening of seaboard harbors at many localities; and

"Whereas authorizing and appropriating legislation for this purpose should be given high priority so that the improvement of Great Lakes connecting channels may be completed to coincide with the completion of the St. Lawrence Seaway project: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the senate (the assembly concurring)*, That the Legislature of the State of Wisconsin hereby memorializes the Congress of the United States for the early enactment of legislation to authorize the deepening of the Great Lakes connecting channels and to appropriate funds for that purpose; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That the Senators and Representatives from Wisconsin be requested to use their best efforts to secure the passage of such authorizing and appropriating legislation by the 84th Congress; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That properly attested copies of this resolution be transmitted to President Eisenhower; to the Chief of Engineers, United States Army; to each House of Congress; and to each Wisconsin Member thereof.

"W. P. KNOWLES,
"*President of the Senate.*
"LAWRENCE R. LARSEN,
"*Chief Clerk of the Senate.*
"MARK CATLIN, Jr.,
"*Speaker of the Assembly.*
"ARTHUR L. MAY,
"*Chief Clerk of the Assembly.*"

Three joint resolutions of the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

"Joint Resolution 39

"Joint resolution requesting Congress to authorize the amendment of certain patents of Government lands containing restrictions as to use of such lands

"Whereas the 82d and 83d Congresses have enacted legislation liberalizing the restrictions on the sale of Territorial public lands for commercial uses, thus evidencing an intent to expand the commercial use of land in the Territory; and

"Whereas patents conveying certain former public lands contain restrictions limiting the use of such lands for residence and eleemosynary purposes; and

"Whereas due to changed conditions in the area surrounding such lands, restrictions in many instances prevent the lands from being developed to their highest and best use as business lots, thereby working a hardship on the owners thereof: Now, therefore,

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

"SECTION 1. The Congress of the United States is hereby respectfully requested to authorize the Commissioner of Public Lands, with the concurrence of the Governor, to amend such land patents by removing the conditions therein restricting the use of such lands for residence or eleemosynary purposes, so that the lands will be free of any such encumbrances: *Provided, however*, No such restriction shall be removed in patents conveying an area in excess of one-half acre: and *provided further*, That in the opinion of the Commissioner the surrounding area in which such lands are located has sufficiently changed to warrant such action.

"SEC. 2. Duly certified copies of this joint resolution shall be transmitted to the President of the United States, to the President of the Senate, and the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States, to the Secretary of the Interior, and to the Delegate to Congress from Hawaii.

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

"Approved this 17th day of May 1955.

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

"Joint Resolution 43

"Joint resolution requesting the Congress of the United States to amend section 73 of the Hawaiian Organic Act to authorize the Commissioner of Public Lands to sell residence lots without further notice or auction after 6 months after said lots were first offered for sale

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

"SECTION 1. The Congress of the United States is hereby respectfully requested to amend section 73 (1) of the Hawaiian Organic Act substantially as set forth in the following form of bill:

"'A bill to amend section 73 (1) of the Hawaiian Organic Act

"'*Be it enacted, etc.*—

"'SECTION 1. The portion of the first proviso of section 73 (1) of the Hawaiian Organic Act which reads "That the commissioner shall, with the approval of said board, sell to any citizen of the United States, or to any person who has legally declared his intention to become a citizen, for residence purposes lots and tracts, not exceeding 3 acres in area;" is hereby amended to read as follows:

"'"That the commissioner shall, with the approval of said board, sell to any citizen of the United States, or to any person who has legally declared his intention to become a citizen for residence purposes lots and tracts, not exceeding 3 acres in area; but any lot not sold after public auction, or sold and forfeited, or any lot or part thereof surrendered with the consent of the commissioner, which is authorized, may be disposed of upon application at no less than the advertised price without further public notice or auction but after a 6 months' period following the auction, only upon reappraisal and at the price of the reappraised value, if it be greater than the original price at the auction."

"'SEC. 2. This act shall take effect on and after the date of its approval.'

"SEC. 2. Certified copies of this joint resolution shall be transmitted to the President of the United States, to the President of the Senate and Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States, and to the Delegate to Congress from Hawaii.

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

"Approved this 19th day of May 1955.

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

"Joint Resolution 45

"Joint resolution requesting the Congress of the United States to waive certain restrictions with respect to exchanges of public lands for emergency relief to distressed persons in Puna, T. H.

"Whereas recent volcanic activity in the district of Puna, county of Hawaii, T. H., has desolated many acres of heretofore productive farm lands; and

"Whereas unlike other catastrophic events which befall lands and render them only temporarily unproductive, lands inundated by flowing lava are rendered totally worthless for thousands of years; and

"Whereas there is little or no privately owned land in or about the district of Puna, T. H., available for purchase by those persons whose lands have been so destroyed; and

"Whereas there are substantial acreages of public lands within and adjacent to the said district of Puna, T. H., which can be exchanged for lands destroyed by volcanic activity: Now, therefore

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

"SECTION 1. The Congress of the United States is hereby respectfully requested to enact suitable legislation to direct the land commissioner of the Territory of Hawaii to exchange public lands within or adjacent to the district of Puna, county of Hawaii, T. H., for lands destroyed by volcanic activity occurring during March and April 1955, such exchange to be of lands of comparable value and area immediately prior to the time of destruction, any provision in the Hawaiian Organic Act in limitation of such authority to the contrary notwithstanding.

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

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

"Approved this 20th day of May 1955.

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

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

"Joint Resolution 41

"Joint resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States of America to authorize the Rural Electrification Administration, Department of Agriculture, to send its representative to Hawaii to investigate the possibility of setting up a rural electrification cooperative under the Rural Electrification Administration to serve areas without electricity in the county of Hawaii

"Whereas there exists in the county of Hawaii considerable areas suitable for homesites and agricultural purposes not now served by electric power lines; and

"Whereas the productive development of such homesites and agricultural lands is hampered by the nonavailability of electricity; and

"Whereas the United States Government, under the Rural Electrification Administration, has provided for the creation of rural electrification cooperatives, and appropriated loan funds to be used in supplying electricity to such areas; and

"Whereas it is felt that the county of Hawaii does qualify for the benefits administered by the Rural Electrification Administration; and

"Whereas the county of Hawaii has never previously benefited from said funds: Now, therefore,

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

"SECTION 1. The Congress of the United States of America is hereby respectfully requested to authorize the Rural Electrification Administration to send its representative to Hawaii to investigate the possibility of setting up a rural electrification cooperative under the Rural Electrification Administration to serve areas without electricity in the county of Hawaii.

"SEC. 2. Certified copies of this joint resolution shall be forwarded to the President of the United States, to the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States, to the Secretary of Agriculture, to the Administrator of the Rural Electrification Administration, and to the Delegate to Congress from Hawaii.

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

"Approved this 18th day of May A. D. 1955.

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

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

"Joint Resolution 42

"Joint resolution requesting the Congress of the United States to enact legislation to provide that the proceeds of sales of real property owned by estates, trusts, and individuals where owned by said estates, trusts, or individuals for 10 consecutive years prior to said sale or sales be taxed for Federal income-tax purposes as capital gains and not as ordinary income

"Whereas large tracts of land in the Territory of Hawaii are owned by estates and trusts, and individuals who may have inherited said lands; and

"Whereas it is to the best interests of this Territory that these lands be subdivided and sold in fee simple to the purchasers thereof; and

"Whereas the owners of said lands desire to cooperate with the Government housing programs and otherwise to make available said lands to small-home owners but are prevented from so doing in the majority of instances because the owners of said lands on subdivision and sale might be taxed on the proceeds thereof for Federal income tax as ordinary income: Now, therefore,

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

"SECTION 1. The Congress of the United States of America is hereby requested to amend the Internal Revenue Code, or by other appropriate legislation, to provide that where real property has been owned for a period of not less than 10 years consecutively prior to any sale thereof by any estate, trust, or individual, that on any sale of said real property, whether by subdivision or otherwise, the proceeds of said sale or sales shall be taxable for Federal income-tax purposes as a capital gain, or gains, and not as ordinary income.

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

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

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

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

CONSTRUCTION OF GREER'S FERRY PROJECT, ARKANSAS—CONCURRENT RESOLUTION OF ARKANSAS LEGISLATURE

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I present, for appropriate reference, and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, House Concurrent Resolution No. 28, which was adopted by the 60th General Assembly of the State of Arkansas earlier this year.

The resolution petitions Congress to provide funds for the planning and construction of the Greer's Ferry project on the White River in Arkansas. I know that other Members of the Arkansas delegation join me in urging that Members give favorable consideration to this project when the civil functions bill is taken up in the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The concurrent resolution will be received and appropriately referred; and, under the rule, the concurrent resolution will be printed in the RECORD.

The concurrent resolution was referred to the Committee on Public Works, as follows:

House Concurrent Resolution 28

Whereas the flood-control program of the United States has saved much of the land in various areas for productive purposes; and

Whereas, said flood-control program has also greatly aided in the elimination of the dangers of overflow and the destruction of crops and various other properties in such areas, thereby increasing the productiveness of such areas and protecting the welfare of the United States; and

Whereas there is great need for additional electrical power in the vicinity of the Greer's Ferry and for the expansion of existing facilities for distribution of such power; and

Whereas there has been considerable progress made in the development of the White River Basin; and

Whereas additional dams are needed for the development of the White River Basin; and

Whereas the general comprehensive plan for flood control and other purposes for the White River Basin, approved by the Flood Control Act of June 28, 1938, as amended, was modified to provide for the generation of power in conjunction with flood control at the Greer's Ferry Reservoir; and

Whereas Greer's Ferry Reservoir has been approved by the Congress of the United States as recommended by the United States engineers; and

Whereas there was $30,000 included in the President's budget message for planning for the Greer's Ferry project: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives of the 60th General Assembly of the State of Arkansas (the Senate concurring therein):

SECTION 1. That we urge the Congress of the United States to give careful consideration to the importance of the Greer's Ferry project.

SEC. 2. That the Congress of the United States be, and is hereby respectfully requested to provide sufficient appropriation to initiate the construction of Greer's Ferry Dam and Reservoir.

SEC. 3. That a copy of this resolution be forwarded, or delivered by an official representative to the President of the United States, the President of the Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to each Member of the House of Representatives and the Senate of the United States representing the State of Arkansas.

ZANTON GORDON,
President of Senate.
CHARLES F. SMITH,
Speaker of the House.
ORVAL E. FAUBUS,
Governor.

MARCH 4, 1955.

THE TREATYMAKING POWER—JOINT RESOLUTION OF UTAH LEGISLATURE

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference, and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, a joint resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of Utah, favoring the enactment of Senate Joint Resolution 1, relating to the treatymaking power.

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

Senate Joint Resolution 3

Joint resolution of the 31st Legislature of the State of Utah reaffirming its support of the Bricker amendment and again memorializing the Congress of the United States to propose an amendment to the Constitution of the United States by passing Senate Joint Resolution 1 of the 83d Congress, 1st session, as proposed by Senator BRICKER

Be it resolved by the Legislature of the State of Utah (both houses concurring therein):

Whereas the Legislature of the State of Utah by joint resolution, passed December 14, 1953, memorialized the Congress of the United States to propose an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to treaties and known as the Bricker amendment; and

Whereas the problems requiring such an amendment still exist: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we do affirm the joint resolution of December 14, 1953, and again petition and memorialize the Congress of the United States to propose an amendment to the Constitution of the United States by passing the following amendment:

"ARTICLE —

"SECTION 1. A provision of a treaty which conflicts with this Constitution shall not be of any force or effect.

"SEC. 2. A treaty shall become effective as internal law in the United States only

through legislation which would be valid in the absence of treaty.

"SEC. 3. Congress shall have power to regulate all executive and other agreements with any foreign power or international organization. All such agreements shall be subject to the limitations imposed on treaties by this article.

"SEC. 4. The Congress shall have power to enforce this article by appropriate legislation.

"SEC. 5. This article shall be inoperative unless it shall have been ratified as an amendment to the Constitution by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States within 7 years from the date of its submission"; be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be transmitted forthwith to the President of the United States, United States Senate, House of Representatives, and each congressional delegate from the State of Utah.

ALTERNATIVE METHOD OF AMENDING THE CONSTITUTION—CONCURRENT RESOLUTION OF GEORGIA LEGISLATURE

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, I present, for appropriate reference, and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, a concurrent resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of Georgia, relating to an alternative method of amending the Constitution of the United States.

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

Concurrent resolution memorializing Congress to call a convention for the purpose of submitting for ratification an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, so as to provide an alternative method of amending the Constitution of the United States

Whereas recognition of the sovereign status of the several States requires that the Constitution of the United States be made subject to amendment in a more direct manner befitting that status, that is to say, without the intervention of Congress: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the house of representatives (the senate concurring), That the General Assembly of Georgia respectfully petition the Congress of the United States to call a convention for the purpose of proposing the following article as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States in lieu of article V:

"ARTICLE —

"SECTION 1. 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; or the legislature of any State, whenever two-thirds of each house shall deem it necessary, may propose amendments to this Constitution by transmitting to the Secretary of State of the United States and to the secretary of state of each of the several States a certified copy of the resolution proposing the amendment, which shall be deemed submitted to the several States for ratification when certified copies of resolutions of the legislatures of any 12 of the several States by two-thirds of each house shall have been so transmitted concurring in the proposal of such amendment; which, in any 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: *Provided*, That no State, without its consent, shall be deprived of its equal suffrage in the Senate.

"SEC. 2. The act of proposal, concurrence in a proposal, or ratification of an amendment, shall not be revocable.

"SEC. 3. A proposal of an amendment by a State shall be inoperative unless it shall have been so concurred in within 7 years from the date of the proposal. A proposed amendment shall be inoperative unless it shall have been so ratified within 15 years from the date of its submission, or shorter period as may be prescribed in the resolution proposing the amendment.

"SEC. 4. Controversies respecting the validity of an amendment shall be justiciable and shall be determined by the exercise of the judicial power of the United States."

Resolved further, That such amendment shall be valid to all intents and purposes as part of the Constitution of the United States when ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States;

Resolved further, That as the power of the sovereign States to propose amendments to the Constitution of the United States by convention under article V has never been exercised and no precedent exists for the calling or holding of such convention, the State of Georgia hereby declares the following basic principles with respect thereto: That the power of the sovereign States to amend the Constitution of the United States under article V is absolute; that the power of the sovereign States to propose amendments to the Constitution by convention under article V is absolute; that the power of the sovereign States extends over such convention and the scope and control thereof and that it is within their sovereign power to prescribe whether such convention shall be general or shall be limited to the proposal of a specified amendment or of amendments in a specified field; that the exercise by the sovereign States of their power to require the calling of such convention contemplates that the applications of the several States for such convention shall prescribe the scope thereof and the essential provisions for holding the same; that the scope of such convention and the provisions for holding the same are established in and by the applications therefor by the legislatures of the two-thirds majority of the several States required by article V to call the same, and that it is the duty of the Congress to call such convention in conformity therewith; that such convention is without power to transcend, and the delegates to such convention are without power to act except within the limitations and provisions so prescribed;

Resolved further, That such convention shall be called and held in conformity with the following limitations and provisions, and that the Congress, in the call for such convention, hereby is requested to and shall prescribe:

(1) That such convention shall be held in the city of Philadelphia, in the State of Pennsylvania, on the first Monday of the first December following transmission to the Senate and the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States of applications for such convention by the legislatures of two-thirds of the several States and, in honor of the Nation's founders and for invocation, shall convene at Constitution Hall, at Independence Square, at the hour of 10 o'clock in the morning of such day, and thereupon adjourn to more commodious quarters within said city for session as the convention shall determine;

(2) That the several States shall have equal suffrage at such convention; that each of the several States shall be entitled to 3 delegates thereat and that each of such delegates shall be entitled to 1 vote; that the delegates to such convention from the several States shall be the highest officer of the senate and the highest officer of the house of representatives of their respective legislatures at the time of such convention, except that in States where the lieutenant governor is president of the senate, the president of the senate pro tempore, or other highest officer from the membership of the senate shall be such delegate from the senate, and in States having a unicameral legislature the 2 highest officers of its legislature shall be such delegates, which 2 delegates in each of the several States shall jointly designate a citizen of such State at large who shall be the third delegate from such State to such convention; that in case of a vacancy in the office of any delegate during such convention, not otherwise filled pursuant to law or by legislative act or as herein provided, such vacancy shall be filled by the governor of such State from the senate or house of its legislature or the State at large, respectively, as the case may be; that during such vacancy and during the absence of a delegate from the floor of the convention the delegates present from such State shall be empowered to exercise the vote of the absent delegate or delegates from such State; that the legislature of any State may choose its delegates to such convention, other than hereinabove designated, in which case the delegates so chosen shall be certified to the convention by the secretary of state of such State and shall constitute the delegates of such State at such convention in lieu of the delegates otherwise hereinabove designated.

(3) That such convention shall be limited and restricted specifically to the consideration and proposal of such amendment to article V, the choosing of officers and adoption of rules of procedure for the conduct of such convention and the maintenance of order thereat, the determination of any issue respecting the seating of delegates, adjournment from day to day and to a day certain and from place to place within said city as may be convenient, and adjournment sine die; and such convention shall not be held for any other purpose nor have any other power, and the delegates thereto shall have no power other than within the limitations herein prescribed;

(4) That a permanent record shall be made of the proceedings of such convention, which shall be certified by the secretary of the convention, the original of which shall be placed in the Library of Congress and printed copies of which shall be transmitted to the Senate and the House of Representatives of the Congress, to the Secretary of State of the United States, and to each house of the legislature and to the secretary of state of each of the several States;

(5) That the powers of such convention shall be exercisable by the States, represented at such convention by duly constituted delegates thereat, by majority vote of the States present and voting on such proposal, and not otherwise;

Resolved further, That this application shall constitute a continuing application for such convention under article V of the Constitution of the United States until the legislatures of two-thirds of the several States shall have made like applications and such convention shall have been called and held in conformity therewith, unless the Congress itself propose such amendment within the time and the manner herein provided;

Resolved further, That proposal of such amendment by the Congress and its submission for ratification to the legislatures of the several States in the form of the article hereinabove specifically set forth, at any time prior to 60 days after the legislatures of two-thirds of the several States shall have made application for such convention, shall render such convention unnecessary and the same shall not be held; otherwise such con-

vention shall be called and held in conformity with such applications;

Resolved further, That as this application under article V of the Constitution of the United States is the exercise of a fundamental power of the sovereign States under the Constitution of the United States, it is requested that receipt of this application by the Senate and the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States be officially noted and duly entered upon their respective records, and that the full context of this resolution be published in the official publication of both the Senate and the House of Representatives of the Congress; and

Resolver further, That certified copies of this resolution be transmitted forthwith to the Senate and the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States, to each Senator and Representative in the Congress from this State, and to the Secretary of State of the United States, and to each house of the legislature and to the secretary of state of each of the several States, attesting the adoption of this resolution by the legislature of this State.

Approved March 3, 1955.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

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

S. 55. A bill to authorize the acceptance on behalf of the United States of the conveyance and release by the Aztec Land & Cattle Co., Ltd., of its right, title, and interest in lands within the Coconino and Sitgreaves National Forests, in the State of Arizona, and the payment to said company of the value of such lands, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 369).

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

S. 516. A bill to amend the act of July 3, 1952, relating to research in the development and utilization of saline waters; with amendments (Rept. No. 370).

By Mr. HAYDEN, from the Committee on Appropriations:

H. J. Res. 310. Joint resolution making additional appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1955, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 371).

By Mr. BYRD, from the Committee on Finance:

H. R. 4725. A bill to repeal sections 452 and 462 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954; with amendments (Rept. No. 372).

APPROPRIATIONS FOR WESTERN LAND BOUNDARY FENCE PROJECT—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE—ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF BILL

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, I report favorably, without amendment, the bill (S. 76) authorizing appropriations for the construction, operation, and maintenance of the western land boundary fence project, and for other purposes, and I submit a report (No. 373) thereon. I ask unanimous consent that my name may be added as a cosponsor of the bill the next time it is printed.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The report will be received and the bill will be placed on the calendar; and, without objection, the name of the Senator from Arizona will be added as additional cosponsor of the bill.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

As in executive session,

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. FULBRIGHT, from the Committee on Banking and Currency:

Frank A. Southard, Jr., of New York, to be United States Executive Director of the International Monetary Fund; and

Andrew Downey Orrick, of California, to be a member of the Securities and Exchange Commission for the remainder of the term expiring June 5, 1957, vice Ralph H. Demmler, resigned.

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

Executive B, 84th Congress, 1st session, a convention on Great Lakes fisheries between the United States and Canada, signed at Washington on September 10, 1954; without reservation (Exec. Rept. No. 7).

BILLS INTRODUCED

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

By Mr. BUTLER:

S. 2038. A bill to amend the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, in order to eliminate the 6-percent differential applying to certain bids of Pacific coast shipbuilders; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. GOLDWATER:

S. 2039. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to lease any unassigned lands on the Colorado River Indian Reservation, Ariz., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BENDER:

S. 2040. A bill for the relief of Shiu-Ming Fok; and

S. 2041. A bill for the relief of Elisabeta Drugoci; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CLEMENTS (for himself and Mr. DUFF):

S. 2042. A bill to restore the jurisdiction of the district courts in certain civil actions brought against the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORSE (for himself and Mr. NEUBERGER):

S. 2043. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to transfer the control of certain land in Oregon to the Secretary of the Army, to provide for the relocation of certain Indians residing on lands required by the United States for the construction of the Dalles Dam project on the Columbia River, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

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

By Mr. KEFAUVER:

S. 2044. A bill to amend section 11 of the Administrative Procedure Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LEHMAN:

S. 2045. A bill to amend the United States Housing Act of 1937, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

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

AMENDMENT OF HOUSING ACT OF 1937

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill providing for amendments to the Housing Act, to provide, among other things, for authorization for the construction of 135,000 units of public housing annually for the next 2 years. I ask unanimous consent that I may speak on the bill in excess of the 2 minutes allowed under the order which has been entered.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the Senator from New York may proceed.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, as a member of the Housing Subcommittee, which is about to go into executive session on housing legislation, I shall move to insert the provisions I have just introduced into any housing bill which our subcommittee reports. In the face of the facts recently presented to our subcommittee, my proposal for a public housing program of 135,000 units annually is a modest one. Any authorization of less would fall far short of providing the housing that must be provided for the low-income groups in our population.

The administration's public housing program has been, and continues to be, a cruel and heartbreaking joke.

Our Housing Subcommittee, Mr. President, has just finished 2 weeks of intensive hearings on proposed housing legislation, including S. 1800, the administration's omnibus bill.

The administration bill makes some needed technical changes in our present housing legislation, but makes no striking advances in the housing field. It contains no new ideas, to speak of. It is of little help in meeting the need for middle-income housing. It is of no help as far as low-income housing is concerned.

I have listened to the witnesses, including the administration's spokesmen and experts on housing. We have had other experts too—the outstanding nongovernmental experts in the housing field. As a result of this testimony, I am introducing this bill, which is a truly modest reflection of expert opinion on the need for housing for the low-income groups of our country.

This proposed legislation would also, Mr. President, meet a few other critical needs, such as housing for elderly married couples and for single elderly persons, although separate amendments to meet such needs are already pending before our subcommittee.

I want to emphasize, however, that in my judgment, we do need a very fresh and new approach to the whole housing problem. What we have now is a series of stimulations, promotions, and thinly disguised subsidies for the construction of new housing, and the rehabilitation of old, but no overall housing plan to insure that the housing that is being built is housing that meets the national need. There is no real planning ahead in our housing program.

But the formulation of housing legislation which goes to the root of the problem, and effectively deals with it, is an undertaking which will require some prolonged study and careful thought. I hope our subcommittee can perform this function in the months ahead. I hope we can come up with a real plan and a real program. But we face a deadline now—the expiration of the public-housing authorization on June 30 of this year. So we must pass some kind of a bill within the next few weeks.

Mr. President, when the Housing Act of 1954 was approved by the Senate last year, I voted against it. My negative vote was based on the public-housing features of that bill. They were a snare and a delusion.

The number of units authorized, 35,000, was ridiculously inadequate. But even that drop in the bucket of public housing was hedged in with restrictions and limitations whose intent, I said at the time, could be none other than to kill all public housing.

The testimony before our committee this year demonstrated clearly that my fears had been fully justified. Do you know how many public-housing units were actually started under the terms of the 1954 act? Two hundred—two hundred units—less than one fair-sized apartment house—for the whole country, in an entire year.

In the course of the hearings, it was stated—authoritatively, I believe—that our current need for public housing runs between 200,000 and 500,000 units a year.

How long can we afford to neglect the urgent needs of literally millions of our people of low income—minority groups and others—who must live in miserable slums? These millions, now living in crowded, substandard, unsanitary conditions, cannot help but reflect these constantly deteriorating influences. Crime and juvenile delinquency cannot be materially reduced until the conditions which stimulate such aberrations are eradicated. Foremost among such conditions are the slums—breeding places of crime and disease.

There is no available remedy for this situation other than Federal aid for public housing. Although overall housing construction by so-called private enterprise is proceeding at an alltime high rate of about 1,300,000 units a year, none of this new housing is within the means of low-income groups.

Nor can these low-income families benefit by the trickle-down method, for our housing needs are so great that even our high building rate is not sufficient to reduce the number of families forced to live in substandard housing.

Our low-income groups, far from benefiting from the high construction rate, are actually experiencing increasing difficulty in finding adequate housing. Private builders simply cannot serve our low-income families' housing needs. Therefore the communities must organize and provide public-housing programs as they have done for years, and the Federal Government must continue to help finance and underwrite such programs.

The administration, however, in its bill (S. 1800), proposes to continue the unworkable public-housing provisions of the Housing Act of 1954, for a token program of 35,000 units a year. Even if 35,000 units had been actually started this year instead of the incredible figure of only 200 units, such a program would still be only a pale reflection of the actual need. The District of Columbia needs almost that many, right here in the shadow of the Capitol.

The proposed legislation would authorize 135,000 public-housing units a year for the next 2 years. The 135,000 units proposed is not enough, in my judgment, but I chose it in a spirit of compromise. This is the figure Congress authorized in the 1949 act which provided for 810,000 units to be built over a 6-year period. The proposed authorization of 135,000 units is less than 10 percent of our annual level of private construction. The late Senator Robert Taft strongly supported the assumption that our public-housing rate should be at least 10 percent of our private construction rate.

The proposed legislation also would eliminate the unworkable provisions of the 1954 act which have, in fact, completely killed our public-housing program. The Housing Administrator testified in our recent hearings, as did others, that the limitations of that act which required a community to have a slum-clearance program underway before it could receive public-housing aid, were a major cause of the failure of the public-housing program this year. Many communities cannot afford a slum-clearance program but desperately need public housing. In some communities public housing would meet the total slum-clearance needs. Furthermore, the need for public housing goes beyond the need to eradicate slums, and many persons require such housing even though they are not displaced by slum-clearance projects.

In many localities there will be no public housing for years if public-housing construction must await the launching of an urban redevelopment or slum-clearance program. Therefore, if we are to have a public-housing program, it must be on its own merits, not as a stepchild of urban redevelopment and slum clearance.

For these reasons, this proposal removes the provisions of the 1954 act which tie public housing to slum clearance and urban dedevelopment.

This proposed legislation would also give recognition, for the first time in our public-housing program, to the needs of elderly married couples and elderly single persons. It removes some present restrictions on housing for elderly married couples. It allows single elderly persons, heretofore excluded, to qualify for public housing. They are given a preference for admission to the public-housing units, but for no more than 10 percent of the units in any community. This limitation is necessary until we have some experience with this new addition to our public-housing program. As our experience develops, I am hopeful that the limitation may be adjusted.

I am hopeful that my proposal will receive favorable consideration by the Banking and Currency Committee, and that it will be enacted into law.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an analysis of the bill, along with the text of the bill, be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

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

The bill (S. 2045) to amend the United States Housing Act of 1937, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. LEHMAN, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That (a) section 2 of the United States Housing Act of 1937, as amended, is amended—

(1) by striking out "solely" in the second sentence of paragraph (1) and inserting in lieu thereof "(i)", and by inserting before the period at the end of such sentence a comma and the following: "and (ii) for aged single persons whose net annual income at the time of admission does not exceed five times the annual rental (including the value or cost to them of water, electricity, gas, other heating and cooking fuels, and other utilities) of the dwellings to be furnished such persons";

(2) by striking out "means families" in paragraph (2) and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "means families (including aged single persons)"; and

(3) by adding at the end of such section a new paragraph as follows:

"(16) The term 'aged single person' means a person who is at least 60 years of age, and who has never married, or who is divorced or legally separated, or whose spouse is deceased and who has not remarried."

(b) Section 10 (g) of such act is amended by striking out "Second," and inserting in lieu thereof "Third,", and by adding immediately following the paragraph which concludes with the words "veterans and servicemen;" the following new paragraph:

"Second, to aged single persons and as among such persons first preference shall be given to disabled veterans whose disability has been determined by the Veterans' Administration to be service connected, and second preference shall be given to widows of deceased veterans whose death has been determined by the Veterans' Administration to be service connected, and third preference to other veterans and widows of veterans;".

(c) Section 15 (8) of such act is amended—

(1) by inserting after "families" in paragraph (a) the following: "(including aged single persons)";

(2) by inserting ", or aged single person" after "each family" and "each such family" in paragraph (b);

(3) by inserting before the semicolon at the end of clause (i) in paragraph (b) a comma and the following: "or, in the case of an aged single person, had a net income not exceeding the maximum income limits fixed by the public housing agency (and approved by the Authority) for admission of aged single persons of low income in such housing";

(4) by inserting before the semicolon at the end of paragraph (b) a colon and the following: "*Provided further*, That the Public Housing Commissioner may, under regulations prescribed by him, waive the requirements of clause (ii) in the case of families consisting of aged persons, or in the case of aged single persons, whenever he deems such action necessary to avoid undue hardship";

(5) by inserting after "families", wherever the term appears in paragraph (c), the following: "and aged single persons";

(6) by striking out "the families' housing needs" in paragraph (c) and inserting in lieu thereof: "the housing needs"; and

(7) by inserting after "families", wherever the term appears, in paragraph (d) the following: "or aged single persons."

(d) The Public Housing Commissioner may, under regulations prescribed by him, reconstruct or remodel low-rent housing (or any part thereof) assisted under section 10 of the United States Housing Act of 1937, as amended, to provide dwelling units reserved and designed specifically for occupancy by aged single persons: *Provided*, That nothing in this act or in any amendment made by

this act shall be construed to authorize the allocation to aged single persons (as defined in section 2 (16) of the United States Housing Act of 1937, as amended) of dwelling units in low-rent housing projects, constructed pursuant to such act, in excess of 10 percent of the total number of such units in any community.

SEC. 2. (a) Section 10 (i) of the United States Housing Act of 1937, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"(i) Notwithstanding the provisions of any other law, the Authority may, with respect to low-rent housing initiated after March 1, 1949, enter into new contracts for loans and annual contributions after July 1, 1954, for not to exceed 35,000 additional dwelling units, which amount shall be increased by 135,000 additional dwelling units on July 1 of each of the years 1955 and 1956, and may enter into such new contracts for preliminary loans in respect thereto as are consistent with the number of dwelling units for which contracts for annual contributions may be entered hereunder: *Provided*, That the authority to enter into new contracts for loans and annual contributions with respect to such addiitonal dwelling units shall terminate 3 years after the first date on which such authority may be exercised under the foregoing provisions of this subsection: *Provided further*, That no such new contract for annual contributions for additional units shall be entered into unless the governing body of the locality has, by resolution, approved such additional units."

(b) Sections 10 (j) and 10 (l) of such act are hereby repealed.

SEC. 3. Section 101 (c) of title I of the Housing Act of 1949, as amended, is amended by striking out "or for annual contributions or capital grants pursuant to the United States Housing Act of 1937, as amended, for any project or projects not constructed or covered by a contract for annual contributions prior to the effective date of the Housing Act of 1954."

SEC. 4. There are hereby repealed—

(1) the third, fifth, sixth, and seventh provisos, and so much of the eighth proviso as is contained in clause (2) thereof appearing in that part of the First Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1954, which is captioned "Annual contributions:" under the heading "Public Housing Administration";

(2) clause (2) of the third proviso, and the fourth, fifth, and sixth provisos appearing in that part of the Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1953, which is captioned "Annual contributions:" under the heading "Public Housing Administration"; and

(3) the fourth proviso appearing in that part of the Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1952, which is captioned "Annual contributions:" under the heading "Public Housing Administration."

The analysis presented by Mr. LEHMAN is as follows:

ANALYSIS OF HOUSING ACT AMENDMENTS

SECTION 1

Elderly single persons (those over 60) are made eligible for public housing and given a preference immediately after that for families displaced from present housing as a result of slum clearance programs. Elderly single persons must meet present requirements of the law regarding level of income, etc. This preference is available to single persons to a limit of 10 percent of the public housing units in any community. Special construction is authorized to meet the special housing needs of elderly persons.

In respect to elderly couples, and elderly single persons, the Administrator is given authority to waive the requirement that they come from substandard housing.

SECTIONS 2 AND 3

One hundred thirty-five thousand new public housing units are authorized beginning in July of 1955 and again in July of 1956. The unused part of the authorization for 35,000 units in the 1954 act as well as the new authorization for 135,000 units in 1955 and 1956 are to remain effective, in each case, for 3 years from the date of authorization. Thus the authorization for the 1954 units will expire in July 1957; for the 1955 units in July 1958, etc.

The provisions of present law limiting public housing in any community to units sufficent to house families displaced by governmental action (slum clearance and urban redevelopment programs) as well as provisions limiting public housing to those communities which have slum clearance or urban redevelopment projects are repealed.

SECTION 4

The self-liquidation provisions requiring continued project payments to the Government of the mortgage period runs out as well as the authority for the sale of public housing projects to private persons are repealed.

Provisions establishing a loyalty test for occupancy of public housing units are repealed. Provisions requiring discontinuance of public housing projects following adverse local referendums are also repealed.

FEDERAL AID ROAD CONTRUCTION PROGRAM—AMENDMENTS

Mr. KEFAUVER submitted amendments, intended to be proposed by him, to 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, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

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

Mr. GORE submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 4725) to repeal sections 452 and 462 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

PRELIMINARY EXAMINATION AND SURVEY OF CERTAIN COASTAL AND TIDAL AREAS—ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILL

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the names of the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. THURMOND] and the Senators from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN and Mr. PASTORE] and the Senator from New York [Mr. IVES] be added as additional cosponsors of the bill (S. 414) authorizing a preliminary examination and survey of the New England, New York, Long Island, and New Jersey coastal and tidal areas for the purpose of determining possible means of preventing damages to property and loss of human lives due to hurricane winds and tides, the next time it is printed.

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

CONTROL OF AIR POLLUTION—ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF BILL

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the name of the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] be added as cosponsor of the bill (S. 928) to amend the Water Pollution Control Act in order to provide for the control of air pollution, the next time it is printed.

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

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. MUNDT:

Excerpts from an address delivered by him before the Rock Creek Women's Republican Club, in the Woodward & Lothrop Auditorium, Bethesda-Chevy Chase (Md.) branch, on May 23, 1955.

By Mr. SYMINGTON:

Address on the control of juvenile delinquency, delivered by Senator HENNINGS at the University of Missouri, at Columbia, Mo., on April 29, 1955.

NOTICE CONCERNING CERTAIN NOMINATIONS BEFORE COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, the following nominations have been referred to and are now pending before the Committee on the Judiciary:

C. William Kraft, Jr., of Pennsylvania, to be United States district judge for eastern district of Pennsylvania, to fill a new position.

John W. McIlvaine, of Pennsylvania, to be United States district judge for western district of Pennsylvania, to fill a new position.

Francis L. Van Dusen, of Pennsylvania, to be United States district judge for eastern district of Pennsylvania, vice Guy K. Bard, resigned.

Herbert P. Sorg, of Pennsylvania, to be United States district judge for western district of Pennsylvania, to fill a new position.

Edward G. Minor, of Wisconsin, to be United States attorney for the eastern district of Wisconsin, for 4-year term, vice Timothy T. Cronin, term expired.

Notice is hereby given to all persons interested in these nominations to file with the committee on or before Monday, May 30, 1955, any representations or objections in writing they may wish to present concerning the above nominations, with a further statement whether it is their intention to appear at any hearing which may be scheduled.

NOTICE OF PUBLIC HEARINGS BY THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON INTERNATIONAL FINANCE OF THE COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY ON S. 1894, RELATING TO THE INTERNATIONAL FINANCE CORPORATION

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, on behalf of the Subcommittee on International Finance of the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency, I wish to give notice that a public hearing will

be held on S. 1894, a bill to provide for the participation of the United States in the International Finance Corporation, on Monday, June 6, 1955, in room 301, Senate Office Building. This hearing will begin at 10 a. m.

All persons desiring to appear and testify at the hearing are requested to notify Mr. J. H. Yingling, chief clerk, Senate Committee on Banking and Currency, room 303, Senate Office Building, telephone NAtional 8-3120, extension 865, before the close of business on Wednesday June 1, 1955.

DELAYS IN DISTRIBUTION OF SALK VACCINE

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, there was some discussion on the floor of the Senate last week as to why Canada has an orderly program for management of the Salk vaccine and the United States has had no such program.

I should like to call to the attention of the Senate an article heralding the Canadian program by Tania Long, in the New York Times of May 21, 1955, and two recent bulletins, dated May 7 and 8, from Canada's Minister of National Health and Welfare, the Honorable Paul Martin.

One particular statement by Mr. Martin seems to me unusually significant. He points out that "all vaccine being used in Canada's joint federal-provincial program is submitted to very extensive testing in two stages."

Mr. President, why was this not true of all the vaccine used in the United States? That question never has been answered satisfactorily by the national administration. It is a question being asked by parents of children from Oregon to Maine. If a nation of comparatively limited financial resources like Canada could test the vaccine in two stages, why were the same careful tests not made of the vaccine in the richest Nation on earth, the United States?

I am not suggesting that any public officials resign, because that is the President's business, and not mine. But I think the country ought to be told why American antipolio vaccine was not subject to the testing in two stages which occurred in the neighboring land to the north, Canada.

I ask unanimous consent that the article which appeared in the New York Times, and the statements by the Canadian Minister of National Health and Welfare, be printed in the RECORD.

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

CANADA IS SPARED POLIO AFTER SHOTS—FIVE HUNDRED THOUSAND CHILDREN INOCULATED WITH TORONTO VACCINE—FIVE MILLION IS TARGET

(By Tania Long)

OTTAWA, May 20.—Ten percent of Canadian children have been inoculated with the Salk poliomyelitis vaccine without a single outbreak of the disease so far.

Of the 500,000 children involved, most of them between the ages of 5 and 6, about half have received the first inoculation and the rest have had their second shot. In the next 6 weeks it is hoped to inoculate 500,000 more children.

Canada at present is using only vaccine produced in the University of Toronto's Connaught Laboratories, having temporarily halted imports of commercially produced vaccine from the United States.

As soon as the present uncertainties concerning the United States vaccine are removed this country intends to resume its imports. The speed with which Canada can complete its program to inoculate its 5 million children under 16 depends largely on the imports.

Health authorities estimate that the program can be completed in less than 2 years with Canadian vaccine. If substantial supplies can be imported, however, the program can be completed that much sooner.

The vaccine used in the Canadian program is subjected to two series of rigorous tests. First, the Connaught Laboratories test their own product by injecting samples of each batch into 18 monkeys—12 directly into the brain and 6 into muscular tissue. If there is the slightest sign of reaction the vaccine batch is discarded.

Next, the Federal Laboratory of Hygiene in Ottawa repeats these tests on its own. It then double-checks the safety of the vaccine by submitting it to tests in mice, guinea pigs and rabbits.

This is to insure that no other noxious viruses are present and to gage the potency of the vaccine. Medical authorities believe the success of the Canadian program is due to the extreme care taken to test the vaccine before use.

The program in this country is controlled by the Government, with the Federal Government and the provincial governments sharing in the cost of the free distribution of vaccine.

The output of vaccine by the Connaught Laboratories in Toronto, and by the Institute of Microbiology of Montreal has been purchased under the Federal national health program. Allocations are made to the Provinces on the basis of population.

The Montreal institute is not producing yet, but is expected to be in production by the fall.

The program was worked out last fall at a meeting of the Dominion Council of Health, 6 months before the success of the Salk vaccine was announced. The council at that time decided that since there was enough evidence to indicate a successful outcome of the mass trials last year, Canada would be wise to initiate its own production of the vaccine.

The Connaught Laboratories were chosen not only because they are experienced producers of biological products but also because the work of their scientists had helped to make last year's mass trial possible.

A large portion of the virus used in the manufacture of the vaccine was produced in Toronto and shipped to the United States. In an effort to find a satisfactory method of making the vaccine in large quantities Connaught laboratory scientists discovered that Medium 199, which they had developed during cancer research, was ideal for the culture of polio virus in vast quantities.

NEUBERGER CITES CANADA

WASHINGTON, May 20.—Senator RICHARD L. NEUBERGER told the Senate yesterday that the Eisenhower administration "could learn a lot from our neighbors in Canada" about a polio vaccine program.

The Oregon Democrat said Canada was making a strict and orderly distribution which can command the confidence of Canadian parents, and which stands in sharp contrast to chaotic confusion which has developed in the United States. He added:

"One facet of the Canadian program will be of interest to the American people. The Canadian Government obtains its supplies by purchasing the entire output of the Connaught Laboratories. The cost of enough carefully tested vaccine for three immunizing inoculations is $1.50. There is no other price for private purchasers because the Government contracted for the entire output."

STATEMENT ON SALK VACCINE BY THE HONORABLE PAUL MARTIN, MINISTER OF NATIONAL HEALTH AND WELFARE, MAY 7, 1955

I have been in touch with my Deputy Minister, Dr. Cameron, and officers of the Department at Ottawa who, in turn, have been in close contact with health authorities in Washington and with all Provincial Deputy Ministers of Health, except Alberta, Newfoundland, and Prince Edward Island, who have not been reached as yet.

Provincial health authorities report that approximately one-half million children have already received their inoculations with the vaccine produced at the Connaught Medical Research Laboratories. In some cases, this has included both first and second doses. I should emphasize that all vaccine used in Canada under Federal and Provincial Government auspices has been doubly checked for saftey, both at the Connaught Laboratories and in Ottawa at the Federal Laboratory of Hygiene.

There has been no evidence whatever of unfavorable reactions among the several hundred thousand Canadian children who have been inoculated.

On the basis of this extensive experience in the use of the vaccine and the safeguards provided by the safety checking, it is the unanimous feeling of the Provincial health authorities with whom we have been in touch that the vaccine is safe and no changes in the immunization program are contemplated.

We will, of course, continue to keep in close contact with authorities in Washington so that we may keep the Provincial departments of health advised of any further developments in the United States.

STATEMENT ON SALK VACCINE BY THE HONORABLE PAUL MARTIN, MINISTER OF NATIONAL HEALTH AND WELFARE, MAY 8, 1955

We have been in touch with the United States public-health authorities who, with their usual courtesy, have been most cooperative in keeping us fully informed regarding the findings of the committee of experts on the Salk polio vaccine. I also discussed the problem late this afternoon with Dr. R. D. Defries, director of the Connaught Medical Research Laboratories, who has been in Washington to consult with officials of the Surgeon General's Office on this matter.

The decision taken by the United States authorities to reexamine the safety testing of the vaccine being used in that country has been discussed by my Deputy Minister, Dr. Cameron, by telephone with the Deputy Ministers of Health of all Provinces, except Newfoundland and Prince Edward Island, who have not been reached. It is their feeling that there is no need for similar action in this country.

Because all vaccine being used in Canada's joint Federal-Provincial program is produced at Connaught Laboratories and is submitted to very extensive testing in 2 stages—first at the Connaught Laboratories and later at the Federal Laboratory of Hygiene—and because approximately 500,000 Canadian children have been inoculated without unfavorable reaction, the Provincial health authorities with whom we have been in touch are unanimously agreed that there should be no interruption in our present nationwide immunization program.

ELIMINATION OF HIPPODROME FEATURES FROM POLITICAL BROADCASTS

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, since I introduced a bill several weeks

ago to eliminate the hippodrome features from political broadcasts, a number of thoughtful commentators have expressed similar concern about the increasing tendency to introduce stage-acting into American politics.

I should like to call to the attention of the Senate a comment by Walter Lippmann from the Washington Post and Times Herald of May 19.

I also wish to cite a column in the Washington Post and Times Herald of May 22 by the radio editor of that newspaper, Lawrence Laurent, indorsing my bill to eliminate deception from political TVA broadcasts. Mr. Laurent writes that "use of prompting devices and male make-up is a form of deception."

A number of newspapers in my home State have tried to burlesque my bill for requiring honesty in TV political programs. These are frequently the newspapers which support those candidates who have introduced the most hippodrome and the most deception into their TV appearances. By contrast, many thoughtful and outstanding newspaper writers in the East have expressed alarm over the very deception and fiction which prompted my bill.

I ask unanimous consent that a portion of Mr. Lippmann's column and Mr. Laurent's column be printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

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

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

TUESDAY'S SHOW

(By Walter Lippmann)

Watching the performance which was put on at the White House on Tuesday evening, it was painfully evident that television plus professional stage management is not necessarily what it professes to be—a new and better way of informing the people, of letting them see and hear directly and at first hand what their officials are really like and what their officials are really thinking. These stage-managed shows with props made out of the White House furniture, with live officials reciting or reading the script, are not a new and advanced form of journalism and true reporting. They are fiction and theater meant to give the illusion that they are true reporting.

[From the Washington Post and Times Herald of May 22, 1955]

TV-RADIO CONVENTION OPENS MONDAY

(By Lawrence Laurent)

Senator RICHARD NEUBERGER, Democrat, Oregon, certainly stirred up a lot of fuss with his recent suggestion. NEUBERGER, you'll recall, wants political candidates to admit to their audience that prompting devices are being used and that makeup is being worn.

NEUBERGER's proposed legislation brought an immediate answer from the teleprompter organization and from Max Factor, the makeup guy.

NEUBERGER's essential point seems to have been overlooked and the essential point has merit. A candidate for either party shouldn't deceive the voters. Use of prompting devices and male makeup is a form of deception.

The junior Senator from Oregon does not object to a speech being read by a candidate, even a ghost-written speech. He does think—and I agree—that the candidate shouldn't deceive the voters with an apparently ad lib speech which is read off a device or from cue cards. This practice is not entirely honest. It deceives the voters. It can make an empty headed dolt appear an intelligent candidate.

The voters need a chance to judge a candidate on his own merits.

As for makeup, what's wrong with admitting that one needs sun tan powder because of a pallor acquired through honest pursuit of knowledge? I think most of us pale and washed-out males would appreciate a candidate's admitting that he needed a bottled tan. This makes him one of us.

The tempest aroused by NEUBERGER has accomplished at least one purpose. It has made the public aware that even politicians need some help in talking on TV.

Kind of startling, wasn't it, to be reminded that even politicians sometimes can't talk without help?

UNITED STATES AND COMMUNIST AIRPOWER

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, despite efforts to suppress discussion of the subject, and despite the confusion of official utterances, evidence continues to pile up that Communist airpower is moving up to us in offensive striking power, and is moving ahead of us in the fields of defensive power, production, and technology.

The warning light is on. Only the blind, or more sinister people, will deny that fact.

The question now at hand is—what to do about it?

The United States is no doubt stronger today than ever before in peacetime. But the one great question, the question this morning every American wants answered is: How does our strength compare with the strength of the Communists, those who have so often reiterated their determination to destroy us?

A great deal of time has been devoted on this floor to the importance of maintaining the friendship, respect, and confidence of our allies. But how will these our friends of the free world react if we ignore or evade this problem instead of facing it frankly?

Mr. President, at this time I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks an article written last Thursday by the highly respected military analyst of the New York Times, Mr. Hanson Baldwin.

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

IMPOLITIC RELEASE—AN OPINION THAT NEWS OF RED BOMBER WAS OLD AND MOTIVATED BY PARTISAN AIM

(By Hanson W. Baldwin)

WASHINGTON, May 18.—The release of military information, particularly intelligence information about a potential enemy, for service advantage is "old hat" to Washington.

But last week the administration released some military information apparently to forestall political attacks by the loyal opposition—the Democrats.

The motivation was not as unusual in a town that is the Capital of domestic and international politics as was the method and the subject matter. The release concerned a sudden discovery by the Pentagon that the Russians had constructed, flown, and exhibited to public view a number of medium- and long-range jet bombers.

The wording of the announcement was terse to the point of obscurity and the motivation decidedly mixed. Special emphasis was attached to it when it was learned that the release had been cleared at the highest level—meaning the White House—and had been considered and possibly written by the Operations Coordination Board.

PROFESSIONAL TOUCH LACKING

The idea apparently had been born originally in the mind of a prominent civilian in the Air Force, but the wording was unmarred by the professional touch of any public information officer.

The intent, as far as could be judged from inquiries in the Pentagon, was to head off and forestall an anticipated criticism of the administration's defense program by Members of the United States Senate. Other sources added that Britain had been expected to announce the formation flights of the Russian bombers and that Washington had decided to release the information first.

If the hoped-for result was to steal the thunder of the opposition, this week's events have proven that the release as written was in vain, for Senator STUART SYMINGTON, Democrat, of Missouri, former Secretary of the Air Force, used last week's Pentagon release to justify his demand for a Senate inquiry into the strength of United States Armed Forces.

The new era of optimism that is dawning in Washington because of the Austrian Treaty and the Soviet gestures of sweetness and light will probably reduce the importance of Senator SYMINGTON's inquiry. Nevertheless, the administration by its strange release last week provided political fuel for the Democratic opposition instead of quenching the fire.

KNOWN FOR MANY MONTHS

This was because of the obscurity of the release, its obvious ulterior motivation, and because it failed to tell anywhere near the whole truth. The 2 Russian jet bombers mentioned in the release—the medium Type 39, and the heavy Type 37, both designed by Ilyushin—have been known to be in existence in some numbers for many months.

The first of these planes was publicly demonstrated in the May Day parade in Moscow in 1954, but no informed military or air attaché in Moscow and none of the correspondents there believed that the few bombers then shown were merely prototypes. The Russians would scarcely be foolish enough, all informed observers agreed, to display publicly merely a prototype.

Other planes of the same type probably were available, though not exhibited publicly, in May 1954, and the Russians were probably then in production with both the Type 37 and the Type 39.

In any case, the large 4-engined Type 37, supposed to be the equivalent of our Boeing B-52, had been seen in the air over Moscow and elsewhere in Russia by foreigners numerous times both before and after May Day of 1954.

Two or three of them, flying together, had been seen and reported by foreign correspondents and the air attachés of many countries as long ago as last summer and fall.

The "news" of the formation flights of heavy and medium jet bombers was, therefore, no news at all, at least in the way it was phrased.

Somewhat more interesting, though not unexpected as the release conceded, was the mention of a Russian turboprop bomber, and a new all-weather fighter. Both of these had been forecast in aviation circles and had been reported in attaché reports.

The Soviet turboprop aircraft may actually have more importance as a potential tanker for air refueling than as a bomber. Presumably it could reach higher altitudes and make greater speeds than the United States piston-engined tankers, thus greatly simplifying the difficult art of air refueling.

MOTIVES IN RELEASE SCORED

The all-weather fighter mentioned in last week's announcement is not the MIG–17, a development of the MIG–15 fitted in some models with radar, and having a day and night all-weather capability.

The new Soviet fighter is a radical delta-wing design. It is believed to be of high speed and is equipped with radar for all-weather day and night use.

All these developments are not really unexpected, for it has long been known that the Soviet Air Force was in transformation from an essentially defensive unit to one with major offensive capabilities. The Russians also are achieving air quality as well as air quantity.

All this can, and should be, told to Congress and the American peope—but not in a sudden, "crash" release issued not for information but for effect and restricted to partial truth.

Last week's release about the new Soviet planes is the best possible illustration of what is wrong with Secretary of Defense Charles E. Wilson's formula for the release of military news that is constructive. The word "constructive," in this instance, was translated to mean for political advantage and service effect.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, I should also like to have in the printed RECORD at this point an article published yesterday by Gen. Thomas R. Phillips, the equally respected military analyst of the St. Louis Post-Dispatch.

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

RUSSIA PASSING UNITED STATES IN DESIGN AND PRODUCTION OF WARPLANES; JOINT CHIEFS SHOWING CONCERN—REDS PRESSED 3 YEARS OF CRASH PROGRAMS WHILE ADMINISTRATION CUT BACK AMERICAN SCHEDULE—NOW FLYING IN FORMATION BOMBERS AIMED DIRECTLY AT UNITED STATES

(By Brig. Gen. Thomas R. Phillips, U. S. Army (retired))

WASHINGTON, May 21.—The significance of the recent disclosures of new Soviet aircraft is that the Russians are surpassing the United States in aircraft and aircraft engine design and are getting into production with advanced types more rapidly than we have been able to.

In the past, the United States has counted on superior quality to overcome Soviet quantity. The Russians are now overtaking us in heavy bombers and are surpassing us in fighters. Their production is much greater than ours.

None of this is fresh news.

The big Soviet bombers were first shown at the May day celebration a year ago. At that time also formations of the MIG–17, a bigger and more powerful version of the MIG–15, were shown. This indicated that the MIG–17 was not only in production, but in combat formations, while our comparable fighter, the F–100, a final version of the F–86, was still in the testing stage.

As to production, it has been known for a long time that 15,000 of the MIG–15s had been made and that at one time they were being turned out at the rate of 450 a month.

There should, therefore, be no surprise or shock at the news that the Russians in the not distant future will be leaving us behind in the air.

REASON FOR TIMING

There has been some speculation about why the information of Soviet progress in the air was released at this time.

* * * * *

Actually the timing of the release had to do with another day. At the annual military parade on May day, the Soviet Union displays its newest military equipment. This release simply followed the Russian May day exhibition.

The information belatedly released in the United States had been published in London and Paris and in most of the principal countries in the world. The new Soviet aircraft had been seen by hundreds of thousands of people in Moscow and by the military attachés of the nations with representation there. The American public was being deprived of what was public information on a worldwide scale.

If the noninformative release of the Defense Department had not been made, the news would have reached here from foreign sources and the administration would have found itself in the position of suppressing information of vital interest to the American people.

SYMINGTON'S COMMENT

Missouri's Senator STUART SYMINGTON told the Senate that "it is now clear that in quality as well as quantity of planes the Communists are at least in the process of surpassing the United States."

President Eisenhower, when questioned about this statement at his last press conference said, "To say that we have lost in a twinkling all this great technical excellence as well as the numbers in total aircraft is just not true."

It has not been lost in a twinkling.

The Soviet by crash programs over the last 3 years have caught up with us and passed us. While the present administration has been cutting back and slowing down the airpower program, the Russians have been rushing theirs.

So far, the Joint Chiefs of Staff have not modified our air program. Gen. Nathan F. Twining, Air Force Chief of Staff, said yesterday that the Soviet advances must be taken into account in the continuous review of our air strength. It is known, however, that belatedly the JCS are seriously concerned with the remarkable Soviet advances in the air.

DECEPTIVE POSITION

The administration position on American airpower has been that never before has the American Air Force been as strong in peacetime as it is today. This is a perfectly true statement, but also a deceptive one. Airpower is relative to that of the potential enemy. It is also true that never before has Soviet airpower been as strong as it is today; and it is also true that Soviet airpower is now in the process of surpassing ours.

REASON FOR FURORE

What started the current furore was the release of information about Soviet aircraft obtained while they were practicing flying in formation over Moscow for the annual May Day military celebration.

During these flights formations of the heavy bomber, type 37, comparable to the American B–52, and flights of the medium bomber, type 39, comparable to our B–47, were seen on a number of occasions.

Eight and ten aircraft were observed in type 37 formations. A year ago a single type 37 was flown on several occasions. This indicates that the heavy bomber is not only in production, but also is in combat units. The Russians, therefore, have put a heavy jet bomber into operational units before the United States has been able to do so.

This bomber, as General Twining has said, is aimed directly as the United States. It is an intercontinental jet bomber with 4 huge engines and a range estimated at 5,200 miles. Production is believed to equal and perhaps to exceed that of the United States B–52.

The engines, when exhibited a year ago, were a shock to American designers. The Russians had achieved about twice as much thrust (power) as any Western-designed aircraft engine. The Russians were able to make 4 engines do the job on a huge plane about the size of our B–52, where we had to use 8. The smaller number of larger engines is more economical of fuel.

AIMED ONLY AT UNITED STATES

The type 37 bomber has no mission except to deter the United States from engaging in war or to attack us. Its range is not needed for any other Soviet target. Its great speed and high altitude performance puts a new dimension on American defense problems. In the past, we could pretty well count on besting the Soviet copy of our M–29, the TU–4, with our air defenses. The new bomber will be able to cut the percentage of kills way down.

The Soviet medium jet bomber, the type 39, was also displayed in formations prior to the present May Day, and about 40 had been seen a year earlier. The plane, comparable to the American B–47 with 6 engines, is powered with only 2 of the huge Soviet jet powerplants.

It is believed that the type 39 is being built at a rate at least equal to, and possibly in excess of, our production of the B–47. This bomber is designed for the longer bomber missions in Europe, and especially against the United States peripheral airbases.

A third large airplane exhibited was a huge turboprop aircraft. This might have been intended as a tanker, a bomber, or long-range reconnaissance aircraft. It had four turboprop engines with double counterrotating propellers.

This plane is believed to be in production. If so, the Soviets are 2 to 3 years ahead of the United States in this field. Our big turboprops are still in the testing stage and the Russians appear to have overcome bugs in these engines that we have not been able to iron out.

MANY MIG-17'S SEEN

The United States is planning to build 50-ton turboprop transports and tankers, but delivery is 2 to 3 years away. Many formations of the MIG–17, a larger and more powerful version of the MIG–15, have been seen. This fighter is roughly comparable to the American F–100. Both can fly in level flight at about the speed of sound. Both are capable of supersonic dives. Some all-weather versions of the MIG–27 have been seen.

While the United States has manufactured a few hundred of the F–100, the Soviets have manufactured 7,000 of the MIG–17. Production is believed to be about 300 a month. It is estimated that 4,000 of these high-performance aircraft are in combat formations in the Soviet Union. Some have been seen in the Far East.

Another shock was formations of a new supersonic day fighter with a 60-degree swept-back wing. This airplane is believed to be capable of speeds in level flight of more than 1,000 miles per hour. The United States has several such aircraft in the design and test stage, but none is operational. It is obvious that the Russians have them in production and that they are already going into combat units.

A new and advanced type of all-weather fighter was also displayed.

EFFECT ON SAC

The impact of the new Soviet supersonic and all-weather fighters on the Strategic Air Command will be very great. Until lately it was believed that the American B–47, due to its great speed and altitude capabilities, could get into and out of the Soviet Union without serious losses. The Russian supersonic and all-weather fighter of high performance may change this optimistic idea.

SAC will have to prepare for heavier losses on its missions; it may have to fly in large

defensive formations, and therefore a larger strategic Air Force will be needed to do the same job in the future.

This recapitulation shows that the Soviets have drawn abreast of us in the intercontinental jet bomber, are reaching for us with a high-performance medium jet bomber, are a couple of years ahead of us in production of high-performance sonic fighters and have a very substantial lead in supersonic fighters.

What every American would like to know is why the United States is losing ground.

One reason is the business approach of the present administration. In emphasizing economy, it has extended the lead time—the years between design and production of new aircraft—so that we cannot compete with the Soviets in advanced designs.

It breaks the heart of a businessman, accustomed to an economical routine, to put an airplane into production before it has been fully tested and then have to send it to a modification center to have extensive changes made in it at great cost. It is much cheaper to spend a couple of years testing and then to go into production.

That may do for automobiles, and the kind of competition there is between motor manufacturers, but in aircraft we are competing with the Soviet Union for survival.

EXAMPLE OF THE B-47

It is not a coincidence that American supremacy in the air today rests on the B-47. This plane was ordered into production without adequate testing. Modification has cost more than $300 million, but it was produced on time and for the last year and for the next two, at least, it will carry the major burden of American airpower.

The B-47 is the lone type of aircraft in which the United States has the advantage over the Soviets. The courageous decision to go ahead with production early was made by then Secretary of the Air Force and now Senator from Missouri, STUART SYMINGTON.

In quantity, the Russians have 20,000 aircraft in combat formations compared to the United States' 12,500 in the Air Force, Navy, and Marine Corps. Some 4,000 additional aircraft of our allies should be added to the West's total, but these are partly offset by planes supplied to the satellites of the Soviet Union.

The total aircraft in combat formations for the United States is deceptive because large numbers of Navy and Marine aircraft are not available for global missions. Marine aircraft operate on a narrow basis of close support of Marine ground units, while about half the naval aircraft on carriers have no other function than to protect the carriers themselves.

SOME SENATORS WORRIED

Soviet advances in aviation threaten our supremacy in bombardment, greatly increase the difficulties of the Strategic Air Command and set back our defensive capacity. There are several Senators on the Armed Services Committee of the Senate who have forseen this and have been worried.

Because of the President's great military prestige it has been difficult to make headway against a military program approved by the 5-star President.

Senator SYMINGTON's resolution (S. Res. 100) for the Senate to determine the relative strength of the Communist forces as against the forces of the Free World may be the beginning of the end of the surrender by the Congress of its functions with respect to the Armed Forces.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, at this time also I should like to present for printing in the body of the RECORD an editorial and an article published and signed by Mr. Robert Hotz, editor of the McGraw-Hill publication Aviation Week.

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

DOUBLE SHOCK FOR AMERICANS

(By Robert Hotz)

Every American citizen should be doubly shocked by the recent Russian aerial display over Moscow.

They should be shocked first because the quantity and quality of new Soviet long-range jet bombers and supersonic fighters indicate that our once wide margin of superiority in the air has been whittled to a very slim advantage. The Russian rate of technical progress during the past year also indicates that even the slim margin of superiority we now hold may be erased in the near future unless we radically revise our own pace of aeronautical development and production.

They should be shocked again by what appears to be deliberate deception practiced against them by some of the highest civilian officials in their Government. These officials have concealed the unpleasant but true and complete facts of the Russian air display behind a vague and incomplete Department of Defense press release.

The Russian flying display of late April and early May over Moscow is described fully for the first time in this issue of Aviation Week beginning on page 12. It clearly demonstrated a significant acceleration of Russian progress during the past year both in the development of a round-the-clock defensive fighter system and in heavy emphasis on production of a long-range turbojet and turboprop bomber fleet that can deliver atomic and hydrogen bombs into the heart of the North American continent. As Gen. Nathan Twining, USAF Chief of Staff, noted last year after the first public appearance of the four-jet Bison (type 37): "It is aimed squarely at us."

REBUTTAL FROM RUSSIA

The oft-repeated statement of Defense Secretary Charles E. Wilson that "Russia is developing a defensive air force" has been smothered by the roar of 40 18,000-pound thrust turbojets that propelled 10 Bison long-range heavy bombers over Red Square early this month. His claim that "we give the Russians credit for having aircraft that they just don't have" has been rebutted by the 50-plane formation of supersonic day fighters of a design more advanced than anything American aircraft factories are now producing; and the 30-plane formation of all-weather fighters and the several thousand supersonic MIG-17's that even Pentagon intelligence experts admit are in service with the Red air force.

The 1955 Moscow air display means that American military airpower policy must be radically revised. Even the official Defense Department statement admits: "These observations establish a new basis for our estimate of Soviet production of the heavy jet bomber (Bison) and of the medium bomber (Badger)."

But even more serious than the growing threat of Russian airpower is the deception being practiced officially by top-level civilians in Government that denies the American people the facts they must know if they are to make the intelligent judgments necessary to insure our survival as a Nation. The complete story of the Russian air display as reported in this issue of Aviation Week was known to top civilian officials in the Defense Department and presumably in the White House where the official press release was edited and cleared for publication.

FOUR QUESTIONS

Why was the whole story withheld from the American people?

Why were facts that were available to every resident of Moscow and hundreds of non-Russian observers who were in the Soviet capital between April 24 and May 7, 1955, denied to the American press and people?

Why are the pictures of these aircraft taken by foreign observers still concealed in the Pentagon under the guise of military security?

Why does not President Eisenhower use the leadership endowed by his position to tell the American people the complete story of the Moscow air show and what it means to the future of this country?

If the executive branch of the Government does not fully discharge its responsibility to tell the American people the facts on Russian airpower it is clearly the duty of the legislative branch to formally investigate and put the whole story on public record.

Senator STUART SYMINGTON, of Missouri, perhaps the most informed man on military airpower in Congress, has already demanded a Senate investigation of this affair. He is supported by Senator RICHARD RUSSELL, of Georgia, another expert on military affairs and chairman of the Senate Armed Services Committee.

This alarm over Russian airpower is no shallow plea for a boost in the fiscal 1956 military budget. It is no false cry of "wolf" from professional soldiers. The crisis is real. This country is facing one of its most dangerous hours. If freedom and democracy are to survive the American people must be told the whole truth.

Intelligent decisions cannot be made in a dark aura of public ignorance and official secrecy.

RUSSIAN JET AIRPOWER GAINS FAST ON UNITED STATES

(By Robert Hotz)

WASHINGTON, D. C.—Russia is winning its technological race with the United States to develop superior airpower.

New and exclusive details on the size and scope of the Russian flying display over Moscow early this month have been reported to Aviation Week by on-the-spot observers.

These facts reveal that the Red Air Force has made such rapid progress in design and production of supersonic fighters and long range jet bombers that it shocked even the top level and most knowledgeable military aviation leaders in the Pentagon.

These details, reported exclusively in Aviation Week, contrast sharply with the official statement of the Department of Defense on the Russian air show.

This official statement was discussed at the highest civilian level of the Government and approved for release by the White House.

Although bad weather canceled the May Day fly-by over Red Square in Moscow, the Russians gave foreign observers ample opportunity to study the latest Red Air Force equipment scheduled for display. More than half a dozen low level sweeps were made over Moscow including several pre-May Day rehearsals and another series of flights during the week after May Day as though the Russians were trying to make certain that no detail of their new aerial equipment escaped notice by foreign observers.

This is what Moscow observers actually saw during the last week in April and the first week in May:

NEW SUPERSONIC FIGHTER

At least 50 new supersonic day fighters. This new model, never before publicly displayed, featured 60 degree swept-back wings and a low-set horizontal tail, both characteristics of extremely advanced supersonic design. Foreign observers evaluated the new Russian fighter design as more advanced than the North American F-100 Super Sabre and its performance as comparable to the 1,000-miles-per-hour plus Lockheed F-104.

ALL-WEATHER FIGHTER

Formation of 30 new all-weather fighters. This new design, a true all-weather interceptor with a solid radome nose has thin, straight wings and engine air intakes on both sides of the aircraft's fuselage.

Performance of this type is estimated to lie above that of the Lockheed F-94C Starfire but not up to the top supersonic speed performance of the Convair F-102.

TURBOPROP BOMBER

Formation of nine sweptwing turboprop bombers. These bombers were powered by four turboprop engines estimated at about 5,000 estimated horsepower, turning contrarotating propellers. They strongly resemble the flight photograph of the IL-38 published exclusively in Aviation Week more than a year ago on February 15, 1954, page 12.

This new Russian turboprop bomber appears capable also of functioning as an aerial tanker for jet bombers and a long-range strategic reconnaissance plane.

FIFTY BADGERS

Large formations of twin-jet Badger (type 39) bombers. Ground observers counted as many as 50 Badgers in a single formation during the Moscow fly-by. Last year the Russians flew a formation of nine Badgers on May Day. This bomber is roughly comparable in size to the Boeing B-47.

BISON FORMATION

First formation of 10 Bison (type 37) bombers. Last year the Russian s flew a single Bison on May Day believed to have been the experimental prototype. Formations ranging from 8 to 10 aircraft were sighted at low altitude over Moscow before and after May Day this year. The Bison is roughly comparable to the Boeing B-52 in size and performance.

Not seen in the May Day flying activity was the MIG-17, a supersonic day fighter already in widespread service with the Red Air Force, and the Il-20, a jet transport reported by Radio Moscow to be in service carrying high-priority cargo on a European-Asia operation.

Foreign observers report to Aviation Week that the Russians have already produced several thousand MIG-17's and production is now running nearly 400 planes a month. Formations of MIG-17's flew in the 1954 May Day show. (Aviation Week, May 19, 1954, p. 14.)

USAF PRODUCTION

This compares with a total USAF aircraft production rate for 1954 that averaged 435 planes of all types per month and reached a maximum of 492 planes delivered last July, according to testimony by Brig. Gen. T. P. Gerrity, director of procurement and production in USAF headquarters, before House Appropriations Committee.

The MIG-17 (AW August 2, 1954, p. 12) is comparable in performance to the North American F-100 Super Sabre. While the MIG-17 was reported to be in squadron service with the Russian Far East Air Forces in Siberia as early as July 1954 by Gen. Earle E. Partridge, then top United States Air Force commander in the Orient, the first F-100 fighter group was equipped late in 1954.

Recent reports on the vital field of propulsion indicate the Russians are pushing technical progress hard in all types of modern aircraft power, covering the entire spectrum from turboprops and turbojets to the ramjet and rockets. There is no definite indication of any work on application of nuclear power to aircraft but since the Red air force has been able to blossom forth with new fighter and bomber types in squadron strength without any prior knowledge by foreign observers, it cannot be assumed they are neglecting development of a nuclear-powered aircraft.

Latest versions of the Bison and Badger turbojet powerplants are delivering from 18,000 to 20,000 pounds thrust. Turboprops of the IL-38 type bomber are in the 5,000 eshp. class. Rocket powerplants range from 8,000 to 12,000 pounds thrust for interceptor aircraft to a 250,000-pound motor for initial stage power for a multistage intercontinental ballistic missile.

PENTAGON PROBLEMS

Top-level military aviation leaders in the Pentagon are shocked by four conclusions that must inevitably be drawn from the 1954 and 1955 May Day aerial displays:

Rapid rate of progress achieved by the Russians during the past year in both technical development and productive capacity. This rapidly accelerating rate of aeronautical progress indicates that the vast effort in technical education and training the Russians have been pouring into their military aviation program since 1946 has reached the payoff stage.

Current momentum of the Soviet technological drive has virtually wiped out the once wide margin of technical superiority enjoyed by the USAF and naval airpower. This is the opinion of experts who have been following Russian developments accurately and warning for several years of the significant acceleration of the Communists' efforts in airpower.

Lack of adequate intelligence on the details of the accelerated Russian military airpower program. On May Day 1954, the Red air force displayed a complete formation of twin jet Badgers as a complete surprise to foreign intelligence experts. On May Day 1955, the formation of 50 new supersonic day fighters with design more advanced than the F-100 was again the first foreign inkling that this type existed. Virtually no intelligence exists on aircraft or missile developments that have not yet reached the hardware production stage.

Consistent misinterpretation of what intelligence has been available by the top level civilian heads of the Government who actually determine United States military policy.

Fast pace of Russian research and development in the field of supersonic areodynamics and propulsion. Appearance of such design features as 60-degree wing sweepback, low-slung horizontal tails, thin, straight wings, flush engine air inlets, and airborne radar indicate the Russians have the ability to translate basic aerodynamic research into military hardware faster than foreign observers have believed possible.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, most important in these publications is the box score of comparative military production, which I now ask to have printed in the body of the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

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

PRODUCTION BOX SCORE

DAY FIGHTERS

Russia

MIG-15. Transonic speed range. Fifteen thousand produced 1948-52.

MIG-17. Supersonic speed range. Seven thousand produced 1952-54. In service with Red air force combat units in Europe and Asia.

Thousand miles per hour, supersonic day fighter. Matching F-104 performance; in production 1954; at least 50 flying; probably in limited squadron service with Red air force.

USAF

F-86 Sabre series. Transonic speed range. Six thousand produced by North American Aviation and Canadair Ltd. 1948-54.

F-100 Super Sabre. Supersonic speed range. Several hundred produced by North American in California 1953-55; second source plant being tooled for production in Columbus, Ohio; first USAF combat wing equipped with F-100 late 1954.

Lockheed F-104. Supersonic 1,000 miles per hour, plus speed range. Two built; one lost in crash; production begun on order for 17 planes. Won't be in USAF squadron service until 1957 at earliest.

ALL-WEATHER INTERCEPTORS

Russia

Straight-wing transonic design. In production 1954; at least 30 flying; probably in limited squadron service.

USAF

Lockheed F-94C. 400 produced 1951-53; in squadron service with Air Defense Command.

Convair F-102. Supersonic speed range. About a dozen experimental models built; production begun San Diego plant on order of about 50 planes; not due for squadron service before 1957.

JET BOMBERS

Russia

Badger (type 39) medium bomber. In production 1953; at least 50 flying; in limited squadron service with Red air force.

Bison (type 37) heavy bomber. In production 1954; at least 10 built; probably scheduled for squadron service in mid-1955.

Il-38 turboprop sweptwing bomber, aerial tanker and strategic reconnaissance plane; in production 1953; formations of from 3 to 9 planes sighted by foreign observers in Russia for over a year; probably in limited squadron service.

USAF

Boeing B-47 medium bomber. In production since 1948; about 1,500 built by Boeing, Douglas, Lockheed; Strategic Air Command is 80 percent equipped with B-47s.

Boeing B-52 heavy bomber. In production since 1953; about 30 built; scheduled for squadron service with SAC by mid-1955.

USAF has no turboprop bomber. Total of 10 experimental transports now flying with turboprops; Lockheed C-130A for turboprop transport now in production Marietta, Ga., plant.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, some might call a box score an accounting—in other words, a balance sheet.

Now that this balance sheet has been supplied by a magazine of high standing in the aviation industry, I again urge that the Administration either confirm or correct the accuracy of this published accounting.

RESULTS ACHIEVED BY MAJORITY LEADER OF THE SENATE

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article from the Washington Post and Times Herald of May 22, 1955, entitled "Matter of Fact: A Real Pro at Work in Senate." This article was written by Mr. Stewart Alsop of the New York Herald Tribune News Syndicate. I believe Mr. Alsop has done a splendid job of summing up the great work being done in the Senate by our majority leader, the distinguished senior Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON].

I, too—even as a freshman Senator—have noticed the great service our majority leader is rendering to his Nation, his State, and to his fellow colleagues in the Senate by his dynamic leadership. I join Mr. Alsop in commending the distinguished Senator from Texas for a job well done.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I deeply appreciate the very gracious and generous statement of my beloved friend from South Carolina. I think I should say, however, that such good work as has been done or will be done in the Senate is due primarily to the fine spirit of cooperation of my colleagues on the minority side and on my side of the aisle. No leader in the Senate or in any other legislative body has had more help from the Members of the body than I have received. I think, Mr. President, it is also fair to say that perhaps no leader has needed help more than I have. In any event, I am grateful to my friend from South Carolina and to the distinguished columnist, Stewart Alsop, who may have seen things through somewhat prejudiced eyes.

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

A REAL PRO AT WORK IN THE SENATE

(By Stewart Alsop)

There is always something peculiarly satisfying about watching a genuine professional at work, whether on the baseball diamond or on the floor of the United States Senate. Anyone who wants to see in action the best professional floor leader of our time need only visit the Senate gallery at a tense legislative moment and keep his eye on the tall, lanky, slow-moving form of the majority leader as he ambles about the floor below.

Like a great professional athlete, Lyndon Johnson of Texas makes no waste motion. A word here and there, a casual, political arm around a recalcitrant shoulder, a brief, companionable colloquy with his opposite number, WILLIAM KNOWLAND of California—and the chances are that the bill under consideration will slide through the Senate almost without debate.

Take a few recent examples. The reciprocal trade bill, which had generated immensely heavy pressures from back home was in very bad trouble. It was being freely predicted that it would pass, if at all, only after weeks of weary wrangling and many crippling amendments. It passed after 3 days of debate, in surprisingly unmutilated form.

Traditionally, the agriculture appropriations bill, touching as it does many sensitive farm pocketbooks, is the subject of loud, long, and angry argument. It passed, all unnoticed, after exactly an hour of debate. The Colorado basin reclamation bill involved one of the hottest political issues in the Far West. The bill has often been debated in other sessions, but never passed. It went through the Senate in this session in 3 days. The Paris accords, which could have been expected at the very least to have elicited a lot of oratory for the folks back home, slipped through in just 2 hours.

And so on. The fact is that this session of Congress has passed a good deal of important and controversial legislation. But it has been done so quietly, with such a minimum of fuss and bother, that old hands are saying that this is the least exciting session since the 1920's. At any rate, it is certainly the most efficiently run session in recent memory. It is interesting, therefore, to visit the majority leader and ask him how he does it.

Now that the White House has been ruined by the modernizers, the Capitol is the last place in Washington with a real smell of the past. JOHNSON's little office off the gallery floor, with its handsome chandeliers sent up from the White House by Theodore Roosevelt, its turn-of-the-century furniture and its odd decorations (an old portrait of "Rebecka, daughter of the mighty Prince Powhattan, Emperor of Attaboughkomouck," for example) help to remind the visitor that the Congress of the United States, after all, is one of the world's most ancient legislative bodies.

The majority leader fits well into the atmosphere. The Senate is in his bones and in his blood. And the same thing is true of the committee's chairmen who are JOHNSON's principal lieutenants and collaborators in the business of running the Senate.

When you ask him how he does it, JOHNSON gives most of the credit to the chairmen. He reels off their names and appends to each a short political biography, going back to the State legislatures and the county judgeships.

"Hell," he says, "every damned one of 'em's an old pro. They've been 25 years in Congress, on the average. You wouldn't expect them to get all flustered up about nothing, would you?"

Getting controversial issues thoroughly settled in committee before they ever reach the floor, and before anyone has a chance to get all flustered up about nothing, is the most important part of the Johnson recipe for running the Senate. For the rest, the recipe calls for a large, efficient, experienced staff, capable of finding out how each Senator will vote almost before he knows himself; and a thorough knowledge of the complicated rules of the Senate. "No slipperies or trickeries," says JOHNSON (who has an odd turn of phrase), "but you've got to know the rules."

Finally, the recipe calls for something intangible, a special sort of instinct. "You haven't got any business being in my profession," JOHNSON says, "if you can't smell things coming."

Those who have watched him in action agree that JOHNSON can certainly smell things coming—especially trouble. His critics say, indeed, that JOHNSON is a great deal better at making the Senate function smoothly, and without unnecessary rows, than at making issues which will help the Democrats win back the White House in 1956.

JOHNSON himself firmly believes that a well-run Congress and a united party are the best possible assets for next year's Democratic presidential candidate, whoever he may be. At any rate, JOHNSON is the kind of man the American system has always had to have—a man who makes the system work.

OWNERSHIP PROBLEMS OF SMALL BANKS

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, more than 2 years ago, a businessman from my State, Richard H. Barry, of Fargo, who is a director in a number of small companies and operates a financial consulting organization, saw a serious problem developing for the owners and operators of small independent banks who were growing old. The problem, in a nutshell, was who was going to buy their banks in a few more years when they were too old to run the institutions themselves.

As Mr. Barry saw the problem, unless steps were taken to help a younger generation of bankers and local businessmen buy the banks from the elderly owners, there would be a wave of mergers that would gradually wind up, not in countywide or statewide branch banking, but in regional and nationwide branch banking. The wave of bank mergers and the growth of branch banking and subsidiary banking in the last few years certainly seems to support his forecast.

Mr. Barry, who has had wide experience in the ownership and capital problems of small business, not only made a careful study of the ownership problems of small banks, but he had the courage to come forward with a challenging idea to help solve certain of the basic problems. His ideas on this subject have been discussed at bankers' meetings and in financial publications throughout the Nation. He has many supporters for his recommendations, but, as might be expected, and as a matter of fact which he recognized in the beginning, a great deal of educational work would be necessary before the Federal bank supervisory officials would be willing to shake the shackles of some of their traditional philosophy. The fact remains he is making headway with a program that has considerable merit.

A few days ago Mr. Barry gave me a memorandum entitled "Mergers—Small Banks," which I believe comes as close to the meat of the small bank merger problem as anything that I have seen recently on the subject. I hope Mr. Barry's supporters in and out of Congress will study this memorandum carefully, as it contains some convincing thoughts.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD, following my remarks, the memorandum entitled "Mergers—Small Banks."

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

MERGERS—SMALL BANKS

Competition to larger banks and bank holding companies in the purchase or acquisition by merger of small independent banks could be improved materially if certain roadblocks in the way of individual investors were corrected.

1. One example is the capital gains tax situation. Individual investors willing to pay cash for a small bank can be at a substantial disadvantage when a larger bank, or a bank holding company, offers the device of a merger to defer for the sellers payment of capital gains taxes. In one recent transaction pertaining to a bank with a net worth of $400,000 deferment of the capital gains tax amounted to over $75,000.

2. Another type of roadblock to individual investors can be illustrated by examining the mechanics related to the financing of part of the purchase of a small bank. Outside of the field of banking there are three fairly common methods to choose from in setting up the mechanics of financing; for instance, $100,000 on the purchase of a $300,000 business. For example:

(A) The purchasers can execute as individuals a personal note for $100,000.

(B) The business in the case of a corporation can execute a $100,000 note in place of the individual investors.

(C) The business in the case of a corporation can issue $100,000 in class A common or preferred stock.

From the standpoint of the amount of earnings of the business required to pay the $100,000 plus the rental cost of the money, (A) above requires almost twice as much as (C).

(B) above is the most economical method.

A comparison of the earnings before taxes required between (A) and (C) on a 10-year amortization program would in round figures to $436,000 in the case of (A) and $230,000 in the case of (C). (Interest or dividends figured at 6 percent per annum. Corporate and personal income tax rates figured at 50 percent and 40 percent, respectively.)

At present the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation and the Comptroller of Currency as a matter of policy refuse to sanction the use of preferred stock (authorized in

the Banking Act of 1933), which for all practical purposes leaves the prospective individual buyer of a small bank limited to (A) above in the mechanics he is permitted to employ. This situation not only creates a tax inequity for the individual investor, but also amounts to a discouraging roadblock for certain potential buyers from the ranks of competent bankers, who, alone, or with the help of local businessmen might be ready to assume the transfer of ownership from an older group of individual investors.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is closed.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CARLSON in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADVANCES FROM FEDERAL UNEMPLOYMENT ACT TO ALASKA

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 1650) to authorize the Territory of Alaska to obtain advances from the Federal Unemployment Act, and for other purposes, which was, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That the Governor of Alaska is authorized and empowered, notwithstanding any provision of the Organic Act of Alaska, or any other act of Congress, or any of the Territorial laws, to the contrary, to obtain from the Federal unemployment fund, established pursuant to the Employment Security Administrative Financing Act of 1954 (Public Law 567, 83d Cong., approved August 5, 1954), and subject to the conditions in said act, such advances as the Territory of Alaska may qualify for and as may be necessary to obtain for the payment of unemployment compensation benefits to claimants entitled thereto under the Alaska employment security law: *Provided*, That the general fund of the Territory of Alaska from which advances have been made for the payment of unemployment compensation benefits shall be reimbursed from advances made through the Governor of Alaska from the Federal unemployment fund.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, the amendment made by the House of Representatives stipulates that the general fund of the Territory of Alaska, from which advances have been made for the payment of unemployment insurance compensation benefits, shall be reimbursed for advances made through the Governor of Alaska from the Federal unemployment fund.

I may say to the Senate that, through inadvertence, this proviso was omitted from the bill as it was passed by the Senate. Previously the bill was agreed to unanimously by both the Senate committee and the Senate, and likewise by the House of Representatives.

The reason for the proviso is that in March of this year, the unemployment insurance compensation fund in Alaska was exhausted. Because of a ruling by the Attorney General, the Territory of Alaska technically was not eligible to apply for benefits under the provisions of the act passed a year ago.

This bill corrects that situation, and in addition makes it possible for the Territory to be reimbursed for advances totaling $2 million which have been made since March.

I move that the Senate concur in the amendment of the House of Representatives.

The motion was agreed to.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I have a brief announcement to make, and I ask the attention of the distinguished minority leader.

Today the Federal-aid road bill will be before the Senate. I understand that there are several amendments to be considered. I am informed that it is likely that a substitute will be offered.

It is planned to keep the Senate in session this evening as long as Senators desire to speak on amendments or engage in general discussion on the bill, perhaps until 7:30 or 8 o'clock.

As most Senators are aware, there is a unanimous-consent agreement to vote on the postal pay bill veto tomorrow. At the conclusion of the morning hour tomorrow there will be a period of debate of 3 hours. I assume that the vote will come at some time between 3:30 and 4:15.

After that vote is concluded, the Senate will continue consideration of the road bill, and if no final action has been taken at the end of the day, it is hoped that the Senate will meet Wednesday morning at an early hour, with the expectation that consideration of the bill may be concluded on Wednesday.

It is hoped that on Thursday it will be possible to have before the Senate the State and Justice Departments appropriation bill. I shall discuss with the distinguished minority leader the possibility of also considering some of the new bills which have been placed upon the calendar.

I have agreed with the distinguished minority leader that there will be no session of the Senate on Monday, Memorial Day. If the Senate is in session on Friday, it can adjourn or recess until Tuesday. I make that announcement in order that Senators may have due notice, and may accommodate their engagements to the program outlined.

I believe that next week and during the following week the schedule of the Senate will be rather crowded. It may be necessary to hold longer sessions. It may be desirable to hold sessions on Saturday. If such sessions can be avoided, of course, they will be. However, the first of June is approaching, which will leave only 30 days of the present fiscal year. A number of appropriation bills must be considered, and there is a necessity of acting upon important legislation which will be expiring It may be necessary, during June, for Senators to be present on Saturdays, and for the Senate to sit later in the evenings.

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. Can the distinguished majority leader tell the Senate what business is likely to come before the Senate for consideration on the day following Memorial Day?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. No. I regret very much that at this stage we have no plans for Tuesday, May 31. During the day and later in the week I shall be glad to confer with Senators, and I shall be glad to inform the Senator as soon as a definite plan is agreed upon. I have not had an opportunity to talk with the distinguished minority leader with respect to the minority attitude on certain bills which have recently been reported. In fairness, I may say that since they were reported I have not had an opportunity to discuss them with our own policy committee. However, before the Senate adjourns or takes a recess for Memorial Day, I shall try to make a somewhat detailed statement for the benefit of the Senator from North Dakota and other Senators. I, myself, am very eager to know what business can be scheduled by the Senate for consideration after Memorial Day.

Mr. LANGER. If Senators return to their homes on Memorial Day to deliver addresses, in some instances considerable distances are involved, and they cannot hope to return to Washington until sometime in the afternoon on Tuesday, at best.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. If it is at all possible to arrange for the consideration on Tuesday of measures of a noncontroversial character, or proposed legislation which is not too highly important—if there is any such type of proposed legislation for the consideration of the Senate—I assure the Senator that the majority leader and the minority leader will attempt to reach an agreement.

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I have received from Members of the Senate a number of inquiries—and perhaps the distinguished majority leader has also—as to whether or not any plans have been made for the Fourth of July period. I am not pressing the majority leader at this time for a statement but if at an early date some statement could be made to the Senate as to the plans for the Fourth of July period, I think it would be very helpful.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I think that is a very good suggestion, and I shall be glad to discuss the subject further with the distinguished minority leader and make an announcement as soon as possible. I appreciate the suggestion.

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, I have discussed with the minority

leader the request which I am about to make.

I ask unanimous consent that the committee amendments to the bill now before the Senate be agreed to en bloc, and that the bill, as thus amended, be considered as original text for the purpose of further amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the request of the Senator from Texas.

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. For the sake of the RECORD, let me say that this is the request which is usually made, in order that the bill itself may be considered as original text, so that Senators may not be foreclosed, because of the parliamentary situation, from offering certain amendments which might otherwise be held to be in the third degree.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. The Senator is correct. After I had discussed the subject with the distinguished minority leader, I asked the Parliamentarian to prepare the usual request, which I have submitted.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Texas? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The amendments agreed to en bloc are as follows:

On page 1, line 7, after the word "of", to strike our "$1,100,000,000" and insert "$900,000,000"; in line 8, after the numerals "30", to strike out "1956" and insert "1957"; on page 2, line 2, after the numerals "30", to strike out "1960" and insert "1961"; in line 5, after "(a)", to strike out "$500,000,000" and insert "$400,000,000"; in line 7, after "b)", to strike out "$325,000,000" and insert "$300,000,000"; in line 9, after "(c)", to strike out "$275,000,000" and insert "$200,000,000"; on page 3, at the beginning of line 7, to strike out "of Commerce"; in line 9, after the word "surveys", to insert "contract awards"; in line 22, after the word "Secretary", to strike out "of Commerce"; on page 4, line 2, after the word "project", to strike out the colon and "*Provided further*, That not more than 10 percent of the amount apportioned to each State under subparagraphs (a), (b), or (c) of this section may be transferred from the apportionment under one subparagraph to the apportionment under either of the other subparagraphs: *Provided further*, That such transfer is requested by the State highway department and is approved by the Governor of said State and the Secretary of Commerce as being in the public interest: *Provided further*, That the total of such transfers shall not increase the original apportionment under any subparagraph by more than 10 percent: *Provided further*, That the transfers hereinabove permitted for funds authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal years ending June 30, 1956, through the year ending June 30, 1960, shall likewise be permitted on the same basis for funds heretofore or hereafter authorized to be appropriated for any prior or subsequent fiscal year: *And provided further*, That nothing herein contained shall be deemed to alter or impair the authority contained in the last proviso to subparagraph (b) of section 3 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1944."

On page 5, line 5, after the word "of", to strike out "$500,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, and a like additional sum for each succeeding fiscal year thereafter, up to and including the fiscal year ending June 30, 1960" and insert in lieu thereof "$1,000,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, the additional sum of $1,250,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1958, the additional sum of $1,500,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1959, the additional sum of $2,000,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1960, and the additional sum of $2,000,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1961"; on page 6, line 1, after the word "to", to strike out "66⅔" and insert "90"; in line 3, after the word "remaining", to strike out "33⅓" and insert "10"; in line 8, after the word "area", to insert a colon and "*And provided further*, That such Federal share payable on any project in any State shall not exceed 95 percent of the total cost of such project"; in line 16, after the word "Secretary", to strike out "of Commerce"; in line 18, after the word "amount", to strike out "unappropriated" and insert "apportioned"; after line 22, to strike out:

"SEC. 3. All provisions of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1944, approved December 20, 1944 (58 Stat. 838); the Federal Aid Highway Act of 1948, approved June 29, 1948 (62 Stat. 1105); and the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1950, approved September 7, 1950 (64 Stat. 785); the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1952, approved June 25, 1952 (66 Stat. 158) and the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1954, approved May 6, 1954, not inconsistent with this act, shall remain in full force and effect."

On page 7, after line 6, to strike out:

"SEC. 4. If any section, subsection, or other provision of this act or the application thereof to any person or circumstance is held invalid, the remainder of this act and the application of such section, subsection or other provision to other persons or circumstances shall not be affected thereby."

After line 11, to insert:

"(d) No funds authorized to be appropriated for any fiscal year by this section shall be apportioned to any State within the boundaries of which the National System of Interstate Highways may lawfully be used by vehicles with any dimension or with weight in excess of the greater of (1) the maximum corresponding dimensions or maximum corresponding weight permitted for vehicles using the public highways of such State under laws in effect in such State on May 1, 1955, or (2) the maximum corresponding dimensions or maximum corresponding weight recommended for vehicles operated over the highways of the United States by the American Association of State Highway Officials in a document published by such association entitled 'Policy Concerning Maximum Dimension, Weights, and Speeds of Motor Vehicles To Be Operated Over the Highways of the United States' and incorporating recommendations adopted by such association on April 1, 1946. Any amount which is withheld from apportionment to any State pursuant to the foregoing provisions of this section shall be reapportioned immediately to the States which have not been denied apportionments pursuant to such provisions.

"(e) The Secretary is directed to take all action possible to expedite the conduct of a series of tests now planned or being conducted by the Highway Research Board of the National Academy of Sciences, in cooperation with the Bureau of Public Roads, the several States, and other persons and organizations, for the purpose of determining the maximum desirable dimensions and weights for vehicles operated on the Federal-Aid Highway System and, as promptly as possible after the conclusion of such tests, to make recommendations to the Congress with respect to such maximum desirable dimensions and weights."

On page 8, after line 18, to insert:

"SEC. 3. Not more than 20 percent of the amounts apportioned to each State under sections 1 and 2 may be transferred from the apportionment under either section or subparagraph to the apportionment under either of the other sections or subparagraphs: *Provided*, That such transfer is requested by the State highway department and is approved by the governor of said State and the secretary as being in the public interest: *Provided further*, That the Federal share payable on account of any project provided for by funds made available by transfer under the provisions of this section shall not exceed 50 percent of the construction costs thereof, including the costs of rights-of-way, except that in the case of any State containing unappropriated and unreserved public lands and nontaxable Indian lands, individual and tribal, exceeding 5 percent of the total area of all lands therein, the Federal share shall be increased by a percentage of the remaining cost equal to the percentage that the area of all such lands in such State is of the total area: *Provided further*, That the total of such transfers shall not increase the original apportionment under any subparagraph by more than 20 percent: *Provided further*, That the transfers hereinabove permitted for funds authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal years ending June 30, 1957, through the fiscal year ending June 30, 1961, shall likewise be permitted on the same basis for funds heretofore or hereafter authorized to be appropriated for any prior or subsequent fiscal year: *And provided further*, That nothing herein contained shall be deemed to alter or impair the authority contained in the last proviso to subparagraph (b) of section 3 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1944."

On page 9, after line 23, to insert:

"SEC. 4. (a) In any case in which the Secretary is requested by any State to acquire any lands or interests in lands (including the control of access to any lands from adjoining lands and the exclusive right to advertise on lands adjoining and not exceeding 500 feet from the right-of-way) required by such State for right-of-way or other purposes in connection with the prosecution of any project for the construction, reconstruction, or improvement of any section of the National System of Interstate Highways, the Secretary is authorized, in the name of the United States and prior to the approval of title by the Attorney General, to acquire, enter upon, and take possession of such lands or interests in lands by purchase, donation, condemnation or otherwise in accordance with the laws of the United States (including the act of February 26, 1931; 46 Stat. 1421), if—

"(1) the Secretary has determined that such State is unable to acquire such lands or interests in lands with sufficient promptness; and

"(2) such State has agreed with the Secretary to pay, at such time as may be specified by the Secretary, an amount equal to 10 percent of the costs incurred by the Secretary in acquiring such lands or interests in lands.

The authority granted by this section shall also apply to lands and interests in lands received as grants of land from the United States and owned or held by railroads or other corporations.

"(b) The costs incurred by the Secretary in acquiring any such lands or interests in lands may include the cost of examination and abstract of title, certificate of title, advertising, and any fees incidental to such acquisition. All costs incurred by the Secretary in connection with the acquisition of any such lands or interests in lands shall be paid from the funds for construction, reconstruction, and improvement of the National System of Interstate Highways apportioned to the State upon the request of which such lands or interests in lands are acquired and any sums paid to the Secretary by such State as its share of the costs of acquisition of such lands or interests in lands shall be deposited in the Treasury to the credit of the appropriation for Federal-Aid Highways and shall be credited to the amount apportioned to

such State as its apportionment of funds for construction, reconstruction, or improvement of the National System of Interstate Highways.

"(c) The Secretary is further authorized and directed by proper deed, executed in the name of the United States, to convey any such lands or interests in lands acquired in any State under the provisions of this section, except the outside 5 feet of any such right-of-way in States unable or unwilling to control access, to the State highway department of such State or such political subdivision thereof as its laws may provide, upon such terms and conditions as to the lands acquired in fee as may be agreed upon by the Secretary and the State highway department, or political sudivisions to which the conveyance is to be made. Whenever the State is able and agrees to control access, the outside five feet may be conveyed to it.

"(d) Whenever rights-of-way on the National System of Interstate Highways are required over public lands of the United States, the Secretary may make such arrangements with the agency having jurisdiction over such lands as may be necessary to give the State or other person constructing the projects on such lands adequate rights-of-way and control of access thereto from adjoining lands, and any such agency is hereby directed to cooperate with the Secretary in this connection."

On page 12, after line 16, to insert:

"SEC. 5. The Secretary is hereby granted authority to incur obligations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, in an amount not to exceed $100 million for acquisition of rights-of-way, and enter into contracts under such authorizations and his action in doing so shall be deemed a contractual obligation of the Federal Government for the payment of the cost thereof and such funds shall be deemed to have been expended when so obligated: *Provided*, That the funds expended hereunder shall be credited against sums apportioned to the State in which expended for projects programed under the provisions of section 2 of this act."

On page 13, after line 2, insert:

"SEC. 6. For the purpose of carrying out the provisions of section 23 of the Federal Highway Act (42 Stat. 218), as amended and supplemented, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated (1) for forest highways the sum of $22,500,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1958, and a like sum for each of the fiscal years to and including the fiscal year ending June 30, 1961, and (2) for forest development roads and trails the sum of $24,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1958, and a like sum for each of the fiscal years to and including the fiscal year ending June 30, 1961: *Provided*, That with respect to any proposed construction or reconstruction of a timber access road, advisory public hearings shall be held at a place convenient or adjacent to the area of construction or reconstruction with notice and reasonable opportunity for interested persons to present their views as to the practicability and feasibility of such construction or reconstruction: *Provided further*, That hereafter funds available for forest development roads and trails shall also be available for adjacent vehicular parking areas and/or sanitary, water, and fire control facilities: *Provided further*, That the appropriation herein authorized for forest highways shall be apportioned by the Secretary for expenditure in the several States, Alaska, and Puerto Rico in accordance with the provision of section 3 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1950."

On page 14, after line 2, insert:

"SEC. 7. (a) For the construction, reconstruction, and improvement of roads and trails, inclusive of necessary bridges, in national parks, monuments, and other areas administered by the National Park Service, including areas authorized to be established as national parks and monuments, and national park and monument approach roads authorized by the act of January 31, 1941 (46 Stat. 1053), as amended, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of $12,500,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1958, and a like sum for each of the fiscal years to and including the fiscal year ending June 30, 1961.

"(b) For the construction, reconstruction, and improvement of parkways, authorized by acts of Congress, on lands to which title is vested in the United States, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of $11,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1958, and a like sum for each of the fiscal years to and including the fiscal year ending June 30, 1961.

"(c) For the construction, improvement, and maintenance of Indian reservation roads, and bridges and roads and bridges to provide access to Indian reservations and Indian lands under the provisions of the act approved May 26, 1928 (45 Stat. 750), there is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of $10 million for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1958, and a like sum for each of the fiscal years to and including the fiscal year ending June 30, 1961: *Provided*, That the location, type, and design of all roads and bridges constructed shall be approved by the Secretary before any expenditures are made thereon, and all such construction shall be under the general supervision of the Secretary."

On page 15, after line 8, to insert:

"SEC. 8. For the purpose of carrying out the provisions of section 10 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1950 (64 Stat. 785), there is hereby authorized to be appropriated for the survey, construction, reconstruction, and maintenance of main roads, through unappropriated or unreserved public lands, nontaxable Indian lands, or other Federal reservations the sum of $2,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, and a like sum for each of the fiscal years to and including the fiscal year ending June 30, 1961."

After line 17, to insert:

"SEC. 9. Any funds authorized herein for forest highways, forest development roads and trails, park roads and trails; parkways, Indian roads, and public lands highways shall be available for contract for one year in advance of year for which authorized: *Provided*, That any amount remaining unexpended 2 year after the close of the fiscal year for which authorized shall lapse. The Secretary of the Department charged with the administration of such funds is hereby granted authority to incur obligations, approve projects, and enter into contracts under such authorizations and his action in doing so shall be deemed a contractual obligation of the Federal Government for the payment of the cost thereof and such funds shall be deemed to have been expended when so obligated."

On page 16, after line 7, to insert:

"SEC. 10. So much of the first section and of section 2 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1954 as authorize appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, are hereby repealed."

After line 11, to insert:

"SEC. 11. (a) Subject to the conditions contained in this section, 50 percent of the cost of relocation of utility facilities necessitated by the construction of a project on the Federal primary, secondary, or interstate systems in which Federal funds have participated, may be paid from Federal funds whenever under the laws or practice of the State where the project is being constructed the entire relocation cost is required to be borne by the utility.

"(b) For the purposes of this section the term "utility" shall include publicly, privately, and cooperatively owned utilities.

"(c) For the purposes of this section, the term 'cost of relocation' shall include the entire amount paid by such utility properly attributable to such relocation after deducting therefrom any increase in the value of the new facility and any salvage value derived from the old facility.

"(d) No more than 2 percent of all sums apportioned to any State for any fiscal year for expenditure on such systems may be expended under the privisions of this section.

"(e) Any utility required to relocate a facility within the terms of this section shall have a right to payment out of Federal funds as in this section provided. The Secretary is authorized to make such payments on the basis of an agreement approved by him, entered into between the State highway department and the utility, which agreement shall contain an estimate or an agreed price of the cost of relocation. In lieu of such agreement the utility may file with the State highway department a certified statement of the cost of relocation, subject to the approval of the State highway department. The State highway department shall transmit such statement to the Secretary with the final voucher for approval by the Secretary.

"(f) Nothing in this section shall be deemed to preclude reimbursement to States of the Federal share of the State's costs in connection with the relocation of utility facilities where a portion of the relocation cost is required by law or practice to be borne by the State."

On page 17, after line 22, to insert:

"SEC. 12. Section 7 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1944 (58 Stat. 838), designating a national system of interstate highways, is hereby amended by striking out 'forty thousand', and inserting in lieu thereof 'forty-two thousand five hundred.'"

On page 18, after line 2, to insert:

"SEC. 13. (a) It is hereby declared to be in the national interest to accelerate the construction of the Federal-aid highways since many of such highways, or portions thereof, are in fact inadequate to meet the needs of local and interstate commerce, the national and the civil defense.

"(b) It is further declared that one of the most important objectives of this act is the prompt completion of the national system of interstate highways. Insofar as possible in consonance with this objective, existing highways located on an interstate route shall be used to the extent that such use is practicable, suitable, and feasible, it being the intent that local needs, to the extent practicable, suitable, and feasible, shall be given equal consideration with the needs of interstate commerce.

"(c) It is hereby declared to be the sense of Congress that all segments of the Federal-aid highway systems should be improved to standards adequate to meet the needs of national defense and the national economy at the earliest practicable date. The Secretary is hereby directed to submit to the Congress not later than February 1, 1959, a report on the progress made in attaining the foregoing objective, together with recommendations for the extension of the program.

"(d) Any State highway department which submits plans for a Federal-aid highway project involving the bypassing of any city, town, village, or any community, either incorporated or unincorporated, shall certify to the Commissioner of Public Roads that it has had public hearings and considered the economic effects of such a location: *Provided*, That a copy of the transcript of said hearings shall be submitted to the Commissioner of Public Roads, together with the certification."

On page 19, after line 8, to insert:

"SEC. 14. All agreements between the Secretary and the State highway department for the construction of projects on the interstate system may contain a clause providing

that the State will not add any points of access to, or exit from, the project in addition to those approved by the Secretary in the plans for such project, without the prior approval of the Secretary."

After line 15, to insert:

"SEC. 15. The Secretary is directed to study, and to encourage the various States to consider, the feasibility of providing by multiple-State compacts for the construction, operation, and maintenance of interstate toll roads, as a supplement to the Federal-aid highway system, for the purpose of providing adequate highway facilities for the interstate movement of motor vehicles, and particularly for the movement of those motor vehicles traveling all or a substantial portion of the length or breadth of the United States. The Secretary shall make a report to the Congress at the earliest practicable date, but not later than June 30, 1956, with respect to the results of such study."

On page 20, after line 3, to insert:

"SEC. 16. The consent of Congress is hereby given to any two or more States to negotiate and enter into compacts providing for the construction and operation of interstate toll roads. Such compacts shall not be binding or obligatory upon any of the parties thereto unless and until it shall have been ratified by the legislatures of all of the States entering into it and approved by the Congress of the United States."

After line 10, to insert:

"SEC. 17. Any State desiring to accept the benefits of section 2 of this act shall submit, through its State agency, a State plan for carrying out the purposes of this act. Such State plan shall provide that all laborers and mechanics employed by contractors or subcontractors on construction work performed on highway facilities projects in the national system of interstate highways approved under the plan, shall be paid wages at rates not less than those prevailing on similar construction in the locality as determined by the Secretary of Labor in accordance with the Davis-Bacon Act, as amended (40 U. S. C. 276a–276a–5), and that every such employee shall receive compensation at a rate not less than 1½ times his basic rate of pay for all hours worked in any workweek in excess of 8 hours in any workday or 40 hours in the workweek, as the case may be. The Secretary of Labor shall have, with respect to the labor standards specified above, the authority and functions set forth in Reorganization Plan No. 14 of 1950 (15 F. R. 3176; 64 Stat. 1267); section 2 of the act of June 13, 1934, as amended (40 U. S. C. 276a); section 625, Public Law 725, 79th Congress, second session; and section 205, Public Law 815, 81st Congress, second session."

On page 21, after line 9, to insert:

"SEC. 18. All provisions of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1944, approved December 20, 1944 (58 Stat. 838); the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1948, approved June 29, 1948 (62 Stat. 1105); and the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1950, approved September 7, 1950 (64 Stat. 785); the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1952, approved June 25, 1952 (66 Stat. 158); and the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1954, approved May 6, 1954, not inconsistent with this act, shall remain in full force and effect."

After line 18, to insert:

"SEC. 19. If any section, subsection, or other provision of this act or the application thereof to any person or circumstance is held invalid, the remainder of this act and the application of such section, subsection, or other provision to other persons or circumstances shall not be affected thereby."

On page 22, line 1, to change the section number from "5" to "20"; and in line 4, to change the section number from "6" to "21"; so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of the Federal-Aid Road Act approved July 11, 1916 (39 Stat. 355), and all acts amendatory thereof and supplementary thereto, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of $900 million for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and a like sum for each succeeding fiscal year thereafter up to and including the fiscal year ending June 30, 1961.

The sum herein authorized for each fiscal year shall be available for expenditure as follows:

(a) $400 million for projects on the Federal-aid primary highway system.

(b) $300 million for projects on the Federal-aid secondary system.

(c) $200 million for projects on the Federal-aid primary highway system in urban areas, and for projects on approved extensions of the Federal-aid secondary system within urban areas.

The sums authorized by this section for each fiscal year, respectively, shall be apportioned among the several States in the manner now provided by law and in accordance with the formulas set forth in section 4 of the Federal-aid Highway Act of 1944, approved December 20, 1944 (58 Stat. 838).

Any sums apportioned to any State under the provision of this section shall be available for expenditure in that State for 2 years after the close of the fiscal year for which such sums are authorized, and any amounts so apportioned remaining unexpended at the end of such period shall lapse: *Provided*, That such funds for any fiscal year shall be deemed to have been expended if a sum equal to the total of the sums apportioned to the State for such fiscal year is covered by formal agreements with the Secretary of Commerce for the improvement of specific projects as provided by this act: *Provided further*, That in the case of those sums heretofore, herein, or hereafter apportioned to any State for projects on the Federal-aid secondary highway system, the Secretary may, upon the request of any State, discharge his responsibility relative to the plans, specifications, estimates, surveys, contract awards, design, inspection, and construction of such secondary road projects by his receiving and approving a certified statement by the State highway department setting forth that the plans, design, and construction for such projects are in accord with the standards and procedures of such State applicable to projects in this category approved by him: *Provided further*, That such approval shall not be given unless such standards and procedures are in accordance with the objectives set forth in section 1 (b) of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1950: *Provided further*, That nothing contained in the foregoing provisos shall be construed to relieve any State of its obligation now provided by law relative to maintenance, nor to relieve the Secretary of his obligation with respect to the selection of the secondary system or the location of projects thereon, to make a final inspection after construction of each project, and to require an adequate showing of the estimated and actual cost of construction of each project.

SEC. 2. (a) For the purpose of expediting the construction, reconstruction, and improvement, inclusive of necessary bridges and tunnels, of the National System of Interstate Highways, including extensions thereof through urban areas, designated in accordance with the provisions of section 7 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1944 (58 Stat. 838), there is hereby authorized to be appropriated the additional sum of $1 billion for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, the additional sum of $1,250,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1958, the additional sum of $1,500,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1959, the additional sum of $2 billion for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1960, and the additional sum of $2 billion for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1961. The sum herein authorized for each fiscal year shall be apportioned among the several States in the following manner: One-half in the ratio which the population of each State bears to the total population of all the States, as shown by the latest available Federal census: *Provided*, That no State shall receive less than three-fourths of 1 percent of the money so apportioned; and one-half in the manner now provided by law for apportionment of funds for the Federal-aid primary system: *Provided further*, That the Federal share payable on account of any project on the National System of Interstate Highways provided for by funds made available under the provisions of this section shall be increased to 90 percent of the total cost thereof, plus a percentage of the remaining 10 percent of such cost in any State containing unappropriated and unreserved public lands and nontaxable Indian lands, individual and tribal, exceeding 5 percent of the total area of all lands therein, equal to the percentage that the area of such lands in such State is of its total area: *And provided further*, That such Federal share payable on any project in any State shall not exceed 95 percent of the total cost of such project.

(b) Any sums apportioned to any State under the provisions of this section shall be available for expenditure in that State for 2 years after the close of fiscal year for which such sums are authorized: *Provided*, That such funds shall be deemed to be expended upon execution of formal agreements with the Secretary for the improvement of specific projects under this section.

(c) Any amount apportioned to the States under the provisions of this section unexpended at the end of the period during which it is available for expenditure under the terms of subsection (b) of this section shall lapse.

(d) No funds authorized to be appropriated for any fiscal year by this section shall be apportioned to any State within the boundaries of which the National System of Interstate Highways may lawfully be used by vehicles with any dimension or with weight in excess of the greater of (1) the maximum corresponding dimensions or maximum corresponding weight permitted for vehicles using the public highways of such State under laws in effect in such State on May 1, 1955, or (2) the maximum corresponding dimensions or maximum corresponding weight recommended for vehicles operated over the highways of the United States by the American Association of State Highway Officials in a document published by such association entitled "Policy Concerning Maximum Dimension, Weights, and Speeds of Motor Vehicles To Be Operated Over the Highways of the United States" and incorporating recommendations adopted by such association on April 1, 1946. Any amount which is withheld from apportionment to any State pursuant to the foregoing provisions of this section shall be reapportioned immediately to the States which have not been denied apportionments pursuant to such provision.

(e) The Secretary is directed to take all action possible to expedite the conduct of a series of tests now planned or being conducted by the highway research board of the National Academy of Sciences, in cooperation with the Bureau of Public Roads, the several States, and other persons and organizations, for the purpose of determining the maximum desirable dimensions and weights for vehicles operated on the Federal-aid highway system and, as promptly as possible after the conclusion of such tests, to make recommendations to the Congress with respect to such maximum desirable dimensions and weights.

SEC. 3. Not more than 20 percent of the amounts apportioned to each State under sections 1 and 2 may be transferred from the apportionment under either section or

subparagraph to the apportionment under either of the other sections or subparagraphs: *Provided*, That such transfer is requested by the State highway department and is approved by the governor of said State and the Secretary as being in the public interest: *Provided further*, That the Federal share payable on account of any project provided for by funds made available by transfer under the provisions of this section shall not exceed 50 percent of the construction costs thereof, including the costs of rights-of-way, except that in the case of any State containing unappropriated and unreserved public lands and nontaxable Indian lands, individual and tribal, exceeding 5 percent of the total area of all lands therein, the Federal share shall be increased by a percentage of the remaining cost equal to the percentage that the area of all such lands in such State is of the total area: *Provided further*, That the total of such transfers shall not increase the original apportionment under any subparagraph by more than 20 percent: *Provided further*, That the transfers hereinabove permitted for funds authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal years ending June 30, 1957, through the fiscal year ending June 30, 1961, shall likewise be permitted on the same basis for funds heretofore or hereafter authorized to be appropriated for any prior or subsequent fiscal year: *And provided further*, That nothing herein contained shall be deemed to alter or impair the authority contained in the last proviso to subparagraph (b) of section 3 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1944.

SEC. 4. (a) In any case in which the Secretary is requested by any State to acquire any lands or interests in lands (including the control of access to any lands from adjoining lands and the exclusive right to advertise on lands adjoining and not exceeding 500 feet from the right-of-way) required by such State for right-of-way or other purposes in connection with the prosecution of any project for the construction, reconstruction, or improvement of any section of the National System of Interstate Highways, the Secretary is authorized, in the name of the United States and prior to the approval of title by the Attorney General, to acquire, enter upon, and take possession of such lands or interests in lands by purchase, donation, condemnation, or otherwise in accordance with the laws of the United States (including the act of February 26, 1931; 46 Stat. 1421), if—

(1) the Secretary has determined that such State is unable to acquire such lands or interests in lands with sufficient promptness; and

(2) such State has agreed with the Secretary to pay, at such time as may be specified by the Secretary, an amount equal to 10 percent of the costs incurred by the Secretary in acquiring such lands or interests in lands.

The authority granted by this section shall also apply to lands and interests in lands received as grants of land from the United States and owned or held by railroads or other corporations.

(b) The costs incurred by the Secretary in acquiring any such lands or interests in lands may include the cost of examination and abstract of title, certificate of title, advertising, and any fees incidental to such acquisition. All costs incurred by the Secretary in connection with the acquisition of any such lands or interests in lands shall be paid from the funds for construction, reconstruction, and improvement of the National System of Interstate Highways apportioned to the State upon the request of which such lands or interests in lands are acquired and any sums paid to the Secretary by such State as its share of the costs of acquisition of such lands or interests in lands shall be deposited in the Treasury to the credit of the appropriation for Federal-aid highways and shall be credited to the amount apportioned to such State as its apportionment of funds for construction, reconstruction, or improvement of the National System of Interstate Highways.

(c) The Secretary is further authorized and directed by proper deed, executed in the name of the United States, to convey any such lands or interests in lands acquired in any State under the provisions of this section, except the outside 5 feet of any such right-of-way in States unable or unwilling to control access, to the State highway department of such State or such political subdivision thereof as its laws may provide, upon such terms and conditions as to the lands acquired in fee as may be agreed upon by the Secretary and the State highway department, or political subdivision to which the conveyance is to be made. Whenever the State is able and agrees to control access, the outside 5 feet may be conveyed to it.

(d) Whenever rights-of-way on the National System of Interstate Highways are required over public lands of the United States, the Secretary may make such arrangements with the agency having jurisdiction over such lands as may be necessary to give the State or other person constructing the projects on such lands adequate rights-of-way and control or access thereto from adjoining lands, and any such agency is hereby directed to cooperate with the Secretary in this connection.

SEC. 5. The Secretary is hereby granted authority to incur obligations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, in an amount not to exceed $100 million for acquisition of rights-of-way, and enter into contracts under such authorizations and his action in doing so shall be deemed a contractual obligation of the Federal Government for the payment of the cost thereof and such funds shall be deemed to have been expended when so obligated: *Provided*, That the funds expended hereunder shall be credited against sums apportioned to the State in which expended for projects programed under the provisions of section 2 of this act.

SEC. 6. For the purpose of carrying out the provisions of section 23 of the Federal Highway Act (42 Stat. 218), as amended and supplemented, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated (1) for forest highways the sum of $22,500,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1958, and a like sum of each of the fiscal years to and including the fiscal year ending June 30, 1961, and (2) for forest development roads and trails the sum of $24 million for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1958, and a like sum for each of the fiscal years to and including the fiscal year ending June 30, 1961: *Provided*, That with respect to any proposed construction or reconstruction of a timber access road, advisory public hearings shall be held at a place convenient or adjacent to the area of construction or reconstruction with notice and reasonable opportunity for interested persons to present their views as to the practicability and feasibility of such construction or reconstruction: *Provided further*, That hereafter funds available for forest development roads and trails shall also be available for adjacent vehicular parking areas and/or sanitary, water, and fire control facilities: *Provided further*, That the appropriation herein authorized for forest highways shall be apportioned by the Secretary for expenditure in the several States, Alaska, and Puerto Rico in accordance with the provision of section 3 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1950.

SEC. 7. (a) For the construction, reconstruction, and improvement of roads and trails, inclusive of necessary bridges, in national parks, monuments, and other areas administered by the National Park Service, including areas authorized to be established as national parks and monuments, and national park and monument approach roads authorized by the act of January 31, 1931 (46 Stat. 1053), as amended, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of $12,500,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1958, and a like sum for each of the fiscal years to and including the fiscal year ending June 30, 1961.

(b) For the construction, reconstruction, and improvement of parkways, authorized by acts of Congress, on lands to which title is vested in the United States, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of $11 million for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1958, and a like sum for each of the fiscal years to and including the fiscal year ending June 30, 1961.

(c) For the construction, improvement, and maintenance of Indian reservation roads and bridges, and roads and bridges to provide access to Indian reservations and Indian lands under the provisions of the act approved May 26, 1928 (45 Stat. 750), there is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of $10 million for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1958, and a like sum for each of the fiscal years to and including the fiscal year ending June 30, 1961: *Provided*, That the location, type, and design of all roads and bridges constructed shall be approved by the Secretary before any expenditures are made thereon, and all such construction shall be under the general supervision of the Secretary.

SEC. 8. For the purpose of carrying out the provisions of section 10 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1950 (64 Stat. 785), there is hereby authorized to be appropriated for the survey, construction, reconstruction, and maintenance of main roads through unappropriated or unreserved public lands, nontaxable Indian lands, or other Federal reservations the sum of $2 million for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, and a like sum for each of the fiscal years to and including the fiscal year ending June 30, 1961.

SEC. 9. Any funds authorized herein for forest highways, forest development roads and trails, park roads and trails, parkways, Indian roads, and public lands highways shall be available for contract for 1 year in advance of year for which authorized: *Provided*, That any amount remaining unexpended 2 years after the close of the fiscal year for which authorized shall lapse. The Secretary of the Department charged with the administration of such funds is hereby granted authority to incur obligations, approve projects, and enter into contracts under such authorizations and his action in doing so shall be deemed a contractual obligation of the Federal Government for the payment of the cost thereof and such funds shall be deemed to have been expended when so obligated.

SEC. 10. So much of the first section and of section 2 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1954 as authorized appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, are hereby repealed.

SEC. 11. (a) Subject to the conditions contained in this section, 50 percent of the cost of relocation of utility facilities necessitated by the construction of a project on the Federal primary, secondary, or interstate systems in which Federal funds have participated, may be paid from Federal funds whenever under the laws or practice of the State where the project is being constructed the entire relocation cost is required to be borne by the utility.

(b) For the purposes of this section the term "utility" shall include publicly, privately, and cooperatively owned utilities.

(c) For the purposes of this section, the term "cost of relocation" shall include the entire amount paid by such utility properly attributable to such relocation after deducting therefrom any increase in the value of the new facility and any salvage value derived from the old facility.

(d) No more than 2 percent of all sums apportioned to any State for any fiscal year for expenditure on such systems may be expended under the provisions of this section.

(e) Any utility required to relocate a facility within the terms of this section shall have a right to payment out of Federal funds as in this section provided. The Secretary is authorized to make such payments on the basis of an agreement approved by him, entered into between the State highway department and the utility, which agreement shall contain an estimate or an agreed price of the cost of relocation. In lieu of such agreement the utility may file with the State highway department a certified statement of the cost of relocation, subject to the approval of the State highway department. The State highway department shall transmit such statement to the Secretary with the final voucher for approval by the Secretary.

(f) Nothing in this section shall be deemed to preclude reimbursement to States of the Federal share of the State's costs in connection with the relocation of utility facilities where a portion of the relocation cost is required by law or practice to be borne by the State.

SEC. 12. Section 7 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1944 (58 Stat. 838), designating a National System of Interstate Highways, is hereby amended by striking out "40,000", and inserting in lieu thereof "42,500."

SEC. 13. (a) It is hereby declared to be in the national interest to accelerate the construction of the Federal-aid highways since many of such highways, or portions thereof, are in fact inadequate to meet the needs of local and interstate commerce, the national and the civil defense.

(b) It is further declared that one of the most important objectives of this act is the prompt completion of the National System of Interstate Highways. Insofar as possible in consonance with this objective, existing highways located on an interstate route shall be used to the extent that such use is practicable, suitable, and feasible, it being the intent that local needs, to the extent practicable, suitable, and feasible, shall be given equal consideration with the needs of interstate commerce.

(c) It is hereby declared to be the sense of Congress that all segments of the Federal-aid highway systems should be improved to standards adequate to meet the needs of national defense and the national economy at the earliest practicable date. The Secretary is hereby directed to submit to the Congress not later than February 1, 1959, a report on the progress made in attaining the foregoing objective, together with recommendations for the extension of the program.

(d) Any State highway department which submits plans for a Federal-aid highway project involving the bypassing of any city, town, village, or any community, either incorporated or unincorporated, shall certify to the Commissioner of Public Roads that it has had public hearings and considered the economic effects of such a location: *Provided*, That a copy of the transcript of said hearings shall be submitted to the Commissioner of Public Roads, together with the certification.

SEC. 14. All agreements between the Secretary and the State highway department for the construction of projects on the interstate system may contain a clause providing that the State will not add any points of access to, or exit from, the project in addition to those approved by the Secretary in the plans for such project, without the prior approval of the Secretary.

SEC. 15. The Secretary is directed to study, and to encourage the various States to consider, the feasibility of providing by multiple-State compacts for the construction, operation, and maintenance of interstate toll roads, as a supplement to the Federal-aid highway system, for the purpose of providing adequate highway facilities for the interstate movement of motor vehicles, and particularly for the movement of those motor vehicles traveling all or a substantial portion of the length or breadth of the United States. The Secretary shall make a report to the Congress at the earliest practicable date, but not later than June 30, 1956, with respect to the results of such study.

SEC. 16. The consent of Congress is hereby given to any two or more States to negotiate and enter into compacts providing for the construction and operation of interstate toll roads. Such compacts shall not be binding or obligatory upon any of the parties thereto unless and until it shall have been ratified by the legislatures of all of the States entering into it and approved by the Congress of the United States.

SEC. 17. Any State desiring to accept the benefits of section 2 of this act shall submit, through its State agency, a State plan for carrying out the purposes of this act. Such State plan shall provide that all laborers and mechanics employed by contractors or subcontractors on construction work performed on highway facilities projects in the National System of Interstate Highways approved under the plan, shall be paid wages at rates not less than those prevailing on similar construction in the locality as determined by the Secretary of Labor in accordance with the Davis-Bacon Act, as amended (40 U. S. C. 276a–276a–5), and that every such employee shall receive compensation at a rate not less than one and one-half times his basic rate of pay for all hours worked in any workweek in excess of 8 hours in any workday or 40 hours in the workweek, as the case may be. The Secretary of Labor shall have, with respect to the labor standards specified above, the authority and functions set forth in Reorganization Plan No. 14 of 1950 (15 F. R. 3176; 64 Stat. 1267), section 2 of the act of June 13, 1934, as amended (40 U. S. C. 276a), section 625, Public Law 725, 79th, 2d session, and section 205, Public Law 815, 81st, 2d session.)

SEC. 18. All provisions of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1944, approved December 20, 1944 (58 Stat. 838); the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1948, approved June 29, 1948 (62 Stat. 1105); and the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1950, approved September 7, 1950 (64 Stat. 785); the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1952, approved June 25, 1952 (66 Stat. 158); and the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1954, approved May 6, 1954, not inconsistent with this act, shall remain in full force and effect.

SEC. 19. If any section, subsection, or other provision of this act or the application thereof to any person or circumstance is held invalid, the remainder of this act and the application of such section, subsection, or other provision to other persons or circumstances shall not be affected thereby.

SEC. 20. All acts of parts of acts in any way inconsistent with the provisions of this act are hereby repealed, and this act shall take effect on its passage.

SEC. 21. This act may be cited as the "Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1955."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to amendment.

Mr. KNOWLAND. 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. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The bill is open to amendment.

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, I call up my amendment, which is in the nature of a substitute for the pending bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the text of the amendment will be printed in the RECORD without being read, unless the Senator from Pennsylvania wishes the amendment to be read.

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. It is not necessary to have it read. I am sure that all Senators are familiar with the text of the amendment, which is known as the administration bill. Unless some Senator desires to have the amendment read, I do not believe it is necessary to do so.

Mr. GORE. I do not believe it is necessary to have the amendment read.

Mr. President, I reserve my right to make a point of order until the Senator from Pennsylvania has concluded his remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A point of order may be made at any time. It is not necessary for the Senator to reserve a point of order.

The amendment, in the nature of a substitute, offered by Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania, Mr. BUSH, and Mr. COTTON proposes to strike out all after the enacting clause and to insert in lieu thereof the following:

SECTION 1. That this act may be cited as the "National Interstate Highway Act."

OBJECTIVE AND POLICY

SEC. 2. It is hereby declared to be in the national interest to foster and accelerate the development of a modern, adequate, safe, and efficient system of highways deemed essential for the expansion of the economy and the changing concepts of the military and civil defense of the United States. It is further declared to be desirable that the development of such system of highways be continued through the cooperation and joint efforts of the Federal Government, the States, and local subdivisions thereof. It is hereby found that those essential highways are in fact inadequate to meet the needs of interstate commerce and the national and civil defense, and that the most important portion of such highways are, or should be, located on the National System of Interstate Highways.

Accordingly, it is the objective of this act to complete the construction of the National System of Interstate Highways within the next 10 years up to such standards as will produce safe highways adequate to handle traffic needs for at least the next 20 years. This objective will be reached only by means of a program which will presently assure the financing of the system as a whole, and provide for prompt acquisition of necessary rights-of-way. It is hereby declared to be the policy of Congress to continue or to impose such taxes as may be necessary to meet this objective.

SEC. 3. This act is divided into titles and sections according to the following table of contents:

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Title I—Federal Highway Corporation

Sec. 101. Creation of Corporation.
Sec. 102. Management of Corporation.
Sec. 103. Duty of Corporation.
Sec. 104. Corporate powers.
Sec. 105. Corporate financing.
Sec. 106. Services and facilities of other agencies.
Sec. 107. Misappropriation of funds.
Sec. 108. Report to Congress.

Title II—Concerning the Department of Commerce

Sec. 201. Cancellation of authorizations.
Sec. 202. Interstate system
Sec. 203. Standards.
Sec. 204. Expenditure authorization.
Sec. 205. Distribution by States.
Sec. 206. Scheduling of construction and participation by States.
Sec. 207. Credits for existing roads and toll roads.
Sec. 208. Right-of-way acquisition.

Title III—Miscellaneous

Sec. 301. Definitions.
Sec. 302. Without compensation employees.
Sec. 303. Amendment to Corporation Control Act.
Sec. 304. Construction of this act.
Sec. 305. Effect on present law.

TITLE I—FEDERAL HIGHWAY CORPORATION

CREATION OF CORPORATION

SEC. 101. There is hereby created, subject to the direction and supervision of the President, a body corporate to be known as the Federal Highway Corporation. As hereafter provided in section 303, the Corporation shall be subject to the provisions of the Government Corporation Control Act. The principal office of the Corporation shall be located in the District of Columbia.

MANAGEMENT OF CORPORATION

SEC. 102. (a) The management of the Corporation shall be vested in a Board of Directors (hereinafter referred to as "the Board") composed of five members. Three of these members shall be public members appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, without regard to political party affiliation. The President shall designate a full-time Chairman of the Board from one of the public members. The remaining two members shall be the Secretary of Commerce (hereinafter called Secretary) and the Secretary of the Treasury, or their representatives. The Board shall meet at least four times a year, or more often, at the call of the Chairman.

(b) The Chairman of the Board shall receive compensation at the rate of $17,500 per annum. As Chairman, he shall preside at meetings of the Board and be the Corporation's chief representative. He shall be responsible for general supervision of the activities of the staff of the Corporation. He shall also maintain liaison with the representatives of the States with respect to the policies set forth in this act. The Chairman in the conduct of his functions as chairman shall act in conformance with determinations of the Board.

(c) The public members of the Board (other than the Chairman) shall receive no compensation, but may receive a per diem of $100 in lieu of subsistence, plus transportation expenses, in accordance with the standardized Government Travel Regulations, when proceeding to and from their homes or regular places of business to the headquarters of the Corporation and when engaged on assignment by the Board or the Chairman in the business of the Corporation.

(d) In addition to managing the Corporation, the Board is authorized to resolve divergencies of views concerning the interpretation or application of the policies under this act which it considers will have significant effect upon the program, excluding (1) divergencies between two or more Federal agencies. Within this limitation, the Board shall have the right to determine the matters which it shall consider and act upon, under such rules and regulations as it may prescribe.

DUTY OF CORPORATION

SEC. 103. It shall be the duty of the Corporation (a) to receive and borrow funds, (b) to provide and make available to the Secretary such sums as are necessary to permit him to make the payments or advances to the States of the Federal share of the cost of construction of projects on the interstate system, and such other costs or expenses as are permitted or required to be paid or advanced by him in connection with the interstate system under the terms of this act, and (c) to perform such other duties as may be required in the performance of its functions and the exercise of its powers under this act.

CORPORATE POWERS

SEC. 104. For the purpose of carrying out its functions under this act, the Corporation—

(1) shall have succession in its corporate name;

(2) may adopt and use a corporate seal, which shall be judicially noticed;

(3) may sue and be sued in its corporate name;

(4) may adopt, amend, and repeal bylaws, rules, and regulations governing the manner in which its functions may be carried out and the powers vested in it may be exercised;

(5) may make and carry out such contracts, agreements, or other transactions as it may deem necessary or advisable in the conduct of its business;

(6) may incur indebtedness as provided in section 105, and incur current obligations incidental to performing its functions, subject to provisions of law applicable to Government corporations;

(7) may appoint such officers, agents, attorneys, and employees as it deems necessary for the conduct of its affairs, define their authority and duties, delegate to them such of the powers vested in the Corporation as the Board may determine, require bonds of such of them as the Board may designate, and fix the penalties and pay the premiums on such bonds;

(8) may utilize the available services and facilities of other agencies as provided in section 106;

(9) may use the United States mails in the same manner as its executive departments; and

(10) may take such actions and exercise such other powers as may be necessary, incidental, or appropriate to carry out the function of the Corporation, and to further the objectives of this act.

CORPORATE FINANCING

SEC. 105. (a) The Corporation is authorized to issue, upon the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury, obligations in an amount not to exceed $21 billion. Obligations issued under this subsection shall have such maturities, not to exceed 30 years, and shall bear such rate or rates of interest, as may be determined by the Corporation with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury, and they shall be redeemable at the option of the Corporation before maturity in such manner as may be stipulated in the obligations. The aggregate amount of obligations under this subsection outstanding at any one time shall not exceed the maximum amount of obligations, as determined by the Secretary of the Treasury as of July 1 of each year, on which the annual principal and interest payments required over the life of the obligations can be made from prospective appropriations under subsection (b) and other revenues of the Corporation, but obligations lawfully issued hereunder will not be affected by determinations subsequent to date of issue. The Corporation shall insert appropriate language in all of its obligations issued under this subsection clearly indicating that the obligations, together with the interest thereon, are not guaranteed by the United States and do not constitute a debt or obligation of the United States or of any agency or instrumentality thereof other than the Corporation. The Corporation is authorized to purchase in the open market for retirement, at any time and at any price, any outstanding obligations issued under this subsection.

(b) There are hereby appropriated and there shall be paid by the Secretary of the Treasury to the Corporation for the fiscal year 1957, and for each fiscal year thereafter in which there are outstanding unmatured obligations of the Corporation, out of any moneys in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, amounts equal to the revenue in excess of $622,500,000 collected during each fiscal year, as shown by the official accounts of the Directors of Internal Revenue, from the taxes (including interest, penalties, and additions to taxes) imposed by sections 4081 and 4041 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 on gasoline and special fuels, upon certification by the Board and the Secretary of the Treasury as necessary to finance this program. The Secretary of the Treasury may advance to the Corporation in any fiscal year an amount not in excess of the estimated appropriation for that fiscal year, such advances to be repaid from amounts subsequently appropriated hereunder in that fiscal year. The Corporation shall pay into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts, on the basis of annual billings as determined by the Secretary of the Treasury, an amount for each fiscal year that bears the same ratio to the estimated costs of collecting taxes, refunds of taxes, and costs of making refunds of taxes under sections 4081 and 4041 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 for that fiscal year as the appropriation hereunder bears to the estimated total revenue collected under those provisions for that fiscal year.

(c) The Corporation may issue to the Secretary of the Treasury its obligations in an amount not to exceed in any one year the amount necessary above all other revenues of the Corporation to provide for debt service of the Corporation during that year but not to exceed the aggregate amount of $5,000,000,000 outstanding at any one time. The obligations issued by the Corporation under this subsection shall have such maturities as may be prescribed by the Corporation with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury and shall be redeemable at the option of the corporation before maturity in such manner as may be stipulated in the obligations. Each such obligation shall bear interest at a rate determined by the Secretary of the Treasury, taking into consideration the current average rate on outstanding marketable obligations of the United States of comparable maturities as of the last day of the month preceding the issuance of the obligation of the Corporation. The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized to purchase any obligations of the Corporation to be issued under this subsection, and for such purpose the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized to use as a public debt transaction the proceeds from the sale of any securities issued under the Second Liberty Bond Act, as now or hereafter in force, and the purposes for which securities may be issued under the Second Liberty Bond Act, as now or hereafter in force, are extended to include any purchases of the Corporation's obligations hereunder.

(d) All obligations issued by the Corporation shall be lawful investments, and may be accepted as security, for all fiduciary, trust, and public funds, the investment or deposit of which shall be under authority and control of the United States or any officer or officers thereof.

(e) The penultimate sentence of paragraph Seventh of section 5136 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, is amended by inserting after the phrase "or obligations of the Federal National Mortgage Association," the phrase "or obligations of the Federal Highway Corporation,".

(f) All revenues of the Corporation, including moneys appropriated under subsection (b) of this section shall be maintained as a trust fund.

SERVICES AND FACILITIES OF OTHER AGENCIES

SEC. 106. (a) Except as specifically authorized by the President, the Corporation shall, with the consent of the agency concerned, accept and utilize, on a reimbursable basis, the services of the officers, employees, facilities, and information of any agency of the United States, except that any such agency having custody of any data relating to any of the matters within the jurisdiction of the Corporation shall, upon the request of the Corporation, make such data available to the Corporation without reimbursement.

(b) The Corporation shall contribute to the civil-service retirement and disability fund, on the basis of annual billings as determined by the Civil Service Commission, for the Government's share of the cost of the civil-service retirement system applicable to the Corporation's employees and their beneficiaries. The Corporation shall also contribute to the employee's compensation fund, on the basis of annual billings as determined by the Secretary of Labor, for the benefit payments made from such fund on account of the Corporation's employees. The annual billings shall also include a statement of the fair portion of the cost of the administration of the respective funds, which shall be paid by the Corporation into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts.

MISAPPROPRIATION OF FUNDS

SEC. 107. (a) All general penal statutes relating to the larceny, embezzlement, or conversion, of public moneys or property of the United States shall apply to the moneys and property of the Corporation.

(b) Any person who, with intent to defraud the Corporation, or to deceive any director, officer, or employee of the Corporation or any officer or employee of the United States, (1) makes any false entry in any book of the Corporation, or (2) makes any false report or statement for the Corporation, shall, upon conviction thereof, be fined not more than $10,000 or imprisoned not more than 5 years, or both.

(c) Any person who shall receive any compensation, rebate, or reward, or shall enter into any conspiracy, collusion, or agreement, express or implied, with intent to defraud the Corporation or wrongfully and unlawfully to defeat its purposes, shall, on conviction thereof, be fined not more than $5,000, or imprisoned not more than 5 years or both.

REPORT TO THE CONGRESS

SEC. 108. The Board shall prepare an annual report of operations under this act for transmittal by the President to the Congress.

TITLE II—PROVISIONS CONCERNING THE DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

CANCELLATION OF AUTHORIZATIONS

SEC. 201. (a) The first sentence of section 2 (a) of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1954 is hereby amended by deleting the following clause: "and a like additional sum for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957," so that said first sentence of said section 2 (a) as hereby amended reads as follows: "For the purpose of expediting the construction, reconstruction, and improvement, inclusive of necessary bridges and tunnels, of the National System of Interstate Highways, including extensions thereof through urban areas, designated in accordance with the provisions of section 7 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1944 (58 Stat. 838), there is hereby authorized to be appropriated the additional sum of $175 million for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956."

(b) Section 1 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1954 is hereby amended by reducing the authorization for projects on the Federal-aid primary system in urban areas, and for projects on approved extensions of the Federal-aid secondary system within urban areas, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, from "$175 million" to "$75 million."

INTERSTATE SYSTEM

SEC. 202. In furtherance of section 7 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1944, the Secretary is authorized, within the limitation of 40,000 miles, to approve as part of the interstate system such lateral feeder and distributing routes, and circumferential routes as may be required to furnish maximum utility of the system within or adjacent to urban areas, provided that one or both ends of such routes shall lie on a route of the system. The Secretary is further authorized to approve as part of the interstate system any highway which complies with the standards of section 203 and which lies on an approved route of the interstate system irrespective as to whether or not tolls are collected for the use thereof. The Secretary is authorized in cooperation with the State highway departments to designate as promptly as reasonable possible routes to take up the mileage still undesignated so that the entire 40,000 miles of this system shall be designated. In approving any undesignated mileage the Secretary shall designate those routes which contribute most to the benefit of the system as a whole and are most important from the point of view of national defense. In case the actual construction of highways on the system increases available undesignated mileage the Secretary may redesignate this mileage in accordance with the preceding sentence.

STANDARDS

SEC. 203. (a) The standards to be used for the interstate system shall be those approved by the Secretary after consultation with the Department of Defense, the Federal Civil Defense Administration, and the State highway departments. The Secretary is authorized to make the final determination of the standards to be used, except as provided in section 102 (d).

(b) The geometric standards for the interstate system shall be such standards as are deemed adequate to properly accommodate the types and volume of traffic forecast for the 20 years' immediately following enactment of this act. Such standards shall provide for the development of a system as nationally uniform in characteristics as possible within a 10-year construction period.

(c) The right-of-way width on the interstate system shall be adequate to permit construction of the route to the geometric standards provided for in subparagraph (b) for a period of at least 20 years following the date of authorization of a project under this act. Such width shall not be deemed adequate if (1) it does not include provision for the addition of more traffic lanes at a future date, except that the maximum width in any case need not exceed that necessary for three moving lanes in each direction, plus service roads as necessary; and if (2) it does not contain the proper and necessary degree and type of control of access or exits from the highway which will permit maximum freedom of traffic flow and promote national safety.

(d) The standards shall be periodically reviewed by the Secretary to insure maximum utility of the completed system with due recognition to the desirability of developing a national system having the greatest uniformity of characteristics possible.

EXPENDITURE AUTHORIZATION

SEC. 204. The Secretary is hereby authorized to make payments in an amount not to exceed $25 billion or such lesser sum as estimated by the Corporation on the basis of prospective revenues to be the maximum amount to be available for the purposes of this act.

DISTRIBUTION BY STATES

SEC. 205. (a) On or before April 1, 1956, each State desiring to avail itself of funds hereunder shall file a statement, and an estimate of the cost as of January 1, 1956, of bringing that portion of the designated interstate mileage within its boundaries up to the standards prescribed under this act. On or before April 1 of each subsequent year, each State shall submit a revised estimate of such cost as of January 1 of such year, including therein the actual or estimated cost of any construction of such mileage begun or carried on subsequent to January 1, 1956.

(b) On or before July 1, 1956, and on or before July 1 of each year thereafter, the Secretary shall establish an approved estimate of cost for construction of projects on the interstate system in each State, and the Secretary shall determine the ratio of the approved estimate of cost for each State to the total of the approved estimates of such cost for all States. After subtracting from the amount determined pursuant to section 204, the estimated total credits under section 207 and estimated total expenses for administrative purposes and research, the Secretary shall apply the ratio for each State to the remaining sum and the resulting amounts shall be the maximum Federal payments to the various States for the purposes of section 206. He shall promptly notify the States of these maximum amounts.

SCHEDULING OF CONSTRUCTION AND PARTICIPATION BY STATES

SEC. 206. (a) On or before April 1, 1956, and on or before April 1 of each year thereafter, each State desiring to avail itself of funds hereunder shall file a statement and an estimate of the cost of projects it proposes to construct during each of the next 2 fiscal years. The Secretary shall examine these estimates, and before the beginning of each fiscal year, commencing with the fiscal year 1957, he shall establish an approved construction program, including the estimated cost thereof, for each State for such fiscal year. Except as provided in section 102 (d), the Secretary shall have the final responsibility, after consultation with the States, the Department of Defense, and the Federal Civil Defense Administration, for determining the scheduling and priority of construction of projects, taking into consideration the objective of a uniform rate of accomplishment of construction on the interstate system in all the States and the availability of funds from the Corporation.

(b) The Secretary shall make allocations to the States in the amounts of the approved estimates, and the Secretary shall promptly notify the States of the approved construction programs and of the amounts so allocated. These allocations shall be available for obligation by the States to which allocated for a period of 2 years. Any sums not under obligation at the end of any 2-year period may be reallocated, as the Secretary may determine.

(c) On or before July 1, 1956, and on or before July 1 of each year thereafter, the Secretary shall transmit to the Corporation a schedule indicating his best estimate of the cash requirements necessary to meet payments during the next 2 fiscal years. These estimates shall include estimates of amounts needed for payments under section 207, for research as authorized by section 10 (a) of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1954, and for administrative purposes in an amount not exceeding one-tenth of 1 percent of the funds made available by the Corporation in any fiscal year. The Corporation shall promptly make available funds to the Secretary as required by his annual estimate.

(d) The Secretary is authorized to advance funds to each State to permit prompt payment of construction costs.

(e) Payments to the States made pursuant to this section shall be subject to the conditions (1) that construction of projects on the interstate system in each State shall be in accordance with the standards approved by the Secretary; (2) that the State participates in the costs of construction in

each fiscal year in an amount in cash or services no less than that which would have been required as its matching amount payable for construction of projects on the interstate system under the provisions of section 2 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1954 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956; and (3) that the State will have the same obligations as to maintenance of the projects constructed under this act that it has under Federal-aid highway legislation.

CREDITS FOR EXISTING ROADS AND TOLL ROADS

SEC. 207. (a) If an existing free highway, which is located upon the interstate system, is believed to measure up to the standards of construction required by section 203, a State may request that it receive a credit for such highway, and the State shall be entitled to receive such a credit subject to the conditions of this paragraph. The Secretary shall first determine whether or not the highway meets such standards. If he approves the same, the Secretary and the Corporation shall determine, in cooperation with each other and in accordance with the rules and regulations issued pursuant to paragraph (e), the amount of the depreciated cost of such highway. There shall be deducted from such depreciated cost an amount equivalent to 10 percent thereof, and also the total amount of any Federal-aid funds used in the construction of such highway. The result shall be the credit to which the State is entitled.

(b) If an existing toll highway, which is located upon the interstate system, is believed to measure up to the standards of construction required by section 203, a State may request that it receive a credit for such highway, and the State shall be entitled to receive such a credit subject to the conditions of this paragraph. The Secretary shall first determine whether or not the highway meets such standards. If he approves the same, the Secretary and the Corporation shall determine, in cooperation with each other and in accordance with the rules and regulations issued pursuant to paragraph (e), the amount of the original cost of such highway, excluding therefrom the cost of the financing thereof, and of any facilities not included within the definition of the term "highway" under Federal-aid highway legislation. For toll roads completed prior to December 31, 1951, he shall allow as a credit an amount not exceeding 40 percent of such original cost, and for toll roads completed during the period between December 31, 1951, and December 31, 1955, he shall allow a credit not exceeding 70 percent of the original cost. The State shall be entitled to the credit so allowed.

(c) If a toll highway, which is located upon the interstate system, the construction of which is completed subsequent to December 31, 1955, is believed to measure up to the standards of construction required by section 203, a State may request that it receive the credit for such highway and the State shall be entitled to receive such a credit subject to the conditions of this paragraph. The Secretary shall first determine whether or not the highway meets such standards. If he approves the same, the Secretary and the Corporation shall determine, in cooperation with each other and in accordance with the rules and regulations issued pursuant to paragraph (e), the amount of the original cost of such highway, excluding therefrom the cost of the financing thereof and of any facilities not included within the definition of the term "highway" under Federal-aid highway legislation. There shall be deducted from such original cost an amount equivalent to 10 percent thereof. The result shall be the credit to which the State is entitled.

(d) Any State for which a credit has been established, whether for a toll or a free highway, shall be entitled to use the same for construction of projects on the Federal-aid primary system, subject to the conditions that all Federal-aid highway funds apportioned to a State under Federal-aid highway legislation have been expended within the meaning of said legislation, and all funds allocated under this act have been contracted as provided under this act. Whenever a State constructs such projects with funds received as a result of a credit under this section, all procedures and steps shall be taken in the same manner as though such funds had been apportioned under Federal-aid highway legislation. Any State for which a credit has been established on account of a toll highway shall be entitled, at its option, to use the credit for payment of any outstanding debt on the highway, which highway shall then become a free public highway.

(e) The Secretary jointly with the Corporation shall establish such reasonable rules and regulations as necessary or advisable to carry out the purposes of this section.

(f) Whenever the Secretary determines that a credit, pursuant to this section, should be made available to a State he shall notify the Corporation. The Corporation, within a reasonable time thereafter, shall make such credit available to the Secretary for use by the State.

RIGHT-OF-WAY ACQUISITION

SEC. 208. (a) If the Secretary shall determine that the State highway department of any State is unable to obtain possession and the right to enter upon and use the rights-of-way, lands or interest in lands, improved or unimproved, including the control of access thereto from adjoining lands, required for any project on the interstate system with sufficient promptness, the Secretary is authorized, upon the request of such a State, prior to approval of title by the Attorney General, and in the name of the United States, to acquire, enter upon, and take possession of such rights-of-way, lands or interest in lands, including the control of access thereto from adjoining lands, by purchase, donation, condemnation, or otherwise in accordance with the laws of the United States (including the act of February 26, 1931; 46 Stat. 1421), and to expend funds for projects thereon. The authority granted by this section shall also apply to lands and interest in lands received as grants of land from the United States and owned or held by railroads or other corporations. The cost incurred by the Secretary in acquiring any such rights-of-way, lands or interest in lands may include the cost of examination and abstract of title, certificate of title, advertising, and any fees incidental to such acquisition; and shall be payable out of the funds available to the Secretary for construction of projects on the interstate system to the extent of 95 percent of the appraised value of such rights-of-way, or of the actual cost, whichever is lower. The Secretary is further authorized and directed by proper deed, executed in the name of the United States, to convey any such rights-of-way, lands, or interest in lands, including the control of access thereto from adjoining lands, acquired in any State under the provisions of this section, except the outside 5 feet of any such right-of-way in States unable or unwilling to control access, to the State highway department of such State or to such political subdivision thereof as its laws may provide, upon such terms and conditions as may be agreed upon by the Secretary and the State highway department, or political subdivisions to which the conveyance is to be made. Whenever the State is able and agrees to control access, the outside 5 feet may be conveyed to it.

(b) Whenever rights-of-way on the interstate system are required over public lands of the United States, the Secretary may make such arrangements with the agency having jurisdiction over such lands as may be necessary to give the State or other person constructing the projects on such lands adequate rights-of-way and control of access thereto from adjoining lands, and any such agency is hereby directed to cooperate with the Secretary in this connection.

(c) The Secretary may adopt such regulations as he deems advisable to protect fully the interests of the United States in the acquisition of rights-of-way. He may take such action as necessary to carry out such regulations.

TITLE III—MISCELLANEOUS

DEFINITIONS

SEC. 301. As used in this act, unless the context requires otherwise—

(a) The term "interstate system" means the National System of Interstate Highways as authorized to be designated by section 7 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1944, and includes those routes heretofore designated by the Commissioner of the Bureau of Public Roads by the attestation of a diagrammatic map, copy of which is hereby made appendix A to this act, as well as routes to be hereafter designated. The mileage so designated as of June 30, 1954, is 37,600 miles. The mileage of the routes so designated is calculated by stating the mileage of the most traveled highway between control points. Such mileage so designated as of June 30, 1954, with respect to each State is contained in a schedule hereby made appendix B to this act. The mileage of the entire system is limited to 40,000 miles.

(b) The term "Corporation" means the Federal Highway Corporation created by title I of this act.

(c) The term "Secretary" means the Secretary of Commerce.

(d) The term Federal-aid highway legislation means "the act providing that the United States shall aid the States in the construction of rural post roads and for other purposes", approved June 11, 1916, as amended and supplemented.

WITHOUT COMPENSATION EMPLOYEES

SEC. 302. The Corporation and Secretary are respectively authorized, to the extent deemed necessary and appropriate, in order to carry out the provisions of this act, to employ persons of outstanding experience and ability, without compensation, and are further authorized to provide by regulation for the exemption of such persons from the operation of sections 281, 283, 284, 434, and 1914 of title 18 of the United States Code and section 190 of the Revised Statutes (5 U. S. C. 99). Persons appointed under the authority of this subsection may be allowed transportation and not to exceed $15 per diem in lieu of subsistence while away from their homes or regular places of business, pursuant to such appointment.

AMENDMENT TO CORPORATION CONTROL ACT

SEC. 303. Section 101 of the Government Corporation Control Act (59 Stat. 597), as amended, is hereby further amended by adding thereto the words "Federal Highway Corporation."

CONSTRUCTION OF THIS ACT

SEC. 304. If any section, subsection, or other provision of this act, or the application thereof to any person or circumstance is held invalid, the remainder of this act and the application of such section, subsection, or other provision to other persons or circumstance shall not be affected thereby.

EFFECT ON PRESENT LAW

SEC. 305. All provisions of Federal-aid highway legislation shall remain in full force and effect, and shall apply to the required actions to be taken, and payments to be made, by the Secretary under this act in connection with the interstate system with the same force and effect that said provisions of the said legislation applied to such actions and payments in connection with the interstate system prior to the passage of this act, except that the provisions of this act shall supersede any provision of the said legisla-

tion which conflicts with a provision of this act, except that section 13 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1950 shall not be applicable to the interstate system, and for the purposes of section 12 of the Hayden-Cartwright Act, the allocations made under this act shall not be deemed an apportionment.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, there can be no question as to the need for a greatly expanded highway program. The population of the United States by 1965 may well reach 185 to 190 million people. This means not only an increased number of automobiles using our highways, but the highways must be improved to take care of the greatly increased truck traffic.

The No. 1 problem, of course, is how to finance this road program and the proper distribution of the funds among the States, in order that we may have an integrated, well balanced highway system.

I ask unanimous consent to have three editorials on this important subject made a part of the RECORD.

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

[From the Tulsa (Okla.) World of March 21, 1955]

IMPASSE ON HIGHWAYS

The Clay Committee report upon which the Eisenhower administration is basing its 10-year, $101 billion highway proposal has hit some bumpy spots in the Congress, but none bumpier than that thrown in its path by Senator HARRY F. BYRD.

The budget-conscious Virginian may well have placed a fatal hex on the program Friday when he refused to support it, simultaneously charging the administration with going behind the barn on its economic balance promises.

Senator BYRD sees no great difference between outrightly raising the national debt limit and the issuance of billions in promissory notes to defray a speedup in highway construction. It all amounts to the same, in his book. Instead, he suggests the Federal Government might get better results by relinquishing to the States the 2 cents in gasoline taxes it is collecting. This, of course, is something the States have been angling for over a considerable period of time.

The Byrd proposal has its good points to be sure. Certainly the 48 States would welcome an opportunity to collect an additional 2 cents in gas taxes without raising the present bite on the taxpayer. But there is a major and dangerous weakness in the plan. At present the Federal-aid-to-highways program pretty well controls where and when major highway routes are constructed; States are not permitted to promiscuously locate a highway in which Federal participation is asked. Under the Byrd plan—with the States levying and collecting the taxes—what similar restrictions could be guaranteed? There seems to be no way Federal legislation could be brought to bear on that point.

In Oklahoma, particularly, there would be doubt that what is intended under the Eisenhower program could be guaranteed to happen if the State were initiating the building of routes. It is the inability of State road building setups to resist political pressure for minor and rural routes that has caused the 25-year neglect of our major highways.

The Byrd program might prove feasible if a way could be found to guarantee that State-raised and State-spent road funds be placed where the highways are vitally needed and not where the politicians want them.

Meantime, the only program halfway assuring this is that submitted in conformance with the Clay report.

[From the Kansas City (Mo.) Star of March 30, 1955]

FOR BIG HIGHWAY PLANS

Motor vehicles and motor travel are part and parcel of America in 1955. Our whole national pattern of life has grown up around the motorcar. Where the car can go readily the American people go. In millions of homes it is the family's most prized possession. It accounts for a vast, sprawling industry and business that employ far more persons than any other. The industry's trucks carry the greater part of American products and merchandise. The motor vehicle is the dominant fact of life in modern America.

Yet from this great Nation's seat of government in Washington we hear that this country can't find a way to build modern highways to permit the full use of its 58 million motor vehicles. Congress has ganged up on the President's highway plan. When you consider the overwhelming importance of motor vehicles the President's plan is modest. It simply proposes to deliver through Federal financing a completely modern trunk line system of 40,000 miles in 10 years. This is only a small fraction of the American primary road system and 10 years is a long time. Yet the estimated cost of $25 billion has flabbergasted Congress.

The outstanding Senator BYRD, of Virginia, has objected strenuously to the proposed financing method by which the Government would underwrite the bonds without adding them directly to the national debt. As an alternative BYRD proposes nothing but repeal of the Federal 2-cent gasoline tax which the States could pick up if they chose. With such a plan this Nation couldn't expect to catch up with its highway needs in a century.

Senator GORE, of Tennessee, and Senator CASE of South Dakota have proposed alternatives that would increase Federal spending but they are far short of the President's plan.

These and other alternatives assume that the great motorized Nation of the world is incapable of building for its urgent needs. The congressional leaders are paralyzed by the difficulty of financing $25 billion of construction in 10 years. Yet within the same period the American people will spend 6 or 8 times the $25 billion on new passenger cars alone.

For this motorized Nation the only course that makes sense is to build for the full need. Finance it by the best means that can be devised—but finance it.

[From the El Paso (Tex.) Times of April 5, 1955]

THINKING ABOUT ROADS

A tremendously improved and expanded highway system in the United States is looked upon as being right at the top of the list for the immediate future.

That is true for several reasons: The ever-increasing number of vehicles make such a program essential; it is needed as a part of our defense system; it would go a long way toward stabilizing our economy by furnishing employment.

Just as an example:

The $101 billion, 10-year highway program recently proposed by the President's Advisory Committee on a National Highway Program if adopted by Congress will ultimately involve 1 million full-time workers in direct construction and in supplying industries, according to a joint estimate made by the United States Departments of Commerce and Labor.

The total, if achieved, would be more than double the current number of 450,000 workers that are now engaged in highway construction and in providing materials, equipment, and supplies for this work. The high point is expected to be reached in 1960, when the proposed road program would reach its peak.

Naturally, the $64 question is how to finance such a far-reaching road program.

Toll roads are being built in many sections of the country.

Under the President's Advisory Committee's plan, bonds would be issued to finance part of the undertaking.

It is being suggested in some quarters that Congress create a corporation to finance and build an integrated highway system with the burden of the cost to be borne by those who use the highways the most.

At any rate, it is very encouraging that much thought is being given to the absolute necessity of expanding and improving our national highways.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD certain editorials which comment on the pending road bill.

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

[From the Huntington (W. Va.) Herald-Dispatch of February 15, 1955]

PRESIDENT'S PLAN TO BUILD ROADS

President Eisenhower's vast new road-building program has encountered serious opposition in Congress even before its formal submission. One critic is Senator HARRY F. BYRD, Democrat, Virginia, chairman of the Senate Finance Committee and economy "watchdog" of Capitol Hill.

As outlined in the report of the President's Advisory Committee on a National Highway Program submitted on January 11, the 10-year plan concentrates "on modernizing the key 40,000-mile National System of Interstate Highways." The Federal Government would continue for 10 years its regular aid to States, at the rate of about $600 million a year. The State and local governments would spend about $70 billion over the 10 years.

In addition to its regular contributions to State governments, the Federal Government would spend an additional $25 billion on interstate highways. Some $5 billion of this would come from licenses—filling stations, motels—on the rights-of-way.

Senator BYRD charges that the bond plan would "dry up gasoline tax revenue for 20 years, from 1966 to 1987," although these revenues would not be specifically earmarked for debt retirement by Congress. And he points out that the aggregated interest charges on the bonds would run to more than $11.5 billion, or 55 cents on the dollar.

[From the Troy (Ala.) Messenger of February 2, 1955]

COMMITTEE PROPOSES HUGE SPENDINGS ON INTERSTATE HIGHWAY SYSTEM

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 the taxpayers another $11.5 billion.

Senator BYRD offers an alternative program: First, he would repeal the 2-cent gasoline 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 urban road systems, on the long-standing matching basis.

Third, he would continue to collect the lubrication 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 East Hartford (Conn.) Gazette February 3 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 the dangers which such a program might entail.

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 gasoline 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 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 hope Congress will give the program a trial before it sets up a vast Federal road bureaucracy.

[From the Boise (Idaho) Statesman of February 1, 1955]

FEDERAL HIGHWAY PLANS

President Eisenhower has announced he will send his proposed multi-billion-dollar highway program to Congress early next week, thereby setting the stage for an all-out congressional battle.

The major contest the highway program will face is finance. The President's program would not be paid out of Federal funds but through bonded indebtedness outside the Federal money structure. This kind of arrangement has already drawn warnings from such men as Senator BYRD of Virginia. The contention is that once the Federal Government starts making obligations outside the established financial framework, there would be no end to it.

This Federal highway plan not only suggests a dangerous detour from normal Federal ways but it also has an effect on the States' highway planning and financing. This is true right here in Idaho at this time. Were the President's highway program not in the works, we doubt that Idaho motorists would be facing higher license plate fees. Instead, the extra highway funds would likely come from another half-cent gasoline tax which would raise as much money as the license plate fee schedule which has passed the House. The reason this half-cent gasoline tax presently is reserved in Idaho is to have it available in case it is needed for Idaho to participate in the President's highway program—if it is voted by the Congress.

What prompted the Federal plan for a national network of highways has not been explained. It is possible that the administration, fearing expansion of the unemployment that has developed since the close of the Korean war, saw the opportunity to couple a desirable project with the benefits of expanded construction payrolls. No one who has traveled across the Nation will admit that we are without superhighways. Fact of the matter, we already have great turnpikes and toll roads in heavily populated areas. A Nation on wheels, there is no lack of roads to travel. The President's program may find an obstacle in this fact that many of the States of the Nation already have what he offers.

Above all, the proposed Federal highway system is an interference with State rights and responsibilities. Except where the Federal Government needs to supply the cash for highways through public domain, the better method would be to return to the States part of the Federal gasoline tax and let the States built their own roads. Money is always used more intelligently on the local level.

Where the opinion exists that we are to learn, some day soon, that the Federal Government is going to built a lot of new roads in Idaho, it should be pointed out that this is a case where it would be better to wait and count the chickens after the eggs are hatched. There is much more reason to believe that Mr. Eisenhower will not get into the highway business than there is to believe that he will. His greatest handicap is that he has a Federal project but, for once, the Federal Government lacks the money. This horse of a different color is starting up a new and hilly road. It is important to the Nation, if the Federal debt is to be contained in one amount, that this journey is never completed. We are too near Federal bankruptcy without opening a new source of Federal obligation.

[From the San Francisco (Calif.) Chronicle of March 2, 1955]

HIGHWAY PROGRAM BUCKS A RED SIGNAL ON COSTS

President Eisenhower's program for a Federal-State-local roadbuilding program, involving the expenditure of $101 billion over the next 10 years, is meritorious on various grounds, not the least of which is necessity.

The Nation's present system of highways, amounting to some 3,365,000 miles, is obviously overtaxed by the 58 million motor vehicles that swarm over it. But, as the President notes, today's traffic jams are but faint shadows of those that would arise on such a system 10 years hence, when some 81 million vehicles will be rolling.

Considerably more than convenience is involved in an adequate nighway system. Accidents, now costing motorists an estimated $4.3 billion a year, would be reduced. So would wear and tear on automobiles, with savings estimated as high as 1 cent a mile of travel. Transportation would be speeded up. And, in the event of atomic attack, target cities could be more quickly evacuated with the saving of countless lives.

To finance the Government's $31 billion share of the 10-year program, the President inclined to the view of selling special bond issues. Interest would be paid from increased Federal gasoline and diesel oil taxes and in limited instances from tolls on the roads.

Opposition to the President's financing plan came in a roar from Senator HARRY F. BYRD of the Senate Finance Committee. He attacked the bond issue as one which would create a debt not totaled under the national debt—it would, in short, bypass debt limitation. There is weight to that argument. But interparty quarreling over means of financing will contribute nothing to the solution of the highway shortage. Congress cannot prudently refuse to come to terms with the problem.

[From the Keokuk (Iowa) Gate City of March 3, 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 gasoline 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 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.

[From the New Albany (Ind.) Tribune of February 22, 1955]

PLANNING FOR THE FUTURE

There are many factors to be considered in the toll roads situation and in the relation of State and Federal financing of roads.

There are arguments for and against toll roads and no one except the most the most ardent and prejudiced supporters or opponents of toll roads would assert such highway building is entirely good or completely evil.

There are also persons who assert that toll roads will not reach the vicinity of New Albany for another 10 years and there are plenty of problems to worry about without getting concerned about toll roads.

These isolationists point out that the persons who use the roads will have to pay for them and since the roads won't run near New Albany the building and paying for such roads becomes a theoretical problem with little concern locally.

Yet history has shown, with few exceptions, that those who benefit from a program generally support it and at the same time try to distribute the burden of payment over as wide an area and large a population base as practical, possible and permissible.

In other words, the people of northern Indiana will benefit most from an east-west toll road and presumably will favor construction of such routes as long as conditions indicate they will benefit from such roads without an unusual financing burden.

There is not much point in trying to maintain the position that the people of northern Indiana will not have to carry the greatest portion of the burden of payment for such road for it is obvious such residents will be the greatest users of the road.

To this extent, the northern Indiana toll road is pretty much the business of residents of that part of the State. But it becomes the affair of southern Indiana residents when laws are passed which are statewide in application.

At this stage of the proceedings it becomes evident that laws are not going to be passed to apply solely to the northern toll route and another series of laws passed regarding inauguration, construction, operation and financing of other toll routes in Indiana.

The toll road question is one of importance to every Hoosier both because of the State's geographical and financial position. This State is a crossroads of commerce in the United States and is a practical toll road route both east-west and north-south. Debt freedom at the State level is a matter of Hoosier pride and must be kept free of encroachment by semi-official agencies in Indiana.

The problem, therefore, for the legislators is to provide a legislative answer to questions which may not arise for many years. Controls should be adequate for reasonable restraint yet not so restrictive as to discourage economically feasible road building.

Senator HARRY F. BYRD in a discussion of the proposed Federal highway program brought out this pertinent fact:

"If the Federal Government can properly borrow money for roads in this fashion (through a Federal corporation with bonding power guaranteed by the Treasury of the United States) without regarding it as a 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."

What Senator BYRD says about Federal road building programs applies with equal vigor to State road construction plans. While the toll State tax revenues has an obligation to the people of Indiana and the duty of providing complete and impartial reports to the people of this State.

The toll road commission is a creation of the people of Indiana and is responsible to the people for its actions. Creation of an agency with the power to perpetuate itself in office, the right to incur indebtedness or other obligation without the expressed consent of the people, or the privilege of determining its fees, rates, concessions, and other income sources without the supervision or consent of the legislature is not sound government practice.

Not all of these rights and privileges are expressed or implied in the present toll road commission operation regulations but these are factors which must be considered by the legislators in outlining operation of the commission and defining powers and privileges of the organization.

As Senator BYRD says, "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."

Whether the people realize it or not, the toll roads in Indiana are the toll roads of Indiana and the best time for a person to determine if he is getting what he wants is before making a purchase.

[From the Longview (Wash.) News of February 5, 1955]

MULTIBILLION FEDERAL HIGHWAY PLAN NOT NECESSARILY BEST

The more we read about President Eisenhower's 10-year, 101-billion-dollar Federal-State roadbuilding program the more doubts we have about it.

For example, Governor Langlie estimates that if this program went through Washington would get $500 million in Federal funds to be used for construction of new highways. A recent survey by the State highway department shows that it will take $674 million to do an adequate job of highway building in this State during the next 10 years. Present revenues from gasoline taxes and other sources will bring in $331 million. That leaves $343 million more that the State could use at the very most. Thus $500 million in Federal funds is more than this State needs, and the same situation probably prevails in other States.

We are unable to see just why the President thinks the big highway building job should be handled with Federal funds rather than State funds. Traditionally States have built their own roads and highways, and it is difficult to see why they should not continue to do so.

One reason the States are hard up for highway money, just as Washington and Oregon are, is because of the Federal 2-cent gasoline tax. Congressman RUSSELL MACK and others have protested repeatedly against the use of part of this money for purposes other than roadbuilding.

Senator HARRY F. BYRD, chairman of the Senate Finance Committee and the traditional economic "watchdog" of Capitol Hill has an alternative plan to Eisenhower's highway program.

First of all he objects to the Federal highway bond issue plan, which is a device to enable large amounts of money to be borrowed without increasing the national debt. This would simply mean "operating the Government on two sets of books," he says.

BYRD charges that the bond plan would "dry up gasoline tax revenues for 20 years, from 1966 to 1987." He points out that the interest charges on these Federal highway bonds could run to more than $11.5 billion or 55 cents on a dollar.

BYRD's alternative plan calls for reducing the present 2 cents per gallon Federal gasoline tax to one-half cent per gallon, thus enabling the States to impose a 1½ cent additional State gasoline tax without raising the price of gasoline. Then BYRD would have road construction made a State responsibility, aside from continued regular Federal aid to the States on a matching basis. Thus, says BYRD, "States would retain as much control over their roads as they have had in the past; $11.5 billion interest would be saved for additional road construction; and road revenue would be evenly distributed over future years to keep highways modernized to meet changing conditions."

Everyone seems to agree that our highway system is greatly in need of modernization and improvement to take care of the estimated 80 million vehicles that will be on the roads by 1974. But resort to the old familiar strategem—Federal aid—is not necessarily the only or the best way of doing it.

[From the Greenville (Tenn.) Sun of February 4, 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 gasoline 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 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 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 Waterbury (Conn.) Republican of February 5, 1955]

NATIONAL HIGHWAYS

A proposal has been submitted to the administration by a committee appointed for the purpose of financing a multimillion-dollar national highway system. The recommended provisions have been attacked by Senator HARRY F. BYRD, of Virginia, chairman of the Senate Finance Committee, as thoroughly unsound. Such criticism from a man of the stature of Senator BYRD deserves profound attention. One of the provisions of the report appearing especially obnoxious to him is that the bonds issued for the highway construction be not included in the regular Government debt figure, now approaching the new legal ceiling of $281 billion.

The purpose of this proposed exclusion appears obvious and reminds one of the more flamboyant New Deal theories such as the statement by the late President Franklin D. Roosevelt decrying alarm over the skyrocketing public debt because we owe it to

ourselves. Pretending that the money is not owed by the expedient of keeping it off the official debt figures looks equally fallacious. As Senator BYRD says: "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 bona fide debt, but arbitrarily removes it from classification as public indebtedness, it creates fiscal confusion and disorder, and destroys confidence in Government credit."

The Senator declares such action would pave the way for endless outlays for building programs in education, hospitals, and public health, and would mean keeping two sets of books. "You cannot avoid financial responsibility by legerdemain," he says.

This program of highway debt financing is scheduled to be submitted to Congress soon. It should be gone over with a fine-tooth comb, lest other undesirable provisions be contained in it.

[From the Glens Falls (N. Y.) Post-Star of February 1, 1955]

TRAFFIC JAM COMING

That $101 billion, 10-year highway construction program recommended to President Eisenhower by a commission appointed to give thought to the inadequacy of the Nation's road system is going to have considerable opposition although everyone agrees that though the United States owns the best highway system in the world, it is entirely inadequate. Frankly, we should rejoice in this opposition for it denotes that fiscally we are not so blase as we sometimes think we are.

Not unexpectedly, Senator HARRY BYRD of Virginia, the economy watchdog and the chairman of the Senate Finance Committee, is the leading objector and naturally his objections are with the method of financing the project.

As the plan was outlined, the Federal Government would continue its regular highway aid to the States for the next 10 years, at the rate of about $600 million a year, while State and local governments would spend about $70 billion on roads over the 10-year period. In addition to its regular contributions to State governments, Washington would spend an extra $25 billion on interstate highways. Some $5 billion of this would come from licenses on filling stations, motels, and similar ventures on rights-of-way. The remaining $20 billion would come from 30-year, 3-percent bonds issued by a Federal Highway Corporation. These bonds, fully taxable, would be guaranteed by the Treasury but the debt they would represent would not be included in the public debt under obligations guaranteed by the Government. At the same time annual payments on the bonds would be met by congressional appropriations from revenues which the Federal Government would derive from motor-vehicle fuel and lubricating-oil taxes projected at the present rates.

Senator BYRD contends that the $20 billion plan would mean operating the Government with 2 sets of books, 1 for activities financed by borrowing outside the public debt and expenditures outside budgetary control, and the other for activities financed by borrowing on the record and expenditures under budgetary control.

Senator BYRD maintains that the bond program would dry up gasoline revenues for 20 years, from 1966 to 1987, although those revenues would not be specifically earmarked by Congress for debt retirement. What is more, he says, the aggregate of interest charges on the bonds would be $11.5 billion or 55 cents on the dollar. His idea is to reduce the present Federal gasoline tax from 2 cents a gallon to one-half cent so that the States could impose a higher gas tax. That way, the Senator argues, given the usual Federal aid on a matching basis, the States could be responsible for road construction, the huge interest charge would be eliminated, and road revenues would be evenly distributed over future years to keep highways modernized.

There ought to be enough brains in Washington to figure out the best plan. The only fear is that it will fall foul of politics and that cannot be permitted. The estimate is that within 20 years 80 million cars will be on the highways.

[From the Jackson (Tenn.) Sun of February 1, 1955]

BILLIONS AT STAKE

Presidential advisers say the Nation must more than double spending for highway construction in the next 10 years to keep from strangling in traffic, but an influential critic calls the $101 billion program unsound.

A vigorous attack on the $20 billion, 30-year, 3-percent bond issue recommended by the administration, together with the proposed Federal corporation which would float the bonds, was launched January 17 by Senator BYRD. Although most pressure groups have not yet taken a position on this specific feature, several told newsmen they expect plenty of controversy over it.

Still another bone of contention is the proposed continuation of the Federal gasoline tax as one major source of Federal revenue. This is favored by such interests as the railroad industry. These groups argue that highways should be self-supporting through user charges. But repeal of the tax is being promoted by farm and truck spokesmen, who would leave collection of gas taxes to the States.

In the meantime, State lobbies and legislators are worrying about how States are going to provide their $31 billion increase under the program. Some have been building roads on a pay-as-you-go basis, since their constitutions prohibit issuing of bonds for this purpose. Others have gone into debt. This problem may stir up arguments and lobbying when Congress studies the President's program.

With controversy over details of the plan growing among State and national groups, most highway specialists feel that, although the administration program's broad objectives are widely supported, traffic jams are sure to develop before final adoption.

[From the Aberdeen (S. Dak.) American-News of January 27, 1955]

WE MUST HAVE BETTER HIGHWAYS

As Senator FRANCIS CASE, Republican, South Dakota, hinted in a speech here last month, President Eisenhower's ambitious roadbuilding program faces serious opposition in Congress.

One critic is Senator HARRY F. BYRD, Democrat, of Virginia, chairman of the Senate Finance Committee and economy "watchdog" of Capitol Hill.

As outlined in the report of the President's Advisory Committee on a National Highway Program, the 10-year plan concentrates on modernizing the key 40,000-mile national system of interstate highways. The Federal Government would continue for 10 years its regular aid to States, at the rate of about $600 million a year. The State and local governments would spend about $70 billion over the 10 years.

In addition to its regular contributions to State governments, the Federal Government would spend an additional $25 billion on interstate highways. Some $5 billion of this would come from licenses—filling stations, motels—on the rights-of-way. The remaining $20 billion would come from 30-year, 3-percent bonds issued by a Federal highway corporation.

The $20 billion bond plan, says Senator BYRD, would mean operating the Government on 2 sets of books: 1 set for activities financed by borrowing outside the (public) debt and expenditures outside budgetary control, and the other set for activities financed by borrowing on the record and expenditures under budget control.

BYRD charges also that the bond plan would dry up gasoline-tax revenue for 20 years, from 1966 to 1987, although these revenues would not be specifically earmarked for debt retirement by Congress. And he points out that the aggregated interest charges on the bonds would run to more than $11.5 billion, or 55 cents on the dollar.

BYRD would reduce the present 2-cents-per-gallon Federal gasoline tax to one-half cent per gallon, enabling the States to impose higher taxes to take up the difference. Then, aside from continued regular Federal aid to the States on a matching basis, road construction would be a State responsibility. Thus, says BYRD:

"States would retain as much control over their roads as they have had in the past; $11.5 billion interest would be saved for additional road construction; and road revenue would be evenly distributed over future years to keep highways modernized to meet changing conditions."

Whether the Federal or State Governments are to bear the increased costs of an adequate highway system, our highways will have to carry some 80 million vehicles by 1974, according to the President's Commission.

Its chairman, Gen. Lucius D. Clay, told the national conference on highway financing of the United States Chamber of Commerce recently: "We are indeed caught in a traffic jam, nationwise."

[From the Bremerton (Wash.) Sun of January 25, 1955]

WHO SHOULD PAY?

It was bound to happen. The honeymoon was bound to end for President Eisenhower's nice-sounding $50 billion Federal shot-in-the-arm for highway construction.

Wrecker of the honeymoon was that old demon watchdog of the Federal Treasury, Senator BYRD, the Virginia Democrat. With typical Byrd bluntness, he labeled the President's idea thoroughly unsound. Not just a little bit wrong, mind you, but thoroughly unsound.

Senator BYRD's opposition is not to be dealt with idly. The great champion of a balanced Federal budget and of Uncle Sam living within his income, he has come to be respected down through the years of his Senate service by leaders of both parties. A conservative Democrat who never has been described as a political foe of Mr. Eisenhower, Senate BYRD's thoroughly unsound view will be respected by many who realize he is not speaking with any object of opposing the President personally or politically. The Senator's sharp opposition will cause everyone, even friends of the President's idea, to take another look at what is proposed.

They'll find that the Virginia Democrat is basing his opposition on the fact that a flatbroke (what has the national debt soared to at this point?) Uncle Sam is being asked to shell out $25 billion (that's billion, not million) as the Federal Government's share of a national highway improvement program. They will find that BYRD, instead, is suggesting that the several States, which are in far less debt trouble than Uncle Sam, should do their own financing. They'll find that he is taking the position that it doesn't make any sense for one heavily debt-ridden Government agency to go deeper into debt to give grants to other Government agencies which are in better debt position to borrow or otherwise get the money on their own.

Just to sharpen up this point, BYRD flatly declares the thoroughly unsound Federal highway program (a) will destroy the Federal budget and (b) will cost the taxpayers 55 cents interest on every dollar borrowed.

Meanwhile, we know our own State has had no difficulty to date in floating highway bond issues, and, thus, obtaining the money for needed road improvements. As a matter of fact, one of the legislative inquiries is likely to be a study of charges that the State actually has wasted $2 million in interest payments by rushing out to get some of this easily-obtained bond money too far ahead of the time for actual spending.

There isn't much argument about a need for a national highway improvement program. But Senator BYRD's opposition is bound to start a lot of folks wondering just what agency of Government ought to finance it.

[From the Point Pleasant, W. Va., Register, January 24, 1955]

A TIMELY WARNING

Alluring as is the prospect of all of those roads envisioned in the administration's hundred billion dollar highway program, thoughtful minds cannot dismiss lightly the objections to the financing plan raised by Senator HARRY BYRD, Democrat, of Virginia.

As projected by Gen. Lucius Clay, Chairman of the Commission which worked up the programs, the Government, in addition to the money regularly spent in Federal road aid to the States, would provide $25 billion for an interstate network of highways. The money for this would come from revenue bonds to be financed by the present 2-cent Federal gasoline tax, and rental fees from filling stations, motels, etc., along the new highways. The whole thing would be handled by a Federal Highway Corporation thus taking the operation outside the regular Federal budget.

BYRD's objection is based, not only on his assertion that every dollar spent in this manner would cost the taxpayers 55 cents in interest, but on the argument that to take this step would "destroy" the federal budget. As BYRD expressed it, "If they can set up a corporation to borrow money outside the budget and the debt limit to build roads, they can do anything. This corporation would not own any roads or have any assets.

As an alternative, BYRD proposes that Congress reduce the gasoline tax from two cents to one-half cent, thus giving the States an opportunity to increase their road revenues without increasing the overall load of the automobile driver. Regular Federal aid to the States he would finance with the half-cent gasoline tax and the present lubricating oil levy.

What Senator BYRD says about the evils of the revenue bond approach, and the danger inherent in the precedent of undertaking public financing outside the budget, commends itself at once to the cautious mind. It will take a lot of persuading to convince conservative minded Congressmen of the wisdom of such a course.

On the other hand, the Senator's proposal would seem to fall short of the need. This newspaper always has adhered to the doctrine that the Federal Government should keep hands off State affairs. For that reason it has opposed in principle the grants-in-aid device. To the extent, therefore, that the Byrd plan would return to the States more taxing potentiality without increasing the public burden, it is, this newspaper believes, a step in the right direction. Apparently however, he does not propose to change the existing Federal-State relationship. The Government would continue collecting and distributing among the States money for roads which have no important relationship to interstate commerce. His proposal would be sounder, we think, were it to contemplate use of all Federal money, whatever its source, for purely interstate highways.

If the Federal Government has any proper place in the road picture, it is in the interstate phase of it. Therefore, if the interstate network envisioned in the Clay program can be financed without resort to revenue bonds, it probably should be undertaken, even if that means complete abandonment of the present policy of sending Federal road money into the States to be spent on a matching basis.

[From the Utica (N. Y.) Press of January 27, 1955]

OPPOSITION TO THE ROAD PLAN

President Eisenhower's vast new road-building program has encountered serious opposition in Congress even before its formal submission today. One critic is Senator HARRY F. BYRD, Democrat, Virginia, chairman of the Senate Finance Committee and economy watchdog of Capitol Hill.

As outlined in the report of the President's Advisory Committee on a National Highway Program, submitted 2 weeks ago, the 10-year plan concentrates "on modernizing the key 40,000-mile national system of interstate highways." The Federal Government would continue for 10 years its regular aid to States at the rate of about $600 million a year. The State and local governments would spend about $70 billion over the 10 years.

In addition to its regular contributions to State governments, the Federal Government would spend an additional $25 billion on interstate highways. Some $5 billion of this would come from licenses—filling stations, motels—on the rights-of-way. The remaining $20 billion would come from 30-year, 3 percent bonds issued by a Federal highway corporation.

These bonds, fully taxable, would be guaranteed by the United States Treasury, but the debt represented would not be included in the public debt under obligations guaranteed by the Government. Annual payments would be met by appropriations by Congress out of "the revenues which the Federal Government will derive from the motor vehicle fuel and lubricating oil taxes projected at the present rates."

The $20 billion bond plan, says Senator BYRD, would mean "operating the Government on two sets of books; one set for activities financed by borrowing outside the (public) debt, and expenditures outside budgetary control, and the other set for activities financed by borrowing on the record and expenditures under budget control."

BYRD charges also that the bond plan would "dry up gasoline tax revenue for 20 years, from 1966 to 1987," although these revenues would not be specifically earmarked for debt retirement by Congress. And he points out that the aggregated interest charges on the bonds would run to more than $11.5 billion, or 55 cents on the dollar.

BYRD would reduce the present 2 cents per gallon Federal gasoline tax to one-half cent per gallon, enabling the States to impose higher taxes to take up the difference. Then, aside from continued regular Federal aid to the States on a matching basis, road construction would be a State responsibility.

[From the Lewiston (Maine) Journal of January 26, 1955]

THE $101 BILLION ROAD PLAN

Presidential advisers say the Nation must more than double spending for highway construction in the next 10 years to maintain a minimum of safety.

The plan would boost spending $54 billion above the projected 10-year total of $47 billion. State and local agencies would chip in $70 billion, or 80 percent more than the $39 billion they would spend under existing programs. The Federal share would more than treble, rising from less than $9 billion to more than $31 billion. Uncle Sam would pay for 30 percent of the highway program, instead of 19 percent.

Most Congressmen have been awaiting the President's message tomorrow on highways before choosing sides, but Senator HARRY FLOOD BYRD, Democrat, of Virginia, pounced on the advisory committee's report within days.

BYRD, who is chairman of the Senate Finance Committee, said the program would "violate financing principles, defy budgetary control, and evade Federal debt law."

He dismissed as legerdemain the advisers' key plan for financing the Federal share of the program. Congress would create a Federal Highway Corporation to issue more than $20 billion in 3-percent bonds. The bonds would not count as part of the Federal debt, which keeps bumping against the legal ceiling.

BYRD's plan emphasizes States' rights.

The Federal Government would cut its gasoline tax from 2 cents to a half cent a gallon, permitting the States to raise their taxes and build more highways with less control by Washington. Acceptance of the $101 billion plan, BYRD predicted, would lead to endless outlays for other programs.

The President's Advisory Committee, headed by Gen. Lucius D. Clay, retired, gave top priority to the interstate highway system, which handles one-seventh of all traffic. Of the proposed $101 billion, $27 billion would be spent on these highways and urban connections, with the Federal Government paying $25 billion, the States $2 billion.

Federal aid for the rest of the highway system would cost $623 million a year, equivalent to the current rate. States match these Federal contributions. The Federal Government would continue to pay for roads on its public lands, a program that now costs $59 million a year.

[From the Joplin (Mo.) Globe of January 22, 1955]

QUESTIONABLE FINANCING

Senator HARRY F. BYRD, of Virginia, who is widely respected in Congress as a watchdog of the Treasury, raises pertinent questions concerning President Eisenhower's $101 billion highway-building program that will merit thoughtful consideration.

Long a foe of Government waste, even under administrations of his own party, the powerful Virginia Democrat assails the plan of financing the big road program as a dangerous innovation in Federal spending in that it would set up a brand new Federal corporation to borrow money outside the Treasury, outside of budgetary control, and outside of the recorded national debt.

Such a procedure, says the Senator, violates financing principles, defies budgetary control in Government, and evades Federal debt law.

He reasons that if the Federal Government can borrow money for roads in that fashion "it may be expected that similar proposals will be made for financing endless outlays which may be desirable for education, hospital, public health, etc."

Such a scheme of financing, as he sees it, would mean operating the Government on 2 sets of books, 1 for spending activities outside the national debt, and the other for activities financed by borrowing on the record as at present.

In other words, the Senator sees the new program opening the door to a new means of deficit financing that would invite all kinds of big spending enterprises. He thinks the least the Government can do in fairness to the taxpayers is to keep books and accounts in a manner to correctly reflect the debt. Otherwise, he points out, confidence in Government credit will be destroyed.

Furthermore, the Senator has figured it out that borrowing $20 billion for interstate

superhighways under the plan would cost the taxpayers $11½ billion in interest. He believes this money well might be saved for future investment in highways by the States and the Federal Government. He favors continued Federal aid to the States for highways, but he would leave major taxing power for highways and their building to the States.

[From the Corpus Christi (Tex.) Caller of January 31, 1955]

HIGHWAY FINANCING DISPUTE

Senator HARRY FLOOD BYRD, of Virginia, has made a career of riding herd on the Nation's finances. He has lost some of his battles over finances, and he has won some. In a recent statement he takes a fall out of the Clay Commission's highway report, got up at the request of President Eisenhower and designed to give Congress a working model of what the Federal road program should be in the next 10 years.

The Senator points out that the Clay plan calls for continuance of the Federal aid to the States for highway purposes at the rate of $623 million annually. On top of that it proposes to spend in the next 10 years an additional $25 billion for the so-called Interstate Highway System, bringing Federal spending on these two items to $31 billion for the next 10 years.

The committee estimates the $25 billion would construct $40,000 miles of road designated as interstate, but BYRD points out that this is little more than 1 percent of all public-road mileage. It would amount to about 800 miles per State.

But what burns BYRD down is the committee's proposal to borrow $20 billion at 3 percent and to collect $5 billion in fees from filling stations, motels, etc., operating on the right of way.

He says these 30-year taxable bonds would cost taxpayers $11.5 billion.

And he's against it. "Based on all recent Federal experience," he declares, "I submit it is a violent assumption to predict these bonds will be paid off at maturity. In effect, we have not paid off a single dollar of Federal debt in 25 years. Continuing increase in the Federal debt is in prospect for an indefinite period."

Obviously, the Clay plan will run into stiff opposition in the Senate, led by HARRY F. BYRD.

[From the Orlando Sentinel of January 23, 1955]

UNSOUND FINANCING

Although the Clay Commission's $101 billion road program has much to recommend it, the method of financing the Government's share of it is extremely dubious and has met with immediate opposition from Senator BYRD.

This calls for an expenditure of $25 billions on 40,000 miles of interstate highways, $20 billion of which would be borrowed through a Federal corporation created by the Government to float the bonds.

According to Senator BYRD, these bonds would bear interest at 3 percent and would extend for 30 years. The interest cost alone would amount to $11.5 billion, or about 55 cents on every dollar borrowed.

Even more objectionable is the method of financing such projects with Government guaranteed bonds outside of the regular budget and constituting an indirect obligation on the Government, but nevertheless an obligation just as binding as any other financial obligation.

"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," Senator BYRD declares.

A better plan would be for the Government to reduce its 2-cent gasoline tax to one-half cent so that the individual States could raise theirs proportionately and build the roads under the present matching fund program with the individual States retaining as much of the control over their road building as they have in the past.

[From the Fullerton (Calif.) News-Tribune of February 1, 1955]

HIGHWAY FUND PLAN

Senator HARRY BYRD, of Virginia, has proposed a plan to finance the $100 billion 10-year highway program proposed by President Eisenhower.

Senator BYRD, the Democratic conservative who has gained a reputation as watchdog of Federal expenditures, suggests that the 2-cent Federal gasoline tax be repealed so that States may levy that much additional and pay for their own highway construction. Then, he says, a Federal tax on lubricating oil and a new half-cent tax on gasoline could be used to finance the present Federal-aid program for roads.

Senator BYRD estimates that his plan would save loading the cost of the program on future generations with an additional price tag of $11.5 billion for interest should the highways be financed by simply adding to the Federal debt.

In the Senator's home State, a first-class highway system has been built and maintained on a pay-as-you-go basis—which makes it cheaper in the long run and doesn't indulge in the dodge of passing on to the children our own obligations.

Senator BYRD's proposal should be given careful consideration.

[From the LaGrange (Ga.) News of January 26, 1955]

BYRD PRESENTS ANOTHER OBJECTION TO PROGRAM

Senator HARRY BYRD, from the State of Virginia, has long been regarded as one of the leading watchdogs on the spending programs of the United States.

As such, he has played an important and strategic part in any financial project undertaken by the Federal Government.

When President Eisenhower proposed his expansive highway construction program Senator BYRD immediately attacked the financing portion of the gigantic plan.

Tuesday we presented the first half of Senator BYRD's statement concerning the highway program. Because of the entire length of the statement we had divided it into two parts.

The Daily News is interested in publishing both sides of the arguments surrounding the highway building program proposed for the United States. Commendations of the Eisenhower program have already been presented. Today we offer the second half of Senator Byrd's statement as follows:

"There is another grave objection to this Federal road plan, of importance equal to those I have mentioned.

"Since 1934, Federal grants to States have enormously expanded in cost and functions. Every Federal grant elevates the control of the Federal Government and subordinates the authority of the States. Nothing is truer than the rule that power follows the purse. When the Federal Government makes a grant it directs the exact manner in which the fund is expended, even though the expenditure is partly contributed by the State. Time and time again I have seen the iron hand of the Federal bureaucracy compel the States to do things that they did not desire to do, because of grants made by the Federal Government.

"The growth in Federal grants is indicated by the fact that in 1934, 21 years ago, the total of such grants was $126 million, for 18 grants-in-aid programs. Now the total of Federal grants is $3 billion for 50 programs. This is an increase of 300 percent in programs and 2,300 percent in cost. Federal grants to States never end. They continue to expand.

"The commitee's proposal contemplates the greatest increase in Federal grants suggested. A Federal agency will determine the location of the interstate road system, will fix the number and location of access roads, which may be considerable distances apart, will fix the fees for the activities such as filling stations, motels, restaurants, etc., that are located along the rights-of-way and will control construction standards, etc.

"No one recognizes more fully than I the need of road improvement to meet the constantly increasing impact of modern-day traffic. A great deal of my public career has been devoted to the problems of road construction in Virginia. As a substiute for the committee's recommendations I propose:

"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 per gallon Federal gasoline tax. Revenue from this tax plus the Federal lubricating oil tax, according to estimates of increasing use, shortly will be sufficient to compensate the Federal Treasury for this Federal aid.

"Under such a plan States would retain as much control over their roads as they have had in the past: $11.5 billion interest would be saved for additional road construction; and road revenue would be evenly distributed over future years to keep highways modernized to meet changing conditions.

"Under the committee plan principal and interest payments on the $20 billion bond issue would dry up gasoline tax revenue for 20 years, from 1966 to 1987, with the exception of about $600 million which is committed to matching funds of States for their primary, secondary, and urban systems.

"In the next few days I will present on a yearly basis figures showing the plan I propose will result in more road development than can be accomplished under the committee's plan; that it will avoid increasing the public debt, and that it will serve to preserve the soundness of the Federal budgetary system."

[From the Sheridan (Wyo.) Press of January 28, 1955]

BYRD AGAINST ROAD BONDS

President Eisenhower's Federal-State highway program in which he recommends a 10-year road building program for a total of $101 billion isn't going to meet with anything like unanimous support in Congress. Already opposition is showing itself, primarily opposed to the Presidential committee's recommendation that the program be financed through a bond issue.

As outlined in the report of the President's Advisory Committee on a National Highway Program in January, the 10-year plan concentrated on modernizing the key national system of interstate highways of some 40,000 miles. The Federal Government would continue for 10 years its regular aid to States at the present rate. The State and local governments would spend about $70 billion over the 10 years.

In addition to its regular contributions to State governments the Federal Government would spend an additional $25 billion on interstate highways. Some $5 billion of this

would come from licenses—filling stations and motels on the rights-of-way. The remaining $20 billion would come from bonds issued for 30 years at 3 percent, issued by a Federal highway corporation. These bonds, fully taxable, would be guaranteed by the United States Treasury, but the debt represented would not be included in the public debt under obligations guaranteed by the Federal Government. Annual payments would be met by appropriations by Congress out of the revenues which the Federal Government will derive from the motor fuel and lubrication-oil taxes.

Senator BYRD objects to the proposal for two sets of books on governmental obligations and the interest charge which he says would total $11.5 billion over the period of 30 years. He would have the States take on a larger part of the burden and reduce the Federal tax on gasoline.

We do not necessarily approve the Byrd recommendation to shift the burden to the States which they would finance by a higher gasoline tax. But the proposal for Federal bonds will stand careful examination.

[From the Lowell (Mass.) Sun of February 1, 1955]

FEDERAL HIGHWAY PROGRAM

Some months ago President Eisenhower proposed a network of superhighways for the United States costing billions of dollars. The plan was quickly supported by businessmen, economists and many others who could see the necessity for such a development if the country is to keep pace with progress.

Traffic strangulation is definitely before the United States unless a broad and nationwide highway-building project is started without delay. In New England, of course, the building of major highways is well along, with all six States doing a good piece of work to provide this section with the best intercity roads. Naturally, however, there is still room for vast improvement and therefore a Federal program would be of great assistance in expanding our growing highway system.

Federal road building would be of great assistance to business; it would create thousands of jobs in all parts of the country, and it would also serve as a significant part of the general national-defense pattern. And when we consider the way in which this Government has been called upon, again and again, to send billions overseas to help put friendly nations back on their feet after being beaten down by war, then we must agree that the time has come when we should take inventory of our own national needs and proceed to spend some billions on ourselves.

Despite the generally favorable reaction which followed the President's statement on a national road-building program, Members of Congress have not been too quick to express themselves; they are waiting until it is presented to them directly and officially on Capitol Hill.

One Senator, however, has come out in violent opposition, contending that the whole thought violates financing principles, defies budgetary control and evades the Federal debt law. That is Senator BYRD, of Virginia, who will unquestionably spearhead the fight against this progressive proposal.

It is not likely that he will prevail in his arguments because too many of his colleagues in the Senate realize the importance of the project. While there may be some modifications of the President's ideas, it is probable that the program will get started very quickly and that 1955 will be the year in which the first phases will be noted in practically every State in the Union. In another 10 years, the whole of the program will probably be completed—with great benefit to all.

[From the Bridgeport (Conn.) Telegram of February 2, 1955]

MORE BILLIONS AT STAKE

President Eisenhower's $101 billion highway-building plan is receiving a lot of attention both for and against, in Congress. His advisors, headed by Gen. Lucius D. Clay, have told him the Nation must more than double its highway funds in the next 10 years to keep from strangling in traffic.

The plan would increase spending $54 billion above the present projected 10-year total of $47 billion. State and local governments would be expected to dig up $70 billion, or 80 percent more than the $39 billion they would spend under existing programs. The Federal share would more than treble, rising from less than $9 billion to more than $31 billion. Instead of 19 percent, Uncle Sam would pay for 30 percent of the highway program.

Congressional Quarterly points out that Connecticut will get $8,086,262 in Federal funds to spend on roads in fiscal 1956, and a lot more, of course, if Congress enacts the Eisenhower proposals. This share of funds already voted will come from the $875 million earmarked by Congress for highway aid. But to get this share Connecticut taxpayers will have to put it up first. The Government has no other way to get it.

Many interests favor modernization of our roads and construction of new ones from coast to coast, from auto manufacturers to the makers of road signs. Construction companies, State and local officials and safety groups favor the program. But it is opposed by farm organizations and groups which hold that it calls for the spending of altogether too much money.

The principal foe of the measure is one of the most influential men in the United States, Senator HARRY BYRD, of Virginia, chairman of the Senate Finance Committee.

He thinks the amount is too great, the proposed financing plan bad, a violation of financial principles. In fact, he called the whole business legerdemain.

The program calls for Congress to create a Federal highway corporation to issue more than $20 billion in 3-percent bonds, which would not be included in the Federal debt. They would be guaranteed by the Treasury and they would be paid off by gasoline and oil taxes, licenses of filling stations, motels, and tolls.

The Senate watchdog sees all this as camouflage. A debt is a debt, whether it is included in the Federal debt or not, and the Government is responsible for it. A sore point has arisen in the States. They are worried about raising $31 billion under the Eisenhower program. What is there left for them to tax?

Senator BYRD's opposition may not block the program but it insures the people that Congress will give the entire scheme a sharp look before going into it.

[From the Saginaw (Mich.) News of January 27, 1955]

BYRD'S HIGHWAY PLAN DESERVES FULL STUDY

President Eisenhower's conservatism in economic affairs involving Government can become overly liberal, in the view of Democratic Senator HARRY F. BYRD, of Virginia. A case in point is the President's proposed $100 billion Federal-States road-building program.

Senator BYRD, chairman of the Senate Finance Committee and "watchdog" of the national economy, has considerable fault to find with the proposed 10-year plan. Basically it is the administration's approach to additional financing which Mr. BYRD considers highly extravagant.

The Senator's criticisms raise questions that deserve fuller exploration.

For example: Aside from regular contributions to State governments, the Federal Government would spend an additional $25 billion on interstate highways. Of this sum $5 billion would be raised by licenses on commercial enterprises along the rights-of way. But $20 billion would come from 30-year 3-percent bonds issued by a Federal Highway Authority.

Senator BYRD believes this debt would dry up the existing gasoline-tax revenue for 20 years since only the present tax sources is counted on to retire them.

More importantly, he points out that aggregate interest charges on the bonds would run to more than $11.5 billion, or 55 cents on the dollar.

That kind of interest, as any home buyer can recognize, is no bargain for the American taxpaying public. The rate isn't exorbitant, but a 30-year mortgage with neither a down payment nor visible source of added income can only extract a heavy interest penalty.

If it were the sole unavoidable solution, it might be accepted as a national necessity. But Senator BYRD offers what seems as a far more workable, economical alternative.

He would turn the job back to the States. In so doing, he suggests that the present 2-cents-a-gallon Federal gasoline tax could be reduced to a half cent per gallon, enabling the States to impose higher taxes to take up the difference.

This would turn both road-building opportunity and responsibility back to the States, where we believe it belongs.

Further, States which are contributing a disproportionate share toward the Federal gasoline and oil taxes would benefit by the Federal tax cut. As it is, States such as Michigan are paying far more than they receive in Federal grants.

The $11.5 billion interest saving would build a sizable length of highway, too.

No one disputes the pressing needs to modernize the 40,000-mile national system of interstate highways. The public is prepared to accept also the prediction that highways will have to carry 80 million vehicles by 1974, as the President's Advisory Committee on a National Highway Program reports. But the means to that end, as Senator BYRD submits, need not be costly Federal financing and control.

[From the Wausau (Wis.) Record-Herald of January 24, 1955]

IT'S STILL DEBT

Senator BYRD (Democrat, Virginia) has raised some very pertinent questions about the suggested means of financing the multibillion highway-building program formally proposed to President Eisenhower.

He's particulaarly concerned about the proposal that bonding of the debt for the program not be included in the regular Government-debt figure.

As the Senator noted, "Count 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."

He further sees the threat that such a means of handling the situation would pave the way for "endless outlays" in the same manner for building programs for education, hospitals, and public health.

Once started in that direction there's no telling where it would stop. Already charges have been made that such an arrangement will discriminate against education unless similar help is provided for building schools.

Proponents of such a means of financing a nationwide road-building program contend that it resembles the many toll road or bridge authorities already in existence and which work out satisfactorily.

The Wall Street Journal has noted, however, that such authorities, where properly constituted, are self-contained operations having their own revenues and responsible for their own debts. The proposal for financing the roads, on the other hand, would set the debt outside the books of the United States Treasury while leaving the Treasury all the liabilities, actual and contingent.

As the Wall Street Journal put it, "If we have to go deeper into debt to finance this highway program, let us at least not kid ourselves about what we are doing. Let us keep an accounting system that reflects the true state of affairs, however harassing."

And as Senator BYRD succinctly expressed it, "You can't avoid financial responsibility by legerdemain."

[From the Charleston (S. C.) Post of January 31, 1955]

SOBER THOUGHT ON HIGHWAY PROGRAM

The Nation is far from sold on the glittering proposal that Federal and State Governments embark on a 10-year road program that would cost $101 billion.

Even some who favor a briskly stepped-up highway development take a dim view of the financing recommended by the Clay committee—a group appointed by the President and headed by Gen. Lucius D. Clay.

Senator HARRY F. BYRD, of Virginia, who has a quick eye for trick financing, calls the scheme a bit of legerdemain. He has in mind the fiction that Federal obligations assumed would not be a part of the public debt. The idea is to create a Government-owned corporation and let it issue highway bonds. So the debt would be the corporation's, not the Government's.

But, as Senator BYRD and other critics point out, the United States Treasury would guarantee the corporation enough money each year to pay off the bonds. Furthermore, it could borrow from the Treasury as much as $5 billion in any year. No; that wouldn't be added to the public debt. Again, the corporation. That agency would have no assets or income, but would be authorized to borrow $20 billion by selling bonds guaranteed by the Treasury; that is to say, by the taxpayers. Congress would have to appropriate for payment of bonds and interest, if necessary.

The States would contribute to the fund, with the program being administered by Washington. There would follow an extension of the Federal Government's structure, along with the inevitable expansion of bureaucracy. And who would police the spending, to see that the billions of dollars were used properly?

The American Automobile Association warns that the program "has a pork-barrel and political potential of serious dimensions." It had in mind particularly the provision that the Government would reimburse the States for the money they spent in building toll roads that would become sections of the interstate network.

It is true that the increase of automotive traffic makes the existing roads inadequate. It is also true that throughout the Nation new highways and bridges are being built. They may always lag behind needs, for there seems to be no end to the increasing volume of automobiles, trucks, and buses. Probably $500 billion could be spent in 10 years without filling all traffic needs. Those needs, however, must be weighed with others.

It may be that the Nation should have a strategic network such as proposed by the Clay committee, but there should be no sleight-of-hand bookkeeping to disguise the fact that it would add to the public debt and mean higher taxes. We line up with Senator BYRD.

[From the Shreveport (La.) Times of January 30, 1955]

ROUGH ROAD AHEAD

President Eisenhower's proposal for $25 billion of Federal spending on highways in a 10-year period which, theoretically at least, would include total spending of around $100 billion by all levels of Government obviously is headed for some hot debate in Congress. The President is expected to place his program before the House and Senate in detail in a special message next Thursday.

Senator BYRD, who is about as informed a student of Federal spending as anyone in Washington, vigorously opposes the plan. It provides for financing of the Federal portion with about $5 billion in revenues from various forms of auto, motel, and filling station licenses as well as gasoline tax, plus $20 billion of Federal financing through a bond issue not carried as a public debt or placed in the budget, yet guaranteed by the Federal Government and its revenues resources.

Such a system, Senator BYRD says, would mean operating the Government on two sets of books, one set for activities financed by borrowing outside the public debt limit and expenditures outside budgetary control, and the other set for activities financed by borrowing on the record, and expenditures under budget control.

Senator BYRD further points out that the aggregate interest charges on the Government bond financing in only 10 years would be 55 cents on the dollar. In other words the people would pay $1.55 for every $1 in highway construction by the Federal Government.

That, of course, is the evil of excessive highway bonds up and down the line. Louisiana, through the years starting with the Huey Long regime, has been paying around $1.50 for every $1 in highway construction and maintenance that came under bonds, even assuming that each dollar paid out on actual highway work brought a full 100 cents in such work—which has not always been the case in this State by any means. Politicians always seem anxious to put upper-bracket interest rates on highway bonds.

Senator BYRD proposes that the present 2 cents a gallon Federal tax on gasoline should be abolished so that States can reimpose it for their own highway revenue. This, he says, would make highway construction strictly a State responsibility, aside from Federal matching funds—which is where the responsibility should lie, in the opinion of the Virginia Senator. Basically he views the issue as part of the general picture of State's rights—that those who demand rights independent of Federal Government also must assume responsibilities independent of Federal Government and not run to Washington every time they want to spend money in large sums.

Senator BYRD added this:

"States then would retain as much control over their roads as they have had in the past and $11\frac{1}{2}$ billion interest would be saved for additional road construction; and road revenue would be evenly distributed over future years to keep the highways modernized to meet changing conditions."

[From the St. Louis (Mo.) Post-Dispatch of February 23, 1955]

WHICH ROAD IS RIGHT?

President Eisenhower's new highway message to Congress has this in common with a new highway: the citizen has to proceed to the end of it to make sure of the destination.

The first section of the message deals with the need for better highways in terms of common knowledge: traffic fatalities on unsafe roads, high-cost transportation on slow roads, inadequate communications for defense. Most citizens will concur with the President that "action, comprehensive and forward-looking is needed."

Mr. Eisenhower then deals at length with the outline of a 10-year road program offered earlier by a special Commission under Gen. Lucius D. Clay. This program calls for Federal-State expenditures of $101 billion, and the core of the proposal is for the Federal Government alone to spend $25 billion on the interstate highway system.

Only in the last paragraphs of his message, however, does the President deal with the question which threw the Clay report into controversy. That is how to pay for this expanded Federal share in highway building. On this point Mr. Eisenhower is not nearly as specific as the Clay report.

General Clay's Commission suggested establishing a Federal corporation to issue 30-year special road bonds at 3 percent interest. The bond debt would not show up in the Federal budget, yet the Government would be obliged to pay off the bonds.

Now Mr. Eisenhower says that "I am inclined to the view that it is sounder to finance this program by special bond issues," but he does not commit himself specifically to the Clay proposal. He appears to add a suggestion which the Clay group rejected; namely, that Congress earmark revenues from gasoline and other highway taxes to pay off bonds.

Since the President and his special Commission seem to be in some disagreement as to just how to pay off a special highway bond issue, this aspect of the program is bound to cause some guesswork in Congress.

But congressional criticism of the Clay report has already shown that the main issue will not be how to finance special bonds, but whether to issue special bonds at all.

Senator BYRD, of Virginia, quoted in today's Mirror of Public Opinion, objects that such special bonds would be a subterfuge. Issued outside the budget, they would evade the debt limit and make the budget appear closer to balance than it really is.

Aside from that, this type of bond financing is far more expensive than the traditional pay-as-you-go method of highway appropriations. Senator BYRD estimates that in 30 years every dollar borrowed through bonds would cost the taxpayers $1.55 because of interest payments.

One related question also has arisen to the bond proposal. Why is the administration willing to issue 20 billion for a 10-year road plan, but has proposed to underwrite no more than 900 million in school bonds, and has offered a health reinsurance plan of just 25 million? Necessary as new highways are, should they have such great precedence over school aid?

Rumblings in Congress about these questions were not quieted by the last-minute White House conference with congressional leaders. This was the first time the administration has called in Democrats on a domestic program. But Presidential assistants said no major changes would be permitted in the program, so the purpose of the meeting was not consultation but a preview.

Since Congress had nothing to do with forming the road policy, that policy is bound to face critical examination as it goes before Congress. The Nation does not have to be told that it needs new highways. It ought to be told how it can get them economically, and that at least should mean keeping Federal highway costs in the Federal budget.

[From the Bluefield (W. Va.) Telegraph of January 27, 1955]

THE NEW ROAD PROGRAM

President Eisenhower is scheduled to send to Congress on Thursday, January 27, his recommendations for a 10-year, $101 billion Federal-State road-building program.

President Eisenhower's vast new road-building program has encountered serious

opposition in Congress even before its formal submission. One critic is Senator HARRY F. BYRD, Democrat, of Virginia, chairman of the Senate Finance Committee and economy "watchdog" of Capitol Hill.

As outlined in the report of the President's Advisory Committee on a National Highway Program submitted on January 11, the 10-year plan concentrates "on modernizing the key 40,000-mile system of interstate highways." The Federal Government would continue for 10 years its regular aid to States, at the rate of about $600 million a year. The State and local governments would spend about $70 billion over the 10 years.

In addition to its regular contributions to State governments, the Federal Government would spend an additional $25 billion on interstate highways. Some $5 billion of this would come from licenses—filling stations, motels—on the rights-of-ways. The remaining $20 billion would come from 30-year, 3-percent bonds issued by a Federal highway corporation.

These bonds, fully taxable, would be guaranteed by the United States Treasury, but the debt represented would not be included in the public debt under obligations guaranteed by the Government. Annual payments would be met by appropriations by Congress out of the revenues which the Federal Government will derive from the motor vehicle fuel and lubricating oil taxes projected at the present rates.

The $20-billion bond plan, says Senator BYRD, would mean "operating the Government on 2 sets of books; one set for activities financed by borrowing outside the public debt and expenditures outside budgetary control, and the other set for activities financed by borrowing on the record and expenditures under budget control."

BYRD charges also that the bond plan would "dry up gasoline tax revenues for 20 years, from 1966 to 1987," although these revenues would not be specifically earmarked for debt retirement by Congress. And he points out that the aggregated interest charges on the bonds would run to more than $11.5 billion, or 55 cents on the dollar.

BYRD would reduce the present 2-cents-per-gallon Federal gasoline tax to one-half-cent-per-gallon, enabling the States to impose higher taxes to take up the difference. Then, aside from continued regular Federal aid to the States on a matching basis, road construction would be a State responsibility. Thus says BYRD:

"States would retain as much control over their roads as they have in the past; $11.5 billion interest would be saved for additional road construction; and road revenue would be evenly distributed over future years to keep highways modernized to meet changing conditions."

Whether the Federal or State Governments are to bear the increased costs of an adequate highway system, our highway will have to carry some 80 million vehicles by 1974, according to the President's Commission. Its Chairman, Gen. Lucius D. Clay, told the National Conference on Highway Financing of the United States Chamber of Commerce on January 13: "We are indeed caught in a traffic jam, nationwise."

[From the Newport News (Va.) Press of February 5, 1955]

PAY-AS-YOU-GO ROADS

Senator ROBERTSON put his finger directly on the sorest spot of all in the Clay Commission's report recommending a $101 billion road program over a period of years. This plan contemplates the extensive issue of bonds, with the Federal gasoline tax eliminated and certain other Federal revenues allotted to highway building.

The Lexington lawmaker simply pointed out that it costs vastly more to build roads on credit than it costs to build them when cash is paid for the job. One has to decide, then, whether it is the more expedient to undertake an immense emergency construction job, or to proceed as rapidly as possible with the available revenue.

Mr. ROBERTSON unbent enough from customary modesty to say that he worked closely with Senator BYRD in the old Virginia State senate days, to get Virginia's road program stated. Virginia has paid for its roads in cash—and avoided the waste of interest on bonds.

Moreover, it is not out of order to recall that a few years ago a prominent American who has traveled much was asked what States had the best roads. Virginia was one of the two States he mentioned. We still wonder whether more would not be accomplished if the States build their own roads—for cash.

[From the Bristol (Va.) Courier of January 28, 1955]

IKE'S HIGHWAY PLAN WOULD AID OUR AREA

Virginia can get $16,825,904 of Federal money to spend on roads in fiscal 1956, and probably a lot more if Congress enacts the multi-billion-dollar highway program proposed by President Eisenhower.

The major new proposal, of course, would boost spending for highway construction from $47 billion to $101 billion over a 10-year period. This would involve formation of a special road bureau empowered to issue bonds to pay the cost of giving the Nation, and the respective States, a better system of primary and secondary roads.

At the present time, the Federal Government is committed under a 1954 law to pay about 19 percent of highway costs. President Eisenhower's plan would raise the Government's share to about 30 percent.

For the moment, the future of the Eisenhower proposal is facing a major roadblock in the form of Senator HARRY BYRD, Democrat, of Virginia, who has attacked the plan as a method of bypassing the Federal budget in order to increase the national debt. He has presented a substitute proposal which would give the States part of the money which the Government presently collects in gas taxes—thereby permitting local highway construction. (The President's proposal envisions using the gas tax fund in retiring the bonds which would be issued by the special road bureau.)

Actually, according to Congressional Quarterly News Features, little extra mileage would be added under the proposed $101 billion program. Most of the money would be spent on replacing and improving highways considered inadequate to carry today's traffic—and Virginia has more than its share of such roads.

Virginia had 54,240 miles of roads, including Federal-aid highways, in 1953. Of that mileage, 5,021 miles are part of the Federal-aid primary system and 16,974 miles are part of the Federal-aid secondary system, which would receive assistance at about the same rate as provided by the 1954 law.

Our section of the State would benefit tremendously from President Eisenhower's proposal inasmuch as it provides for a new, limited access highway from northeast Virginia to the Tennessee State line, near Bristol. Presumably, this would connect with another proposed superhighway from Bristol to west Tennessee.

There seems little hope of obtaining such a highway or of improving and expanding Virginia's present road system, under existing conditions involving diversions which subtract heavily, from the State's highway funds.

As we noted before, Senator BYRD's substitute proposal might have great merit if we could be assured that all the money made available for highways was used for highways and not for construction of buildings or upkeep of convict camps.

The report of the Clay committee, on which President Eisenhower's proposal is based, would perform a necessary service in a minimum amount of time. It may be that Senator BYRD is correct in arguing against further indebtedness on the national level, but there can be no argument on the highway needs of Virginia, and especially southwest Virginia.

If Senator BYRD can devise a plan by which Virginia could provide us with the necessary, safe highways, we would be the first to stand by his side. Until such time arrives, however, we can only hope that the Eisenhower proposal is adopted.

If it fails to win approval from Congress, and if the present system of road construction and maintenance in Virginia continues, we have little to look forward to, as one wag noted, but miles and miles of nothing but miles and miles.

[From the Freeport (Tex.) Facts-Review of February 7, 1955]

BILLIONS AT STAKE IN ROAD PROGRAM

Presidential advisers say the Nation must more than double spending for highway construction in the next 10 years to keep from strangling in traffic, but an influential critic calls the $101 billion program unsound.

The plan would boost spending $54 billion above the projected 10-year total of $47 billion. State and local agencies would chip in $70 billion, or 80 percent more than the $39 billion they would spend under existing programs. The Federal share would more than treble, rising from less than $9 billion to more than $31 billion. Uncle Sam would pay for 30 percent of the highway program, instead of 19 percent.

Most Congressmen have been awaiting the President's January 27 message on highways before choosing sides, but Senator HARRY FLOOD BYRD, Democrat, of Virginia, pounced on the advisory committee's January 11 report within 4 days. BYRD, who is chairman of the Senate Finance Committee, said the program would violate financing principles, defy budgetary control, and evade Federal debt law.

He dismissed as legerdemain the advisers' key plan for financing the Federal share of the program. Congress would create a Federal Highway Corporation to issue more than $20 billion in 3 percent bonds. The bonds would not count as part of the Federal debt, which keeps bumping against the legal ceiling.

BYRD's own plan emphasizes States rights. The Federal Government would cut its gasoline tax from 2 cents to one-half cent a gallon, permitting the States to raise their taxes and build more highways with less control by Washington. Acceptance of the FHC plan, BYRD predicted, would lead to endless outlays for other programs.

Interest costs high: The President Advisory Committee, headed by Gen. Lucius D. Clay, retired, gave top priority to the interstate highway system, which handles one-seventh of all traffic. Of the $101 billion, $27 billion would be spent on these highways and urban connections, with the Federal Government paying $25 billion, the States $2 billion.

Federal aid for the rest of the highway system would cost $623 million a year, equivalent to the current rate. States match these Federal contributions. The Federal Government would continue to pay for roads on its public lands, a program that now costs $59 million a year.

Full cost of the $20 billion in bonds would reach nearly $32 billion, including interest. The Clay Committee estimated Federal gasoline and lubricating oil taxes—at current per-gallon rates—would feed nearly $566 billion into the Treasury during the 30-year

term of the bond issues. Subtracting nearly $19 billion—the cost of the continuing $623 million-a-year program—the committee found that $37 billion would remain. That would pay off the bonds and cover the $5 billion not raised through bonds.

Ordinarily, less is spent on highways than is collected from motor fuel and oil taxes. The committee's proposal would channel into highways money that normally would be spent on other Federal programs.

[From the Dallas (Tex.) Times-Herald of February 11, 1955]

SPIRALING DEBT, FEDERAL CONTROL, ISSUES IN NATIONAL HIGHWAY PLAN

Able and crusty Senator HARRY F. BYRD, Democrat, of Virginia, can always be counted upon to hoist the warning flag when dubious proposals are made to plunge the Nation further into debt and extend the iron hand of Federal bureaucracy.

Currently, the Senator is championing opposition to the $25 billion national-highway program which has been recommended to the President by an advisory committee. His points of criticism merit the notice of all taxpayers.

If—and it's a big if—the money borrowed for this program to improve the interstate highway system is paid off on schedule, the interest on it will amount to $11,500,000,000. But, as Senator BYRD points out, it is a wild assumption that the bonds will be amortized in 30 years as proposed, since, in effect, not a single dollar of Federal debt has been paid off in 25 years. The unique proposal is to finance the program through a Federal corporation which would borrow from the public, with the Treasury guaranteeing the corporation's bonds. Congress would be asked to make annual appropriations to meet principal and interest.

The plan, in effect, provides for a new method of disguising new public debt. If adopted for roads, the Virginia solon points out, it will open the way for similar legerdemain to finance endless outlays that may be desirable for education, hospitals, public health, and so forth. But public debt is still a debt of the public, a burden which must sooner or later be disposed of. The Federal-highway program would, moreover, add greatly to Federal grants-in-aid programs. Since 1934 these programs have grown in amount from $126 million to $3 billion annually—a 2,300-percent increase.

Senator BYRD proposes as a substitute for the $25 billion program that the Federal 2-cent gasoline tax be repealed and reimposed by States. The needed highways then could be built under State control and on a current basis at a saving of at least $11,500,000,000 in interest. But it may be too late to stem the tide of Federal encroachment, for States are showing little progress in meeting their responsibilities. Senator BYRD's sane voice probably will be lost in the roar of millions of Americans foolishly clamoring for something for nothing.

[From the Beaver Falls (Pa.) News-Tribune of February 1, 1955]

PAYG BEATS IOU

When Virginia's Senator HARRY FLOOD BYRD was 15, as the legend goes, he made a pay-as-you-go deal with the station agent who was holding the Byrd newsprint for express charges, so that the family paper, the Winchester Star, might continue publication. His subsequent rescue of the family fortunes may well explain his dedication to pay as you go.

Later, as a State senator, young Mr. BYRD was a prime mover in establishing a State highway system for Virginia, whose only paved road connected Washington and Richmond. This, too, at the insistence of Senator BYRD, and then Governor BYRD, was a pay-as-you-go operation, and still is. No bonds, no debts, and for years now a system of roads as adequate as those of any State to the needs of its citizens and visitors.

Today, Senator BYRD warns against President Eisenhower's 10-year highway program, expanded by his advisory committee in record time from 50 billion to 101 billion. Dollars, that is. Instead of loading this additional debt on unborn generations, with an additional $11 billion of interest, the Senator would repeal the Federal 2-cent gas tax, give it back to the States to do their own roadbuilding, and finance the present Federal-aid program with a new half-cent gas tax and a tax on lubricating oil.

We are told that our present State Governors, all 48, favor the Clay Committee plan—proving no doubt, that $101 billion can't be wrong. But perhaps we'd better listen to former Governor BYRD. We can't think of a better qualified witness.

[From the Pensacola (Fla.) Journal of January 26, 1955]

ROAD PLAN FINANCING UNSOUND

Prediction by Senator EDWARD MARTIN, Republican, of Pennsylvania, that there's no doubt Congress will approve President Eisenhower's $101-billion-highway program if a satisfactory financing plan can be worked out is equivalent to the housewife planning on that new hat if housekeeping funds permit. Something suffers, the house or the frau.

Recommendation of the President's advisory committee that the $27 billion Federal share of the 10-year program be raised by issuing bonds through a Federal highway corporation leaves too much open to chance, especially when it is projected that the corporation would borrow from the Treasury if tax collections lag behind bond payments.

The Nation definitely needs such a program but, as pointed out by Senator BYRD, Democrat, of Virginia, that means of financing is unorthodox and unsound. Certainly, a lot of thought is needed if this feather is to be placed in the administration's hat.

[From the Redding (Calif.) Record-Searchlight of February 9, 1955]

WHAT OTHERS SAY: BYRD CALLS IT NONSENSE

(From the San Francisco News)

Senator HARRY F. BYRD has come out with a "preliminary" appraisal of the $101,000,000,000 highway program proposed by President Eisenhower's advisory commission.

The respected Virginian has made it clear that he is choosing his words with restraint, pending Ike's formal announcement on where he stands.

While merely warming up, so to speak, Mr. BYRD has this to say:

"Legerdemain * * * thoroughly unsound * * * a procedure that would violate financial principles, defy budgetary control, and evade the Federal debt."

That is pretty good for a starter. In full voice, Mr. BYRD may peel the paint right off the White House.

We admire both his splendid early season form and his views on this matter.

The President's commission says among other things that if a Federal "corporation" is set up, and if that corporation sells $20,000,000,000 worth of 30 year bonds, then for some reason or other we can just forget about adding the total to our national debt.

Nonsense, says Senator BYRD. The so-called corporation plans to pay 3 percent interest to the bond buyers. Over 30 years, that will mean the buyers must be paid $11,500,000,000 in interest. And who will be in hock for all those billions? The taxpayers, of course. If that is not adding to the national debt, what is?

Good luck, Senator BYRD. From any angle, the whole setup looks about as sound as a chain letter.

[From the Worcester (Mass.) Telegram of February 1, 1955]

BUMPY ROAD AHEAD

The road is evidently not going to be smooth for the ambitious Federal and State highway program proposed by a presidential commission.

Senator HARRY F. BYRD, Virginia Democrat, doesn't like part of the proposed financial arrangement. The American Automobile Association objects to more toll roads. The National Education Association fears so much will be spent on highways there won't be enough left for schools.

Everyone seems to agree new roads are desirable, even essential. Massachusetts has put in its bid for $850 million to improve existing interstate highways, such as routes 1, 5, 9, and 20, and build new ones. Reports from Washington say the State might receive $750 million if the Federal program goes through.

This would give highway construction a tremendous boost here. But even that would not meet all our needs; the State department of public works has estimated $2.3 billion would have to be spent in the next 10 years to put all roads in the State in topnotch condition.

If it is agreed we need better highways, the only question is how we are going to pay for them. The President's Commission suggested a variety of sources. The States would supply most of the money, although the Commission didn't indicate just how this might be raised. Revenue from toll roads would help provide the Federal share. The Federal Government would continue to contribute part of the income from the gasoline tax, although on a reduced scale. In addition, it would borrow $20 billion.

This borrowing has aroused Senator BYRD's ire. It would be done by a new Federal corporation. By this device, the additional debt wouldn't show up as part of the regular Federal debt. This would be hardly more than a bookkeeping trick, for the borrowing would be repaid from Federal revenue. And if the corporation got into financial difficulties, the Government would probably bail it out.

The plan boils down to this: the Government would borrow $20 billion in the next 10 years and pay it back with gasoline and oil tax revenues of the next 30 years.

If we can meet all our highway needs for 30 years with one grand burst of road building in the coming decade, the plan is financially sound. Otherwise, it is not.

If, by 1964, huge new highway projects appear imperative—as they almost certainly will—then taxes will have to be raised sharply to meet those needs. We cannot spend beyond our means indefinitely.

That does not mean the highway program should be shelved. But if we are to undertake heavy new spending for roads without raising motor vehicle taxes proportionately, we should do it with our eyes open.

[From the Ogdensburg (N. Y.) Journal of January 29, 1955]

NATIONAL HIGHWAYS

Nobody will argue with the President when he says that the United States is caught in a traffic jam. But several objections are being fired at the details of the White House $100 billion program to get the Nation out of the jam.

Very shortly the President will send his program to Congress for action. Motorists, bus riders—just about all of us—have a stake in this Federal highway program, so let's take a short look at it and some of the objections.

The American Automobile Association objects principally to the building of any more toll roads. This is part of the President's proposal. The New York State Automobile

Association says this State should not rely on the national program. The State should go ahead and spend the proposed $750 million agreed on by both parties at Albany, says the NYSSA, making sure that any increase in motor fuel taxes is used to pay for better roads.

Senator HARRY BYRD, Virginia Democrat, who now heads the Senate Finance Committee, also has an objection. He doesn't like the idea of tieing up the revenues from Federal taxes on motor vehicle fuel to pay for highway bonds. The Senator suggests that these Federal fuel taxes be cut so that the States can raise their own taxes on gasoline and diesel oil. That way, he says, the States can build these roads and control them. His idea is undoubtedly good, so far as it goes, for the bigger, more populous States. But will the smaller States be able to pay for their share of the roads we will need to carry the 80 million vehicles that will be crowding them within 10 years?

Even Senator BYRD and the group that supports his distaste for the financing plans of the President's program do not come out flatly and say we do not need a national net of superhighways. That would be something like saying we do not need peace on earth. There seems to be recognition that we as a Nation have committed ourselves to living on wheels. The problem is bigger than the ability of the separate States to cope with it. Whatever is done in this Congress to the President's program, if the alterations result in putting off the solution, may be regretted by the whole Nation. Details may be altered but some national program should be started.

[From the St. Louis (Mo.) Post-Dispatch of February 23, 1955]

THE ROAD PLAN: YES OR NO?—THE MIRROR OF PUBLIC OPINION

(New York Times approves administration road program, says Nation can no longer make small plans for the automobile; Idaho newspaper says project is worthy but questions methods of bond financing outside of budget; asks if this is businesslike.)

THE NEW YORK TIMES

The massive road-building program proposed by President Eisenhower's Advisory Commission on Highways under Gen. Lucius D. Clay denotes at last acceptance of the principle that the United States can no longer be satisfied with making small plans for the automobile.

The spending of $101 billion for the modernization and expansion over a 10-year period by the Federal Government, States, and other levels of jurisdiction would be sound investment in the future of America.

The program can be financed without undue hardship on the economy. It will be a productive expenditure, saving lives, opening new areas of the country to business, industrial and recreational development and stimulate the fuller enjoyment of our resources. When we consider that there is an automobile for about every third person in our population it is clear that the problem of highways cannot be adequately dealt with on anything less than a planned, long-range basis.

As to sharing the costs

The interest and responsibility of the Federal Government in this problem are, of course, apparent. Interstate commerce must flow, as our very lifeline. Topside direction must be given, so that the end result has connection and integration.

The States, within the limits of their resources, have struggled with an insuperable challenge. The cities, built for the vehicles of another generation, have fought a losing battle and one in which their plights as the focal center of traffic brought to their borders has not been fairly recognized.

We suppose that much of the debate, as this plan is threshed out in Congress and elsewhere, will turn upon the sharing of costs, and whether the Federal Government should assume more than the approximately 30 percent contemplated.

The Federal share would be underwritten, it is hoped, by the present 2-cent-a-gallon gasoline tax. A special highway corporation would be set up as a device to avoid increasing the Federal debt, and bond issues would be retired through Congress setting aside funds drawn from the motor-fuel taxes.

Lesson of the turnpikes

By requiring lower levels of Government to match certain funds the Federal Government hopes to encourage a stepping up of construction on those levels to make the $101 billion goal, of which the Federal share would be $31,225,000,000. Where States and cities will find such money is one of the major questions that lie ahead.

The prospect of having, in a decade or thereabouts, the great modern highway system we actually need right now is exciting. We know already, from such pioneers as the Pennsylvania Turnpike and its successors, what the dividends are, in time saved, in lowered use of gasoline and diesel fuel, in repairs and maintenance costs saved on cars and trucks.

Every new highway exceeds the preliminary estimates of use. We have plenty of evidence that the American motorist (and who isn't one?) is more than willing to foot the bill for good highways.

While the details of the program will of course deserve careful study, we applaud and support this attempt to see the problem whole, to prepare for the future and to get prompt action.

LEWISTOWN (IDAHO) TRIBUNE

President Eisenhower's proposed national highway program seems headed for critical examination in Congress, chiefly because of the odd financing plan recommended for it.

Senator HARRY F. BYRD (Democrat), Virginia, objected that the program would "violate financing principle, defy budgetary control and evade Federal debt law."

Byrd has a habit of objecting almost automatically to proposals which he thinks threaten "States rights" or a balanced budget. This time, however, he seems to have found a cause to which he can recruit objectors from outside his normal circle. BYRD said:

"The Committee's recommendations fall generally into two 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 the interstate system.

"Some 11 billions in interest

"The Committee estimates the $25 billion would construct 40,000 road miles designated by the Federal Government as interstate highway. For this the Committee recommends borrowing $20 billion at 3 percent interest and collection of $5 billion in fees from filling stations, motels, etc., operating on the rights-of-way.

"If the 30-year taxable bonds recommended by the Committee can be sold at 3 percent interest, and if they are paid off on schedule, the interest would cost more than $11,500,000,000. At this rate, every dollar borrowed would cost taxpayers $1.55."

However, BYRD contends it is most unlikely in view of the Federal debt's history, that the bonds would be paid off on schedule.

"The Committee recommended to the President," said BYRD, "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. 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 endless outlays.

"Unbusinesslike financing

"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."

Perhaps BYRD's condemnations of the fiscal methods suggested are unduly harsh. But it does seem odd that a "businessman's government" has proposed an apparently unbusinesslike method of financing a worthy project.

If the Federal Government cannot countenance, for example, a separate Columbia Basin account to help finance the expansion of self-liquidating Federal dam projects in the Northwest, how can it justify going outside regular budget channels to finance a national project which cannot directly repay its costs?

Surely there must be some way, considering the importance of a national highway program, to depend more upon direct taxing to finance it and less upon cost-doubling bonds, annoying tolls, and other trick methods of raising funds.

EXPLORATION, LOCATION, AND ENTRY OF MINERAL LANDS WITHIN THE PAPAGO INDIAN RESERVATION

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, on May 17, the House of Representatives passed H. R. 2682, relative to the exploration, location, and entry of mineral lands within the Papago Indian Reservation. On May 19 the Senate passed an identical bill, S. 33. The Senate was not aware that the House had passed H. R. 2682.

I ask unanimous consent that the Senate reconsider the vote by which the bill (S. 33) relative to the exploration, location, and entry of mineral lands within the Papago Indian Reservation, was passed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the vote whereby the bill was passed is reconsidered.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs be discharged from the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 2682) relative to the exploration, location, and entry of mineral lands within the Papago Indian Reservation, and that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the House bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs is discharged from the further consideration of H. R. 2682. Is there objection to the present consideration of the House bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 2682) relative to the exploration, location, and entry of mineral lands within the Papago Indian Reservation.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, about 250 years ago a large area in what is now southern Arizona and northern Sonora, where the Papago Indians were then living and have continued to reside to the present time, was by discovery, conquest, and settlement, taken over by the Crown of Spain, and under Spanish law, all minerals were reserved to the Crown. When the present Papago Indian Reservation was created by Executive order on February 1, 1917, all the minerals were reserved to the United States for disposal to all American citizens under the mining laws. For that reason the only way the mineral rights in the Papago Reservation can be transferred to the Indian tribe is by an act of Congress.

I should like to quote for the RECORD from an opinion by Mr. Nathan R. Margold, former Solicitor of the Department of the Interior, with respect to this matter. It is dated March 7, 1934. In his opinion, after reviewing Spanish and Mexican laws and authorities, Mr. Margold said:

Since the cession to the United States the courts in this country have recognized both the ownership of mines by Spain and Mexico before the cession, and the succession of the United States to that ownership * * * The Supreme Court has stated expressly that under Spanish law minerals in Indian lands were the property of the crown * * *," and cites the case of *Chouteau d. Molony* (16 How. 203 (U. S. 1853)).

The executive and legislative branches of the Federal Government likewise have recognized the succession of Federal Government to the ownership of mines in what was formerly Spanish and Mexican territory.

In support of this statement he cites the annual report of the Secretary of the Interior for 1849 quoting the Secretary's statement concerning laws of Spain and property title to Spanish and Mexican mines. In addition, he states that the Congress expressly excluded mineral lands from the operation of the statute creating the office of Surveyor General for New Mexico and providing machinery for the establishment and confirmation of land claims existing under the Spanish-Mexican law.

He continues as follows:

In the Court of Private Land Claims Act it is provided:

"Third. No allowance or confirmation of any claim shall confer any right or title to any gold, silver, or quicksilver mines or minerals of the same unless the grant claimed effect the donations of such mines or minerals to the grantee or unless such grantee has become otherwise entitled thereto in law or in equity; but all such mines and minerals shall remain in the property of the United States."

In conclusion, Solicitor Margold says:

In the light of the facts now at hand, it is my opinion that in 1853 the United States acquired title to the land in question subject to an Indian right of occupancy of an area not exactly determined; that whatever surface rights the Papago Indians may have enjoyed, no interest in minerals was accessory or incidental to those surface rights; that complete and unencumbered title to minerals in the land was vested formerly in the Mexican state and passed to the United States upon cession of the territory. It follows that the question of the appropriate manner of protecting the Papagos in their possession was, and still is, a matter exclusively of political cognizance. * * * The present measure of the rights of the Papagos is the Executive order of February 1, 1917, as modified by the act of February 21, 1931. The Papagos have no independent title which can make that action ineffective or embarrass any future action that to Congress may seem appropriate in the premises.

Mr. President, to show the change in public sentiment in Arizona in the past two decades, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a joint memorial adopted by the Arizona Legislature on March 6, 1933, and another legislative memorial adopted on February 4, 1955.

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

House Joint Memorial 15

To the honorable the SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR,

Washington, D. C.:

Your memorialist, the 11th Legislature of the State of Arizona, respectfully represents:

By Executive order of February 1, 1917, supplanting an Executive order of January 14, 1916, there was set aside in southern Arizona, as a reservation for the Papago Indians, a great body of land, embracing a large portion of the territory lying between the city of Tucson on the east and Ajo on the west, and Casa Grande on the north to the Mexican border. To the reservation so formed has recently been added, by act of February 21, 1931, the so-called 6-mile strip, the whole body of land thus set aside as a reservation amounting to 2,633,974 acres.

As a result of negotiations between representatives of the Department of the Interior and the Governor of Arizona, or his representatives, the Executive orders creating this reservation contained a specific provision to the effect that all mineral lands therein should continue to be subject to exploration, location, and entry. Without such an agreement Arizona would have objected strenuously to the creation of the reservation, with its immense addition to the already tremendous area of Indian reservations within her borders.

Relying upon said exception, prospectors continued to search the mineralized portions of the reservation, with the result that 122 placer mining claims of 20 acres each have been patented, while 58 others have been surveyed and approved for patents. There are also within the area several lode properties of importance.

These activities, while contributing to the prosperity of the State, have in addition afforded considerable employment to Indians residing on the reservation, and have in not the slightest degree curtailed or detracted from the use of the reservation lands by the Papagos.

Despite the fact that these lands were set aside with the understanding and agreement that the reservation rights so created should be exclusive of mineral explorations, location, and entry rights, the Secretary of the Interior, under date of October 26, 1932, approved an order withdrawing the said land from all forms of mineral entry or claim "in order that Congress may consider the claims of the Indians to the mineral rights within these lands."

The records disclose that this action was taken at the instance of "certain friends of the Papagos," notably certain attorneys of Washington, D. C., and Los Angeles, Calif., whose friendship appears to be based upon a contract under which they would receive a percentage of any revenue accruing from the establishment of such mineral rights.

The result of this violation of both the letter and the spirit of the agreement under which the said reservation was created has been to put an end to prospecting within the area affected; to deny many idle American copper miners, thrown out of employment by the depression in the copper industry, the opportunity to work the gulches in which placer gold is found, or, aided by a "grubstake," to search the hills for ore deposits; to discourage capital from giving assistance to the development of properties to which no other titles might be secured than objectionable and undependable Indian leases, and generally to stop all mining activities.

Wherefore your memorialist requests that the agreement of the Federal Government, embodied in the Executive orders creating the Papago Reservation, which was the basis of this State's withdrawal of objections to the said reservation, be carried out, and not treated as a "scrap of paper"; that the order withdrawing the lands of the reservation from mineral exploration, location, and entry, be rescinded, and that encouragement be given to efforts to discover and develop such mineral properties as may be found within the said Papago Reservation.

And your memorialist will ever pray.

Passed the house, March 6, 1933.

Passed senate, March 7, 1933.

House Memorial 2

Memorial requesting the Congress of the United States to pass legislation withdrawing all tribal lands of the Papago Indian Reservation except lands previously patented or now subject to valid mining claims, from all forms of mineral entry and location, and directing that the mineral rights in said reservation be held in trust by the United States for lease for mining purposes for the benefit of the Papago Indians on the same terms and conditions as mineral rights are leased in other Indian reservations in Arizona

To the Congress of the United States:

Your memorialist respectfully represents the Papago Indian Reservation, created by Executive Order 2524 and extended by statute 46 St. 1202, is subject to mineral entry and location under the mining laws of the United States.

Except for the mining laws of the United States and Arizona, the said right of entry is not subject to any control by the United States or by the Papago Tribe.

Said right of location has caused hardship to numerous Papago Indians in the past by forcing them to move from their homes and fields and by depriving them of desirable lands and waterholes.

Due to the great interest of the general public in the possibility of discovering uranium ore on the reservation, there is great fear among the Papago Indians that they will be deprived of their reservation piecemeal by mining claimants.

The Papago Indian Reservation does not have adequate resources to support the population presently living there and the possibility of substantial mineral discoveries seems the only hope that the reservation can provide an adequate economic base for the Papago people.

Wherefore your memorialist, the House of Representatives of the State of Arizona prays that the Congress of the United States withdraw all tribal lands of the Papago Indian Reservation, except lands previously patented or now subject to valid mining claims, from all forms of mineral entry and location and directing that the mineral rights in said reservation be held in trust by the United States for lease for mining purposes for the benefit of the Papago Indians on the same terms and conditions as mineral rights are leased in other Indian reservations in Arizona.

Adopted by the house February 4, 1955, by the following vote: 68 ayes, 0 nays, 12 not voting.

Filed in the office of the secretary of state; February 4, 1955.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill (H. R. 2682) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, Senate bill 33 is indefinitely postponed.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4876) making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments, and the Tax Court of the United States, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the amendments of the Senate to the 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.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message further announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the Vice President:

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 indemnity 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;

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

S. 1727. An act to authorize certain administrative expenses in the Treasury Department, and for other purposes;

H. R. 4052. An act 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; and

H. R. 4876. An act making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments, and the Tax Court of the United States, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, and for other purposes.

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. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, before I begin my speech I should like, in my present position as acting minority leader, to express my personal appreciation and that of the minority for the fine, courteous manner in which the majority leader [Mr. JOHNSON of Texas] has acted at all times. He has been very diligent in connection with the work being done by the Senate, which, of course, is his duty. I congratulate him and thank him.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I appreciate the statement of the Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, I am offering as an amendment in the nature of a substitute for the pending bill what is known as the administration bill. I think the administration bill has been very carefully thought out. It provides a plan for constructing an interstate system of roads in the United States which was laid out in 1947, and it also provides a method of financing without requiring additional revenue.

As I stated last Friday, the chairman of the subcommittee held very exhaustive hearings. They lasted for many days. Everyone who desired to be heard was given an opportunity. I have already mentioned to the distinguished Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], an outline which I made for my own use. I penciled it and placed under the head of "Financing," which is the important thing in connection with anything we do in the United States, the method by which this great system of roads could be financed:

(A) From taxes on gasoline and other commodities used in the operation of motor vehicles;

(B) Tolls on the interstate system;

(C) Charge trucks, buses, and automobiles a license fee for traveling on the interstate system of roads;

(D) Bonds, as provided for in the so-called administration bill.

There must also be considered rates of speed, weights, rights-of-way, and limited access. In the pending bill the determination of questions of this kind is retained by the States. Personally, I have always felt that the matters relating to weights and speeds should be handled locally.

On the subject of construction, the question of having the facilities with which to build the roads arises. We went into that question very thoroughly. We considered whether we have an adequate number of engineers to prepare the plans; whether there is available in our country sufficient road machinery and other materials to carry out this great program; whether we have adequate contracting facilities and men possessing the know-how to build the number of roads desired.

On this matter the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee heard several witnesses, and I think we have all concluded that we do have a sufficient number of skilled engineers to lay out the roads and that we have the road machinery and the necessary facilities, or we can have them in sufficient quantity in perhaps a year.

In the case of materials the situation is a little different. It will probably take 2 years before we have an adequate supply of cement to build the number of miles of roads contemplated. Procurement of the required amount of gravel is probably the most serious thing confronting us. But we are informed, and I believe—and I think the distinguished Senator from Tennessee will agree with me—that we have sufficient engineers, sufficient building organizations, and sufficient machinery to enable this road program to go forward at full speed in a period of not exceeding 2 years.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Pennsylvania yield?

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. I shall be glad to yield to the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. GORE. I agree that the suppliers and contracting organizations gave the committee satisfactory information which indicated that a vigorous highway construction program could be inaugurated soon. I believe the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania will recall that the president of the Highway Constructors Association testified that within a year they would have sufficient facilities to double the present rate of highway construction and reconstruction, but that it would probably be from 3 to 4 years before they could double it again. This played a part, as I believe the Senator will recall, in the decision reached by the committee to place in the bill a provision for a progressive stepping up of the program until in the fourth year a level would be reached which ordinarily might have required 10 years.

The same principle of acceleration of the program is contained in the Clay report and is inherent in the amendment in the nature of a substitute, which the Senator from Pennsylvania has offered.

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. I agree with the distinguished Senator. I think what he has stated is correct. We had before the committee persons who had an excellent knowledge of what can be done relative to the construction of highways as from the standpoint of machinery, engineering, and materials. They were perhaps the best informed

witnesses who could be secured in the entire United States, and I think the country owes a great debt to that group of men who, at their own expense, made such an exhaustive study for the benefit of our committee.

Mr. GORE. I agree with the Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. I thank the Senator from Tennessee.

The fourth point I have listed in my own outline as to what we should know before reporting a bill is this: Are the States in a situation to be able to match the Federal Government in the accelerated program? Probably it will be necessary to resort to considerable discussion in order to answer the last question in the affirmative. I think the States will be able to meet their requirements, but that is a matter which I shall leave for discussion a little later.

Improved roads have been built in the United States during the past 50 years. I think the first improved country road was built in my own State in about 1902. Much experimentation was necessary in order to determine the type of road that would stand up under the travel conditions to which our highways are subjected. It has been essential continually to strengthen the roads. It has been of great importance to obtain better drainage. It has been necessary to build roads having fewer curves. Those have been progressive developments.

The construction of roads to any great extent in the country areas was not begun until the early 1930's.

As I recall, the first gasoline tax was levied by Oregon in 1919. Now every State levies a gasoline tax for the purpose of building roads. Twenty-five States now have constitutional limitations requiring that all gasoline taxes be used for roadbuilding. I think such a constitutional provision is now pending in another State or two. This shows the tendency toward paying for road construction in the United States.

The hearings before the subcommittee showed, without a peradventure of doubt, that more improved roads are needed. Unless some plan such as that suggested by the Clay Committee or the administration shall be adopted, modern roads will not be constructed.

We have been working on this problem for almost a half century. It is frequently impossible to leave one State and enter another on an improved, continuous direct highway. It is true that U. S. Route 40, U. S. Route 30, and possibly U. S. Route 6 have been very well developed throughout the country; but generally speaking one is never quite certain, when he starts on a highway, what the condition of the road will be in an adjoining State.

I first became greatly interested in an improved highway system for the United States while I was engaged in transporting soldiers over the Nation. My last job of handling troops was in early 1941. At that time General Marshall asked if I would undertake the responsibility of moving 18,000 soldiers by motor vehicles some 1,600 miles from the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania to the State of Louisiana.

I was amazed—yes; I was shocked—at the poor condition of our roads. It was necessary for me to send engineers ahead to repair bridges and to remove short curves. We were not handling any heavy material; we were attempting to carry only light material.

I have also had experience with the maneuvering of soldiers in many of the States, especially in practically all the Southern States, including Texas. I have also done similar work in Ohio and New York and throughout New England.

Mr. President, the roads of the United States need to be improved. A system is needed which will eventually connect the large centers of population. The roads to be provided under the administration bill, or the amendment in the nature of a substitute, which I am now discussing, would connect 42 of the 48 State capitals. They would connect 90 percent of all municipalities having a population of 50,000 or more.

As to financing such a program, the people of the United States are becoming very much worried about taxation for roadbuilding. I hold in my hand an editorial entitled "Nobody Sells Roads," published a few days ago in the Washington (Pa.) Observer. The editorial comments that almost everyone is selling automobiles and accessories, but that it is necessary to build roads if the present large output of motor vehicles is to be continued. The editorial states that probably many persons who are now selling automobiles should be selling the plan of extending our road system. I feel the editorial is so pertinent that I ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

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

NOBODY SELLS ROADS

Automobiles are selling like hotcakes this year. That's an understatement. It's a lucky pancake flipper whose hotcakes are selling like automobiles.

Through April of last year, 2.1 million 1954 model cars were sold to the public. Through April this year 3.4 million 1955 models found owners. That's an increase of 62 percent in a single year.

Despite this tremendous record, there were more new cars in the hands of dealers at the end of April—679,000—than at any previous time in history. But the industry isn't worried. It has proved that it can sell, and it is finding that more and more families can be persuaded to own more than one car.

But another problem continues to grow. As people buy more and more cars, what are they going to do with them? More homes are being built with two-car garages, but nobody buys cars to keep in a garage. They aren't worth much to their proud owners unless they can be driven—and parked.

And that's where the squeeze is. City traffic is getting worse and worse everywhere. Municipal officials struggle with the problem of parking facilities. But these plans move in low gear while car salesmen swing into high and tromp on the accelerator.

Of course, a driver can leave the city behind and get out on the open road. Haw. Traffic is almost as heavy on main highways as in cities, and every car sold makes the problem more acute. Is the answer to draft some of the Nation's auto salesmen and put them to work selling highways?

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, the Pittsburgh Press, a newspaper of very large circulation, also dealt recently with the tax situation in Pennsylvania. I call particularly to the attention of the Senate the criticism by the newspaper of the proposal to increase the gasoline tax in Pennsylvania in order to take care of the roads. The editorial states that the motorist already is paying up to 8 cents a gallon in many States, which is as much as should be expected from the traveling public. The editorial, to my mind, is so pertinent that I ask unanimous consent to have it 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:

Mr. Leader wants to add another $99 million to the taxes on motorists. He wants another penny added to the 5 cents a gallon tax on gasoline. (With the Federal tax of 2 cents, that would make a total tax of 8 cents a gallon.) He also wants the license fee for passenger autos increased from $10 to $15 and truck license fees increased by $18 million.

Mr. Leader sprung this program in a hit-and-run manner in his budget message, with a scant reference to the need for improved highways and a promise to explain in detail later.

The taxpayers already stand to put up a total of $494 million in highway funds under existing legislation. That, however, isn't enough for Mr. Leader's program.

Pennsylvania now boasts of the world's greatest highway system, totaling 40,000 miles. We have accomplished that without the extra $99 million Mr. Leader wants. We also pioneered the spreading toll turnpike system, which takes much heavy traffic off State highways, with the user paying for the turnpikes.

Of course, the State highway system needs constant repair, maintenance and improvement. But does it need another $99 million on top of $494 million?

The auto long ago ceased to be a pleasure vehicle. It's now a tool, used by employed people to get to their jobs. Another penny added to the tax on gasoline is just another tax on employment, in the same class as an increase in trolley or bus fares.

As for the $5 increase in motor vehicle registration fees, it's simply a head tax on Pennsylvania's 3,500,000 motorists and truck and bus owners, in the same class as the per capita tax collected by many communities.

Mr. Leader should explain, and soon, why he thinks Pennsylvania motorists should pay these additional taxes, on top of the taxes they now pay. The motorists have demonstrated that they'll stand for fair taxes which give them value in return for what they pay, but they're not apt to look kindly on any attempt to add unnecessary burdens to their tax bills.

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. The question of financing the road program is so important that I feel I should say something about it at this time. The Clay committee, whose recommendations are embodied in the administration bill, suggested the issuance of bonds, to extend for not exceeding 30 years, and to be issued by a corporation to be known as the Highway Corporation.

The bonds would be supported by the gasoline tax collected by the United States in excess of $622,500,000. That amount, Mr. President, would take care of the present appropriations for secondary, primary, and urban roads in con-

nection with which the States match the funds provided by the Federal Government. This plan would not require any additional taxes. The tax now levied would take care of those bonds in 30 years. The roads would be constructed in 10 years and would be built in accordance with specifications which would insure that they would be good 20 years from now.

Mr. President, the question of interest charges has been brought up. It has been stated that under the Clay committee or administration plan the interest charge would be $11 billion. Under the pending bill, for which I am proposing the substitute, there is no way of calculating how much the interest charge would be, because there would be deficit financing from the beginning. Furthermore, if that plan were put into effect, only 30 percent of the interstate system would be completed. It encompasses only a 5-year period.

In the bill I am proposing all the interest would be taken care of, as well as all the costs of the roads, in 30 years. The other plan is entirely indefinite.

Many citizens in private life, as well as Members of the Senate, have stated that my proposal is not a good plan; that it is not legal. Mr. President, the Attorney General of the United States has stated, and until he is overruled his opinion should be controlling, that this is a legal method, and that these bonds would not come within the category of bonds that have the full faith and authority of the United States. The operation would be similar to that of negotiating a loan at a bank. A man goes to his banker and says, "I want to borrow so much money, and I will pay for it in the following manner." He has certain income to take care of it, and the loan is made.

That is a sound procedure. It is one being followed hundreds and thousands of times every day in the year in various communities throughout the country. It is a sound financial plan if income is available to take care of the payments.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HRUSKA in the chair). Does the Senator from Pennsylvania yield to the Senator from Louisiana?

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. I am glad to yield.

Mr. LONG. In paying off the bonds, is not the money to come from Federal revenues obtained from taxes collected by the Federal Government?

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. That is correct.

Mr. LONG. If we are to pay off the bonds by Federal tax receipts, would we get a lower interest rate if we borrowed through a corporation, or would we get a lower interest rate if we borrowed directly on the credit of the United States Government?

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, the Secretary of the Treasury thinks the bonds of the corporation would be salable at a slightly higher rate of interest than would be the case if the bonds were a direct obligation of the United States. I might say to the distinguished junior Senator from Louisiana that throughout the Nation, in the case of bond issues by what we call general State authorities or municipal authorities the interest rate is just a little bit higher.

Mr. LONG. Does the Senator see any prospect whatever that any set of circumstances could occur whereby the taxpayers of the United States or the Government of the United States could escape the liability of paying off these bonds?

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, it is unnecessary to worry about that, because there will be revenue to take care of the bonds as they become due. I might say to the distinguished Senator that if receipts from gasoline taxes continue to increase as they have been increasing, we would be able to liquidate the bonds much before the end of the 30-year period.

In various places local authorities have issued bonds in order to construct toll turnpikes and toll bridges. I would say 90 percent of them are exceeding the engineers' estimates as to how long it would take to liquidate the bonds.

Mr. LONG. If the Senator will yield further, I should like to comment that I know that in the State which I have the honor to represent, the State of Louisiana, a bridge is being built under an authority, and the State of Louisiana does not assume the liability of paying for that bridge. If the bridge proves not to be a paying proposition, it will simply be a bad break for the people who financed it. That occurred with respect to a bridge across Lake Pontchartrain. The people who financed that bridge lost a great amount of money, because the bridge did not prove to be a paying proposition. Over a certain period of time the owners could not meet the tax liability on the bridge, much less pay off the bonds. However, the State of Louisiana does have the authority to build bridges within the framework of its constitution. The State has not operated under that authority so far as the bridge at New Orleans is concerned. That is a separate authority. However, within the framework of the State constitution, the State earmarks revenues for certain purposes, and the taxes are used for that purpose.

As I understand, the Federal Government cannot earmark its funds for such a project. One Congress cannot bind a future Congress. Does the Senator feel we can earmark funds for the bonds of a corporation when the bonds do have back of them the full faith and credit of the Federal Government?

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. In reply, I may suggest to the Senator that we have provided pensions for certain types of soldiers, and then each Congress has made appropriations for the pensions. So far as I have known, no Congress has ever failed to make an appropriation for that purpose.

Mr. LONG. We do not, however, create a special corporation to pay the pensions; they are a direct obligation of the Federal Government.

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. In the proposal we would use gasoline revenues above $622,500,000. I think there is no question that the Congress could refuse to make the appropriation, but it would be the first time in the history of our country such a thing had ever been done.

Mr. LONG. Inasmuch as the Government expects to pay off the bonds, anyway, a lower interest rate could be obtained by making them a direct obligation of the United States Government. Inasmuch as no businessman would buy the bonds unless he felt sure they were going to be paid for, why should we not provide directly for a loan as is done in the case of veterans' pensions. In that case the Government pays the loan and pays the interest. We could then say, "On the full faith and credit of this Government, we will assure you that these obligations will be paid."

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. In reply to the distinguished Senator from Louisiana, I may say that what we are anxious to do is to get the bonds paid off. I am afraid if we were to use the plan the Senator is urging, we would have no commitment to take care of them. As a result, the obligations might run on for 2 or 3 generations.

In 1926, I was asked to make a speech on a suggested model gasoline tax law, because then the States were rather generally beginning to collect gasoline taxes. We began with the premise that an ideal tax would be one from which the taxpayer would receive the advantage; and the consensus of opinon was that the gasoline tax was in that category if the revenue from the tax would be used for the building of roads.

There does not seem to be a great deal of opposition over the Nation—even though at this time gasoline taxes are very high—so long as the taxpayer receives the advantage in the form of better roads.

Until 1954, the Congress did not appropriate sufficient funds for roads to use all the gasoline tax. The distinguished Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE] was on the committee when we tried to have Congress appropriate approximately what the Federal Government would collect from the gasoline tax; and that arrangement has been very satisfactory generally. The State highway departments of the various States and the traveling public have been very much pleased. Personally, I have received many commendatory letters and messages, and probably the Senator from Tennessee has also, because there is general satisfaction over the use of the gasoline tax for that purpose.

All we are contemplating in this case is to use the gasoline tax in that way.

Mr. LONG. I am not opposed to dedicating the gasoline tax revenues to road purposes, and that is done in my State. So I have no objection to having it done in this case. However, it is argued that under the Constitution that is not possible and cannot be done by the Federal Government. I can imagine no more deplorable a situation than one in which our great Government, representing the richest Nation in the world, would find itself in such a circumstance that it would default on these bonds and would refuse to appropriate sufficient funds for the use of the Federal Highway Corporation to enable it to meet the payments on the bonds.

In view of the fact that we propose to see to it that the bonds are paid off anyway, and in view of the further fact that certainly the Government of the United States will have a moral obligation to see to it that the bonds are paid off, why not have the Government assume the legal obligation to pay them off, and thus be able to obtain a lower interest rate?

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. The Secretary of the Treasury testified before our committee that the difference in interest rates would be very small, amounting to only a fraction. Furthermore, this plan provides for the completion of the almost 40,000 miles of road. As I stated before the Senator from Louisiana entered the Chamber, under the plan the interstate roads will connect 42 of the 48 State capitals, and will connect 90 percent of the communities of 50,000 or more persons. In addition, the plan will absolutely finance the construction.

Mr. LONG. I do not see in the bill anything which will finance the construction. The only thing which will finance it will be the anticipation that the Congress will appropriate sufficient funds to meet the payments on the bonds. That is my understanding of the proposal.

The Senator from Pennsylvania feels that the revenue from oil, gasoline, and other taxes on automobiles would be adequate, so that Congress would not need to make appropriations for this purpose. But it is not possible to earmark the money or to write into a bill language which will undertake to guarantee that Congress will appropriate sufficient funds from year to year.

Let me ask the Senator from Pennsylvania whether I am mistaken, and whether such language appears in the amendment.

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. The amendment merely states that the amount of the gasoline tax above $622,500,000 a year shall be used for the purpose of paying the interest and liquidating these bonds.

Mr. LONG. Would that require an annual appropriation?

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. It would require an annual appropriation; and I may say it requires an annual appropriation to pay the interest on the direct obligations of the United States Government. That happens every year.

Mr. LONG. What I am trying to understand is the purpose of having a separate corporation to assume the liability. In a State such as Louisiana, if an authority is established to construct a project, such as a bridge across the Mississippi River, in the heart of New Orleans—a project presently being undertaken—that agency is set up in order that the State may escape the legal liability of paying for the bridge, in the event the bridge is not a sound project; and therefore, such an arrangement perhaps calls for a higher interest rate than the one the State itself would have to pay.

But as I understand, in this case there is no suggestion or proposal by anyone that the Federal Government would escape the legal liability of paying off the bonds. In other words, if the revenue were not adequate to pay for the highways, I am sure the Senator from Pennsylvania himself would be among the first to insist that the Congress appropriate sufficient funds to pay off the bonds. Certainly I would take that position; and I am sure that the Senator from Pennsylvania, fairminded man that he is, would also insist that the Congress appropriate sufficient funds to take care of the bonds, if the revenue were not adequate. Is that not correct?

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. Yes; and I think Congress would make such an appropriation.

But, Mr. President, unless there is to be a complete change in transportation methods in the Nation, the bonds will be paid off in less than 30 years. As I said a moment ago, the States have been collecting the gasoline tax. Oregon began collecting a gasoline tax in 1919, and among the other States the collections from the tax have gradually increased every year.

So I see no reason why the revenue from the tax will not continue to increase for the next 30 years. Some change may occur in transportation methods; for instance, perhaps the time will come when all of us will travel by air. But that is not in the foreseeable future.

Mr. LONG. But my point is that if everyone agrees that the bonds must be paid and that the United States Government should see to it that the bonds are made good, and if there is no intention of having the Federal Government evade the responsibility of paying off the bonds, why not put the full faith and credit of the Government of the United States behind the bonds, and thereby make it possible to obtain for the taxpayers a saving of interest, by means of a lower interest rate?

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. I think that unquestionably the interest rate would then be lower. But what I am submitting is a plan which will make it possible to complete approximately 40,000 miles of road in 10 years, and at the same time will provide a method for the liquidation of the bonds. All of that is in one package, so to speak.

I have advocated extension of our roads, and so has the Senator from Louisiana; all of us have. Now we have a plan by which it will be possible to do the job. I am afraid that if we continue to proceed in a piecemeal manner, it will be many years before it will be possible to complete the job everywhere in the Nation and connect the States as they should be connected from the standpoint of industry and from the standpoint of both military defense and civil defense. We need to have the system completed; and this plan is one for doing so.

Mr. LONG. The point I had in mind is that only a very small and minor modification of the plan would be required, in order to put the full faith and credit of the Government of the United States behind the bonds and behind the funds which will be used for the building of the highways. If that were done, there would be a major saving in money.

So I am curious to know why there should be objection to modifying the plan in such a way as to result, over a period of years, in a lower interest rate and in substantial savings to the taxpayers. Would the Senator have any objection to such modification of the plan, so as to make the bonds full-faith-and-credit bonds?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, if the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania and my friend from Louisiana will indulge me, I should like to submit a proposed unanimous-consent agreement, so that Senators may know approximately the time when amendments will be voted upon.

On behalf of the distinguished minority leader and myself, I send to the desk a proposed unanimous-consent agreement and ask that it be read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ALLOTT in the chair). The proposed unanimous-consent agreement will be read for the information of the Senate.

The proposed unanimous-consent agreement was read by the legislative clerk, as follows:

Ordered, That after the conclusion of routine morning business on Wednesday, May 25, 1955, further consideration of the bill S. 1048, the Federal Aid Highway Act of 1955, shall be proceeded with under the following limitations:

(a) Except as to a substitute for the bill or a motion to lay on the table, debate on any amendment, motion, or appeal shall be limited to 2 hours, to be equally divided and controlled, respectively, by the mover of any such amendment or motion and the majority leader: *Provided, however*, That if the majority leader is in favor of any such amendment or motion, the time in opposition thereto shall be controlled by the minority leader or some Senator designated by him.

(b) On any substitute amendment for the bill, debate shall be limited to 3 hours, to be equally divided and controlled as above indicated.

(c) No amendment that is not germane to the provisions of the bill or a substitute therefor shall be received.

(d) On the question of the final passage of the bill, debate shall be limited to 2 hours, to be equally divided and controlled as above indicated.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, in explanation of the proposed agreement, I may say that I have agreed with the distinguished minority leader that the Senate will meet at 10 o'clock a. m. on Wednesday. It is our hope that the Senate may remain in session on that day until consideration of the bill is completed. We do not expect any committees to meet during the time the bill is being considered or voted upon.

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I think our mutual understanding is that the distinguished majority leader is prepared to hold the Senate in session today as long as there are any speeches to be made. Tomorrow afternoon, upon completion of disposition of the veto of the postal pay bill, time will be available for further discussion of the pending bill.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. The Senator from Texas has previously so stated.

Mr. President, may we have action on the proposed unanimous-consent agreement?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the proposed unanimous-consent agreement?

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I do not know whether such a narrow interpretation would be placed upon the word "germane" in connection with the pending bill as was insisted upon during the debate on the last tax bill. I do not know whether the interpretation to be placed upon the word "germane" would preclude the junior Senator from Louisiana from offering any amendment he might contemplate offering to the pending bill. I do not have in mind offering an amendment to provide statehood for Alaska or Hawaii, or an amendment in the nature of a civil rights bill, or anything of that sort. However, I am somewhat fearful of agreeing to the proposed unanimous-consent agreement until I have had an opportunity to think through whatever amendments I may wish to offer.

I wonder if the majority leader can assure us that any amendment which has to do exclusively with constructing highways or financing highways, and which in no wise raises extraneous issues such as those involved in various controversial bills which are brought to the floor from time to time, and which provoke very bitter sectional issues, would be considered as germane.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. The only assurance I can give the Senator is my own assurance. As the Senator knows, the decision as to whether or not an amendment is germane rests finally with the Senate itself.

I will say to the Senator that the intent of the authors of the proposed unanimous-consent agreement was as the Senator has indicated. The intent was to preclude consideration by the Senate only of amendments on some other subject. I assume that the Parliamentarian and the Presiding Officer could indicate to the Senator from Louisiana what amendments would be in order under the germaneness provision of the proposed agreement.

I have the problem of trying to accommodate 96 Senators, on both sides of the aisle. It is certainly not our object to preclude any Senator from offering any amendment which is pertinent to the bill. On the other hand, as the Senator from Louisiana well knows, at times some of our own colleagues have been extremely insistent that every unanimous-consent agreement include the so-called germaneness provision. The distinguished Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] has often insisted upon it.

While I do not know, and cannot envision, what the Senator's amendment might be I believe that if it went to the merits of the bill, certainly the Senator would not be precluded from offering it and having it considered. It is not the intent of the authors of the proposed unanimous-consent agreement to preclude anything except extraneous amendments. I believe the Senator from Louisiana is skillful enough to draft an amendment which would express his views, and which would at the same time be germane.

Mr. LONG. Would any amendment which has to do with the apportionment of funds, or with the quantum of funds in which a State would be entitled to participate, or an amendment which might have to do with the qualifications of the Federal Highway Corporation, be germane?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I think it would be germane.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will state that it would be impossible for the Chair to rule on amendments until they have been actually offered and are before the Senate for consideration.

Is there objection to the proposed unanimous-consent request propounded by the Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON]?

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, trusting our distinguished majority leader to protect my rights, and trusting the Chair not to place such a strict interpretation upon the word "germane" that a truly germane amendment could not be offered, I will not object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the proposed unanimous-consent agreement? The Chair hears none, and the request is agreed to.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN] a question.

If the credit of this Government is to be placed behind the proposed program, why should we not go ahead and issue full-faith-and-credit bonds, and obtain a lower interest rate?

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. The program of completing the interstate system is really the trunk of the tree. The other systems are branches. They are most important, but, as I stated a few moments ago, industrially, and from a military and civil defense standpoint, we need to complete the interstate system. If the financial arrangement referred to by the Senator could be placed in operation, I would have no particular objection. However, I am interested in getting the plan underway, so that we may know that the program will be completed. That would be fair to every State in the Union, and it would greatly strengthen our country from an industrial standpoint. It would also make us very much safer from a military and civilian defense standpoint.

Mr. LONG. If the money were to be borrowed from the Secretary of the Treasury rather than from the general public by the Federal Highway Corporation, of course, a lower interest rate could of obtained; could it not?

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. There can be no question about that, although in Pennsylvania the difference is very small. In Pennsylvania, we have what is called a general State authority, which constructs school buildings, hospitals, and some roads. The interest rate is very little different from the rate involved in the direct plan, in which the full faith and credit of the State is behind the operation.

Mr. LONG. But even a fraction of 1 percent interest, when applied against a $20 billion operation extended over a 30-year period, can amount to a large sum.

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. That is a sound approach. I appreciate very much this discussion of the question. I believe that all such questions should be thoroughly discussed. Although I am fully in accord with the unanimous-consent agreement which has just been entered into, I realize that we shall have to move a little more rapidly. We must make our speeches a little more compact, in order to get our thoughts into the RECORD.

I appreciate very much what the Senator from Louisiana has said. All my life I have been an advocate of a pay-as-you-go type of government. Under the proposed arrangement we would pay as we use. The gasoline tax would be paid in, and then used by the Federal Government and by the various States to complete this highway system.

Mr. President, the administration bill will complete the interstate system, which, as was indicated in the colloquy between the Senator from Louisiana and myself, and as we agreed, is the trunk of the tree. The branches of the tree are the primary, secondary, and urban systems. They are all important, but I think the most important consideration is to get the plan started. In my own State of Pennsylvania we went along for many years without getting direct roads to certain places. Therefore we tried the plan of connecting up county seats. It is now 25 years since access by means of a good road has been provided to every county seat. Then lateral roads were constructed, and we now have 40,000 miles of roads, which include what we call the farm-to-market roads.

Mr. President, I do not wish to take too much time of the Senate. As I understand from the unanimous-consent agreement which has been entered into, we will be able to discuss the bill today and then vote on it on Wednesday.

Mr. GORE. The plan is to finish consideration of the bill on Wednesday.

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. In fairness to my colleagues, I feel that I should yield the floor at this time. I shall wish to speak later, but I believe the time should be distributed.

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

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. I yield very gladly.

Mr. GORE. In colloquy with the Senator from Louisiana the Senator from Pennsylvania said that the retirement of the bonds would depend upon an annual appropriation. Will the Senator refer to page 8, section 105 (b) of the substitute? I read as follows:

> (b) There are hereby appropriated and there shall be paid by the Secretary of the Treasury to the Corporation for the fiscal year 1957, and for each fiscal year thereafter in which there are outstanding unmatured obligations of the Corporation, out of any moneys in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated.

And so forth.

What I desire to point out to the Senator from Pennsylvania—and I am sure he wants to have the record as clear as we can possibly make it—is that the language which I have read is an appropriation not only on an annual basis but for each fiscal year for so long as the corporation may have an unmatured,

outstanding obligation. Does the Senator agree with that statement?

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. Would not the Senator consider it an authorization for an appropriation?

Mr. GORE. No; I would not so consider it. It says: "There are hereby appropriated."

It cannot be an authorization. It is an outright appropriation of an indefinite amount for an indefinite period of time.

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. It is an amount, as was brought out in my colloquy with the junior Senator from Louisiana, which is "equal to the revenue in excess of $622,500,000 collected during each fiscal year, as shown by the official accounts of the Directors of Internal Revenue, from the taxes—including interest, penalties, and additions to taxes—imposed by sections 4081 and 4041 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 on gasoline and special fuels, upon certification by the Board and the Secretary of the Treasury as necessary to finance this program." It is any amount derived from the 2-cent tax above the $622,500,000, as I understand.

Mr. GORE. In other words, this section of the substitute would appropriate all the funds from all the revenue realized from the fuel and lubricating oil taxes. Is that correct?

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. I believe that is correct.

Mr. GORE. All the funds in excess of $622,500,000 a year——

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. As may be necessary to finance the program.

Mr. GORE. I do not find that language.

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. It is on page 9, lines 5 and 6.

Mr. GORE. Yes. There is a little transitional language at that point.

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. That is correct.

Mr. GORE. In other words, the Senator will agree, will he not, that not only would the retirement of the bonds depend upon appropriations made by Congress, but the substitute amendment does in effect constitute an appropriation for such time as there might be an outstanding, unmatured obligation of the corporation. Is that correct?

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. It could be interpreted in that way. That would certainly make the bonds even more secure.

Mr. GORE. If that be true—and I think there is no question that this is an appropriation bill—a certain amount of money would be going out of the Treasury. There are outstanding and in the hands of the people all over the country United States Government bonds. Also outstanding would be the bonds of this corporation. Therefore, what the Senator from Pennsylvania says, in effect, is that we would give priority to the bonds of the corporation, and that out of the funds within the Treasury first priority would be given to the retirement of the corporation bonds. If there is not sufficient money with which to retire the United States Government bonds which matured during the same period, the outstanding bonds of the corporation would be given priority and the Government bonds would have to be extended. In other words, if there is sufficient money in the Treasury only to retire a certain amount in bonds, priority would be given to the corporation bonds, and the bonds of the United States Government, which are direct obligations, and behind which is pledged the full faith of the United States Government, as the junior Senator from Louisiana has stated would be placed in a secondary position. Is that correct?

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. At the present time, as the distinguished Senator from Tennessee knows, we are appropriating approximately all the tax money collected from gasoline taxes and lubricating oil taxes for the purpose of building roads. This proposal simply provides a definite plan for so much roadbuilding every year during 10 years until the interstate system is completed. From the way we are appropriating money now, I do not see that it makes any difference in the security of the obligations having the full credit of the United States Government, because we are already appropriating the taxes received from gasoline and lubricating oils for roadbuilding purposes.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Pennsylvania yield further?

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. I yield.

Mr. GORE. The point I am trying to make is that it is sought to do two things with these corporation bonds: First, to give them priority over United States Government bonds, and, second, to pay a higher rate of interest. I find myself in agreement with the junior Senator from Louisiana, that if the Government must borrow the money with which to build a national system of highways adequate to our national needs, then the taxpayers should have the benefit of the lowest possible rate of interest and not be burdened with an unnecessarily high rate of interest.

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, if the bankers go into this proposition and come to the same conclusion to which the distinguished junior Senator from Tennessee comes, probably these bonds will collect a lesser rate of interest than will the bonds which have the full faith and credit of the United States. There is that possibility.

Mr. GORE. But the highest fiscal authority of the Government, namely, Secretary of the Treasury Humphrey, estimated that the bonds would sell at a rate of interest from, I believe he said, one-quarter to one-half a percent higher than United States Government bonds.

Mr. President, if the Senator from Pennsylvania will yield further, there is one other point I have not been quite able to understand, namely, why the proponents of Senate bill 1160 feel that the revenue from the motor fuels tax will pay for the good roads which might be built under S. 1160, but would not pay for the good roads which might be built under S. 1048.

It seems to me that if we build a fine system of modern highways there will be more travel, more use of the highways, greater consumption of gasoline and oil, and more revenue coming into the Treasury. That will be true whether the roads are built under the terms of Senate bill 1048, Senate bill 1160, or some other bill. Is not that a correct statement?

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, the administration bill will complete the interstate system. It will be done in one act of Congress. We have been working on this problem for a long time. This is my ninth year as a Member of the Senate, and the Senator from Tennessee has been in the House and the Senate considerably longer than that, but we have not yet formulated a plan for completing the entire interstate system, which involves the important roads from the national standpoint. To my mind, the strong feature of the administration bill is that it provides a plan for completing the roads and for financing their construction. The roads will be completed in 10 years for a need of 20 years from now, and they will be paid for in 30 years.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Pennsylvania yield further?

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. I yield.

Mr. GORE. Will not the Senator agree that the rate of expenditure on Federal highways provided by these two bills within the first 5-year period is roughly comparable?

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, that is correct; but that is my objection to the bill which the Senator has introduced. I think the time has come when we want to proceed with a plan which will complete the entire job.

Mr. GORE. According to the terms of S. 1048 in which the legislative intent is declared, and by the terms of the report accompanying the bill, the Congress is declaring that this is a program not only to complete the interstate highway system, but also to bring to a condition of adequacy all Federal-aid highways. That is one of the principal points of difference between the two bills, the committee bill and the substitute bill. The committee bill states as its policy—and it is inherent in the terms thereof and the funds made available therein—the construction and improvement of all Federal-aid highway systems to a condition of adequacy for the national defense and the national economy. The committee bill is regarded and termed as the first installment and the committee considered the question seriously.

I apologize to the Senator for transpassing on his time. I interrupted not out of discourtesy, but with respect and in the hope that by our colloquy we may assist Members in arriving at a conclusion.

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, I think it is very enlightening. The only regret I have is that there are not more Senators on the floor at this time, because aside from war activities, I consider this to be the largest undertaking in which the United States has ever engaged. In my opinion, it is absolutely necessary that we start on a plan

that will complete not only the interstate system but will bring up to standard the other roads of the United States.

Mr. GORE. I thank the Senator.

I started to say that the committee considered the proposition of making S. 1048 a 10-year bill. Several Members, including the junior Senator from Tennessee, suggested that they would have no serious objection to doing so. However, the committee finally concluded that it would be the better part of wisdom to have the program operate for 5 years. That would permit Congress to make a review and to consider the second installment. The program might require modification. Of course, Congress could modify even a 10-year program. But with the expiration of both the program and the authorization of the funds after 5 years, under S. 1048, it would be necessary for Congress to review the program.

If the Senator from Pennsylvania would be better pleased to have S. 1048 extended to a 10-year program, the Senate might find that suggestion agreeable.

It is the intention of those who have reported S. 1048 to the Senate as the recommendation of the committee that not only the interstate highways but also all Federal-aid highways shall be brought to a condition of adequacy.

That brings me to the big point of difference, to which I alluded earlier, namely, that every single dollar of expenditure which is proposed under S. 1160 would go exclusively to the interstate highways, which are important, but which carry only one-seventh of the traffic.

S. 1048, on the other hand, provides for additional Federal aid not only for the interstate highways but also for the primary and urban highways and for the farm-to-market roads.

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. In reply to the suggestion by the distinguished Senator from Tennessee, the administration's plan will leave to the States considerably more money than has ever before been contemplated to enable them to do work on the primary, secondary, and urban roads. I think I am the first one in Pennsylvania who advocated what are called farm-to-market roads, which have been very helpful to the State.

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

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. I yield.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SPARKMAN in the chair). Does the Senator from Pennsylvania yield for that purpose?

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. I gladly yield.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BIBLE in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the amendment in the nature of a substitute offered by the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN], for himself and other Senators.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I wish to make a very brief statement regarding my position on the highway program for the Nation. I am making the statement because I served as a member of the subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Public Works that reported S. 1048, which is the bill now before the Senate.

As is well known, Mr. President, I am only a new Member of the Senate, and I wish to comment very briefly upon my favorable reaction to the thorough and conscientious manner in which this bill was considered by all members of the committee. I was particularly impressed by the leadership of the distinguished Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], who is chairman of the Committee on Public Works, and with the leadership of the chairman of the subcommittee considering the bill, the junior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE]. I do not think there was a single witness anywhere in the country who wanted to be heard who did not have an opportunity to come before the committee, and that includes witnesses from my own State.

I was likewise favorably impressed by the conscientious interest of the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN], who has offered the substitute bill which is backed by the Eisenhower administration. I do not think I ever saw one espousing any cause who was more convinced of the righteousness of what he was doing than was the Senator from Pennsylvania.

The legislation to be enacted will affect every State in the Union. I think, however, all of us have to take a national interest in this program, as well as a regional or sectional interest. I believe I am taking a national interest when I say that the Gore bill, S. 1048, does far more justice and equity to the majority of the States of the Union than does the administration bill as advocated in the so-called Clay report.

I wish to outline some of the reasons for my conviction in this respect.

To begin with, the Clay report would concentrate so vast a proportion of additional highway revenues on the interstate system that rural and secondary road improvements would be virtually abandoned. This is especially important because the interstate system as now envisioned by engineers will have only limited access from roads which will be built across the country. In other words, if there are not available parallel roads—secondary roads, if you please—to serve the rural population, the people of rural areas are going to be unable to get their produce to market.

I received a letter from a constituent of mine in the agricultural area known as Milton-Freewater, Oreg., who asked if I could make it possible for him to purchase of surplus dirigible or helicopter by which he could get his produce to market if the plan recommended by the Clay report should be enacted. He went on to point out that the vast bulk of highway funds would be spent on the interstate highway system, and there would be no way for him to get the vegetables which he produces on his land to the nearest canning or marketing center.

Mr. President, I think the Gore bill, S. 1048, provides reasonable funds to finance the continuance of the rural road, urban road, and secondary road programs. On the other hand, under the plan proposed by the Clay report, these arteries would be largely neglected, because most of the available new revenues would go to the interstate system. The Clay report, for example, would freeze at existing levels, or less, all Federal aid to the secondary, urban and rural roads. I think such a policy would be inadvisable at this time.

Mr. President, I also am opposed to the plan embodied in the Clay report because of the great advantage which it gives to States which are able to support toll roads.

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

Mr. NEUBERGER. I yield.

Mr. GORE. I assume the distinguished Senator from Oregon has concluded his discussion of what he regards as a vital weakness of the administration bill in its failure to provide a balanced program. I should like to inquire of him if it is not true that the substitute offered by the distinguished senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN] actually provides $100 million less a year for urban highways than does the present law.

Mr. NEUBERGER. That is correct.

Mr. GORE. Is it not true that it does not provide a single dollar for expenditure on the farm-to-market roads and on the primary Federal roads?

Mr. NEUBERGER. That is correct; it simply leaves that to a catch-as-catch-can.

Mr. GORE. Did not the statistics presented to our committee show that if that program were carried through for 10 years, in some States the secondary roads would have only 10 percent of adequacy, 10 years from now?

Mr. NEUBERGER. That is correct. Moreover, many engineers admitted that in quite a number of States the secondary roads actually need improvement even more than does the interstate system, compelling though the needs of the interstate system may be.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield further to me?

Mr. NEUBERGER. I yield.

Mr. GORE. Did not the records also show that at the end of the proposed 10-year period, some categories of Federal-aid highways—very important systems—would be even more inadequate than they are at present?

Mr. NEUBERGER. That is correct; we had testimony to that effect from many persons.

Mr. GORE. In other words, at the present level of expenditure for primary roads, urban roads, and secondary roads, we are falling behind, instead of going ahead?

Mr. NEUBERGER. Obviously; we heard that from many people.

Mr. GORE. Then, if we adopt that system, if we freeze the Federal expenditures at that level, not only for 10 years, but for 30 years, does not the distinguished Senator from Oregon think we would be doing a great injury and a grave injustice to the roads and highways on which most of the people are dependent, both as regards travel and as regards earning their living?

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, it is quite obvious that what the distinguished Senator from Tennessee says is correct. If we followed the Clay report, I think it quite evident that most farmers may have to get their produce to market by using dog teams or rickshaws; and as the roads deteriorate, it seems to me—at least, insofar as I am able to judge, on the basis of my limited knowledge of the subject—that in many areas the rural roads will become inadequate and nearly worthless.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield further to me?

Mr. NEUBERGER. I yield.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, before asking the question, I wish to thank the able Senator from Oregon for his generous reference to the work I undertook to do on the bill.

Mr. NEUBERGER. I never saw a committee chairman or a subcommittee chairman who was more patient and more tireless.

Mr. GORE. I thank the Senator from Oregon very sincerely.

I wished to ask whether it is not a fact that the testimony before our subcommittee showed there was a definite limit on the amount of highway construction which could be inaugurated within the immediate future, because of the limitations on the supplies of building materials and on construction facilities?

Mr. NEUBERGER. Yes; I think we heard that stated very definitely. We even heard statements to the effect that there is a limitation on the amount of gravel available. For example, I remember that at one of the hearings we heard it said that only a certain amount of gravel is available and only a certain amount of construction machinery is now ready, and that new materials would become available only relatively slowly.

Mr. GORE. Did not the committee recommend the maximum amounts the committee thought could be wisely and economically spent during the period covered by the bill, without inflating the cost of highway construction to the point of making it impossible for the taxpayers to receive a proper return, in terms of roads constructed, for the dollars spent?

Mr. NEUBERGER. Yes; and I remember, as I know the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee does, that we voted to increase the amounts, particularly those for the interstate system; and we voted to do so to such an extent that we felt that they could not be increased further without doing great damage to the budget and without committing the roadbuilding industry to a goal which could not be attained. I believe we went to the very outer limits; and I think that even some of the minority members of the committee agreed we had done so. I believe they said so when we were discussing that point in the committee.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield further to me?

Mr. NEUBERGER. I yield.

Mr. GORE. Some point has been made of the fact that the committee bill would "require"—and I point out that in using that word, I use it with quotation marks around it—the States to raise larger matching funds than those which would be required under the provisions of Senate bill 1160.

As a matter of fact, neither bill requires any State to match any amount; is that not correct?

Mr. NEUBERGER. That is correct.

Mr. GORE. Is it not also true that under the committee bill, more Federal funds will be available for matching by the States, to improve the primary, urban, and farm-to-market roads?

Mr. NEUBERGER. That is correct.

Mr. GORE. The States are not required to accept and match these funds, are they?

Mr. NEUBERGER. No; the funds will simply be available, if the States wish to take advantage of the opportunity thus afforded.

Mr. GORE. Is it not one of the basic differences between the two bills that, whereas the committee bill seeks to continue to aid the States and to continue to provide Federal aid to bring the primary, urban, and farm-to-market highways to a proper condition, the other bill does not provide for such matching?

Mr. NEUBERGER. Yes. As I recall—and I hope the Senator from Tennessee will correct me if I am in error—the Gore bill provides that in the case of the rural and secondary roads, the existing matching formula of 50–50 shall be continued. I think that formula goes back to approximately 1912 or 1913, does it not?

Mr. GORE. Yes; the 50–50 matching formula will be continued, as in the present law.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Does not it go back to approximately 1912?

Mr. GORE. It goes back to 1916, I believe.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Then I stand corrected. I knew it went back a long way.

Under that formula, every State is assured its share of the revenue. Under that formula, no State can be discriminated against, regardless of its political complexion or regardless of how small in area, in population, or in the number of electoral votes it may be. Is not that correct?

Mr. GORE. Yes.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Yet—and again, Mr. President, if I am incorrect, I know the Senator from Tennessee will correct me—under the plan recommended by the Clay report there would be created a separate corporation or board. Of course we do not now know who the members of the corporation would be, but we do know that they would have vast authority in designating where the road money would be spent; and in the absence of any formula or standard for them to apply, it is quite possible that the members would be subjected to the most intense political pressure, with the result that many of the smaller States—those smaller in population, such as the State the Senator from Tennessee represents in part, and the State which I represent in part—might be discriminated against because they do not have as many electoral votes as do some of the States which have vast populations.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield further to me?

Mr. NEUBERGER. I yield.

Mr. GORE. The Senator from Oregon correctly states that the administration bill would abolish the apportionment formula for the interstate highways.

If the Senator from Oregon will examine the proposed substitute, he will find the following on the last page:

> Except that section 13 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1950 shall not be applicable to the interstate system, and for the purposes of section 12 of the Hayden-Cartwright Act, the allocations made under this act shall not be deemed an apportionment.

In other words, by the terms of Senate bill 1160, no State is assured of any particular amount or part of the allocations for the interstate system. I do not wish to have it inferred that it would be the intention of anyone to discriminate against a particular State. But it is quite erroneous to list, as the distinguished members of the minority have done on page 47 of the report, an apportionment to the States under S. 1160. The table on page 47 is not based upon any evidence which was supplied to the committee. It cannot possibly be based upon the bill which is now offered as a substitute. I do not know upon what it is based, but under S. 1160 no State would be assured of any particular part of the funds.

Mr. NEUBERGER. That is correct.

Mr. GORE. Whereas, under the committee bill, the apportionment formula which has been arrived at after years of trial and error and successful experience—the State highway departments and the Bureau of Public Roads cooperating to that end—would be continued, so that each State would know in advance the amount of funds which would be apportioned to it under the bill, should it become law.

Mr. NEUBERGER. That is correct; and the States could make ready for such apportionments through their legislatures, their budget departments, and their highway commissions, to see if they could provide the matching funds and go ahead and develop their road systems. But under S. 1160, which is now offered by the minority as a substitute for the committee bill, the States would have to go hat-in-hand to this nebulous corporation, to see how they would fare.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. NEUBERGER. I yield.

Mr. GORE. Is it not true that the $21 billion proposed would, under the terms of the substitute bill, be turned over to the Highway Corporation and to the Secretary of Commerce, and those authorities, in Washington, would have arbitrary power to decide where the

money should be spent, when it should be spent, how it should be spent, and in what amounts?

Mr. NEUBERGER. The Senator is eminently correct. Does it not strike the distinguished Senator from Tennessee as rather curious that members of the very minority party which makes such a fetish of States rights are taking the lead in abolishing the tried and tested formula under which the right of States to obtain their fair share of highway funds have been so carefully protected? In place of this tried and tested formula, they would establish no formula at all to protect the States, but would leave discretion entirely with the Federal Government; yet this proposal is initiated, promoted, and advocated by those who say they are zealous believers in States' rights.

The distinguished President of the United States, who, I believe, through the entire campaign several years ago, stressed the importance of returning these functions to the States, established the Clay Committee, which submitted a report that would destroy the matching formula, which has protected the States, and would leave the entire determination to a Federal corporation.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. NEUBERGER. I yield.

Mr. GORE. In the same table to which I have referred, on page 47 of the report, it is indicated that the States would necessarily provide more matching funds for the primary, secondary, and urban highways. However, it is not pointed out that under the administration bill all the expenditures on such roads above the present level would be left to the States, cities, and counties. The Congress is not advised by this table that under the committee bill the Federal Government would assist the States, in connection with those roads, to a greater extent than would be the case under the administration bill. Nor is it pointed out that under the administration bill the States, cities, and counties would bear 100 percent of the increased burden connected with such roads. Unless that burden were borne, those roads would be in worse condition next year, the year after, and 10 years from now, than they are now.

Mr. NEUBERGER. The Senator is certainly correct. Is it not quite strange that the very ones who shed such crocodile tears over the fact that the States would have to put up some matching funds under S. 1048 seem happily oblivious to the fact that under S. 1160 they would have to put up all the money to expand secondary roads? They seem to think it is worse for a State to be required to put up $50 million in matching funds than to put up $100 million which is not matched at all.

Mr. GORE. I find it quite strange.

Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. NEUBERGER. I yield.

Mr. GORE. I appreciate the indulgence of the Senator from Oregon. I should like to make one brief comment, and then I shall desist from further interrogation of the Senator. He is making an able address, and I do not wish to spoil it.

During the hearings, as chairman of the subcommittee, I sought to find out what funds would be apportioned to the respective States under the terms of S. 1160. No such official estimate was made. No such figures could be officially supplied, because the bill would specifically abolish the apportionment formula.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, let me say that the very excellent comments by the Senator from Tennessee have in no way spoiled my address, but have added to it very beneficially.

I remember that the able Senator from Tennessee tried to elicit this information. I believe he tried to elicit it from the Secretary of Commerce himself. However, he never did get a definite answer or any specific information, because, of course, there is nothing specific or definite about Senate bill 1160. The only thing definite and specific about Senate bill 1160 is that the American people would spend about $11 billion in interest, which would not pay for 1 inch of pavement or a single metal tube to go into a culvert.

So far as Senate bill 1160 is concerned, I repeat that it means that the great advocates of States' rights would turn over to a Federal board entire discretion in connection with building our highway system. I think that point cannot be overemphasized. The entire lexicon of the present national administration has stressed words which emphasize States rights. They talk about States rights again and again and again; and yet they bring forth a highway bill which would destroy States' rights, and leave the entire authority under a Federal corporation.

It seems to me that such a situation would inevitably redound to the disadvantage of States with smaller populations, and to the advantage of States with great metropolitan populations.

I wish also to thank the distinguished Senator from Tennessee for the comments which he made with respect to rural and secondary roads. Both he and I represent agricultural States. If Senate bill 1160 is passed, we shall leave the farmers—certainly after 10 years, 20 years, or 30 years—without any satisfactory means of getting their products to market.

I desire now to refer to the toll road situation, which is dealt with in the substitute, Senate bill 1160. This bill, which embodies the recommendations of the Clay Committee report, provides for special credits with respect to toll roads. I think such credits would amount to about $2,155,000,000. These credits would accrue to the States of Maine, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New York, Connecticut, Pennsylvania, Ohio, Indiana, Oklahoma, Kentucky, and Massachusetts for roads either completed or under construction.

Parenthetically, my State of Oregon would not share in these credits, and most of the other States of the Union would not share in them. My State cannot support a toll road under existing conditions. The State of Oregon has about twice the area of the State of New York, but the State of Oregon has about the population of the Borough of the Bronx in New York City, which is approximately 1,600,000. Under such a situation it is simply impossible for the State of Oregon to support economically a toll road. It does not have the density of population which the engineers and economists have worked out as being essential to maintaining economically a toll highway.

It seems to me that the minute we interject the situation of toll roads, we eliminate the bulk of the States of the Union from inclusion in the essential terms of the highway bill.

S. 1048 provides no such reimbursement for toll or free roads. Apportionment of Federal-aid highway funds would be made to the States on the basis of formulas established by existing law. The Federal-aid highway funds for the primary, secondary, and urban systems would be matched by the States 50–50, while the interstate funds would be matched on a 90-percent Federal, 10-percent State. Thus all States would be treated equitably and none favored. Established procedures and precedents would be followed. Work would be carried forward on all programs on a balanced basis, and no system would be neglected.

The Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1954 authorized $210 million for fiscal years 1956 and 1957 for apportionment to the States for work on the Federal-aid secondary highway system. As reported out by the Senate Committee on Public Works, S. 1048 provides for an increase in the amount for the secondary system to $300 million annually for fiscal years 1957 through 1961. It would be apportioned to the States on the same basis as heretofore. S. 1048 also includes provision for interchange of 20 percent of funds between systems, thus permitting more flexibility in the programs.

The Clay Committee, in its report to the President, recommended that the authorization for the secondary system be continued at the present rate, $210 million annually.

Again I emphasize—and I am drawing on the very helpful material supplied by the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE]—that if we do that, our secondary roads and our rural roads are bound to deteriorate.

The administration bill, S. 1160, would authorize appropriations for work on the National System of Interstate Highways only. These annual appropriations would consist of the revenues collected from motor fuel and oil taxes in excess of $622.5 million, which would be the same as amounts now spent on the regular systems, with even a reduction of $100 million in urban funds.

Enactment of S. 1160 would still necessitate enactment by the Congress of laws authorizing funds for expenditure on the secondary system, as well as for the primary and urban systems, forest highways, and other miscellaneous roads. These authorizations have been on a biennial basis in the past. Such enactment, by holding the $622.5 million Federal taxes, would tend to freeze the present regular programs at or less than their present authorizations, and would tend

to prevent future expansions of those programs.

S. 1160, the administration bill, also provides for credits to the States for free or toll roads located upon the Interstate System, provided they are believed to measure up to the interstate standards.

For the existing free and toll highways, the Secretary and the Corporation would issue rules and regulations to carry out the provisions of the law. He would determine the depreciated cost of the highway, in determining the credit to which the State is entitled. From the depreciated cost of a free highway, an amount equal to 10 percent of that cost and the total amount of any Federal-aid funds used in construction of the highway would be deducted.

For a toll road, the cost of financing it and the toll facilities not considered a part of the highway are excluded from the original cost of the highway. Credit is then allowed the States on the basis of age of highways, 40 percent if constructed prior to 1951, 70 percent if constructed between 1951 and 1955, and 10 percent deducted from the original cost if constructed subsequent to December 1955.

Any State for which a credit has been established for toll or free highways would be entitled to use such credit for construction of projects on the Federal-aid primary system if all Federal-aid highway funds apportioned to the State have been expended and all funds allocated under S. 1160 have been contracted. At its option, the State could use the credit established for toll highways for payment of any outstanding debt on such highway, which would then become a free public highway.

It would be possible under S. 1160 for a State to receive reimbursements in excess of the estimated needs for completion of the Federal-aid primary system in that State. The programs on systems in that State would then be out of balance. If the State did not exercise the option to pay off the toll-road bonds, it could use the funds received in credits for such roads on other highways in the State, and continue the tolls on the toll highway.

Many of those connected with the State highway department of my State, I believe, favor the financing methods recommended in the Clay report, and the recommendations of the Clay Committee are contained in S. 1160. For example, Mr. R. H. Baldock, the very able chief engineer of the Oregon Highway Department, testified before our committee that he favored the financing methods of the Clay report. Mr. Baldock, in my opinion, is the outstanding highway engineer in the Nation. Under his leadership, the State of Oregon has pioneered in many essential roadbuilding and highway developments. I am proud of Mr. Baldock, and many of my fellow citizens in Oregon are also proud of him.

However, I must disagree with Mr. Baldock when he endorses the financing arrangements provided in the Clay report. Under those arrangements, for each dollar spent on pavement, 55 cents would go to the banks in interest rates. In other words, this would not be a roadbuilding program; it would be a bankers' program.

The Clay report entails payment of $11,500,000,000 in interest to bankers in order to finance $20,200,000,000 worth of roads. Again I emphasize that each time we spend 1 dollar on asphalt or concrete or a bridge pier, we would spend 55 cents in interest charges to bankers.

I do not know whether Mr. Baldock realized that or not. He is an unusually well informed person, and it may well be that he fully understood the vast amount of interest which the American people would have to pay under the Clay report.

However, I wish to say this, Mr. President, that I do not blame Mr. Baldock, who is a highway engineer, and a very distinguished one, for favoring the financing method provided in the Clay report.

The Clay report would leave accelerated highway expenditures on the interstate system completely outside the Federal budget. In other words, about $31 billion would be spent on interstate highways, and this vast sum would not come within the scope of the Federal budget. I do not blame a highway official for favoring it, any more than I would blame school officials for favoring the expenditure of $31 billion on schools outside the budget.

Neither would I criticize a general of the Army for favoring $31 billion for the Department of Defense outside the budget.

However, the Members of the Senate and of the House of Representatives must take the national viewpoint on this subject. If we are to allow $31 billion to be spent on roads outside the Federal budget, what about other needs of the Government? Urgently needed though roads are, I would say that roads are not as important as schools or as the health of the Nation. If we are to spent $31 billion outside the budget on roads, how about a billion dollars for cancer research outside the budget? That is very important, too.

We all know, without being told, of the desperate situation regarding the construction of schools. I believe we are supposed to need approximately 370,000 new classrooms to take care of the vast number of children who are of school age or who are coming of school age. How about spending $5 billion or $10 billion for school construction outside the budget?

It seems to me that that is as much justified as spending money on roads outside the budget.

At the present time the whole Nation is concerned with the efficacy and with the orderly distribution of the Salk antipolio vaccine. Why should we not appropriate a huge sum of money for that humanitarian program outside the budget?

I daresay that far greater numbers of the American people believe that that is an urgent and compelling need than believe more roads are an urgent and compelling need of the Nation.

I should like to point out that once we violate our established procedures of budgeting Federal funds for the construction of roads, Congress will be under ever increasing pressure to do the same thing for public health, for schools, for national defense, and for many other absolutely imperative functions of the Government.

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

Mr. NEUBERGER. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. GEORGE. I understand that a unanimous-consent agreement limiting debate on the pending bill has been entered. I should like to ask the Senator what section 4 (a) on page 9 of the bill means. It reads:

SEC. 4. (a) In any case in which the Secretary is requested by any State to acquire any lands or interests in lands (including the control of access to any lands from adjoining lands and the exclusive right to advertise on lands adjoining and not exceeding five hundred feet from the right-of-way) required by such State for right-of-way or other purposes in connection with the prosecution of any project for the construction, reconstruction, or improvement of any section of the National System of Interstate Highways, the Secretary is authorized, in the name of the United States and prior to the approval of title by the Attorney General, to acquire, enter upon, and take possession of such lands or interests in lands by purchase, donation, condemnation or otherwise in accordance with the laws of the United States (including the act of February 26, 1931; 46 Stat. 1421), if—

I shall not read the remainder of the subsection.

I should like to ask the Senator from Oregon, in the first place, does that mean that 500 feet outside the right-of-way acquired is to be taken without compensation?

Mr. NEUBERGER. It is my understanding—and I would appreciate it if the distinguished Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], the chairman of the subcommittee, would corroborate me or correct me on this point—that the Bureau of Public Roads, when it acquires land on which the interstate system is to be built, may likewise buy the advertising rights within 500 feet of each side of the road.

Mr. GEORGE. Is the Bureau of Public Roads to acquire the rights?

Mr. NEUBERGER. When requested by the States to do so.

Mr. GEORGE. The initiative is with the States?

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield?

Mr. NEUBERGER. I yield.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, no authority is conferred by the terms of the bill with respect to the rights-of-way or realty rights except as the Federal Government may be requested by a particular State to act. I should like to point out to the able Senator from Georgia that there are a few States which do not have authority, constitutional or statutory, to acquire control of limited access right-of-way. The Bureau of Public Roads recommended that it was necessary, in order to get the program under way, to grant authority to the Secretary of Commerce to act, through the Bureau of Public Roads, as the agent of the State for the purpose——

Mr. GEORGE. Who will act as the agent of the State?

Mr. GORE. The Secretary of Commerce.

Mr. GEORGE. Wait a minute. We are coming now to the very vitals of the question. The Secretary of Commerce of the United States will request the States——

Mr. GORE. It is the other way around. I may have misspoken myself.

Mr. GEORGE. Only the legislature or the governor can act for a State.

Mr. GORE. Under the terms of the bill, if a State requests the Secretary of Commerce to acquire limited access rights-of-way for highways, he is authorized to do so, but only upon the initiative and request of the State.

Mr. GEORGE. I understand that. But suppose that under the highway laws he can acquire a right-of-way of 100 feet or 200 feet, or whatever the State law requires. This language seems to contemplate that the Secretary can go over that right-of-way as much as 500 feet, I assume, on each side, and take jurisdiction over signs, and so forth.

Mr. GORE. That is in addition to the right-of-way.

Mr. GEORGE. That is what I say.

Mr. GORE. If requested to do so by a State?

Mr. GEORGE. By whom in any State?

Mr. GORE. The proper State authority.

Mr. GEORGE. The legislature and the governor, I presume.

Mr. GORE. I presume so.

Mr. NEUBERGER. The highway department, I should say.

Mr. GEORGE. That is what I am not going to consent to, I will say to the distinguished Senator from Oregon. The language is:

> To acquire any lands or interests in lands (including the control of access to any lands from adjoining lands and the exclusive right to advertise on lands adjoining and not exceeding 500 feet from the right-of-way) required by such State for right-of-way or other purposes in connection with the prosecution of any project for the construction, reconstruction, or improvement of any section of the National System of Interstate Highways.

I may say to the Senator from Tennessee that I would be absolutely opposed to this whole provision under any circumstances, but, at the same time, I should like to be sure of my facts.

Are we to pay for the additional 500 feet on each side of the right-of-way?

Mr. GORE. The Senator is asking only with reference to advertising rights on land adjacent to the right-of-way?

Mr. GEORGE. That is correct. Who is going to pay for that?

Mr. GORE. The Secretary of Commerce will pay for that, and will do so if he can acquire the land at a reasonable figure. The case supplied to the committee was from the State of New York. In that instance, where a new road was being constructed, the advertising rights on the lands adjacent to the right-of-way were acquired at the nominal cost of approximately $100 a mile. The committee had in mind acquiring the rights to be conveyed to the States at the time the right-of-way is conveyed to the States.

If the Senator will read a little further in the committee amendment to the bill he will find that at the time the right-of-way is conveyed to the State, whatever advertising rights the Secretary may then have acquired are likewise to be conveyed to the State.

The bill does not contain any provision for the regulation and control of advertising on a national basis. It merely provides that if the States request that the Federal Government acquire the rights-of-way, the Secretary may, in addition, acquire advertising rights on adjacent lands; but they must be conveyed to the States at the time the rights-of-way are conveyed to the States.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I should like to suggest to the distinguished Senator from Georgia that the point was made before the committee by by Mr. Du Pont, the former Commissioner of Public Roads, that the advertising rights would become subject to the laws of the individual States concerned.

Mr. GEORGE. Who offered that opinion?

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. Du Pont. Am I not correct that he was a former Commissioner of Public Roads?

Mr. GEORGE. It sounds more or less like the Attorney General. On other occasions I have said he is a rather odd Attorney General. It could not have been a great lawyer who gave that opinion, I may say to the Senator, because if the Federal Government acquires the land it will have the exclusive right to 500 feet on each side. Suppose that in my State there is a law covering the condemnation of land for a right-of-way 200 feet wide. Under this provision of the bill, in addition to the 200 feet there would be 500 additional feet on one side and 500 feet on the other side, or a total of 1,200 feet, which the Federal Government would control right through the heart of the State, even for advertising purposes. Did the committee recommend that type of bill?

Mr. GORE. The bill does not contain any provision to acquire fee title to any land——

Mr. GEORGE. I am not talking about that. I am talking about what it does do.

Mr. GORE. It permits the Secretary of Commerce, in the event of a request by a State, to acquire advertising rights on the land.

Mr. GEORGE. To the extent of 500 feet on each side of the right-of-way?

Mr. GORE. To the extent of 500 feet adjacent to the right-of-way.

Mr. GEORGE. That is what I said. If a State can acquire a 200-foot right-of-way, then it can also acquire 500 feet on each side of the right-of-way, or 1,200 feet right through the heart of the State.

Mr. GORE. I know of no reason why a State cannot do that now. Some States do, as a matter of fact.

Mr. GEORGE. Perhaps so. I hope mine does not. I say now to the Senator from Tennessee that much as I dislike certain provisions of the so-called administration bill, I would not vote for this provision in the committee bill. There are other provisions in the committee bill, also, which look exclusively to the enlargement of the Federal jurisdiction right at the point where the State has a most vital control and interest. I could not support the committee bill if this provision were to remain in it.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield further?

Mr. NEUBERGER. I yield.

Mr. GORE. I point out to the able senior Senator from Georgia that the advertising provision contained in S. 1048 is not a part of the administration bill.

Mr. GEORGE. No. I said that much as I dislike certain provisions of the administration bill, which I do not think I could support, I am pointing out now one reason why I could not support the committee bill.

Mr. GORE. I was about to draw a distinction between the advertising rights and the rights-of-way for the highways. Both bills contain similar provisions which authorize the Secretary of Commerce to acquire controlled access rights-of-way when he is requested to do so by the States. Both bills contain similar provisions to that effect. The administration bill does not contain authority to acquire advertising rights-of-way, to which the Senator has made specific reference.

Mr. GEORGE. I am glad to have the Senator's interpretation, because I have not had an opportunity to study the bill. I point out, however, that there are also other provisions in the bill which look very strongly toward Federal control of what I think are matters which ought to remain within the jurisdiction of the States. But this is one I could not support.

Let me illustrate. I have a house, in which I live. It is located 100 feet from a highway. The highway would probably be considered an interstate highway. Yet under the bill I could not erect a sign within 400 feet behind my house, on my own land, without the approval of the Federal Government.

The Senators from Tennessee and Oregon do not come from States which were colonies before there was a Union.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon further yield?

Mr. NEUBERGER. I yield.

Mr. GORE. I wish to point out to the able Senator from Georgia that most States—and I would be surprised if the Senator's State of Georgia were not one of them—undertake now to regulate highway advertising.

Mr. GEORGE. The States, yes; I grant that. But the Senator is proposing to place such jurisdiction in a Federal bureau.

Mr. GORE. Quite to the contrary.

Mr. GEORGE. Oh, no; there is nothing to the contrary. I only wanted to ask if it was proposed even to pay for the right. It is not clear that payment is to be made; but probably, by implication, payment would be made.

Mr. NEUBERGER. It was the thought of the committee, when the amendment was included, that the advertising rights would be acquired when the right-of-way was bought, but that they would be turned over to the States, and the States would then have final jurisdiction as to

whether advertising would be permitted. That was the thought of the committee.

Mr. GEORGE. Where is that thought expressed? I should like to have the Senator tell me where that language is.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield? I can answer the Senator's question.

Mr. NEUBERGER. I yield.

Mr. GORE. It is on page 11, line 20, and reads as follows:

(c) The Secretary is further authorized and directed by proper deed, executed in the name of the United States, to convey any such lands or interests in lands acquired in any State under the provisions of this section, except the outside 5 feet of any such right-of-way in States unable or unwilling to control access, to the State highway department of such State or such political subdivision thereof as its laws may provide, upon such terms and conditions as to the lands acquired in fee as may be agreed upon by the Secretary and the State highway department, or political subdivisions to which the conveyance is to be made. Whenever the State is able and agrees to control access the outside 5 feet may be conveyed to it.

Mr. GEORGE. I do not understand the meaning of "the outside 5 feet." If it is just as obscure as the meaning of the 500 feet to which I have been referring, it could mean anything or it might mean nothing. The meaning of what the Senator has read is that when the Secretary acquires the fee to land he does not acquire the fee to the 500 feet outside the right-of-way; he acquires only an easement or a negative prohibition against what the owner of the land may do.

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

Mr. GEORGE. I do not have the floor. I am merely asking questions.

Mr. KERR. I assumed this was a general discussion.

Mr. GEORGE. Yes; I think it is.

Mr. KERR. First, let me say to the Senator from Georgia that it was not the purpose of the committee to replace State jurisdiction in any of these matters.

Mr. GEORGE. I am asking about this one.

Mr. KERR. I will address myself to the one in which the Senator is interested.

Mr. GEORGE. I am very much interested in it. I shall be against the whole bill if this provision remains in it.

Mr. KERR. I know there is no greater champion——

Mr. GEORGE. No; I shall be against it, because I could not conscientiously vote for such a bill.

Mr. KERR. I know the Senator wants to know the answer to the question he has raised.

Mr. GEORGE. Yes; and I think I know it.

Mr. KERR. I want to tell the Senator.

Mr. GEORGE. Very well; the Senator from Oklahoma may tell me; but I think I know it already.

Mr. KERR. If the Senator will read the language on page 11, he will find the following:

The Secretary is further authorized and directed by proper deed, executed in the name of the United States, to convey any such lands or interests in lands acquired in any State under the provisions of this section.

Mr. GEORGE. Yes; but the Secretary has no interest in the land 500 feet away from the right-of-way; he has only a negative easement in that land.

Mr. KERR. It could not affect the land without there being interest in it, I remind the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. GEORGE. Oh yes, it could.

Mr. KERR. There is no interest that could be acquired which the Secretary is not directed to reconvey to the State, except the control of 5 feet of right-of-way for limitation of access.

Mr. GEORGE. I have not come to that. I do not know what that is.

Mr. NEUBERGER. It is the limitation of access.

Mr. KERR. Would not the Senator from Georgia like to know?

Mr. GEORGE. I suppose it is intended to keep the owner from going onto the 500 feet.

Mr. KERR. Not the 500 feet. The only land the Federal Government is permitted to keep is 5 feet of right-of-way in order to limit access.

Mr. GEORGE. Five feet from where?

Mr. KERR. Along the edge of the right-of-way. It is no part of the 500 feet.

Mr. GEORGE. Is it the right-of-way?

Mr. KERR. It is a part of the right-of-way.

Mr. GORE. It is the outside 5 feet of the right-of-way.

Mr. GEORGE. Very well. With whatever the Government acquires there, it has a right to do as it pleases.

Mr. KERR. The interest it acquires in the 500 feet must be turned over to the State.

Mr. GEORGE. Oh, no.

Mr. KERR. I beg the Senator's pardon. If he will read the language——

Mr. GEORGE. I have read the language three times. I did not have to read it more than once to know I was against it.

Mr. KERR. The Senator has a right to be against it.

Mr. GEORGE. I certainly will be against it.

Mr. KERR. I rose because I know of the great influence of the Senator.

Mr. GEORGE. No; the Senator need not mention influence.

Mr. KERR. I know of the profound judgment of the Senator.

Mr. GEORGE. I will not approve that sort of legislation. Throughout the bill there is a decided trend toward the federalization of everything which the Government touches on roads of the States. I am pointing out only one thing, and I am simply trying to ascertain what it means.

Mr. KERR. The Senator is mistaken in his interpretation of the provision in the bill.

Mr. GEORGE. No; I am not. I will read the language; then I will discuss it further with the Senator.

Mr. KERR. Very well.

Mr. GEORGE. The Senator was reading from page 11, was he not?

Mr. KERR. That is correct.

Mr. GEORGE. At what part of the page?

Mr. KERR. The part to which the Senator objected is at the bottom of page 9 and top of page 10. If the Senator will read it, he will see, in the first place, that this right is granted only where the acquisition is at the request of a State.

Mr. GEORGE. Who will request it?

Mr. KERR. The State.

Mr. GEORGE. Yes; the highway department, which gets its money from a bureau in Washington.

Mr. KERR. I challenge the Senator to show me the words "highway department."

Mr. GEORGE. Well, who particularly is going to make the request?

Mr. KERR. The State.

Mr. GEORGE. Who is going to do it for the State.

Mr. KERR. Whoever the State designates. This language says the State. It does not say the highway department.

Mr. GEORGE. I differ with the Senator. This language says the State, and whoever under the law of the State could act for the State, could do it.

Mr. KERR. Would that be an infringement of the right of the State?

Mr. GEORGE. I would think so.

Mr. KERR. To permit the State to designate who could act for it?

Mr. GEORGE. To permit the acquisition of 1,200 feet running through the very heart of any State and control it.

Mr. KERR. I ask the Senator if it would not be an infringement of the right of his State if the Congress should attempt to tell his State who could act for it.

Mr. GEORGE. No, but the Congress is undertaking——

Mr. KERR. Not in the bill.

Mr. GEORGE. Yes; it is.

Mr. KERR. The bill says this shall not be done except at the request of the State.

Mr. GEORGE. I ask the Senator what authority is going to make the request—the State legislature or the Governor? What does the bill say?

Mr. KERR. The bill says the State.

Mr. GEORGE. What is a State, within the meaning of the bill?

Mr. KERR. For me to attempt to tell the great Senator from Georgia what a State is would certainly be presumptuous on my part.

Mr. GEORGE. I did not ask the Senator about that. I asked what is a State within the definition of this bill. The Senator has used the word "State." What is a State under the definition of this bill?

Mr. KERR. I say to the Senator this bill does not attempt to define what a State is.

Mr. GEORGE. It leaves it up in the air?

Mr. KERR. No. The definition of a State has been adjudicated, as the Senator knows, from time immemorial.

Mr. GEORGE. What has been adjudicated?

Mr. KERR. The definition of what a State is.

Mr. GEORGE. Oh, no.

Mr. KERR. Where the bill refers to the highway department, it says so.

Mr. GEORGE. I understand that, but in this instance it says State, and I ask the Senator to define "State."

Mr. KERR. I repeat that for me to attempt to define "State" to such a distinguished authority on States as the eminent Senator from Georgia would be presumptuous on my part. If I were seeking the definition of "State," the Senator from Georgia would be the first man to whom I would go.

Mr. GEORGE. I do not want the Senator from Oklahoma to pay me such a high compliment; but I know the bill does not define "State," and I know that term would be held by the Department in Washington to mean the Bureau of Public Roads in Georgia or in Colorado or in Oklahoma.

Mr. KERR. Then I say to the Senator, first, the Department of Commerce does not buy any interest except at the request of the Senator's State——

Mr. GEORGE. I ask the Senator——

Mr. KERR. May I finish?

Mr. GEORGE. Yes.

Mr. KERR. Second, whatever right it does acquire, it then transfers back to the Senator's State.

Mr. GEORGE. I was coming to that. That was the second question. I say on that point the Senator is entirely wrong.

Mr. KERR. I say to the Senator that is the intent of the language, and if the members of the committee, who worked several months on this bill, and made a sincere effort to accomplish that purpose, were unable to do so, I know of no one better able to teach them and to show them how to accomplish their purpose than the Senator from Georgia, and I know of no one to whom they would rather listen, in devising language which would do what he speaks of, and which they thought they had done, than the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. GEORGE. I am sorry the Senator continues to pay me excessive compliments when I am not asking for them. I have asked for information. I have gotten exceedingly little up to now.

I should now like to read what the bill says the Secretary in Washington is required to do to reconvey land to the State. I take it he has referred to subsection (c) on page 11.

Mr. KERR. That is correct.

Mr. GEORGE. I read from that subsection:

The Secretary is further authorized and directed by proper deed—

I presume that means a Federal secretary.

Mr. KERR. It means the Secretary of Commerce.

Mr. GEORGE. Very well; the Secretary of Commerce.

The Secretary is further authorized and directed by proper deed, executed in the name of the United States, to convey any such lands or interests in lands acquired in any State under the provisions of this section, except the outside 5 feet of any such right-of-way in States unable or unwilling to control access, to the State highway department of such State or such political subdivision thereof as its laws may provide, upon such terms and conditions as to the lands acquired in fee as may be agreed upon by the Secretary and the State highway department, or political subdivisions—

All he is authorized to convey is lands which are acquired in fee, and the negative easement with respect to the land of the original owner conveys no interest in such land; it is simply a prohibition. But the bill limits even that right, for it provides—

upon such terms and condition as to the lands acquired in fee.

That is all he could convey, and under this bill the Secretary could convey nothing else.

as may be agreed upon by the Secretary and the State highway department, or political subdivisions to which the conveyance is to be made. Whenever the State is able and agrees to control access, the outside 5 feet—

I am not interested in that now. All the Secretary can convey to a State or any subdivision is whatever fee there is, not an easement or a prohibition in the form of a negative. What is being proposed here today, in so many words, is simply to run a strip through any State 1,000 feet in excess of the amount which is allowed to be taken under the law of eminent domain in the State, and it is being proposed that the Federal Government alone shall decide who shall advertise on that land.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon has the floor.

Mr. GEORGE. That is all the bill proposes. It does not propose to convey that land back to the State, notwithstanding my distinguished friend from Oklahoma, who mistakenly thought the proposed law, when it referred to any interest in land, included a negative easement. Of course, that is not interest in land. An easement is not interest in land. It is a use that goes with the land, but it is not title to it. That is all the Secretary could convey.

Mr. KERR. The Senator is eminently right in saying an easement is not title to land, but if I know anything about the law, the Senator is wrong when he says an easement is an interest in land.

Mr. GEORGE. It is not an interest in land. It is use that attaches to the land. It is not a part of the land itself at all. It is a condition imposed on the use of the land. That is not an interest in the land. But the bill uses further language. It says that the Secretary may convey——

Mr. KERR. That he must convey.

Mr. GEORGE. Let us assume it is mandatory and that he must do so—

upon such terms and conditions as to the lands acquired in fee—

Not an easement; not a negative easement.

Mr. KERR. There is no difference between the thought of the Senator from Georgia and that of the committee. As I told him, if the committee did not put the proper language in the bill, it would not be the first time that such a thing had happened in legislative history.

Mr. GEORGE. I suppose not. But I would not wish to quibble about that. I am raising a far more fundamental question, I may say to the Senator. He has simply said to me that, for purposes of illustration, we are to assume that he is living on land on the side of a road which, if and when the interstate highway is constructed, will be a part of that highway, and that his land begins perhaps 100 or 125 feet from the center of the highway. He asks us to assume that the State has a right to condemn for a distance of 200 feet on each side of the highway; and he says that distance would extend almost to the rear boundaries of his land, and thus he would have no right to say what advertising could be erected in that area. In other words, under this provision of the bill, that right would be vested in the Federal Government until such time as the bureau or agency charged with authority under the provisions of the bill—even under the Senator's construction of the bill—would convey that right back to the State.

Mr. President, I do not wish the Federal Government or any bureau or agency of the Federal Government to have that right.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Georgia a question. Does he think it would be undesirable, as a goal, to attempt to regulate or control advertising signboards which might be erected along the interstate highway system?

Mr. GEORGE. Does the Senator from Oregon mean along the Federal Government's interstate highway system? No; the Federal Government has a right to regulate that. But it has no right to go 1 foot beyond that, for if the Federal Government can go 1 foot beyond, it can go 5 miles beyond. I do not subscribe to any such doctrine.

Mr. NEUBERGER. If it were possible, under proper language, for the Federal Government to acquire advertising rights, and then to turn them over completely to each State, for the State to administer or use as it might see fit, would the Senator from Georgia have objection to such language?

Mr. GEORGE. I think I would. I do not want to have any such Federal interference in my State. If the Senator from Oregon wants to have such Federal interference in his State, all right; but I do not wish to be prosecuted if—on behalf on my neighbor who may live downtown or on behalf of my friend who may live in an adjoining county—I place a sign 500 feet from the Federal Government's right-of-way. I do not wish to be prosecuted by anyone in Washington or by anyone in the State.

However, I am not discussing that point. Instead, I am discussing what the bill provides.

I say now that this bill will not be passed if it contains this provision. Other Senators can do as they please about the bill, but I know the Senate of the United States will not pass such a bill.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Let me say to the Senator from Georgia that this provision is not a part of my original amendment.

Mr. GEORGE. I did not say so; I simply pointed out the objection to the provision.

Mr. NEUBERGER. I merely wish to explain the purpose of my original amendment. I submitted an amendment containing language different from this language. My amendment had only one purpose, namely, that in the case of the interstate system, which the American people are going to invest and are investing billions of dollars to construct, it should not be possible to plaster it with all kinds of advertising material, which would have no value whatsoever unless the American people had invested billions of dollars in the road system.

In the course of the discussion in the committee, this language was submitted to us by, I believe, some members of the staff of the Bureau of Public Roads—although I am not sure of that.

Mr. GEORGE. Yes; I would think that would be where it would come from.

Mr. NEUBERGER. But my point is that it seems to me that inasmuch as quite a few States already control advertising——

Mr. GEORGE. I do not object to State control.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Would the Senator from Georgia object if these rights could be turned over fully to the States, after the Federal Government acquired the rights?

Mr. GEORGE. Yes. Let the States acquire the rights, if they wish to acquire them, and if they wish to pay for them under the condemnation laws of the States. But I do not wish to have the Federal Government intervene, and say what the States must do in reference to lands adjacent to the public highways running through the States.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Do I correctly understand that even if the Federal Government were completely to turn over to the States the advertising rights, the Senator from Georgia still would not approve of such an arrangement?

Mr. GEORGE. Why should such an arrangement be made? Why not let the States acquire the advertising rights, if they wish to acquire them and control them and use them? Why is it desired to have the Federal Government intervene, unless there is a desire to have the power of the Federal Government supersede the power of the State?

Mr. NEUBERGER. No; I do not wish that to be done.

Mr. GEORGE. However, the bill contains 4 or 5 provisions which look definitely in that direction. At this time I am pointing out only one of them.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield to me, to permit me to ask a question of the Senator from Georgia?

Mr. NEUBERGER. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. I should like to ask this question of the Senator from Georgia: In the absence of any legislative provision—either in existing legislation or as a provision of the pending bill—conferring on the Federal Government the power to regulate advertising along these highways, would not the States have that power, anyway, beyond the right-of-way which was acquired by the Federal Government?

Mr. GEORGE. Absolutely.

Mr. BARKLEY. So in the absence of any legislation on that subject or in the absence of any provision of that sort in the bill, would not that power or right automatically be left to the States?

Mr. GEORGE. Yes, unless the Federal Government acquired the right. If the Federal Government acquired the right, the Federal Government could reconvey it under whatever conditions it might see fit to specify.

Mr. BARKLEY. But in reference to the right-of-way——

Mr. GEORGE. I am not speaking of the right-of-way. I think the Federal Government has the right to control the advertising on the right-of-way.

Mr. BARKLEY. No doubt. However, the bill contains a provision that the Federal Government may control advertising 500 feet beyond that.

Mr. GEORGE. Yes.

Mr. BARKLEY. In the absence of such a provision, the State would control it, anyway, would it not?

Mr. GEORGE. Absolutely—either the State or the owner of the land.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. NEUBERGER. I yield.

Mr. GORE. I should like to say that, although I did not sponsor the amendment, I heard all the discussion of it. No intent was expressed on the part of any member of the committee to invest the Federal Government with any power to acquire in this regard any right which it would not be required to convey to the State whenever the State was prepared to accept conveyance of the right-of-way.

If the words "interest in land" can be interpreted so narrowly as not to encompass direction for the conveyance of this right, then I feel confident, and am prepared to say, that the committee will readily accept amendments to bring the bill into conformity with the intent of the committee and with what seems to be the obvious wish of distinguished Members of the Senate.

However, that is separate and apart from the acquisition of the right-of-way proper.

If the able junior Senator from Oregon will yield further to me, let me say that, as I understood the senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], he was not raising questions about the roadway itself, but, rather, he was raising questions about the proposal to acquire the right to advertise on adjacent land at the time when the right-of-way is acquired. If such interest in the land or if such easement—to use the expression the Senator from Georgia uses—is to be acquired, it can be acquired at a much less cost if it is purchased at the time when the right-of-way is acquired, rather than if it is acquired later.

If the committee has used a term which does not have sufficient meaning to encompass that interpretation, then we shall restudy the matter and shall bring the language into conformity with that intent.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield, so as to permit me to ask some questions of the distinguished Senator from Tennessee?

Mr. NEUBERGER. Certainly.

Mr. KERR. In order that the RECORD may be entirely clear, I should like to ask 1 or 2 questions of the distinguished Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. NEUBERGER. I am glad to yield for that purpose.

Mr. KERR. First, let me ask the Senator from Tennessee whether it is his understanding that the Federal Government's Bureau of Public Roads would seek to acquire either the right-of-way or the right to advertise adjacent to the right-of-way only on the request of the State in which the interest was to be acquired?

Mr. GORE. That is correct; it is spelled out. That was the intention of the committee and that is the provision of the bill.

Mr. KERR. My second question is this: As regards the acquisition of the rights to advertise on any adjacent land, is it the understanding of the Senator from Tennessee that the Federal Government could acquire such rights only by purchasing them from the owner of the land?

Mr. GORE. With due compensation.

Mr. KERR. By paying for them?

Mr. GORE. By paying for them.

Mr. KERR. Is it the understanding of the Senator that it was the purpose of the committee, and the judgment of the committee as to the language of the bill, that in those instances in which that was done, it would be mandatory for the Federal Government to reconvey such interest to the State in which the land was located?

Mr. GORE. That was clearly the intention of the committee. No member expressed a contrary intention. The distinguished Senator from Georgia has raised questions as to the language used. There may be such questions. Undoubtedly there are if he says there are. I recognize him as one of the eminent legal authorities in this body. If there is a question in that connection, it is contrary to the intent of the committee. The committee did not wish any question to remain. It was the intent of the committee to require the conveyance of all interest in land.

Mr. KERR. All interest acquired?

Mr. GORE. All interest acquired. That is what the bill says.

If an easement is not an interest in land, then we need to make an amendment. Speaking with the background of my limited knowledge of easements, as I understand, an easement may be either affirmative or negative. It may be a right to use, as well as a right having a negative quality. But I do not wish to argue the point.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further question?

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. KERR. In the event there is the slightest question or doubt as to the purpose of the bill, the Senator from Tennessee, like the Senator from Oklahoma, would wish to join the Senator from Georgia in making expressly clear the purpose of the bill.

Mr. GORE. The Senator from Tennessee is eager to join the senior Senator from Georgia to that end.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield to me in

order that I may ask the Senator from Tennessee a question?

Mr. NEUBERGER. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. Can the Senator from Tennessee tell me what a negative easement is? If I have an easement over certain land, to use such land, that is a positive easement. What is a negative easement? Is it the right not to go over it? In law, I do not quite understand what a negative easement is.

Mr. GORE. If I may explain to the junior Senator from Kentucky, the junior Senator from Tennessee had in mind a limitation upon the use of land for specific purposes. For example, in the conveyance of a piece of land, a condition may be imposed granting the right to use the land upon certain conditions and for certain purposes, and those purposes only. It may also contain a covenant by which the conveyor conveys his own right to use the land. For example, if I may continue, the junior Senator from Tennessee might sell a strip of land to the junior Senator from Kentucky, or he might sell an interest in such land. He might also sell to the junior Senator from Kentucky such interest in the land as would prevent the junior Senator from Tennessee from constructing a building of a certain type upon it, adjacent to the property of the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. BARKLEY. If the Senator conveys to me a tract of land, or if the Government acquires a tract of land from the Senator or from me, and gives me an easement over it, the right to use it, that is a positive easement. It is not a negative easement. If, in the deed of conveyance, or the contract, I were denied the right to use it for certain purposes, or if the Senator himself, as the conveyor, were to deny me the right to use it, that might be a negative restriction, but I cannot see how it would be an easement, because an easement is a right to use or to occupy a strip of land or certain other property in a positive degree. A prohibition against using it might be absolute and legal, but it would not be an easement, because I could not even use it. It would be a prevention of use.

Mr. GORE. I think it may be said that a covenant may be either positive or negative. It may be a right to use, or it may be the denial of a right to use.

Mr. BARKLEY. A denial of the right to use is certainly not an easement.

Mr. GORE. I think that is correct.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield to me for a moment?

Mr. NEUBERGER. I yield.

Mr. GEORGE. I merely wish to make plain my own position. I have no objection whatever to restrictions upon the use of the right-of-way, such right-of-way as the State acquires, or as the Secretary acquires and reconveys to the State, with respect to advertising, or any other use of it. I think that is proper. I am perfectly content with that.

But I wish to invite the attention of Senators to the fact that there could be no such thing as the conveyance of a negative of an easement. The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY] is correct. An easement is a use which runs with the land; and a mere negation of such use is not a use which runs with the land. No one could convey it. The Supreme Court of the United States even held that, when a deed provided that people of a certain race or color should not become the owners of a fee simple title in the District of Columbia with respect to certain property, such prohibition was utterly void under our law and under our Constitution.

In the present case there is involved, not an easement, but a negation of an easement. It is a prohibition. It does not run with the land. It cannot run with the land. Therefore it cannot be conveyed; and no court in the land would permit it to be reconveyed. So all that could be done would be to reconvey whatever fee was acquired, with such uses as run with that fee. That is all that could be done.

I have no objection whatever to the exclusion of advertisements on the right-of-way acquired by the State or by the Secretary, whether it be for 100 feet, 200 feet, or 300 feet on each side of the roadway. However, I do object to the conveyance of a so-called right which is nontransferable, which is not alienable, and cannot be conveyed. It is a purely personal right, which cannot run with the land at all, under any of the decisions of the courts of this country. The right to prohibit the use of any additional number of feet beyond that right-of-way, whether it be 500 feet, 1 mile, or 5 miles, cannot possibly be sustained as any form of easement which would run with the land itself.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield to me in order that I may address a question to the distinguished Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE]?

Mr. NEUBERGER. I yield.

Mr. GORE. As I understand, the able Senator from Georgia is not raising any question as to the acquisition of the right-of-way necessary for the road itself?

Mr. GEORGE. Not at all.

Mr. GORE. As I understand, the Senator from Georgia is confining his objection to the acquisition by the Federal Government—whether it conveys or whether it does not convey—of advertising rights with respect to land extraneous to the right-of-way.

Mr. GEORGE. Beyond the right-of-way. The Senator is correct. I do not believe that such so-called rights can be conveyed.

What is proposed to be done by the pending bill? I do not believe the proponents of the bill fully realize what it proposes to do. It is proposed that a mere prohibition against the use of land for a certain purpose, the title to which land has not been acquired and which it is not proposed to be paid for, can be acquired under the right of eminent domain. The doctrine of eminent domain cannot be sustained in such a case. No court would permit a State to exercise its right of eminent domain to acquire a right over adjacent land merely for the purpose of preventing such land from being devoted to certain uses.

If the Senator will examine the law on that point he will find that the doctrine of eminent domain does not apply in that kind of case.

Mr. NEUBERGER. I should like to explain to the distinguished Senator from Georgia very briefly how this amendment became a part of the bill. Before I got myself into my present predicament, I was a journalist. I submitted to the committee, in my own language, a very brief amendment which I thought would deal with the control of sign boards on the highways. The attorneys for the Bureau of Public Roads—and also Mr. du Pont—stated, that the amendment should be stated in different language. The result is the language the Senator from Georgia has objected to on the floor of the Senate.

My purpose was agreed to by the committee. The language is not my language.

I wish to point out, in justice to Mr. du Pont, who was most helpful to the committee, that he claimed the State of New York, when it constructed its throughway, had acquired advertising rights along the throughway in New York State. I believe that is correct.

Mr. GORE. At a cost of only $100 a mile, I believe.

Mr. NEUBERGER. I believe he said $100 or $200 a mile.

Mr. GORE. It was not the purpose of either the State of New York or of other States to prevent advertising, but, rather, to regulate it and to prevent a sign from being placed at an intersection or on a curve, where it would create a traffic hazard.

Many States, including the State of Tennessee, have laws to regulate advertising along and adjacent to highway rights-of-way. The only purpose the committee had in mind was to help the States in gaining that objective in the most economical way.

If we wait until the highways are constructed and signs are constructed, the cost of the rights will come very high. It may well be that we should not have entered this field at all.

The distinguished Senator from Georgia may be eminently correct, as he usually is, but the committee was undertaking to help the States in gaining their objective in this field, and to save the taxpayers money in the acquisition of the rights at the time they could be acquired at the most economical figure and at the time when signs could be prevented from being placed in positions which would endanger drivers.

Mr. NEUBERGER. The situation I had in mind was that the people of my State, together with the people of the rest of the country, through the matching of funds procedure have built a magnificent network of roads in Oregon, which has a population of 1,600,000 people, who are spread over nearly 100,000 square miles. As is well known, Oregon has wonderful scenery. Yet, the signboard industry has put along the roads of the State of Oregon, which have cost the people of our State and of the Nation millions of dollars, all kinds of advertising material, generally at curves, which are strategic locations, of course, because people will look at them longer when they are placed at an arc, without

regard at all to the scenery along the roadway.

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

Mr. NEUBERGER. I yield.

Mr. THYE. Has the Senator ever seen any signs which have been beneficial or helpful to him?

Mr. NEUBERGER. Signs which state that the distance to Frederick, Md., for example, is so many miles, or that the distance to Eugene, Oreg., is so many miles are beneficial. However, such signs are not put up by the signboard industry; they are put up by the State highway commissions.

Mr. THYE. I ask the Senator if he ever found signs which were helpful, not from the standpoint of telling him the distance to a city, but with respect to hotel accommodations and motels and business establishments located in the area. Were not such signs of some help to the Senator?

Mr. NEUBERGER. I would say that such signs are not of as much help to a driver as looking at Mount Hood. Mount Hood is a very invigorating sight, I will say to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. THYE. I am familiar with the Senator's State, because both my mother and father are buried in Portland, and I have visited the State many times.

Mr. NEUBERGER. I am acquainted with some of the members of the Senator's fine family.

Mr. THYE. If any sign ever obstructed a view of Mount Hood for the Senator, I would say that he was very nearsighted.

However, I should like to say to my distinguished friend from Oregon that I believe the States should have the right to determine what type of billboard construction shall be permitted along a highway. If we begin to write into Federal law, in connection with Federal-aid highways, that a certain type of billboard cannot be constructed along a highway, we will be writing into a Federal act much more restrictive language than we have ever written into a Federal act in the past.

I trust my good State administration and I trust the State highway commissioner, and the legislative body of my State, to determine what shall be constructed along the highways in the State of Minnesota.

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

Mr. NEUBERGER. I yield.

Mr. POTTER. There has been a certain amount of activity of late in behalf of Federal regulation of other types of advertising. I refer to television advertising. What I fear in connection with this whole subject is that a law limiting billboard advertising may well be the camel's nose under the tent flap, and may very well result in further encroachment by the Federal Government in the field of regulating advertising.

Mr. NEUBERGER. If I am not mistaken, the Senator from Michigan has the impression that Federal regulation of radio and television advertising is something new. As I understand, the Federal regulation of radio began when Herbert Hoover was Secretary of Commerce and the Federal Communications Act was enacted. The Senator from Michigan gives the impression that the regulation of television advertising and radio advertising is something new. The regulation of advertising on radio—and radio is the predecessor of television—was first started when Herbert Hoover was Secretary of Commerce.

Mr. POTTER. I am sure the Senator from Oregon is aware of the fact that there is much interest among some people to further regulate radio and television advertising.

Mr. NEUBERGER. I should like to ask the Senator whether he regards it as undesirable to have some control over construction of signboards along our highways.

Mr. POTTER. In my opinion, the States are the best judges of the type of advertising that should be placed along our highways. If the State of Oregon should decide that it can eliminate highway billboards, let the State of Oregon so decide. If the State of Michigan should decide that it wants some billboards along its highway, let that be a decision of the people of the State of Michigan.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Does the Senator object, may I ask, to the Federal Government setting certain specifications as to the width of the road surface, as to the maximum curvature of roads, as to bridge piers, and as to bridge structures?

Mr. POTTER. No; I am not objecting to any of those. However, the language proposed seems to be a means, in a highway bill, for the Federal Government to regulate outdoor advertising.

Mr. NEUBERGER. I realized, when I first raised this issue, that there would be great objection. Again I wish to repeat that the exact language of the provision is not mine. The purpose to do something about signboard advertising was my original suggestion.

I wish to say, that, in general, I feel that signs have to do with road safety, just as do curves, bridges, or anything else. I am perfectly willing to defer to the judgment of the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], who is chairman of the subcommittee and who is the principal author of the bill. If he believes the language to which the senior Senator from Georgia has objected should be eliminated from the bill, it is agreeable with me.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregan yield?

Mr. NEUBERGER. I yield.

Mr. GORE. Few bills of the magnitude of S. 1048 have ever been before the Congress. It may be that the committee has erred in including a provision which is extraneous to highway legislation. The committee was undertaking to facilitate the acquisition of lands by the States. As chairman of the subcommittee, I have conferred with members of the subcommittee, and we are unanimous in our feeling that such a small matter as this should not in any way endanger the bill. Therefore, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the junior Senator from Oregon, without losing his right to the floor, may yield to the junior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. THURMOND] to propose an amendment which I believe will be agreed to without objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request? The Chair hears none.

Mr. NEUBERGER. I yield.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, leaders on both sides have been contacted, and they are willing to agree to this amendment, and the Senator from Oregon has stated that he will not object to it.

I offer an amendment on page 10, line 3, after the word "lands", to insert a closing parenthesis.

On page 10, lines 3 to 5, inclusive, strike out "and the exclusive right to advertise on lands adjoining and not exceeding 500 feet from the right-of-way."

I believe, Mr. President, that covers the main objection raised by the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], and I am in hearty accord with the Senator from Georgia in the position he has taken.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment offered by the Senator from South Carolina.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. It is proposed on page 10, line 3, after the word "lands", to insert a closing parenthesis; and on page 10, lines 3 to 5, inclusive, to strike out "and the exclusive right to advertise on lands adjoining and not exceeding 500 feet from the right-of-way."

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, may I ask whether this amendment would still permit a State which desires to control advertising rights along the highway to provide for the purchase of such rights at the time of the purchase of the right-of-way?

Mr. THURMOND. It would leave to the States the control of advertising on the highway.

Mr. AIKEN. Would it permit the use of any Federal funds for that purpose?

Mr. THURMOND. No.

Mr. AIKEN. Could the Federal Government purchase for a State the advertising rights, provided the State paid for the rights?

Mr. THURMOND. No.

Mr. AIKEN. Then the State would have to conduct a separate negotiation to acquire advertising rights if it wanted to keep the roadside perfectly free from advertising?

Mr. THURMOND. That is correct. It would have to conduct its own negotiations for that purpose.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Carolina yield?

Mr. THURMOND. I yield.

Mr. THYE. Why is it desired to offer this amendment? Why should there be any language at all in the bill with respect to signs?

Mr. THURMOND. The amendment would delete that language.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Carolina yield?

Mr. THURMOND. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. The committee amendments were agreed to this morning, with the understanding that an amendment could be offered to the clean bill. The amendment offered by the Senator from South Carolina pro-

poses to strike from the bill the language of the committee amendment.

Mr. THYE. Then the bill will be absolutely silent as to road signs of anykind on the right-of-way?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. The Senator is correct.

Mr. THYE. That is what I wanted to be certain of.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I should like to say that the amendment offered by the Senator from South Carolina is entirely agreeable to me.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. THURMOND].

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I ask that the amendment be agreed to by unanimous consent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the amendment is agreed to.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield?

Mr. NEUBERGER. I yield.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, now that the amendment is disposed of, I wish to cite support of the brief remarks I made by referring to American Jurisprudence, page 934, in which a section is devoted to a discussion of easements, affirmative and negative.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, before I conclude what I had expected to be brief remarks on the bill, I should like to point out to the Senate a defect of S. 1048, which I support, and a defect of S. 1160, which I oppose. I think this particular point is undesirable in both bills. The defect to which I refer is the total exclusion of the Territory of Alaska from highway aid provided for in both S. 1048 and S. 1160. I think it is passing strange that the President of the United States pointed out in his press conference not long ago that Alaska was so important strategically, from a military standpoint, that perhaps the advisability of statehood for Alaska was dubious, and yet Alaska does not receive any Federal highway aid, even though many of the witnesses who testified in behalf of the bill and in behalf of various highway proposals, such as the Clay report, stated that these highways are vital to national defense.

It is a disappointment to find that the bill, which I believe is generally a good one, makes no recommendations with regard to Alaska's road needs. It is true that the program recommended is geared to the Federal-aid highway acts from which Alaska is excluded, but it had been my hope that recognition might have been given to the discrimination against Alaska which has too long been allowed to continue.

It is true that in recent years—but due to military necessity alone—quite large sums of money have been made available for roadbuilding in Alaska by the Alaska Road Commission, an agency of the Department of the Interior. But for many years before that, the road funds appropriated were infinitesimal compared with what Alaska would have received if the Federal-aid highway program had been extended to that great Territory. And now those appropriations are on a rapidly diminishing scale and the time has come, I believe, when serious consideration should be given to bring Alaska under the Federal-aid highway program. Both Hawaii and Puerto Rico are included, and there is no cogent reason for Alaska's continued exclusion. A formula should be worked out whereby Alaska's needs could be made part of the road program envisioned for the entire country. Alaska is an integral part of this country, and should be allowed to participate as a partner with the other States and with Hawaii and Puerto Rico.

It seems to me to be very curious that Hawaii and Puerto Rico, for example, are included in the Federal-aid highway program, but that Alaska, which at one point is only 40 or 50 miles away from the territory of the Soviet Union, is not included. I have stood on the shores of Bering Strait and, on a clear day, seen the headlands of Siberia in the distance. One could realize, in such a moment, the vast military significance of Alaska.

Yet despite all our talk about the importance of roads to the national defense, it is not proposed that Alaska be include in a road-building program which extends even to Hawaii and Puerto Rico.

This is no reason for voting against S. 1048, because, as I pointed out earlier, Alaska is omitted in both the committee bill and the administration bill, which has been offered as a substitute.

In general, it is my firm opinion that S. 1048 offers the best method for developing not only the interstate road system, but also the secondary, urban, and rural road system.

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

Mr. NEUBERGER. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. I wish to express myself as being in strong sympathy with the objective of the distinguished junior Senator from Oregon, since I have taken part several times in the formulation of the Federal Aid Road Act.

However, I want the Senator to realize that the failure to include Alaska along with the States results not from any desire to exclude Alaska, but, I think, to the contrary, from the desire to treat Alaska more generously than she would have been treated had she been included simply as another State.

The Senator from Oregon will recall that approximately 97 or 98 percent of the lands of Alaska are publicly owned. If the distinguished Senator will read the provisions of the last Federal-Aid Road Act, he will find that there was only $1 million a year added to the special funds to build roads through the public-lands areas. He would find that the formula relative to mileage of roads and to population was completely inadequate to give anything like fair representation to Alaska, leaving only the authorized formula, which again, was so out of balance with the developmental actualities, as well as the needs, as to make it very hard to ascertain on what basis to include Alaska. So Alaska has had a separate public-roads program.

I wish to remind the Senator that only a few weeks ago, during the consideration of the Department of the Interior appropriation bill, the Senate, upon the recommendation of the committee, raised the appropriation for public roads in Alaska from $1 million to $5 million, as I recall, for the fiscal year 1956, which begins on July 1, 1955.

Besides that, separate funds for Alaska have been added through the forest and reclamation provisions, which the Senator has already mentioned. Furthermore, in connection with the public works bill for Alaska, we have made it possible to construct, on a 50–50 basis, some very urgently needed roads in the small communities and nearby areas.

While I am happy the distinguished Senator has called attention to the plight of Alaska, I wish to say that, having sat several times on the committees which worked on those bills, I was of the conclusion, and I still am, subject always to being corrected if new facts may be discovered, that it is more to Alaska's interest to be treated in a separate classification; and that we must treat Alaska much more generously, and I am certain that she will be treated much more generously, than she would be if she were simply provided for in the bill as one of the States.

Mr. NEUBERGER. I thank the distinguished Senator from Florida. I am aware, and also appreciative, of the fact that the Appropriations Committee has made more ample allowances for roads in Alaska.

It was my thought in the Subcommittee on Public Roads of the Committee on Public Works that perhaps as much as one-half percent, or even one-fourth percent, of the total Federal-aid funds might be made available to Alaska. It was felt by some other members of the committee that this totally new feature should not be added to the bill at this time.

I am very glad to observe that the distinguished Senator from Florida is aware of the road needs of Alaska. I think I have traveled in Alaska as much as has any other Member of Congress, save, of course, Delegate BARTLETT, who represents Alaska.

One need only go across that vast land to become aware of the urgent necessity for more roads. There are many communities which have only 4 or 5 miles of road. For example, in southeastern Alaska there are many communities, like Ketchikan and Juneau, which could be connected by roads, but as to which the only existing means of travel is by ship or by air; and necessarily, in very bad weather in Alaska, this is frequently impossible because of fog, wind, or other storms.

If we are to take cognizance of Alaska's extreme importance militarily, it will be necessary to provide for more and better surface transportation in Alaska.

I am glad that the Senator from Florida has made this contribution to the discussion.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

ADDITIONAL APPROPRIATIONS, FISCAL YEAR 1955

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, from the Committee on Appropriations, I report favorably, without amendment,

House Joint Resolution 310, a joint resolution making additional appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1955, and for other purposes, and I submit a report (No. 371) thereon.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The report will be received, and the joint resolution will be placed upon the calendar.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield to me in order that I may address a question to the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN]?

Mr. NEUBERGER. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Is this a report on the House joint resolution providing additional appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1955?

Mr. HAYDEN. It is. The joint resolution is reported unanimously, without amendment.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. In the same amount as passed by the House?

Mr. HAYDEN. Yes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. And it is unanimously reported from the Committee on Appropriations?

Mr. HAYDEN. Yes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I give notice to the Senate that the report has been made, and that, whenever it is possible for the Senate to consider the joint resolution, it will be taken up. I wish all Senators to be placed on notice.

TRANSFER OF CONTROL OVER CERTAIN LAND, AND RELOCATION OF INDIANS RESIDING THEREON

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, since time beyond the memory of man, Indians of Oregon and Washington have lived along the banks of the mighty Columbia. In early times, forests of incomparable beauty were generous to these Indians of the river. There, game abounded in plenty, and a bountiful earth brought forth food more than adequate for these, her children.

The river, too, was kind to the Indians. It provided the salmon so rich in nourishment for a hardy people. For centuries the salmon gathered annually in countless numbers at Celilo Falls, on the Columbia, where in obedience to the command of nature they struggled mightily to leap the falls on their last journey—their return to the tiny upriver streams of their origin. At Celilo, the Indians traditionally assembled for the salmon catch; and it was there at some remote time in the past that they took up their homes, and lived in comparable well-being.

The coming of the white man brought weighty problems of survival to the Indians of the Columbia. Their forests were thinned or stripped, the wild game sought refuge in more remote areas, and the Indians along the Columbia were compelled to rely more and more upon the river as their source of food. Celilo Falls thus became the central point of their salmon fishery.

Celilo Falls will soon disappear, a casualty of the march of progress. In months to come, the falls will be inundated by the backwaters of the Dalles Dam. The Indians of Celilo must withdraw to new places of abode; but they will carry with them the memories of past years—past centuries—when their ancestors fished at the beautiful falls on the Columbia.

The Indians of Celilo know that the Pacific Northwest is a new frontier of progress and economic achievement. They know that the dams of the Columbia are inseparable parts of that progress. With sadness, but with dignity, they have bowed to the inevitable. They know that their homes on the river banks at Celilo stand in the way of completion of the works of the Dalles Dam, and that these homes must be removed.

The American people are known the world around for their traits of fairness; they recognize moral as well as legal obligations. The problem of providing new homes for the Indians who live at Celilo calls for a demonstration by the American people of these qualities. The problem is one of urgency; it cannot await leisurely solution.

The situation confronting these Indians has been described to me by their representatives and friends and by residents of many Oregon communities. Those with whom I have conferred agree that, due to the relocation of the railroad right-of-way, during the coming summer several Indian families must move from Celilo.

Mr. President, only a few weeks ago I was at The Dalles, Oreg.; and I held a series of conferences not only with Indian groups, but also with their representatives and with their council and with representatives of community groups of The Dalles and of the surrounding area. In the area there is complete unanimity that, in being removed to new abodes, these Indians are entitled to fair treatment from the American people, and that the Government of the United States should compensate the Indians for the cost of the removal, and should also compensate them for the value of the homes they are losing, and should make available to them new homes in which to live.

Mr. President, the advancing waters of the Columbia River will compel the remaining families to withdraw by not later than the summer of 1956. But the plain fact is that they have no new village or new homesites to which to turn. They are without funds to reestablish themselves. They need the Nation's help, and they need it promptly.

There are many who share my apprehensions concerning the welfare of these Indians. A group of resolutions describes the problem in graphic detail, and suggests the type of remedial action b the Federal Government which will be of greatest help. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks, three resolutions: The first, adopted by the Confederated Tribes of the Warm Springs Reservation, of Oregon; the second adopted by the Celilo Community Club; and the third, a resolution which was adopted by the 41st annual State conference of the Oregon State Society of the Daughters of the American Revolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. THURMOND in the chair). Is there objection?

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

RESOLUTION 938

"Whereas the Dalles Dam project on the Columbia River near The Dalles, Oreg., will inundate the Celilo Falls Fishery and will also flood and otherwise destroy the homes of some 26 Indian families who have their permanent homes in the vicinity of Celilo, Oreg., and in the vicinity of Spearfish, Wash.; and

"Whereas according to the present schedule of the Army engineers, some 5 or 6 families will be displaced during the coming summer, probably in July or August 1955, due to the necessity of relocating the Union Pacific Railroad running through the Celilo Falls area, and the homes of the other remaining permanent Indian residents will be inundated during the fall of 1956; and

"Whereas the Army engineers have no plans for relocating the Indian families whose permanent homes will be destroyed by this project; and

"Whereas these families, in addition to losing their homes, also are losing their means of livelihood due to the inundation of their traditional fishery at Celilo Falls and vicinity; and

"Whereas the Indians of the Yakima, Warm Springs, and Umatilla Reservations, together with unenrolled Indians residing in the Celilo Falls area, in cooperation with the Indian Service and the County Court of Wasco County, Oreg., are doing everything possible to aid and assist the Indian families whose homes are to be destroyed by this project, in bringing the matter to the attention of Congress, and have aided in drafting a proposed form of legislation for introduction in Congress during the current session, whereby the Corps of Engineers, United States Army, would be authorized and directed to utilize the sum of $200,000 of funds to be made available in connection with the Civil Functions Appropriation Act for the fiscal year 1956, for the construction of the Dalles Dam, for the purpose of providing housing and for the relocation of the Indian families in question: Be it therefore

"*Resolved*, That the tribal council of the Warm Springs Indian Reservation hereby approves the efforts being made to secure funds for relocating and providing housing for the Indian families in question, and urges the Commissioner of Indian Affairs, the Chief of Engineers, Corps of Engineers, and the Members of the Congress to take such steps as are necessary to provide means of relocating and providing housing for these Indian families."

The undersigned, as secretary-treasurer of the Confederated Tribes of the Warm Springs Reservation of Oregon, hereby certifies that the tribal council is composed of 11 members, of whom 9, constituting a quorum, were present at a meeting thereof duly and regularly called, noticed, convened, and held this 10th day of March 1955; that the foregoing resolution was passed by the affirmative vote of 8 members, the chairman not voting; and that the said resolution has not been rescinded or amended in any way.

JAMES G. SMITH,
Secretary-Treasurer.

Approved: March 10, 1955.

J. W. ELLIOTT,
Superintendent.

RESOLUTION

"Whereas residents of Celilo Village, Celilo, Oreg., an Indian fishing village, are advised that their homes and fishing facilities, and their fishery, are to be inundated by the Dalles Dam; and

"Whereas the residents of Celilo Village are in the process of forming an organization to be known as the 'Celilo Community Club,' to be composed of all residents of the village who wish to join, the principal purpose of this organization to be to keep informed regarding matters which affect them and their interests, and to take such steps as they feel necessary to protect their interests, and the interests of the Indians residing in this vicinity; and

"Whereas the members of the Celilo Community Club are advised that the schedule for completion of the Dalles Dam calls for final closure in October, 1956, at which time, all Indian homes, fishing shacks, and other property will be inundated; and

"Whereas the Army engineers have advised that relocation of the Union Pacific Railroad will necessitate the evacuation of 5 or 6 Indian families who reside within the relocation area, some time during the coming summer, probably in August or September 1955; and

"Whereas no provision has been made by the Army engineers, or by anyone else to provide for housing or relocating these families; and

"Whereas, these families face a very serious and critical situation, being faced with the necessity of moving within the next few months, and having no housing facilities to move to, or means of providing other facilities; and

"Whereas a meeting of members of the Celilo Community Club was held at Celilo, Oreg., on March 22, 1955, at which 16 members were present; and

"Whereas, it is understood that the Indian Service and the governing bodies of the Yakima, Umatilla and Warm Springs Tribes and their attorneys, are taking steps to have introduced in the present session of the United States Congress, legislation which would authorize and direct the Chief of Engineers, Corps of Engineers, to expend $200,000 of funds to be appropriated for construction of the Dalles Dam for the purpose of providing housing for Indian families who will be displaced by this project; and

"Whereas it is the feeling of members of the Celilo Community Club that every possible effort should be made to provide immediate means of relocating and housing the families who will be displaced by the Union Pacific Railroad relocation, and for relocating the other families who will be displaced upon closure of the dam in the fall of 1956: Be it therefore

"*Resolved*, That the members of the Celilo Community Club hereby endorse the form of legislation which the Indian Service and the Yakima, Umatilla, and Warm Springs Tribes are sponsoring, which, when enacted, will provide means of housing and relocating Indian families who will be displaced by the Dalles Dam, and hereby urge the Commissioner of Indian Affairs, the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, the congressional delegation from Oregon, and the congressional delegation from the State of Washington to do everything possible to bring about the enactment of the legislation in question, or similar legislation, to relieve the Indian families whose homes and means of livelihood are to be destroyed by the Dalles Dam project."

EDWARD EDMONDS,
Chairman of Celilo Community Club.

I hereby certify that the above resolution was duly adopted at a meeting held at Celilo, Oreg., on the 22d day of March 1955, by an affirmative vote of 16; that there were 16 members present at this meeting.

SHIRLEY P. BACON,
Secretary, Celilo Community Club.

The following resolution was passed by the 41st annual State conference of the Oregon State Society of the National Society, Daughters of the American Revolution, March 1, 1955, during their meeting in Portland, Oreg.:

"Whereas the Government of the United States, in pursuance of the program of the development of the Columbia River, is building the Dalles Dam below Celilo Falls; and

"Whereas the structure in pooling the river destroys the fishery which the Indians have reserved under treaty and have enjoyed for many generations; and

"Whereas damages have been paid to reservation Indians using the fishery; and

"Whereas the resident Indians have received no payment of damages nor has any provision been made for housing, rehabilitation, care of the aged, education of the children, or any way left open for future subsistence or livelihood except to become objects of charity: and

"Whereas the resident Indians are the descendants of Army Scouts, who served as guides and friends to the early settlers and were never moved from their long abiding places to any reservation; be it

"*Resolved*, That the Oregon State Society of the National Society, Daughters of the American Revolution, hereby deplore this grave wrong against a helpless, loyal people, and call upon the Congress of the United States to make prompt and substantial amends for this act of rank and unjust discrimination against the Indians whose homes are in the Columbia Gorge; be it further

"*Resolved*, That copies of this resolution be supplied the United States Senators and Representatives of Oregon and Washington and to Mr. Douglas McKay, Secretary of the Interior, and a careful note be kept of their responses thereto."

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, my office has been in conference with representatives of the Army engineers, in Washington. I wish to take this opportunity to observe that the Engineers have cooperated to the fullest extent in working out a legislative solution to the problem of relocating the Celilo Indians. I appreciate the Army engineers' fine work on this problem, and I know that all who are interested in the welfare of these Indians share my views in this respect.

Mr. President, on behalf of myself and my colleague, Senator NEUBERGER, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to facilitate the relocation of the Celilo Indians, and to authorize, for the purpose of the relocation, the use of funds heretofore appropriated to the Army engineers in connection with the Dalles Dam project; and I ask unanimous consent that the bill be printed in full in the body of the RECORD, at the conclusion of my remarks on this issue.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred, and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 2043) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to transfer the control of certain land in Oregon to the Secretary of the Army, to provide for the relocation of certain Indians residing on lands required by the United States for the construction of the Dalles Dam project on the Columbia River, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. MORSE (for himself and Mr. NEUBERGER), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD.

(See exhibit A.)

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, among its other provisions, the bill contains one which would empower the Secretary of the Interior to relocate the resident Indian families in the Dalles project who were domiciled there when the project was authorized. The bill would enable the Secretary to acquire lands for the purpose of the relocation, and would authorize him to take title in trust for the individuals affected. Under the bill, the Secretary may terminate the trust when, in his judgment, the occupant is capable of managing his own affairs. The latter provision is consonant with the admirable trend toward endowing our American citizens of various Indian groups with full privileges and responsibilities of citizenship.

The bill would authorize the transfer of $210,000 from the Secretary of the Army to the Secretary of the Interior. This amount appears to be sufficient to meet all the expenses of the relocation.

Problems are likely to arise in connection with the administration of the program covered by the bill, but these must not be permitted to overshadow the importance of obtaining prompt passage of this proposed legislation.

One administrative problem deserves special mention at this time: A group of the elderly residents of the Celilo Falls Indian community are most anxious to establish new homes in close proximity to the village they will be leaving. One of the finest friends of the Indians, and a leading citizen of our State and a very wonderful person she is, Mr. President; I refer to Mrs. Martha Ferguson McKeown, of Odell, Oreg.—discussed this matter with me just a few weeks ago, and at the same time she provided me with a memorandum which she had prepared in regard to these elderly Indian people. I ask unanimous consent to have her memorandum printed at this point in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks.

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

The resident Indians at Celilo Falls, under the leadership of venerable Chief Tommy Kuni Thompson, asked to be housed in a separate village beside the river. They ask that the longhouse, worship pole, and the chief's dryshack be moved, if necessary, for their preservation.

These old "long-hairs" want to remain beside the bones of their ancestors (their cemetery on top of the high bluff overlooking the falls). They want their worship pole restored and in its rightful place directly in front of the longhouse door. They want to live on in the old ways, "because they are best."

They ask that their own distinction between "home-folk and comers" be recognized by those in authority: "comers" come and go to homes in other places; "home-folk" have always lived within the rocky confines of the Columbia River Gorge.

The Wy-am-pums blame the "comers" for much of the dirt and discord at the falls. They were deeply disturbed when vandals destroyed the little carved bird on top of pole. Not only was that bird a symbol of chiefdomship, but it also carried their messages to the Almighty.

There is no official of the Bureau of Indian Affairs living in this area. Because they are wards of the Federal Government, these people are not given protection by our State police. They would like help in establishing and maintaining an "old-time Indian village" where they could welcome school children and courteous visitors.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, Mrs. McKeown is one of the outstanding authors of Oregon, and she is recognized as one of the best-informed persons in the Nation on Indian folklore. She understands the Indians of the West. She has engaged in a great deal of research into the history of our Indian problems; and, in particular, she is very well informed on the problems of the Celilo Indians.

Mr. President, to the officials of the Indian Bureau who eventually will undertake the details of the relocation as provided in the bill, I suggest serious and sympathetic study of the desires of the elderly Indians. Those who know the Indians appreciate their deep reverence for the area of the falls. It is their home, and it was the home of their forefathers; the earthly remains of their ancestors lie at rest on the high bluff overlooking the falls. The Indians feel that they belong to this very special part of the great river, and they wish to stay there for their few remaining years on this earth.

I am sure that the officials of Government who are to be entrusted with the important task of placing the Celilo Indians in new homesites will not overlook the little items which have such great importance to the people most directly affected, and I am sure that the Congress will cooperate to the fullest extent in giving basic justice to the people who dwell on the banks of the Columbia, at the Falls of Celilo.

Mr. President, just the other day, when I was in The Dalles, and when we discussed the matter of relocation and possible sites where the new homes for the Indians could be built; namely, as close as possible to the falls, and as close as possible to the Indians' historic, ancient burial grounds, and as close as possible to the ceremonial sites of the tribe—and those who are familiar with Indian history know how important to Indians such sites are—I became satisfied that there are sites very close to the falls where these Indians could be relocated.

Although I shall discuss this matter further in the Senate when the bill comes before us for action, at this time I wish to say to those who are responsible for the relocation that I hope they will never overlook the importance of relocating these Indians as close as possible to their old homesites, because, Mr. President, those of us who are white cannot possibly begin to understand and appreciate the sentimental values, the emotional values, and the deep religious and spiritual values to these Indians of their past, in light of their traditions, their history, and their folklore.

So I hope the committee to which the bill is referred will take speedy action on it; and I hope it will be possible for the Senate to pass the bill very quickly, on the calendar.

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

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Is it not true that many of the Indians of whom the Senator spoke so eloquently have treaty rights with our own country which go back almost a century? As I recall, they go back to about 1855. We have a very solemn obligation, which goes back even before Abraham Lincoln's tenure in the Presidency, to take care of these people.

Mr. MORSE. The Senator is quite correct. He and I, in introducing this bill, are seeking to fulfill two clear obligations of the American people—first, a legal obligation, and secondly, a moral obligation. I believe that as a people we have a duty to see to it that justice is done to this small tribe of Indians, who are really being washed out so far as homesites are concerned, because of legislation which produced the great Dalles Dam. We have a duty to see to it that, as the result of the legislation, we do not do an injustice to this small Indian tribe.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. NEUBERGER. I know my colleague, with his vast knowledge of the history of our State, is aware of the fact that the Indian fishery above the Dalles Dam is soon to be wiped out as the waters rise behind the dam. This fishery may be the oldest industry in the Pacific Northwest. I think it is quite significant that in this year when the Senator seeks to do something helpful for these Indians, we are celebrating the 150th anniversary of the arrival at Celilo Falls of Meriwether Lewis and William Clark. In their famous journals they commented about the fishing activities of these Indians. Even then, salmon fishing was the only means of livelihood that tribe knew.

These Indians, whom the senior Senator from Oregon wishes to help, and will help if it is within his power to do so, were living in that area prior to the coming of the first white man to Oregon. I think we certainly would be abdicating all our moral and ethical obligations if we did not take action to see to it that these people are relocated properly and have a means of supporting themselves.

Mr. MORSE. The Senator is entirely correct. I talked with Mrs. McKeown about this subject when I was at home recently. We are referring to what was certainly the first fishing industry in the State of Oregon. The salmon-fishing industry can be said really to have originated at Celilo Falls. The Celilo Indians made an important contribution to that region. I wish to stress something of which my colleague is well aware. He has referred to it in some of his brilliant magazine articles. We are dealing here with one of the richest lores of the State of Oregon. The relationship of the Celilo Indians to the salmon run in the State of Oregon is a very dramatic relationship. One has only to be at Celilo Falls at the time of the salmon run to appreciate it. It is still a very colorful event, although in decades gone by there was much more Indian ceremony connected with it than there is at the present time. The return of the Indians each year to Celilo Falls in large numbers for the salmon run, and the colorful ceremonials which formerly took place happened to be among the most rich and interesting pages of Oregon's history. The junior Senator from Oregon and I really are trying to do justice, both legally and morally, to this great tribe of Indians in our State.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for one further question?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. NEUBERGER. I should like to ask the Senator if it is not true that Mrs. Martha Ferguson McKeown, of Hood River County, a loyal friend of both the senior Senator from Oregon and myself, has done a great deal of most useful and humanitarian work in an effort to alert Members of Congress to the very urgent human needs of the Indians at Celilo Falls?

Mr. MORSE. Let me say in reply to my colleague that Mrs. McKeown really has been the No. 1 spokesman for the Celilo Indians in the State of Oregon, with regard to many of their problems, including this problem.

I do not know exactly what her title is, but she enjoys an honorary title within the Tribe of Celilo Indians. They have recognized her as a benefactress and as one who clearly understands the problems of the Celilo Indians. She has the confidence not only of the Indians, but of other groups in our State which are very much interested in protecting the legitimate rights of Indian tribes in our State.

EXHIBIT A

S. 2043

Bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to transfer the control of certain land in Oregon to the Secretary of the Army, to provide for the relocation of certain Indians residing on lands required by the United States for the construction of the Dalles Dam project on the Columbia River, and for other purposes

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized and directed to transfer to the control of the Secretary of the Army for use in connection with the Dalles Dam project, Oregon, an irregular-shaped parcel of land containing in the aggregate approximately 5.5 acres, located in lot 1 of section 17 and in lots 1 and 2 of section 20, township 2 north, range 15 east, Willamette Meridian, Oregon, lying northerly from and adjacent to the Columbia River Highway, being a portion of land previously transferred to the Secretary of the Interior by the Secretary of the Army pursuant to the act approved February 9, 1929 (45 Stat. 1158).

SEC. 2. The Secretary of the Interior is authorized to relocate those permanent resident Indian families in the Dalles project who were domiciled within the project area on May 17, 1950, and to acquire such lands as may be necessary therefor. Title to the lands so acquired shall be taken in the name of the United States in trust for the individual Indian for whose benefit it is acquired. Any such trust may be terminated by the Secretary of the Interior by the conveyance of a fee simple title to the Indian or his heirs or devisees, without application therefor, when in the judgment of the Secretary of the Interior the Indian or his heirs or devisees are capable of managing their own affairs.

SEC. 3. The Secretary of the Army is hereby authorized to transfer to the Secretary of the Interior, from sums appropriated for the constructed of the Dalles Dam project, not to exceed $210,000 for all expenses in carrying out the provisions of section 2 of this act.

SEC. 4. The Secretary of the Interior is authorized to enter into a contract or con-

tracts with any State or political subdivision thereof for carrying out any part of the Indian relocation authorized by this act.

NOTICE OF EARLY CONSIDERATION OF HOUSE BILL 4725, AMENDMENTS TO INTERNAL REVENUE CODE OF 1954

During the delivery of Mr. MORSE's speech,

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me in order that I may make a brief announcement, with the understanding that he will retain the floor, and that my remarks will appear at the conclusion of his statement?

Mr. MORSE. I am glad to yield under those conditions.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I ask the attention of the distinguished Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], chairman of the Committee on Finance, for the purpose of announcing to the Senate that today the Senator from Virginia has filed a report from the Committee on Finance on House bill 4725, a bill to repeal sections 454 and 462 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954. This report was filed pursuant to the unanimous action of the Committee on Finance. It will be available to all Members of the Senate.

I expect to confer with the minority leader [Mr. KNOWLAND] shortly, and I hope to bring this proposed legislation before the Senate some time later in the week. I wish Senators to be on notice that the report has been filed on the bill to repeal the so-called blooper, and that it is expected that the bill will be considered by the Senate later in the week.

I wonder if it will be agreeable to the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Finance to proceed to the consideration of the bill on some day later in the week.

Mr. BYRD. It will be entirely agreeable; and the sooner the better.

ORDER FOR RECESS TO TOMORROW

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I now ask unanimous consent that when the Senate concludes its business today it stand in recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

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. MORSE. Mr. President, I wish to say a word or two with reference to the road bill which is before the Senate.

At the outset I wish to extend my very sincere compliments and congratulations to the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE] for what I consider to be the great job of statesmanship he has performed in connection with the road bill.

The questions which I now raise with regard to a certain section of the bill constitute but tentative opinions on my part. If I am proved to be mistaken in some of my tentative conclusions, I shall not hesitate to change them as the debate progresses, because I never have any pride of opinion in a wrong conclusion, and I am always willing to cast my final vote on any issue on the basis of the preponderance of the evidence before the Senate. I have been giving some study to the bill, and shall give more study to it before the final vote. I wish to raise a question or two about the bill.

I refer particularly to section 2 (d) of the bill, which has to do with weight and length limits. In my judgment, reasonable weight and length limits can be justified; but I wish to point out a Federal-State problem which I think would be created by the language of section 2 (d) in its present form.

This section of the bill applies only to a national system of interstate roads, a system which encompasses only 40,000 miles of our primary roads.

We have a total of 234,000 miles of primary roads. Of course, section 2 (d) does not apply to those many thousands of miles of primary roads over and above the 40,000 miles of interstate highways. The committee report, at page 14, points out that there are portions of the primary system in certain States which carry more traffic than the national interstate system of those States. I understand from road authorities in my State that that is true in the State of Oregon, and I believe it to be true in a good many other States.

I shall refer shortly to the map in the rear of the Senate Chamber to illustrate the question I am raising this afternoon.

In the State of Oregon only one national interstate highway traverses the State. All the other primary roads are noninterstate highways, although we have a good many miles of interstate highway. What I wish to point out is that on all the other highways of our State the trucker or logger may haul a certain weight under State law and comply with the law. However, if section 2 (d) should become the law, and he should drive his vehicle over a small portion of the interstate highway, he would be in violation of the law. That would very clearly create a great deal of conflict.

Let me now refer to the map in the rear of the Senate Chamber to illustrate my point.

We are dealing with the red line on the map. That is the interstate highway which runs from the Oregon-Idaho boundary across the State of Oregon. Of course it continues on down from Portland to California, as the map shows.

Let us take the example of a logger or trucker—and I care not what his transportation vehicle is—and let us assume that he starts at Ontario, Oreg., which is on the eastern boundary between Oregon and Idaho, and that he stays off the interstate highway itself but travels on primary roads all across the State of Oregon, until he finally must cross the interstate highway at Pendleton or just outside Portland. He may not travel more than 10 miles on the interstate highway, but he must travel those 10 miles on the interstate highway in order to reach his destination.

Under section 2 (d) of the bill he would not be able to haul that load of logs or merchandise on the interstate highway, because he would be in violation of the prohibitions in section 2 (d).

The truckers and loggers of my State and others interested have spoken to me about this subject. I have just returned from Oregon, where in a series of conferences with truckers and loggers I was besieged with inquiries regarding this matter. I spent Friday and Saturday in Oregon making five major speeches. In addition I held a series of conferences with a great number of groups who wanted to discuss this problem with me.

They pointed out that that section would work a great disadvantage in our State. Because of the fact that our towns are much farther apart and because of our sparser population, our State permits larger vehicles and larger loads, and we therefore build our highways to accommodate the larger loads. That would not be possible in a State like Connecticut, for example, which is in part so ably represented by the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BUSH]. Traffic congestion on eastern highways is quite different from what it is on the so-called open ranges of the West.

The truckers and loggers have made known to me—and that is why I am raising the point for the consideration of the Senator from Tennessee—their contention, at least, that the enactment of section 2 (d) would have the effect of putting out of business in the State of Oregon thousands and thousands of dollars' worth of equipment.

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

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. GORE. First, I wish to thank the able senior Senator from Oregon for his very generous references to me. I am grateful to him. I cannot understand by what interpretation of section 2 (d) any piece of equipment which is now legal in the State of Oregon or in any other State would become illegal. In fact, the section does not undertake to fix or affect any legal limit. It only attaches, as a condition to the 90-percent investment in interstate highways the requirement that the States maintain their present weight and dimensional limitations on vehicles, or comply with standards recommended by the State highway officials and the Bureau of Public Roads, whichever is the greater.

Mr. MORSE. I should like to reply to the Senator on the basis of the representations made to me. I am merely transmitting to the Senator and to the Senate what the representatives of the trucking industry have said to me. They feel that if the bill should be passed with this section in it the load length in the State could not be changed even if they wanted it changed.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. GORE. That was not what the Senator had just stated before I asked him to yield. He was saying that the representatives had said to him that the use of thousands of pieces of equipment would be rendered unlawful by section 2 (d). I believe that is an erroneous interpretation. I should like to say that indications have come to me that a great deal of erroneous information has been sent out by certain people with respect to this bill.

Mr. MORSE. That representation was also made to me. That is why I am raising the question on the floor of the Senate this afternoon. We must have on the record the answer to such representations. If what has been represented to me is in error, I want the record to show it.

In my discussions with the truckers and loggers it was pointed out to me that in Oregon, for example, rather than having a legal limitation upon lengths and weights, what happens is that the State highway department, particularly during the war, granted a good many permits for lengths and load weights over and above the basic or maximum weights which theretofore had been allowed. That has become the practice in Oregon, and apparently in some other Western States. It has become the practice to grant to vehicles hauling within those States permits which allow them to exceed, so it is contended, the weights and lengths which would be permissible under section 2 (d).

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

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. GORE. The section to which the Senator refers would not alter that situation. I take it that what he refers to is done now in the State of Oregon in accordance with the law of the State of Oregon. The amendment would not in any way change that. It would not in any way undertake to persuade the State to change it. Permits are necessary in unusual cases, but the provisions of the bill would not in any way affect the present Oregon law on the subject.

Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield further?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I have here a compilation of State laws with respect to this particular point. The State of Oregon now permits maximum loads of 76,000 pounds. That would not in any way be affected or repealed by this provision of the bill. What the provision does is simply to say, "Let us call a halt to the ever-increasing trend toward heavier loads, higher loads, and greater lengths." The taxpayers cannot keep ahead of the ability of the automotive industry to build axles that will carry heavier loads. There is some doubt whether the taxpayers can keep ahead of the ability of certain industries to persuade State legislatures to increase the load limits.

This bill, as has been said repeatedly, is the largest bill ever to be considered by the Congress, other than a war measure. We are undertaking to build a magnificent system of national highways and to place them to a condition which is adequate to meet the problems of national defense and our national economy. When we are undertaking in one bill to start a program which will ultimately cost the American people more money than have the combined wars which the United States has fought, with the exception of World War II, then it seems to me we should not only lodge in the Congress the right but also place upon it the responsibility of protecting the people's investment in this vital system of national highways.

I wish to say to the Senator from Oregon, if he will pardon me——

Mr. MORSE. This is very helpful to me.

Mr. GORE. I have never had any connection whatsoever with railroads. I do not now have any such connection, and never expect to have any. But I do have a very personal interest in the trucking industry. The small business of which I am a majority owner operates a fleet of trucks, some of which are a little bit heavy. We could make more money if the weight limits were increased. But I take it, Mr. President, that the long-term interest of the trucking industry, which is so vital to our national economy, rests in uniformity, for one thing—uniformity of weights and dimensions—and also, more importantly, in a fine system of national highways which will endure.

I believe the responsible elements of the trucking industry favor this amendment. I have talked to responsible representatives of the trucking industry in the State of Tennessee, who tell me they strongly favor it. Of course, there is always a fly-by-night operator who wants to make a "fast buck" by overloading. But he must be restrained, and the responsible members of the industry want to see such an illegal operator restrained.

I had not intended to ask the distinguished Senator to yield to this extent, but since the question has been raised, I wish to say emphatically that this amendment would not make illegal the operation of any particular vehicle. It does not fix Federal limits. It attaches as a condition to the 90-percent investment in interstate highways the requirement that the States either maintain their present limits, load and dimensional, or comply with the recommendations of the State highway officials and the Bureau of Public Roads, whichever allow the greatest leeway.

Mr. MORSE. That is what I want in the RECORD, Mr. President. I want the contentions which are made, and the answers, and the Senator from Tennessee has usually been very cooperative in giving me his answers.

Another argument which has been presented to me is that, if we adopt this provision, an Oregon trucker who has a route from an Oregon town to a State of Washington town, may be stopped from traveling on the interstate highway in Washington to which Federal funds have gone, although he could travel on the same interstate highway in the State of Oregon. This would cause him to have a terminal on the border for the transfer of goods, or he would have to buy a fleet of smaller trucks, at great loss to himself, in order to continue transporting goods into the State of Washington. What has the Senator from Tennessee to say about that situation?

Mr. GORE. If that were the case, it would be the result of a law enacted by the legislature of the State of Washington.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. KERR. What the Senator from Oregon suggests could not occur unless that is the present situation.

Mr. GORE. It would not in any way be enforced by this provision.

Mr. KERR. If that were not already the situation the bill would not affect it, and if it were already the situation it would be by reason of the law of the State of Washington and not by reason of this bill.

Mr. GORE. I should like to go one step further and say that there is nothing in the bill which would prevent the State of Oregon from bringing its present limits up to the limits recommended by the Bureau of Public Roads. Let me remind the Senator that the Bureau of Public Roads now recommends design and construction standards to carry maximum loads at the levels recommended by the various State highway departments and concurred in by the Bureau of Public Roads. If we are to start building roads costing many billions of dollars with standards and designs inadequate to carry the loads presently being carried on those roads, then they will be broken up. If we are to build them at standards adequate to carry the loads now recognized by the States, then we would be foolhardy indeed if after spending billions of dollars of the taxpayers' money to build roads adequate to carry loads of those standards we should then sit idly by and do nothing and see the limits increased and the roads broken up again.

I repeat, that the long-term interest of the transportation industry is to have a national system of long-lasting highways. We can build them well, but we cannot build them to last under unlimited load conditions.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I have before me a summary of the principal State legal maximum limitations of motor vehicles. It is dated as far back as March 1952, and there have been some changes in some of the States; but, according to this statement, and judging from the standards set by the American Association of State Highway officials, there are 32 States—or there were at that time—including the State so ably represented by the Senator from Oregon, with a limit of 18,000 pounds on the axle; in 2 States the limit is 19,000 pounds; in 3 States the limit is 20,000 pounds; in 4 States the limit is 22,000 pounds; in 7

States the limit is 22,400 pounds, making a total of 48 States. But the majority of them at that time were complying with the recommendations of the American Association of State Highway Officials.

Mr. MORSE. Would the Senator from New Mexico be willing to have that material placed in the RECORD at this point?

Mr. CHAVEZ. Certainly.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the data to which the Senator from New Mexico has just referred may be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

Summary of principal State legal maximum limitations of motor-vehicle sizes and weights,[1] *March 1952*

[Revised where later information is available]

State	Width	Height		Length, longest combination	Number of towed units	Axle load		Practical maximum gross weight	
						Single	Tandem	2-axle trucks	Combinations, maximum
	Inches	*Ft.*	*In.*	*Feet*		*Pounds*	*Pounds*	*Pounds*	*Pounds*
Alabama	96	12	6	45	1 semitrailer	18,000	28,600	26,000	56,000
Arizona	96	13	6	65	1 semitrailer and 1 trailer	18,000	32,000	26,000	76,800
Arkansas	96	12	6	60	1 semitrailer or 1 trailer	18,000	32,000	26,000	71,900
California	96	13	6	60	Not restricted	18,000	32,000	26,000	76,000
Colorado	96	12	6	60	1 semitrailer, 2 trailers, or 1 semitrailer and 1 trailer	18,000	36,000	26,000	76,000
Connecticut	102	12	6	45	1 semitrailer	22,400	36,000	30,400	60,000
Delaware	96	12	6	60	1 semitrailer, 1 trailer, or 1 semitrailer and 1 trailer	20,000	36,000	28,000	60,000
Florida	96	12	6	50	1 semitrailer or 1 trailer	20,000	32,000	26,000	64,650
Georgia	96	13	6	45	do	18,000	36,000	26,000	56,000
Idaho	96	14	0	65	1 semitrailer, 1 trailer, or 1 semitrailer and 1 trailer	18,000	32,000	26,000	79,000
Illinois	96	13	6	45	do	18,000	30,000	26,000	72,000
Indiana	96	12	6	50	do	18,000	32,000	26,000	72,000
Iowa	96	12	6	45	1 semitrailer	18,000	32,000	26,000	60,800
Kansas	96	12	6	50	1 semitrailer or 1 trailer	18,000	32,000	26,000	63,890
Kentucky	96	12	6	45	1 semitrailer	18,000	36,000	26,000	42,000
Louisiana	96	12	6	60	1 semitrailer or 1 trailer	18,000	32,000	26,000	76,000
Maine	96	12	6	45	do	22,000	32,000	30,000	50,000
Maryland	96	12	6	55	Not restricted	22,400	40,000	30,400	65,000
Massachusetts	96	(1)		45	1 semitrailer	22,400	36,000	30,400	50,000
Michigan	100	12	6	55	1 semitrailer, 1 trailer or 1 semitrailer and 1 trailer	18,000	32,000	26,000	102,000
Minnesota	96	12	6	45	1 semitrailer or 1 trailer	18,000	28,000	26,000	65,500
Mississippi	96	12	6	45	do	18,000	28,650	26,000	52,650
Missouri	96	12	6	45	1 semitrailer, 1 trailer or 1 semitrailer and 1 trailer	18,000	28,600	26,000	56,000
Montana	96	13	6	60	1 semitrailer or 1 trailer	18,000	32,000	26,000	76,800
Nebraska	96	12	6	50	do	18,000	32,000	26,000	64,650
Nevada	96	(2)		(2)	Not restricted	18,000	32,000	26,000	76,800
New Hampshire	96	13	6	45	do	22,000	(3)	30,000	50,000
New Jersey	96	13	6	50	1 semitrailer or 1 trailer	22,400	32,000	30,000	60,000
New Mexico	96	12	6	65	do	18,000	32,000	26,000	76,800
New York	96	13	0	50	do	22,400	36,000	30,400	63,750
North Carolina	96	12	6	48	do	19,000	38,000	31,500	58,800
North Dakota	96	12	6	45	do	18,000	30,000	26,000	61,250
Ohio	96	12	6	60	1 semitrailer; others not restricted	19,000	31,500	27,000	82,000
Oklahoma	96	13	6	50	1 semitrailer or 1 trailer	18,000	32,000	26,000	98,000
Oregon	96	12	6	50	do	18,000	32,000	26,000	76,000
Pennsylvania	96	12	6	50	do	20,000	36,000	28,000	62,000
Rhode Island	102	12	6	50	do	22,400	(3)	30,400	108,800
South Carolina	96	12	6	50	do	20,000	32,000	28,000	64,650
South Dakota	96	13	0	50	do	18,000	32,000	26,000	64,650
Tennessee	96	12	6	45	do	18,000	30,800	26,000	42,000
Texas	96	13	6	50	do	18,000	32,000	26,000	58,420
Utah	96	14	0	60	1 semitrailer, 2 trailers or 1 semitrailer and 1 trailer	18,000	33,000	26,000	79,900
Vermont	96	12	6	50	1 semitrailer or 1 trailer	(3)	(3)	30,000	50,000
Virginia	96	12	6	45	do	18,000	36,000	24,000	50,000
Washington	96	12	6	60	do	18,000	32,000	26,000	72,000
West Virginia	96	12	6	45	do	18,000	32,000	26,000	60,800
Wisconsin	96	12	6	45	do	18,000	30,000	27,500	68,000
Wyoming	96	13	6	60	do	18,000	32,000	26,000	72,250
District of Columbia	96	12	6	50	do	22,000	38,000	30,000	64,650
AASHO uniform standard.	96	12	6	60	do	18,000	32,000	26,000	71,900
Number of States higher	3		14	3	10	15	13	16	18
Number of States same	46		33	10	30	33	24	32	1
Number of States lower	0		0	35	5	0	9	1	30

[1] Variations from these limits for some specific items of minor significance are omitted.

[2] Not restricted.

[3] Not supplied.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from New Mexico and the Senator from Tennessee for giving the answers to the contentions I have presented, more or less by request, I may say, in that I did not have the information to supply answers to the contentions when they were raised with me.

There was one other point which the delegations raised. They said that the State highway departments were able to change the requirements by administrative order without the necessity of including this section in the bill.

Mr. GORE. The bill conveys to the Federal Government no authority whatsoever in this field. It does not vest in the Federal Bureau of Roads any power to bring about load or dimensional limitations by regulation or otherwise. It merely says to the States, "If you wish to participate in the program, by which the Federal Government is now willing to make the principal investment in the interstate highways—90 percent of that investment—then you must agree either to maintain your present weight and dimensional limitations, if they are equal to or above the standards recommended by the American Association of State Highway Officials, or not to go beyond those standards in the event your present laws are below AASHO standards."

To state it in another way, the committee did not desire to undertake to compel any State to roll back its laws, nor did it in any way want to dissuade States whose standards or limits are now below standards recommended by the AASHO, from bringing them up to that level.

I believe 14 States now have either weight or dimensional limitations above the standards for which the roads are to be designed and constructed. There was a good deal of sentiment in the committee to the effect that a condition should be attached that all States having limits above those standards should reduce their standards to the proposed level. After careful consideration, the committee decided that it would not undertake to persuade the States to roll back their laws. The committee also decided, as I have said, not to discourage States having limits below the proposed standards from raising their limits to that level.

We think this bill will help to bring about uniformity in the weight, height, length, and width of vehicles. It will allow the equipment manufacturers to

standardize their production in that respect.

If it is possible to attain this uniformity, the operator of a truck which originates in Florida and is headed for Boston or Chicago will be able to load the truck with the assurance that when it meets the standards it can transport the load in every 1 of the 48 States.

Mr. MORSE. That leads to the final point I wish to make, and which was raised with me. It deals with the reciprocity problem, which has been such a headache in the administration of the road program. It relates to trucks being stopped at State boundaries, even though they are operating on so-called Federal highways, because they are carrying cargoes in excess of the load limits or exceed the length limits allowed in a given State.

It was explained to me that some States have worked out so-called reciprocity relationships, while many other States have not agreed to such reciprocity.

Would the passage of the bill permit, for example, a truck from Portland, Oreg., which meets the length and weight limits of Oregon, to travel from State to State, to Miami, Fla., without being barred in any State because its length or weight was in excess of what the law of the State requires for its trucks?

Mr. GORE. We hope that that will eventually be the result. However, this provision does not fix any Federal limits, nor does it undertake to persuade the States either to raise or to lower their present limits. We think the provision eventually will bring about the uniformity which the Senator recognizes by his statement as being desirable.

The question of reciprocity or lack of reciprocity, and the lack of uniformity, creates many hazards. Perhaps no other State in the Union has had more problems in that respect than has the State of Florida. The trucking industry in Tennessee now has many problems growing out of the lack of uniformity and the lack of reciprocity. However, no assurance can be given that uniformity will be the result of the provision. It is hoped that it will be; and an additional section was included in the bill, directing the Secretary of Commerce to proceed with exhaustive road tests and to recommend to Congress, as expeditiously as possible, whatever standards of construction or standards of weights and dimensions he thinks are necessary; but also to recommend to Congress practical means, so far as he is able to do so, of obtaining the uniformity so necessary for the motor vehicle transportation industry, and which I think is desired by the senior Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. One of the most remarkable contentions made by one of the spokesmen was that under modern highway construction requirements, the argument that weight is a factor which should be taken into account no longer applies. It was his contention that highways now, under modern engineering construction, are such that the adding of weight to a truck does not produce any deterioration in the highway.

This is very difficult for me to believe, and somewhat challenges my credulity. Nevertheless, the argument is made that the building of highways under modern highway construction standards is such that no truck could, on that kind of highway, carry a load which really would deteriorate the highway.

Mr. GORE. In other words, it was difficult to convince the Senator that the law of gravity had been repealed.

Mr. MORSE. And also a few other laws of physics, such as the laws relating to friction.

Mr. GORE. I repeat: The standards for design and construction which are now recommended and approved by the American Association of State Highway Officials comply with the standards recommended by the State highway officials and the Bureau of Public Roads. It is by those standards that the highways for which money is authorized in the bill are to be constructed. It would be an improvident Congress which would make a 90 percent investment in the national system of interstate highways, but would then take no move whatsoever to protect the vast investment of the people in such highways.

Mr. MORSE. I wish to thank the Senators from Tennessee and New Mexico for giving me this record, which I shall use in a further conference with those who seem to think that section 2 (d) is a dangersous provision of the bill. In my opinion the Senators have made a record which the opponents must answer in order to continue to take the position that the section ought to be stricken from the bill.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. CHAVEZ. The Senator from Oregon formerly was a member of the Committee on Public Works.

Mr. MORSE. That is correct.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I wish he were still there. If he had been there at the time the bill was being considered, he would have had an opportunity to see the moving pictures which were shown to the members of the committee, indicating how heavy loads can damage a road. The actual conditions were brought before one's eyes. The tests shown in the pictures were made by the State of Maryland in the immediate vicinity of Washington. Words simply cannot describe the picture; they are not adequate to give a description of the severe damage heavy loads can do to a road.

The main thing the Senator from Tennessee was trying to emphasize was that there was no desire in the minds of the members of the Committee on Public Works to hurt the trucking industry. Uniformity in weights will help the trucking industry more than if it were allowed to raise its allowable weight by 10,000 pounds, because it will tend to insure the durability of the roads. Much money will be expended under this bill in constructing roads, and if the roads are going to be destroyed in 2 or 3 years, or in 1 year, will the trucking industry be better off? Are the American people, who, under this bill, will be paying 90 cents out of every dollar for the construction of interstate roads, to be protected, or are we to legislate in favor of someone who does not understand the damage he is doing to himself by overloading his trucks, and the damage which would be done to the American people?

Mr. MORSE. I assure the Senator from New Mexico, and the Senator from Tennessee, too, that my raising questions this afternoon does not indicate I am opposed to the bill. I am going to support the bill, but if someone can show me that the bill can be perfected in some way, then I shall offer perfecting amendments. That is why I raise these questions this afternoon.

I desire to remind the Senator from New Mexico that I served with him when he was the ranking minority representative on the Committee on Public Works, and he did a grand job in that capacity, as he had previously done as chairman of the committee, and as he has done once again as chairman of the committee. He is making a fine contribution to the work of the Senate by the bill which has been brought before the Senate under his chairmanship, and as a result of the efforts of the Senator from Tennessee, who has labored shoulder to shoulder with the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. CHAVEZ. If the Senator will permit me to say so, there were other features of the bill which caused the committee to decide to support S. 1048 instead of the so-called administration bill. The administration bill would have frozen the moneys for country roads, farm-to-market roads, primary and secondary roads, for a period of 30 years. We did not forget those roads in this bill. We know that they are just as necessary as are the interstate roads. We have plenty of respect for and interest in the interstate roads, but we must not forget that the farmer has to be taken out of the mud, even if he may not like that phrase.

Mr. MORSE. I completely agree.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I am somewhat in the same situation as that of the Senator from Oregon, who has just yielded the floor. Complaints have reached me from my State, from persons who are genuinely concerned about various provisions of the pending measure and also of the so-called administration measure, which I understand has now been offered as a substitute.

I should like to ask the consent of the Senate to address some questions to the Senator from Tennessee, who is steering the pending bill, in an effort to bring about for the RECORD some discussion of some of the points which have already been mentioned, and also additional points which I believe have not been mentioned.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. DOUGLAS in the chair). Without objection, if the Senator from Tennessee is willing, permission is granted.

Mr. HOLLAND. First with reference to the point just made by the Senator from Oregon, which arises under section 2 (d) of the bill, I have had from my State a great many inquiries and a great many complaints, and some mere expressions of anxiety, in connection with that

section. I believe the Senator from Tennessee said a few minutes ago, and with great truth he spoke, that no State had had more serious problems than had the State of Florida in this field, because we have had literally thousands and thousands of trucks moving our citrus fruits and our vegetables into other areas of the Nation to which we can move them, and those trucks have encountered differences in road structure, differences in reciprocity, differences in State law, differences in municipal laws, and differences in license requirements and in road tax requirements, which have been sufficient to turn grey the hair of any operator in the motor trucking industry whose hair was not already grey.

Several questions have arisen, some of which have been ably discussed between the Senator from Oregon and the Senators from Tennessee and New Mexico, and I should like to refer to one of them. My attention has been drawn to the fact that, while the bill would be made applicable only to interstate roads, in the first place there is in my State, and I think in nearly every other State heavy mileage on the interstate roads which have already been completed, either wholly by State or city expenditure or under the 50–50 program which has been under way for a long time. The question has arisen whether or not it is wise, or even proper, to impose a Federal regulation on a system which has by no means been constructed altogether by the 90–10 program outlined in the bill, but which in some States is much nearer completion than it is in others, and which, as I have said, has been constructed in different States by various methods of contributory financing.

How does the Senator justify the extension of Federal regulation to this field which is so unevenly occupied, nationwide, for interstate highway roads which are to be constructed on the 90–10 basis?

Mr. GORE. I am sure the Senator will not mind if I say that the bill does not provide for Federal regulation. It contemplates attaching a condition to the 90 percent grant to the States for the purpose of building interstate highways. As to the many hundreds of thousands of miles of highways to which the Senator has referred as having been constructed partly with Federal aid, and in some cases without Federal aid, I should like to call his attention to the fact that almost invariably those roads have been constructed and designed under standards which are below the standards under which the new interstate roads will be constructed, and below the standards under which the interstate roads have been constructed for the past several years.

The committee did not wish to attach a condition upon the grant of Federal funds for aid in the construction of farm-to-market roads because the heavy traffic does not move to any great extent on farm-to-market roads. The heavy traffic and the rapid traffic are the important factors. I point out that it is the speed of the vehicles and the rapidity of the passage of the vehicles at high speeds and under heavy loads which have a deteriorating effect, as well as the condition of the road itself, which is also an important factor. The committee saw no way to attach conditions, nor did it desire to do so, in order to aid primary, urban, and farm-to-market, or secondary, roads, because in that field we are still participating on a 50-50 basis. But it felt that Congress had the right and obligation to protect the people's investment in a project in which the Federal Government is making the principal investment, namely, 90 percent.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the Senator from Tennessee. However, from the provisions of this section I note that in the beginning it would permit every State to participate; and I also note that the condition is in the nature of a condition subsequent, rather than a condition precedent, because in effect it provides that if hereafter the law is changed in such a way as to permit of the carrying of weights greater than those stated in the provision, then, from that time forth, no Federal money shall be paid on construction of the interstate system in the State which has thus changed its law. Is not that correct?

Mr. GORE. My interpretation concurs with that of the able Senator from Florida. After considerable discussion, the committee felt that we should erect a stop sign, and should say that somewhere, at some time, somehow, there must be a limit to the loads and the dimensions of the vehicles traveling on our highways, if we are ever to catch up, to to speak, as regards the construction and modernization of our highways, so that they will be able to handle the traffic as of a given period.

Mr. President, it may be that the committee has not done the wisest possible job in this case. I know of no Member of the Senate who has had as much experience in this field as has the able senior Senator from Florida. He has served as Governor of his State; and during his membership in the Senate of the United States he served for a number of years on the Senate Committee on Public Works, where he was very instrumental in bringing to the Senate and to the entire Congress major highway legislation. I sought his advice on several occasions, as the able Senator from Florida will recall, as we in the committee proceeded with the bill. So I wish to state that I appreciate very greatly the splendid contribution he has made.

If we have erred in some respects in this amendment, I solicit his aid in correcting it. We wish to submit to the Senate the best possible legislative proposal, and we wish to have the Senate pass the best possible legislation on this subject.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Tennessee for the overly warm and kind things he has said about me.

I desire to call his attention to the fact that some States now have prescribed limits which in my opinion are too high for safe and secure operation of vehicles upon the highways and for the long life of the highway. Furthermore, I desire to point out that the proposed provision will not correct that situation, but, instead, will perpetuate it. I am sure the distinguished Senator from Tennessee realizes that is the case.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I certainly concur in the statement of the able Senator from Florida that it will permit that condition to continue, and will not correct it. I do not think I could go so far as to say that the provision would perpetuate the condition. It would permit of its perpetuation.

I wish to say in all candor that in the committee there was sentiment—and I am not sure it was not majority sentiment—to have this condition attach more severely. I shall go a little further, and shall say that I believe that in the committee there may have been majority sentiment in favor of attaching to the 90 percent grants a condition that all States comply with the standards in accordance with which these roads are to be designed and constructed.

I asked the committee not to do that. Perhaps I was in error. However, I felt that this was the first time the Federal Government had undertaken to bring about some uniformity and to encourage the States to develop a pattern of uniformity and a pattern of realistic limits on loads and dimensions; and I believe that the Congress should, if possible, do so in a way which it can defend against all reasonable criticism. Perhaps we should have gone further.

At any rate, after much discussion, the committee finally decided to report to the Senate a measure which would not compel the States to roll back their laws, but would permit their existing laws to stand, and would permit the funds to continue to flow into the interstate system, and would permit other States to raise their limits up to the standards recommended by the Association of State Highway officials and the standards in accordance with which the highways are to be constructed, in terms of the loads to be carried.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, it seems to me that perhaps some attention should be given to the point I have just made, namely, that in the States where the limits are very high—and too high, I believe——

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I desire to concur in that statement by the able senior Senator from Florida.

Mr. HOLLAND. As I was saying, Mr. President, I believe that some attention should be given to the point I have just made, namely, that in the States where the limits are very high—in fact, too high, I believe—the situation will be left as it is.

Secondly, I wish to call the attention of the distinguished Senator from Tennessee to the fact that even where some relief is to be given to States whose limits are now too low, according to my judgment, not sufficient relief is provided by the standard employed. That is the 1946 standard, as suggested and recommended by the American Association of Highway Officials, and followed, likewise, by the Bureau of Public Roads, in the case of heavy-duty highway construction, but not necessarily the construction of heavy-duty highways of the type which it is proposed to build for this brandnew mileage on the interstate system of highways. So it seems

to me there is grave question as to the adequacy of the treatment now proposed.

Having in mind the grave questions I have mentioned, it seems to me that it would be wholly unwise for the Federal Government to go into this field, because I believe that would encourage and almost surely would bring on such things as the following:

First, a Federal speed law. I believe that the harm done to the roads by heavy traffic travelling at high rates of speed is greater than the harm done by great weight, in and of itself.

Second, whether hordes of Federal inspectors and policemen would not be on the roads, checking on such matters as speeding, size, weight limits, and length and width.

Third, whether the continued operation of very heavy buses, which now exist by the thousands over the Nation, would not actually be legalized in such a way as to permit the States to continue to receive aid, under this measure, for their interstate mileage. In that respect, I refer to buses of a width and height greater than those prescribed by the American Association of Highway Officials. Such buses operate on city streets which have been built heavy enough to carry them, although such streets are a part of the interstate system.

It seems to me the objectives are certainly sound. But I believe that the possible ill effects and the lack of good effects to flow from this provision are so many, and cause so much doubt as to its wisdom, that in my opinion it would be sounder for us to deal with this situation by reciting—and I believe that is done elsewhere in the bill—the concern of the Congress, and the fact that a survey is underway. Even though it may not be underway on the scale on which we believe it should be made, at least let us have the survey made. Then, in the case of highways built in major part with Federal funds, in the event the facts show that those highways are being traveled upon in such a way as to destroy them with undue rapidity, either because of the weight of the vehicles or because of the speed of the vehicles or because of the other factors which destroy highways, the Congress could call attention to the fact that remedial legislation would be enacted or at least would be possible. Then we could determine where we should go from there.

We are embarking on a very worthwhile venture, which will require a good many years. Facts will be developed in connection with it as we move along. It seems to me that for us to try to put something in a bill which is of doubtful effect, and may be hurtful instead of helpful in some areas, would be certain to cause grave questions to arise in certain localities, and would be of very doubtful wisdom.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield in order that I may comment?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. GORE. The senior Senator from Florida is one of the truly fine and able logicians in the Senate. I usually follow his logic step by step with admiration, and, for the most part, eventually with agreement.

I cannot exactly follow him in this instance, however, when he says, first, that the provision recommended by the committee is inadequate, and therefore we should not enter this field at all.

I concede it may be inadequate. I concede that there are States now with limitations, both as to dimensions and as to weight, which, in relation to the standards by which the roads are to be constructed, are already too high. It may be that the committee should have brought to the Senate a provision which would have required reduction of the legal limits to permit those States to qualify for this program. However, for reasons which I have already cited, we concluded not to do so, but to bring to the Senate a provision which could be defended in all respects, in the opinion of the committee, as being reasonable.

The Senator from Florida says that the standards were adopted in 1946. That is true; but the standards recommended are consonant with the engineering, design, and construction standards employed at the present time.

The Senator from Florida made one further point, and that is that we had directed the Secretary of Commerce to proceed with certain tests. We have; and we thought that was a wise step. We thought it also wise to undertake to maintain the present limits so long as they do not go beyond the standards we establish in the act, until we get a report on these studies and tests. It may well be that the Congress will then wish to adopt a different provision. It may well be that the Bureau of Public Roads and the State highway officials will recommend different standards. But it would seem to be the part of wisdom—at least it so appeared to the committee—that, pending the making of such tests, which will require a period of 4 to 6 years, we should attach conditions which would preserve the people's vast investment in this national highway system.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the distinguished Senator.

In closing I merely wish to call attention to the fact that the Senator has recognized, as I was sure he would, because of his candor, that the standards prescribed by the bill are inadequate.

He has also recognized that the standards prescribed are nonuniform, in that, in every case in which the State statute permits greater weight, greater height, or greater length of vehicle than prescribed in the 1946 recommendations of the AASHO, those higher standards prevail. They are not uniform, as the distinguished Senator well knows.

So it seems to the Senator from Florida that the result of the enactment of this measure would be to prescribe a standard which is stated by the sponsors of the bill to be inadequate, which is known by all to be nonuniform, and which—and this is the main point I make—in the anxiety of many people, would simply be an opening step to federalization of the enforcement of highway travel regulations, to a degree we have not seen heretofore. I believe that most States are desirous of avoiding such a situation.

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

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. GORE. The junior Senator from Tennessee does not know how the Federal Government could quickly bring about uniformity in weight and dimensional limitations, except through enactment of a Federal statute providing such limitations as Federal law. That would place the Federal Government in the position of exercising police power upon the roads within our various States. The committee regarded this step as repugnant. We did not propose any such step.

As I have said to the Senator, I readily acknowledge that the provisions we have recommended may be inadequate in some respects, but we think it is vastly preferable to doing nothing at all.

Mr. HOLLAND. Does not the Senator also recognize that the standard sought to be imposed is nonuniform, and would permit 1 State to secure matching funds for its interstate highway mileage on a 90–10 basis, on conditions under which another State would be refused the opportunity to accept such funds?

Mr. GORE. In the case of the 14 States with weight limitations above the standards recommended by the American Association of State Highway Officials, it would operate to permit States with limits above those of other States to obtain these funds——

Mr. HOLLAND. And would deny to the other 34 States the right to obtain the same Federal help on a 90–10 basis for the construction of their interstate mileage, if in the wisdom—or unwisdom—of their legislatures, they should raise their now existing limits to the limits of the 14 States, or any of them, which are above the standards set by the American Association of State Highway Officials.

Mr. GORE. That is true; and the committee reached that decision after due deliberation. We did not wish to bring to the Senate a repressive measure. We did not wish to bring to the Senate a provision which would require States to roll back their laws. As one member of the committee, I would hope that the States now permitting weights and dimensions above those standards would recognize that it is in the interest of the State, in the interest of the motor vehicle transportation industry, and certainly in the interest of preserving good roads, to roll back their laws to the standards. I inquire of the Senator just how he would propose that we bring about national uniformity with respect to weights and measures.

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator from Florida has made no recommendation along that line, except that the subject be studied, and that the States be apprised of the fact that it is being studied and that the Congress has in mind going into a field which we would very reluctantly enter. The Senator from Florida thinks that would bring more pressure to bear than would the enactment of a law which would permit 14 States to receive Federal money on terms which we now believe, from the best information we have, to be unsound terms.

Mr. GORE. I am sure the Senate would give very careful consideration to an amendment, offered by the Senator from Florida, which attached to the use of the funds the condition that all States comply with the standards of the American Association of State Highway Officials. I would not be in a position to vote for the amendment, but I am not sure that I would be entirely out of sympathy with it.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the distinguished Senator from Tennessee. The Senator from Florida would not offer such an amendment, because he does not believe the present state of the facts and the present state of the law permit the working out of anything in this field which would be fair as between the States. The Senator from Florida further believes that the admission of his friend the distinguished Senator from Tennessee, to the effect that the provision under discussion is inadequate and nonuniform as between States generally rather clearly proves that it cannot be fair in its present form.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I wonder whether the Senator from Florida would change his word "admission" to "acknowledgment."

Mr. HOLLAND. I am perfectly willing to change the statement to read that the Senator from Tennessee acknowledges or concedes. The effect is the same. The distinguished Senator from Tennessee pursues a fine objective, and in so doing admits or concedes or acknowledges the two facts which I believe prevent the legislation from being sound; namely, that it is inadequate to do what he wants it to do and, second, that it is nonuniform as between the States, recognizing as he does, that that leaves us in the position of granting sums of money to certain States in which, under this provision in the bill, there is grave doubt whether the money would be wisely expended.

Mr. GORE. It is precisely upon that illogical premise—if I may respectfully describe it as such—that I believe my able friend perhaps trips himself in an unusual manner. He says, first, that the measure is inadequate. He criticizes the measure because it does not provide a perfect cure to all the ills. Because it does not provide a perfect cure to all the ills, he says we should not undertake to provide any cure at all, or to do anything at all, because we do not do all that is necessary to be done. I am unable to follow the Senator there.

I believe there is a very grave problem involved. I do not believe that the provision recommended by the committee is a perfect solution. However, I do not think we can ignore the problem merely because we are unable to recommend a perfect solution. Nor do I think we can abstain from attempting to do something merely on the ground that we cannot do a perfect job at the present time. It seems to me that, on the contrary, now is the time to give warning to the States. Now is the time to let them know that Congress is giving very careful consideration to this problem, and that it has directed the Secretary of Commerce to proceed with these exhaustive tests and to transmit to Congress his findings and recommendations in order that Congress may attain some uniformity and safeguard the people's investment.

Meanwhile, however, unless Congress does take some acton, the horse may be out of the barn.

Mr. HOLLAND. Meanwhile, if I understand the situation, we will be making grants to 14 States on terms which we would deny to any of the other 34 States if they tried to claim them on those terms, and on terms which they say are so high that they are fearful of the soundness of the investment being made.

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, I wonder whether the Senator from Florida would yield so that I may ask the distinguished Senator from Tennessee some questions, provided the Senator from Florida does not lose thereby the floor.

Mr. HOLLAND. With that understanding, I am glad to yield.

Mr. BIBLE. The Senator from Florida has commented on some dangers which may come about because of a lack of uniformity, and the Senator from Tennessee has pointed out that a warning is being given to the various States.

I am advised it is more than a warning so far as the State of Nevada is concerned. The proposal made, if enacted, would practically put the whole trucking industry in Nevada out of business. I say that because in the State of Nevada there is no statute with respect to weights and lengths. I invite the Senator's attention to the fact that the State of California has a height limitation of 13 feet, 6 inches, and a length limitation of 60 feet. The recommended AASHO standard is a height of 12 feet, 6 inches, and a length of 50 feet. In Utah the height limitation is 14 feet, and the length limitation is 60 feet.

If a truck leaves Utah and enters Nevada, how does it comply with the provisions of section 2 (d)?

Mr. GORE. Section 2 (d) does not in and of itself create or provide any limits. I believe the Senator has pointed to a very real problem, to wit, where a State now does not have a limitation on height or length.

Mr. HOLLAND. And which—if I may interject—has trucks that go freely over the border eastward into Utah and westward and southward into California, and most of whose business must go in one direction or another.

Mr. BIBLE. I use the example because the State of Nevada has for many years attempted to bring itself into uniformity with western State associations, State highway engineering officials, and the American Association of State Highway Officials, but the State has not enacted legislation because of the divergence between the limitations imposed by the State of Utah and the State of California, to use two examples.

The same thing is true with respect to the States of Arizona, New Mexico, Oregon, and Washington. They also have different height and length limitations.

I should like to know what would happen to Nevada's requests for interstate funds if it has no statute on that point. If it must fall back on the AASHO measurements, it cannot permit any trucks to come into Nevada from New Mexico or Oregon, for example.

Mr. GORE. It would appear to me that there is no problem at all, because so long as the State maintains its present law it can fully comply. Nevada has no law. All it needs to do is to continue in that category.

Mr. BIBLE. Is the distinguished Senator from Tennessee willing to have that fact spelled out in the law, so that there will be no question about it?

Mr. GORE. I believe it is already spelled out in the bill.

Mr. BIBLE. Will the Senator point to that provision?

Mr. GORE. I refer the Senator to page 7 of the bill. I read as follows:

> (d) No funds authorized to be appropriated for any fiscal year by this section shall be apportioned to any State within the boundaries of which the National System of Interstate Highways may lawfully be used by vehicles with any dimension or with weight in excess of the greater of (1) the maximum corresponding dimensions or maximum corresponding weight permitted for vehicles using the public highways of such State under laws in effect in such State on May 1, 1955.

That is the answer to the Senator's question. All that Nevada need do is to keep its legislature out of session or keep it from doing anything in that regard.

Mr. BIBLE. Why not provide that in the event there is no law, alternative No. 2 does not apply? Some people in my State are fearful that alternative No. 2 would apply.

Mr. GORE. I know that some people are disturbed about it. However, in line 16 the bill reads:

> In excess of the greater of—

Alternative 1 or alternative 2. I have read alternative 1. No. 2 spells out the standards recommended by the American Association of State Highway Officials.

Mr. BIBLE. Nevada has no law on height. California provides a height of 13 feet 6 inches. The maximum recommended by AASHO is 12 feet 6 inches.

Mr. GORE. So long as Nevada maintains its present law, it compiles fully with this section. If the State of Nevada has no limit on height, and if it does not enact any law on that point, it complies fully with the provisions of this bill. I must concede that here again is another example of a situation in which this bill, if enacted, may not bring about uniformity. However, it certainly does not enforce uniformity, and that is what the committee refused to do. We did not want to attempt, certainly not at this stage, to enforce a national uniform code on weights and sizes of vehicles. It may become necessary to do so after the tests are completed, unless there is cooperation and compliance with the provisions of the bill. I personally hope it will not be necessary.

Does that answer the Senator's question?

Mr. BIBLE. I think it partially answers it. I am not so much worried about the warning as about the legalistic facts which may be presented.

I thank the Senator from Florida for yielding to me for asking questions of the Senator from Tennessee. I wish to be abundantly assured that if the bill becomes law there will be no problem

about Nevada's failure to have a law on the question of height and length precluding her from receiving funds.

Mr. GORE. I point out that in line 19 the language reads "under laws in effect in such State." The provision is not limited to specific dimensional law; it does not specify weight law; it refers to laws in effect in such States. As I understand, a truck height corresponding to that which is legal in California is now legal in the State of Nevada.

Mr. BIBLE. That is correct. But there is no law on that particular subject.

Mr. GORE. I cannot see how Nevada's right would be jeopardized in the situation stated by the Senator.

Mr. BIBLE. I will say to the Senator that it would be embarrassing for me to go home and discover that funds for interstate roads are no longer available. Certainly the authority can be spelled out in this particular provision of the bill.

Mr. GORE. That is my interpretation of it.

Mr. BIBLE. I thank the Senator very much for his answers to my questions, and I thank the Senator from Florida for his indulgence.

Mr. HOLLAND. I am very glad to have the Senator participate in the colloquy, because I think we are all trying to bring out the rough points in the proposed legislation, of which there are manifestly many.

The next point I had marked for question I shall not go into, because I think it has been taken care of by the amendment striking out the language concerning advertising signs within 500 feet on each side of the right-of-way. Has not that been entirely eliminated from the bill?

Mr. GORE. Yes; it has been.

Mr. HOLLAND. There is another point which I should like to go into before the Senate takes a recess, and there are still others which I may want to explore in the morning.

I now refer to section 17 of the bill, page 20, concerning provisions of the Davis-Bacon Act, with which, of course, the Senator is completely familiar, which would be made applicable to highway projects in the national system of interstate highways, that is, construction projects on the interstate system in every State. By way of a preface to my remarks I should like to say that while I can see how any earnest Senator would want to extend to the provisions of the Davis-Bacon Act to those who work with their hands under public contracts; but I personally feel that we are now talking about a field of public works in which the provision is completely inapplicable as a matter of practicality, and to my way of thinking we would simply be loading down the program with an unsound and unworkable provision.

I will say to the distinguished Senator that in my 4 years as chief executive of my own State, to which the Senator has been kind enough to refer, we had to build a great many roads. It was in time of war, and we had to build a great many of them under force account because contractors could not be interested at that time.

We built nearly all the overseas highway to Key West under force account. From my observation during that experience, and in the State legislature, and since I have been a Member of the Senate, I have felt that work on road projects is peculiarly not adaptable to the provisions of the Davis-Bacon Act, which requires a level of pay the same as that which prevails in the same or similar industries in the neighborhood, and it also applies the weekly and hourly limitations which the pending bill would provide, and the overtime limitations.

For instance, let us assume a contractor begins rolling a section of road and it begins to rain, it rains a while and then lets up a while, then rains a while and again lets up for a while. He has his road materials hot and moving, and there is no way for him to shut off for the day. There is no employee of his who would think of wanting to quit at that time. The employees would keep right on, if necessary, until midnight or for such time as was necessary to get the job completed. When it comes to esprit de corps, few organizations which have come under my observation compare in the loyalty to employers and in the feeling of friendliness between employers and employees which exists in this particular field. Here they are, out on the road somewhere, building something that is very worthwhile from the standpoint of the development of the area. They are joint adventurers in it, and they will do their utmost to bring about the desired result.

It is not proper to put a business of that type under the hazard of having applied to it wages and hours which may obtain at some other point, in another direction. That is what would confront us, for instance, in the length of the interstate system in north Florida between Jacksonville and Pensacola, or is what would happen on the length of the highway between Jacksonville and Miami, between Miami and Orlando, or between Miami and Tampa. It is all impractical. Such provision has been omitted as a result of sound decisions made in this field by committees ever since we have had a Federal-aid road program.

So far as I am concerned, I am very strongly opposed to the continuation of this provision of the Davis-Bacon Act in the bill. I have supported the extension of such a provision as this with regard to ordinary Federal construction, such as the construction of public buildings, and I have supported a State law which is known as the "little Bacon-Davis Act," applied to certain State structures within the State of Florida. But I see so much difference between ordinary building construction and highway construction that I feel obliged to state my anxiety and concern at the inclusion of this provision, and my desire to eliminate it.

Perhaps the Senator from Tennessee would care to comment upon the provision and why it was included. I have read the report very carefully. One of the portions of the report which I thought was almost entitled to a smile was that wherein it is said that we are not going to confine the operation of the law to secondary roads because they often are away from civilization. There is no place that goes farther away from civilization than do many of the stretches of the interstate system, because they run clear across our Nation and through remote areas. So it seems to me that the justification in the report for this provision is very slight. Certainly, it is not conclusive or satisfactory from my viewpoint.

Does the Senator from Tennessee feel that this provision should remain in the bill?

Mr. GORE. First, in my opinion, the provision is not vital to a good highway bill. Regardless of whether the provision applying the Davis-Bacon procedure to the interstate highway project remains in the bill or is deleted, we will nevertheless have an excellent, vigorous highway program as a result of the bill.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for one incidental question?

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. Is it not true that if applicable anywhere, this provision would be more nearly applicable to the urban system than to the interstate system?

Mr. GORE. That may well be, and I will come to that point in a moment. However, I have said that the provision is not necessary in order to have a sound highway program; and to some extent it may be regarded as extraneous to a highway program. Nevertheless, I think it is a wise and just provision.

Everything the Senator has said about the start of a project, about the rain coming, and so forth, can also be said of an airport project or of the construction of a hospital under the Hill-Burton Act.

The Davis-Bacon Act applies to both types of projects. It applies also to lease-purchase projects.

The committee first considered an amendment to apply the Davis-Bacon procedure to all projects on Federal-aid highways. I took the position, and eventually the majority of the committee also took the position, that we ought not apply the Davis-Bacon procedure to projects in which the Federal Government was making only 50 percent of the investment.

Mr. HOLLAND. What about projects like forest highways, highways in the public lands and national parks, and parkways, where the Federal Government pays 100 percent of the cost?

Mr. GORE. That brings us to the second standard which the committee sought to follow, namely, that those projects are almost exclusively far removed, not from civilization—I think the Senator from Florida was interpreting the report liberally when he used the word "civilization"—but far removed from industrial centers and large municipal centers, where, to a great extent, labor indigenous to the area would be used. It may already apply in those instances.

At any rate, the committee did not feel that in this act it should apply the Davis-Bacon procedure to the rural roads. Neither did it believe the Davis-Bacon procedure should be applied to projects

in which the Federal Government met only 50 percent of the cost.

However, the committee reached the conclusion, not unanimously concurred in, but agreed to by a majority, that unless the Davis-Bacon procedure could be applied to projects in which the Federal Government made 90 percent of the investment, then the Davis-Bacon Act might as well be repealed. Perhaps we were going a little far in reaching that conclusion. Perhaps I have overstated the feeling of the committee.

But we felt, first, that the Federal Government had the Davis-Bacon Act and was applying it to all purely Federal projects, unless there are exceptions which I do not now have in mind, and to many other projects in which we were making only part of the investment.

Second, we were undertaking a program of interstate highway construction in which the Federal Government would be making 90 percent of the investment.

Third, for the most part, contracts on the interstate system would be undertaken by large contractors and large contractor organizations, which perhaps would not have great difficulty in complying with this provision.

Those are the reasons, as I understand them, which actuated the committee in making this recommendation and reporting the provision to the Senate. I shall support its retention. Frankly, I would not want the provision to endanger the passage of the bill. I think the bill is more vital than the provision. I think, however, that the provision is just and wise.

Mr. HOLLAND. I wish to read for the RECORD that portion of the report to which I referred, because I think the wording of it is somewhat between the position first taken by the Senator from Tennessee and the position he may have taken in answer to my question.

Mr. GORE. Will the Senator from Florida smile when he comes to the word "civilization"?

Mr. HOLLAND. I do not believe we have that word to consider.

Here is the wording:

> It is believed that the provisions should apply to projects on the Interstate System, but that some difficulty might be experienced should the provisions apply to the Federal-aid primary and secondary projects, many of which are located in rural and isolated areas.

Mr. GORE. I live in a rural, somewhat isolated area, but I have had a little contact with civilization.

Mr. HOLLAND. I think the distinguished Senator from Tennessee realizes, as I do, that this provision is not necessary to the enactment of an excellent bill. What I am trying to do is to get the bill in such shape that I can support it as readily as the Senator from Tennessee is now supporting it.

Secondly, the provision is highly questionable, because it goes into a new field, from which the Federal Government has heretofore steadfastly abstained from entering, even as to 100 percent paid projects, projects constructed wholly with Federal funds, either on force account or under contract. My understanding is that the Federal Government has completely abstained from entering this field for the reasons which I recited a few minutes ago, and I believe they are sound reasons, which make the highway-construction business so difficult to regiment in the way that most industrial and building businesses can be regimented.

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

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I believe exactly as does the Senator from Tennessee. I want to support the provision, but I would be willing to agree to some kind of compromise. Would the Senator be satisfied if the language were to provide for the prevailing wage in the individual States through which the interstate system goes?

Mr. HOLLAND. That would be better, of course, I may say to the distinguished Senator. I think when it comes to applying that kind of provision every time, and trying to regiment a business which simply cannot be regimented in the way a factory can be——

Mr. CHAVEZ. The Senator should not be surprised at the Government regimenting, because the Government is regimenting every day in the week.

Mr. HOLLAND. Yes; but we do not have to assist the Government in its effort in the way some officials of the Government extend regimentation to ever more fields.

Mr. CHAVEZ. But I believe this provision will not do anything more than to try to give to the human beings who work for contractors on Federal highways, and who are making plenty of money out of their contracts, at least a living wage.

Mr. HOLLAND. I certainly join with the distinguished Senator from New Mexico in the feeling that those who work on highway projects should earn a living wage, but my own observation is that the contractors are looking for the best men; and that a man who is lazy or noncooperative or disloyal cannot stay long with a contractor or with a State, if that State is building on force account. The highest degree of loyalty, cooperation, and satisfaction with the wage rate being paid should be required of a man who works on the building of public roads.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Yes; but a contractor is out to make a profit; and I am for that. He is entitled to a legitimate profit, yes; but not at the expense of human suffering. A contractor is like anyone else. If he can get a loyal, efficient man to work for 40 cents an hour instead of 80 cents an hour, he will do it.

But if the Federal Government is to pay 90 cents out of every dollar toward the construction of a highway, I cannot see any reason why Congress, in passing this bill cannot include in the bill a provision that one who labors, who toils, who will not make a profit, but who is actually going to construct the road, should receive a fair wage, and nothing more.

We love to brag—oh, how we brag—about the American standard of living. But the American standard of living is dependent upon our ability to maintain it. If a contractor pays a wage that will not permit his employees to maintain the American standard of living, how will the American standard of living be maintained?

Our only reason for including the provision was our desire to have a fair wage paid in every State; but I think an amendment can be drawn by which we can provide that the States shall fix what the minimum standard of wages shall be within their jurisdicaion. Let Florida control her minimum wages; let New Mexico control hers; let the other States control theirs—so long as we recognize the particular problem. That is what we had in mind.

Mr. HOLLAND. That kind of provision certainly would be preferable to the present provision of the bill, and I shall be glad to study any amendment which the distinguished Senator may prepare.

Mr. President, I have other questions to ask about the proposed act, but it is now 6 o'clock. I appreciate the attention of the Senators who have stayed here this overlong period this afternoon. I hope we can eliminate some three or four provisions of the bill, and then pass the bill in such form that we can get a resounding majority for it.

I may say that I am not unmindful of the fact that the administration has a bill in the Senate. I was privileged to know the contents of that bill, along with other Senators, prior to its introduction.

I think a very real service was performed in the suggestions made that the interstate system was being neglected. Senators may remember that I was the author of the first proposal in the Senate committee to put $50 million a year into this field exclusively, and we wrote it into the Senate bill, though it was reduced to $25 million in the House. I believe it was in 1950 that I proposed separate treatment of the interstate system, apart from the other three systems.

Senators will also remember that I supported ardently the effort by which we raised the amount to $175 million in the last Federal aid proposal. I was very strongly of the feeling that we should go even further.

I certainly want to have a measure I can not only vote for but feel is a culmination of an effort which I at least had some part in starting.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Florida yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. GORE. I wish to point to one other step for which the Senator was largely responsible. It was last year that for the first time Congress raised the Federal share of the cost of interstate highways to 60 percent. The Senator offered that amendment in the Public Works Committee. If he will recall, I was the junior Senator on the committee at that time, and the vote was tied, and when my turn to vote was reached I voted with the distinguished Senator from Florida.

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator from Tennessee is correct. I am glad he has reminded me of that. It was his vote, standing with my own, which had been cast earlier, and with the votes of 4 or 5 other Senators who felt as we did, that made it possible to have the 60–40 program which is now in the law. I am

proud to have been the author of that amendment.

Certainly I want this bill to come up for further consideration, on a final reading, in such shape that I can support it heartily. I favor it over the administration bill in certain respects.

I do not like at all the provisions of the administration bill relative to toll roads and relative to roads already constructed.

I am doubtful of the policy of the administration bill in connection with issuance of bonds and the creation of an Authority which would be just another Authority—with quite a bit of power, by the way—which would enter the picture. I doubt very seriously if it would be an improvement over the situation in which the Bureau of Public Roads has been the effective administrative agency insofar as the Federal Government is concerned.

I doubt the effectiveness of some other provisions in the bill. For instance, I think it is unwise for us to try to anticipate a 10-year program at one time. In the Federal-aid program we have always heretofore confined our thinking either to 2 or 3 years, but not more, with the thought that Congress should reserve authority to itself, with full power to review or extend or change any provision which it might feel should be changed, without doing violence to contractors, the State, the general public, organizations like the AAA, and so forth, all of whom have such concern in this field. I doubt the wisdom of a fixed 10-year program.

I particularly doubt the wisdom of that part of the administration bill which would encumber, by a bond issue, the proceeds, so far as they can be foreseen at this time, of all the Federal tax receipts in this field—gasoline and other taxes—without allowing any increase at all for a period of 30 years.

In other words, I see many things in the program which bears the name of the distinguished Senator from Tennessee, which I prefer over the administration bill, and I have just related a few of them; but there are some stumbling blocks for me in the Senator's bill, of which I have mentioned, I think, 3 this afternoon, and 1 of which has been removed. I hope we can get the bill in such shape that we can all heartily support it, not merely Senators on this side of the aisle, but Senators on the other side of the aisle as well, realizing that we cannot, at one sitting, do a 10-year or a 30-year job, and that it is much wiser to do the job over the term of 5 years, as the Senator has suggested, so that we will have a right to review and extend it at the end of that time.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I was absent from the Chamber at the time the Senator was discussing the objections to the bill as he saw them. I understand he disapproves of the bill as it was reported, one of the objections being to the provision which related to advertising. Will the Senator enlighten me as to the other specific objections to the bill?

Mr. HOLLAND. I mentioned one of them while the Senator was present on the floor, and one while the Senator was absent. One of them was the provision which is section 2 (d), for the application of standards, of a sort, though nonuniform, and not adequate to meet the problem. The second was the provision which was already been eliminated, and which I am glad is eliminated, relative to advertising within a zone of 500 feet on each side of the highway. The third I have mentioned was the inclusion of the application of the Davis-Bacon Act.

Since the Senator has raised the question, I have no disposition to hold back until tomorrow morning. I shall be glad to place in the RECORD my thoughts as to the other provisions which cause me concern, so that there will be no surprise on that point at all in the morning.

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

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. GORE. I covet the support of the Senator, and I wish to call his attention to the fact that whether the Davis-Bacon provision remains in the bill or is stricken, it is a minor point in the bill, vastly inferior in importance to the vigorous highway improvement and construction program encompassed in the bill. Though we shall hope to win the Senator's consent as to all of the provisions, I am hopeful, in the event the bill does not conform exactly to his liking, that he will resolve some of his doubts on some of the minor points and give us the support which I know in his heart he really desires to give. And I wish to thank him.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I appreciate the warm invitation of the Senator from Tennessee—which is the way I interpret what he has said.

Let me state the other two matters I had in mind. First of all, it is proposed that the Federal Government pay up to 50 percent of the cost of relocating utility facilities. This provision would not apply to States where the State law permits that to be done. I pointed out that a great many States already have such a law; and the other States can have such a law if they desire to have it. But let me read from the bill the provision regarding the payment which would be made:

> Whenever under the laws or practice of the State where the project is being constructed the entire relocation cost is required to be borne by the utility.

In other words, regardless of whether the State law permits it, or even if the State law does not permit it generally because the right-of-way is held only by sufferance, it is held here that such payment shall be made with these funds, notwithstanding the State law and notwithstanding the preference of the State to have these funds go into the mileage of the interstate highway system rather than into the relocation of utilities in such a way as to controvert the provision of State law. I feel that such a provision is quite unwise.

In this instance, all the provisions which I regard as unwise are those which tend to perpetuate Federal control. I am very much averse to writing Federal control into the program, which has been a fine one primarily because of the independence of action which has been left to the States. The Federal Government has simply been a contributor. I know of no finer group of men in the States than the professional engineers who head the State highway departments; and I may say the same, generally speaking, of those on the policy level in the State highway departments.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Florida yield to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SCOTT in the chair). Does the Senator from Florida yield to the Senator from Missouri?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Will the distinguished Senator from Florida give us an idea of how he believes this particular provision with respect to remuneration of utilities in case their property is taken away should read?

Mr. HOLLAND. First, let me say that if it is vested property, the courts do not permit such property to be taken without having proper reimbursement made.

The question arises chiefly where there is no sound and supportable property right, and where the utility is located on the right-of-way only by sufferance. If there is a property right and if there is interference between the public right and the property right, as the Senator from Missouri well knows, the property right may not be taken, even for public-road purposes, without due process of law and without the payment of adequate compensation.

The States know what is going on, Mr. President. The officials of the State highway departments know perfectly well what is going on. In my State they know that in California, under a different set of laws, reimbursement is being made for utility relocations, and the amounts thus paid are deductible from that State's part of the Federal-road-program funds.

So the legislature of my State, having had that matter called repeatedly to its attention, and knowing that the State needs new road mileage, has insisted that such reimbursement for utility relocation shall not be made from the Federal funds for the interstate road system. Instead, the legislature has decided that it will leave the situation in such a way that in a case in which reimbursement must be made—as it must be, if a vested property right is taken—reimbursement in full will be made by the State, rather than by using the Federal-interstate-highway-system funds, and thus diminishing the Federal Government's contribution to the interstate system.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Florida yield for a further question?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. SYMINGTON. In a case where a utility had gone to the expense of erecting poles and wires, and thus would lose all benefit of that expense if it had to erect them elsewhere, would the Senator from Florida believe the utility should be reimbursed, regardless of

whether it had been given a right-of-way?

Mr. HOLLAND. My very deep conviction on that point is that the matter should be left to the States, or to the municipalities, when such cases arise within the municipalities. If a property right exists, we know perfectly well that under both Federal law and State law, reimbursement must be made if a property right is taken. We believe it improper for the Federal Government to provide—and now I am quoting from the bill—"whenever under the laws or practice of the State where the project is being constructed the entire relocation cost is required to be borne by the utility," if there is a contrary provision of State law which states the wishes of the people of the State, according to their wisdom. In that event, the contribution of the Federal Government to the State, for the purpose of road construction, would be reduced up to 50 percent of the amount of the payment, regardless of whether a property right existed in such case, and regardless of whether the property right, if taken away, would have to be reimbursed for, under court order.

Let me say that the Senator from Missouri has brought up a case which is worthy of consideration.

In some instances poles have been located along the highway right-of-way as a matter of sufferance. In such cases the poles must be removed. I may say that the States must be very zealous to safeguard any existing property rights.

But even if no property right exists, the utility company concerned will not suffer, inasmuch as it is entitled to fix its rates on a scale which will permit it to make a profit. So far as I know—and certainly this is true in my State—the regulatory bodies recognize such a cost as a legitimate one to be figured and reflected in the appropriate rates.

Of course, consideration must be given to the fact that such rates must be borne by those who live in the area in question. They are the ones who are best served by the facilities which are installed. Regardless of whether such cases arise in Florida or in Missouri or in any other State, I wish to say that I believe greater justice would be done by having the utility customers respond by paying slightly higher rates, rather than by having the Federal Government impose increased taxes on all of us, to undo the will of the State. That is what I do not wish to have done.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Florida yield further to me?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. SYMINGTON. In the opinion of the Senator from Florida, if a State decided it would not reimburse a utility for the loss of its property, could not the loss be expressed in increased utility rates, so that the loss would be borne by the consumers who would have to pay the higher rates which would be allowed for the particular electric current or other utility service provided? Is not that correct?

Mr. HOLLAND. Let us say that if the State would not allow reimbursement, or if the State, under State law, could not allow it, that would be the case.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I thank the Senator from Florida.

Mr. HOLLAND. Furthermore, although, it may be strange to relate, it is true that several of the instances in which this matter has been called to my attention have occurred where muncipal utilities were the ones affected, and where those receiving the advantage were the ones who owned the utilities and were being served by them, regardless of whether the utility concerned was an electrical system, a water system, a gas system, or some other utility system.

It seems to me that if complaint is to be made in such cases because of allegations that those who are served are required to pay rates which, in their opinion, are too high, then their remedy is, and should be, no farther away from them than their State legislature. I would not wish them to feel that they would have to appeal to the Congress of the United States, inasmuch as the various States approach this matter in so many different ways, and inasmuch as it is very difficult to reach a common denominator, whereas by local legislation, enacted by the State senators and representatives, the situation could easily be taken care of.

It seems to me it is somewhat in the nature of an imposition on good nature to expect the Members of the United States Congress—upon whose shoulders so many other burdens fall, and who have gone into this question during three sessions prior to this one, and who are attempting to strike a strong blow in support of the defense and security of the Nation, in terms of the interstate highway system—to go into this question, which can so clearly be completely taken care of back home.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I thank the Senator from Florida.

Mr. HOLLAND. The fifth matter I wish to mention—and I have already discussed it with the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE]—is the proposal, under section 12 of Senate bill 1048, to increase the mileage of the interstate system from 40,000 to 42,500.

One of the finest provisions of the legislation to give aid for the primary roads was the one requiring the setting up in each State of a system prescribing how that should be done, and then providing that until 90 percent of the mileage of the system in any particular State was constructed, there could be no additions to the system.

I will not say that that is precisely what we ought to have here, but I will say that if we begin this legislation with a force play under which we jump the mileage from 40,000, which was the figure set in 1944, when we are getting well under way, to 42,500, with full knowledge of the fact that already a group of bills are in the hopper to put new roads in this system, and with full knowledge of the fact that it is a good American custom for the chamber of commerce and everyone else to go out and fight for anything good they think any other community might have, we can expect a succession of drives for increased mileage and for increased recognition in this field.

It is my deliberate judgment that the wise course would be to leave the mileage at 40,000. There are still available some 2,400 or 2,600 miles of undesignated mileage within the 40,000 total.

We should leave the mileage at 40,000 and hedge the provision around with some protection against the drive which has only started. If Senators think this drive has force, imagine what it will be like when some of the 90–10 construction gets underway, and community A has it, and a neighboring community 30 miles away, of the same size and nature, does not have it. How anxious it will be to get into the interstate system. I can see confusion and difficulty, and all kinds of real trouble in connection with that point.

So, rather than extend the welcoming hand to increases, rather than increase the mileage from 40,000 to 42,500, without hedging it about with any restrictions whatever, my feeling is that it would be wiser to keep the mileage at 40,000 and throw certain restrictions around it.

If the committee feels that the figure should be not less than 42,500, in order that the new figure may not be interpreted as being an open invitation to communities, States, and people to ask for additional mileage in the interstate system, by all means the mileage agreed upon should be hedged around with conditions which would make it impossible for a long period of time for new mileage to be added to the system—that is, new mileage above any figure stated in the bill.

Mr. President, I have taken much more time than I had intended. I have unburdened my heart with respect to the things which were troubling me about the bill of the Senator from Tennessee. Some were of major concern, and some of not such great concern, but all of them have caused me anxiety. Each of them is reflected in my mail in one way or another—some by large amounts of mail, as in the case of the Bacon-Davis Act point, and in the case of the advertising question, which have already been handled. To a lesser degree, some other points are represented by only a few letters.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, first I wish to thank the Senator from Florida for his probing analysis of the bill on which we have worked since early in February. Undoubtedly we could not bring to the floor a bill which would be entirely satisfactory to everyone. It is certainly characteristic of the nature of the Senator from Florida to examine all proposed legislation carefully, but particularly highway legislation. I have previously stated, perhaps no Member of this body has contributed more greatly to the cause of good highways, particularly interstate highways, than has the able senior Senator from Florida.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the Senator.

Mr. GORE. I take it from what the Senator from Florida has said that the bill does contain many strong points which appeal to him; and for that we are grateful.

I wish to comment briefly, even though the hour is late, upon the point he raises with respect to increasing the interstate mileage.

First, I remind the Senator that the country has undergone vast growth and development, and that vast shifts of population have taken place since 1944. The growth has been particularly rapid with respect to our municipal centers. There have been created new municipal centers unknown in 1944, which are now populous centers. I cite only one; namely, Oak Ridge, Tenn. A few years ago it was a wooded mountain. Today it is a rather large city; that is, large by my standards.

The Senator from Florida referred to the fact that there remain 2,400 miles of undesignated mileage. That is correct. 2,400 miles of the 40,000 limitation are undesignated. However, those 2,400 miles have been reserved for urban bypasses, circumferential routes, through routes, and interconnections.

Our municipal growth, particularly suburban development, has been so great that in the opinion of the committee those 2,400 miles are wholly inadequate to meet the demands of urban needs.

In addition, some 3 or 4 State capitals are not as yet connected by interstate highways. As the Senator knows, that was one of the stated objectives in the act which created the designation of interstate highways.

The committee was very conservative in arriving at the recommendation of 42,500. We could perhaps with equal justification have gone further—perhaps to 48,000 miles. The committee recognizes the cogency of the observation of the senior Senator from Florida. There will be increasing demand for interstate designation due to the 90–10 contribution by the Federal Government. The Congress must meet that test when it arises. That, as well as other tests, will grow, perhaps, as we proceed down through history. But the committee felt that there was justification for a reasonable increase.

We took one further step. The Senator will find from the hearings that, recognizing the danger that designations would be influenced by political pressures, the committee asked the Bureau of Public Roads to submit, with the approval of the Secretary of Commerce, the criteria which the Department would use in arriving at further designations of interstate highways. The committee also recognized that various bills had been introduced to have the Congress designate given highways as interstate highways. The committee thought it would be very inadvisable for the Congress to undertake to designate which of the highways should be interstate highways, and which should not be. That is a matter for decision by the engineers and the highway officials of our respective States, working in cooperation with the Bureau of Public Roads.

The committee may have erred in this respect. We do not claim that the 42,500 figure is sacrosanct. Perhaps it should be 42,000. Perhaps it should be 45,000. This recommendation represents the composite of our best judgment. I recognize the danger, as the Senator points out, of raising the figure at all. It may well open the floodgates. However, there has been a great deal of growth in this country since 1944, and I believe Congress will be able to resist those pressures successfully when they come.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the Senator.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, the hour is late, but I wish to make a few comments for the RECORD on the pending legislation. I have had the pleasure of being a member of the Committee on Public Works for the past 2 years. It has been a pleasant experience for me. In participating in the drafting of highways legislation I can say that I have acted neither as a Republican nor as a Democrat, but as an American. That has been the history of the committee's actions this year and in the past 2 years which I have been a member of it. That is the way these questions ought to be decided.

I find myself in vigorous disagreement with some of the recommendations of the majority of the committee. I must add that I find myself also in some disagreement with the recommendations which the minority has made to the Senate.

In the position which I thus occupy, I give high praise to the chairman of the subcommittee, the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], and the chairman of the full committee, the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], and, indeed, to all the Senators who participated in the discussions of this subject in the committee.

Speaking for myself, I can also say that the recommendations which the Clay Committee, appointed by the President of the United States, made to Congress and the country are in the best interest of the people of the United States, as that Committee saw them, and are not geared in anyway to partisanship or to politics.

I was delighted when the chairman of the subcommittee, the Senator from Tennessee, indicated that he held the same high opinion of the Committee headed by the distinguished American, General Clay, who appeared before our committee and urged the consideration of the recommendations of the Clay report.

I was struck with the conclusion which the Clay Committee reached with respect to the needs of the American people of an interstate highway system which would tie together the 48 States of the American Union by means of a modern and efficient network of highways, as well as the reasons which General Clay and his Committee gave concerning the urgency of such a system and the reasons which prompted him and his Committee to recommend its prompt construction.

When General Clay appeared before the committee, he said the interstate highway system in America needs to be brought to an efficient and modern standard within the next decade, first, because of the necessities of American military defense in the event—God forbid—we were to find ourselves in conflict, in war, at some time in the future. In such a situation it would certainly be to the benefit of all the people of the Nation for the Military Establishment to have available across the continent of the United States, a modern and efficient network of highways.

The chairman of the Clay Committee went on to say that the interests of civil defense would be greatly served by an accelerated program through Federal assistance to an interstate highway system.

He pointed out as reason No. 3 what certainly is obvious to Senators on both sides of the aisle and to the American people that a modern and efficient interstate highway system would greatly contribute to the economy of our people.

Then the General referred to the social aspects. He mentioned the appalling death toll from accidents which occur daily on our highways and which, it is generally conceded, are in part due to their inadequacy and inefficiency.

As I listened to the testimony, I concluded for myself that the imperative need of the interstate highway system ought to be recognized by all our people, and that any legislation passed by Congress this year should be geared to satisfy that need.

In their wisdom, the members of the committee who formed the majority—and it was a bipartisan majority—have recommended in the bill which is before the Senate a program which authorizes more money for an interstate system, but which falls far short of what a great number of distinguished Americans have urged be made available for that part of the program.

The bill, as reported by the majority members of the committee, also makes more Federal money available for allocation to the States for use on the primary, secondary, and urban systems, other than on the interstate systems.

Early in the hearings, at the request of the chairman, the Governors of the various States of the Union were contacted on the question of whether their States would be financially able to participate in the provisions of S. 1048 as introduced. Twenty-six of the Governors replied they would not be.

In all candor it must be stated that subsequent to the receipt of information from the Governors of the 48 States on that question, the bill was amended considerably. I participated in the adoption of many of those amendments. It may be that some of the 26 Governors may now look differently on the provisions of the bill. Nevertheless, I suggest that very little is going to be gained by increasing the amount of Federal assistance for the roads and highways of America other than those constituting the interstate system if the States have any apprehension about their ability to match dollar for dollar the Federal contributions. Thus I am completely convinced that the sound American position for the Congress to take in 1955 is that the interstate highway system needs rapid development with Federal assistance. That is why I accept completely the recommendations of the Clay Committee regarding the interstate highway system.

Mr. President, I think it was a week ago last Monday in the city of San Fran-

cisco that representatives of the 11 Western States met. They came from the legislative and executive branches of those States. I met with government representatives of my own State. They told me that among the States whose representatives participated in the conference only one State could live under the provisions of the bill which is now pending before the Senate. That State, Mr. President, is the State of California, from which I come. The representatives of the other States all said they could not live under it.

I have some documentation here which subsequently I shall put into the RECORD for the benefit of the Members of the Senate. One of the comments made at the meeting to which general agreement was given was as follows:

The present program of Federal aid for primary, including urban, and secondary highways should be continued on the present basis with no change in allocation formulas of matching requirements at this time. This program may be regarded as one essential basis of the concept of equalization, and it is intended also to discharge certain special obligations of the National Government. Some States contribute more in taxes than they receive in aid under this program, but this is necessary and desirable in the interest of equity and of achieving coordinated basic highway development throughout the Nation. However, Congress might well provide a comprehensive review of national responsibilities for equalization and other aid to discharge special obligations.

Earlier, Mr. President, the State Legislature of California adopted a resolution in which it spelled out what it believed to be the essential nonpartisan American principles upon which you and I, Mr. President, and the other Members of Congress could draft legislation which would be acceptable.

I ask unanimous consent that a copy of that resolution be included in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

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

Senate Joint Resolution 28

Joint resolution relative to the enactment of Federal highway legislation

Whereas the President of the United States has placed before Congress the matter of the improvement of the roads, streets, and highways throughout the Nation, giving special emphasis from the standpoint of national defense to the rapid completion of the interstate system of highways; and

Whereas there are now numerous bills pending before the Congress relating to the improvement of the Federal aid systems of highways; and

Whereas the interstate system is now recognized by Federal law as including 40,000 miles of highways throughout the United States but at the present time only 37,600 miles have been designated as being on said system, it being understood that that portion of said remaining 2,400 miles which will be allocated to California will comprise circumferential and other connecting routes in metropolitan areas; and

Whereas that portion of the interstate system located within California includes highways most seriously deficient from the standpoints of traffic volumes, traffic safety, and structural inadequacy; and

Whereas the completion of the interstate system from Federal funds would permit the more rapid correction of the remaining deficiencies on the public streets and highways in California: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and Assembly of the State of California (jointly), That the Congress of the United States is memorialized to enact legislation for the completion of the interstate system within the shortest feasible period of time, and that such legislation should recognize the following principles:

1. That the provisions for the Federal financing of the interstate system should permit long-range planning, to the end that the system can be completed as rapidly as possible and as a free system of highways.

2. That the program for improving the interstate system should not interfere with the orderly allocation of funds for the other Federal aid systems of highways.

3. That the formula for the allocation of additional funds among the various States for improvement of the interstate system should be based upon the needs for improvement of that system in the various States, and that such formula should be made definite and certain, so that the various States may plan and construct said interstate system as rapidly as possible in an orderly manner.

4. That the provisions requiring States to match Federal funds for the improvement of the interstate system should not require a greater outlay by the States for such system than was required in amount to match the 1956 allocations for that system under the 1954 Federal Highway Act.

5. That the preparation of the plans and specifications of projects, their priority, and the handling of the construction work be substantially as has previously been provided under existing Federal-aid legislation.

6. That if credit is to be given to any State by reason of the previous completion or toll financing of any portion of the Interstate System, the legislation be so drafted that such credits be taken into consideration in computing the allocation formula, so that no delays will result while such credits are being computed; and, be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be transmitted to the President of the United States, the Vice President of the United States, the chairmen of the appropriate committees of the Congress, and to each Senator and Representative from the State of California.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I point out specifically one of the bases on which the legislature believes Congress might adopt highway legislation at this time:

That the provisions for the Federal financing of the interstate system should permit long-range planning, to the end that the system can be completed as rapidly as possible and as a free system of highways.

I believe in the wisdom of that recommendation. It is not too much for American engineering genius to look forward 10 years or more than 10 years and to develop appropriate plans for raising the level of safety and efficiency of the highways of our country. Take my own State, for example, Mr. President. It is 1,100 miles long. There live in it 13 million people. The interstate system in California runs north and south, and there are two avenues of ingress and egress east, one in the north from San Francisco, and the other in the south from Los Angeles. They are not in very good shape. If they were to attempt to satisfy the standards which General Clay prescribed for a modern interstate highway system they would fail and fail rather badly.

In the opinion of the Clay Committee, the interstate system in California and across the country can be brought up to an efficient level within a decade. I do not agree with those who feel that that is too long a time for engineering planning to be made ahead.

I realize that the hour is late, but I wish to make one more comment, and that is with respect to the basic question involved in this proposed legislation. I refer to money. The money problem is important. The pending bill follows the pattern of past highway legislation. It authorizes Congress to appropriate money. After the authorization has been signed into law, then Congress may appropriate up to the limits set in the authorizing act.

Mr. President, we have a debt limitation staring us in the face. I do not know what this Congress or the next Congress will do with respect to it. I very much fear—and I say this with the greatest respect for my Republican and Democratic brethren who favor this bill—that we may be authorizing Congress to appropriate moneys which we will be unable to appropriate under the debt limitation which is now in force and effect.

I feel sure that the Clay Committee had all the fiscal facts of the Government of the United States in mind when it made a recommendation that Congress create an agency empowered to sell revenue bonds, and that those bonds would be retired from gasoline revenues as they came into the Treasury. The reason why they urged revenue bonds is because they did not want to make them general obligation bonds and run head on into the debt-limitation provision. There is nothing illegal or unethical about that type of bond. The people of California have sold revenue bonds from time to time for the very reason that they did not want to collide head on with the debt limitation of the constitution of my State.

How is that method of financing justified in this instance, Mr. President? I justify it, because, very frankly, in my judgment, we face an emergency in America with respect to highways, which are needed across the land, and, therefore, on the basis of that emergency, the one avenue which is open to the Congress of the United States to make available $25 billion or more to do what it is believed should be done is that recommended by the Clay Committee that an agency be created with authority to issue special, not general, obligations, which will not require appropriations by Congress and will not have an impact on the debt limitation.

Those two points constitute the burden of the few words I had prepared to indicate my own views as a result of serving on the committee. I hope the Senate will consider both of them.

I should have said earlier that, in my judgment, if the interstate highway system recommendations of the Clay Commission were to be carried into law, every State in the Union would then have available a greater portion of its own moneys, raised under its own State tax laws, to utilize as it desired with respect to the other roads, highways, and streets within its boundaries. I think that is a point which ought to be iterated and reiterated in this debate.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the comments which were made a week ago last Monday by Mr. J. W. Vickrey, assistant State highway engineer, division of highways, department of public works, State of California, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

SOME FACTORS RELATING TO AN ACCELERATED ROAD PROGRAM IN CALIFORNIA

(By J. W. Vickrey, assistant State highway engineer, division of highways, department of public works, State of California)

Any change that Congress makes in highway policy and financing naturally affects our highway operations in California. We have attempted to analyze the possible effects of a number of the current proposals on potential rates of progress, on our potential ability to carry our share of the program, and on potential benefits that may accrue. I shall summarize a few of these factors.

ABILITY TO CARRY PROPOSED PROGRAMS

We believe that California can carry any of the accelerated programs thus far proposed in this Congress, and could provide matching funds for any of the financial proposals. However, at a recent meeting with representatives of the 11 Western States, we were informed that a number of these States would not be able to meet the matching requirements under proposals which greatly expand the entire Federal-aid program. However, all these States would be able to meet the matching requirements under a program such as that embodied in H. R. 4260.

We in California favor an interstate system program, such as that embodied in H. R. 4260, for the following reasons:

1. We need to complete our highways on the interstate system as rapidly as possible. This proposed program, of all that have been proposed, would enable the earliest completion of this vital system of highways.

2. A definite 10-year program will enable an effective, expeditious, and orderly planning and construction schedule to be carried out.

3. While we have been concentrating a very sizable proportion of our State funds on the highways in this system, it is very problematical how long we can maintain this allocation. A separately financed and accelerated interstate system program is the only way we can see that can give any reasonable assurance of meeting the traffic requirements on this system in the next decade.

4. The benefits which would be derived from an accelerated 10-year program will more than pay off the expenditures involved. In other words, it is an eminently sound financial investment.

BENEFIT STUDY

An analysis of benefits or savings which would result from an accelerated program which would complete the interstate system of highways in California in a period of 10 years was made recently by Prof. R. A. Moyer of the Institute of Transportation and Traffic Engineering at the University of California. Because the proposed interstate system would be designed to meet the traffic demands for a period of 20 years, and partly because the effective average life of some of the elements of such a facility would be about 20 years, Moyer calculated the savings which would be made over this period, resulting from lower vehicle operating costs, time savings, and reduction in accident damage costs. He found this amazing result: that the savings on this system in 20 years totaled $3,855,413,000. This figure exceeds by a considerable margin the capital investment ($2,533,335,000) plus the total interest which would have to be paid if credit financing were used with 30-year serial bonds, the sum of interest plus principal being $3,401,083,000. A review of Professor Moyer's study demonstrated that he was very conservative in his estimates. For example, he charged off the costs of rights-of-way, which of course have a much longer economic life than 20 or 30 years. Further, his study did not purport to evaluate national defense benefits, increased property values, and other general economic enhancements.

THE POST-10-YEAR PROBLEM

We note that the question has been raised, both by your committee and also by our own people, as to what would happen if further needs developed on the interstate system and no more special funds were forthcoming for this system for 20 years after its supposed completion. Our answer is: We believe our own financing could take care of it.

One way of looking at the situation is this—our present rate of financing is roughly adjusted to our growing highway needs, but we have a big backlog of needs—a large gap must be overcome. If we can somehow fill that gap and get current, our revenue rates should keep us current.

THE LIMITED ACCESS PROBLEM

As Mr. Durkee has indicated, we have had considerable experience with the limited access feature of arterial highway construction. I offer a few examples of the benefits that may be attributed to having a highway facility that preserves investment.

Just north of Sacramento across the American River, U. S. 99E going to the north, and U. S. 40 going to the east, formerly passed through the center of the town of North Sacramento. In October 1947, a freeway bypass of North Sacramento was opened to traffic. This freeway is approximately a mile to the east of the former location of the highway. It is constructed on a full freeway basis, that is, there is no access from abutting property and all intersecting streets and roads are at separate grades. The acreage price of land along this alinement in 1947 was $600 per acre. In 1949 it was $1,100 per acre. In 1950, $7,100 per acre, and in 1951, $10,000 per acre. Industries have bought large tracts and located facilities in the area.

At the same time, we find that the established business in the town which was bypassed continuously increased at a greater rate than other businesses in the county after the opening of the freeway. One hundred and fifty-eight retail establishments were studied on the basis of their gross sales. During the 4-year period, from 2 years prior to the opening of the freeway until 2 years afterward, the business increased 48.5 percent, while the same types of businesses on a countywide basis increased their business only 27 percent. Cafes and bars increased their business 13 percent, while the county average was a minus 1½ percent. Service stations experienced an increase of over twice the average of the county.

A similar situation exists on the so-called Eastshore Freeway leading from Oakland along the eastern shore of San Francisco Bay to the south towards the city of San Jose; 3.3 miles of this freeway were opened on June 1, 1950, and an additional 4.2 miles on June 18, 1952. After the 7½-mile section was opened, the traffic count was approximately 60,000 vehicles per day. In 1947 the acreage land value in the area was found to be about $2,000, whereas in 1952, it had increased to $11,300 per acre. It was found that the entire area along both sides of the freeway was being developed not only for industry, but for residential subdivision. The number of new industries far exceeded the average of new industries in other areas.

A third example involves a 5-mile length of freeway in the Los Angeles area, running southeast from Los Angeles towards San Diego. A 5-mile section was opened on June 1, 1953. The traffic count, shortly after the freeway was opened, was approximately 77,000 vehicles per day. A study of land values from 1946 to 1954 was made. Land values along this freeway increased substantially more than in other areas where freeways were not present, in one instance the value rising approximately 605 percent between 1946 and 1954. Industrial acreage in 1954 was sold for as high as $55,000 per acre. It is interesting to note that the value of the property was not predicated upon the distance therefrom to the nearest freeway opening.

An additional important benefit, which cannot be evaluated in dollars, is that modern expressways preserve and improve the general service values and investments along other and ordinary routes because they lift from them the burden of through movements.

FEDERAL-STATE RELATIONS

I should like to conclude my remarks by offering a comment on a phase of what might be called the management problem. We note that in H. R. 4260 there is a provision for a Federal Highway Corporation with a Board of Directors, which in addition to its fiscal and management functions, would act as an appeals board concerning the application of the act. In the past, we, and we believe the other States, have experienced no difficulty in working with the Bureau of Public Roads of the Department of Commerce, and have been able to resolve successfully such differences in interpretation as have arisen. We have no reason to expect that the workable joint-management relationships which have been developed cannot be continued. We fear that this kind of provision, regardless of what bill it might finally appear in, would result in delays and undue controversies.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, those are the general comments I wanted to make on this occasion. I hope we will have an opportunity to consider what I believe to be in the high public interest, namely, an accelerated Federal program for a modern, efficient interstate highway system, financed in the only fashion in which I know it can be financed under the existing fiscal situation of the Federal Government; a program recognized as an emergency, which requires emergency treatment.

These Presidential commission recommendations are in the best interests of the country. I suggest to the Senate that they be the basis of our new Federal highway laws.

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

Mr. KUCHEL. I yield.

Mr. GORE. First, I thank the able junior Senator from California for his generous references to me.

Second—perhaps I should have said this first—I thank him for the splendid contribution he made and cooperative attitude he manifested throughout the long deliberations on the bill. There are many features of S. 1048 which bear his mark. Although he did not finally find himself conscientiously able to support the bill as reported by the committee, that fact did not deter him in the least from helping, with all the fine talents he has, to make the bill a better one. As it comes to the Senate, it is the product of the committee, and in significant part, the product of the able junior Senator from California.

Mr. KUCHEL. I sincerely thank my friend, the distinguished junior Senator from Tennessee. I do not believe I ever enjoyed working under a fellow Senator more than I did working under my friend from Tennessee in the consideration of the proposed highway legislation; nor have I ever received a greater education in a given field of Federal legislation than I have received in this one.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I desire to make an announcement for the RECORD.

Tomorrow, sometime between 3:30 and 4:30 p. m., the Senate will vote on the question of the passage of the postal-pay bill over the President's veto.

Following that action, we will resume the debate on the unfinished business, which is the road bill.

Tomorrow it will be the plan of the leadership to ask that when the business of the Senate is concluded for the day, the Senate stand in recess until 9:30 on Wednesday morning. At 9:30 on Wednesday morning it is proposed to have the usual morning hour. It is contemplated that that will be finished sometime in the neighborhood of 10 o'clock.

It is then planned to consider amendments which may be offered, and then the amendments in the nature of a substitute, in the hope that before the Senate recesses on Wednesday evening, it will have completed the consideration of the highway bill.

Again, I call the attention of Senators to the fact that it is possible, either late tomorrow, after action has been concluded on the veto message, or on Thursday or Friday, the Senate will take up the so-called blooper repeal bill, reported by the Committee on Finance. I should like to have every Member of the Senate to be on notice that at some time convenient to the Senate that measure will be considered.

As I have previously announced, when the Senate has acted on the road bill and the so-called blooper repeal bill, it is planned to adjourn or recess until Tuesday of next week. It is expected that the mutual security bill will have been reported by the Committee on Foreign Relations in time for consideration by the Senate on Tuesday of next week. I anticipate that it will be necessary to spend at least Tuesday and Wednesday on the consideration of that bill.

ENROLLED BILLS PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, May 23, 1955, he presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bills:

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 indemnity 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;

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

S. 1727. An act to authorize certain administrative expenses in the Treasury Department, and for other purposes.

RECESS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, if no other Senators wish to address the Senate, then, in accordance with the order previously entered, I move that the Senate stand in recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock and 56 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess, the recess being under the order previously entered, until tomorrow, Tuesday, May 24, 1955, at 12 o'clock meridian.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, MAY 23, 1955

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Thou who hast been our help in all our yesterdays and art our strength for today and our hope for tomorrow, may we now be inspired by Thy spirit and endowed with insight to know Thy holy will and courage to obey it.

We beseech Thee to lift us out of all doubting and disbelieving tempers and moods of mind and heart lest we become too willful and rebellious to follow Thy leading and too gloomy to hope for nobler and better ways of living.

May we yield ourselves unreservedly to the guidance of Thy infallible spirit and daily come nearer to what Thou wouldst have us be and do.

Grant that humanity may be blessed with a new nativity of faith in Thee, and with a love that seeketh not its own and a hope that will become the authentic basis and sure foundation of a higher idealism and a more heroic endeavor to build a civilization in which there is peace.

Hear us in Christ's name. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, May 19, 1955, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

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

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

H. R. 4052. An act 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.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 3322. An act 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 message also announced that the Senate had passed bills and joint resolutions of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 153. An act to amend the Rural Electrification Act of 1936;

S. 1580. An act to regulate subsistence expenses and mileage allowances of civilian officers and employees of the Federal Government;

S. 1805. An act 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;

S. J. Res. 8. Joint resolution to amend the Constitution to authorize governors to fill temporary vacancies in the House of Representatives; and

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

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendment of the House to a bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 1650. An act to authorize the Territory of Alaska to obtain advances from the Federal Unemployment Act, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4876) entitled "An act making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments, and the Tax Court of the United States, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, and for other purposes."

The message also announced that the Vice President has appointed Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina and Mr. CARLSON members of the joint select committee on

the part of the Senate, as provided for in the act of August 5, 1939, entitled "An act to provide for the disposition of certain records of the United States Government," for the disposition of executive papers referred to in the report of the Archivist of the United States numbered 55-17.

LEGISLATION TO PERMIT MEMBERS OF ARMED FORCES TO DESIGNATE THE EASTERN ORTHODOX FAITH AS RELIGIOUS PREFERENCE

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, in the district that I have the honor to represent are many fine men and women of Greek blood and ancestry. Among these is A. A. Pantelis, who served in World War I and later was one of the organizers of the American Legion in Illinois. He was the first commander of Hellenic Post of the American Legion and was one of the group of the membership of that post that made Hellenic Post such a vital force in that early period of the Legion.

Mr. Pantelis is one of many who have written me concerning a measure now pending in this body to grant servicemen of the Greek Orthodox faith religious equality in the Armed Forces.

Servicemen of the Greek Orthodox faith have served this country loyally and patriotically in World War I, World War II, and in Korea.

The Greek Eastern Orthodox Church has a total of more than 250 million communicants in the world. One of the outstanding Greek Orthodox edifices in the United States is located in the Second District of Illinois. I join wholeheartedly with others of my colleagues in support of legislation to permit members of the Armed Forces to designate the Eastern Orthodox faith as a religious preference. There must be nowhere in all our country, and least of all in the Armed Forces where all Americans serve with equal ardor and with equal patriotism, any semblance of any kind of discrimination.

COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Public Works and its subcommittee on flood control may meet this afternoon during general debate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. MORRISON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 hour today, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered.

JUDGE SAM M. CATHEY, HANDICAPPED MAN OF THE YEAR

Mr. SHUFORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. SHUFORD. Mr. Speaker, today in a ceremony conducted in the auditorium of the Labor Department, an outstanding blind American citizen was honored. The President of the United States presented to the Honorable Sam M. Cathey, Asheville, N. C., the trophy as the handicapped man of the year. I witnessed this presentation and was thrilled to see one of my boyhood friends thus honored.

Sam Cathey was not always blind. He lost his eyesight at the age of 20 in a dynamite explosion while working on a road construction job.

To many such a handicap would have resulted in an idle life, but not Sam Cathey. He forthwith attended North Carolina State School for the Blind and became efficient in the use of braille. Thereafter he studied law at the University of North Carolina and graduated from that institution with a bachelor of laws degree and a Phi Beta Kappa key. Following the completion of his college course and his admission to the bar, Sam Cathey returned to his native city and engaged in the practice of law, and this with notable success. He was elected judge of the municipal court of the city of Asheville and has held that important office continuously for 24 years. Last Monday, May 16, 1955, he was again sworn in as judge of the municipal court for another 4-year term.

Judge Cathey's service on the bench has been outstanding. He administers justice with that rare temperament necessary to instill confidence and understanding. His counsel to the erring has been of inestimable value to his home community where he enjoys the affection, respect, and confidence of all.

Judge Cathey's activities for good have not been limited to the bench. He has been active in the rehabilitation program in North Carolina for the handicapped and has sponsored legislation to that end. He is one of the founders of the State association for the blind, and presently is board chairman of the North Carolina State Commission for the Blind.

The honor bestowed today upon Judge Sam M. Cathey is well earned. He has led and is leading the way for others to follow.

The presentation today was under the auspices of the President's Committee on Employment of the Physically Handicapepd. This Committee was established by Presidential directive in August 1947. It was created to enlist public interest and support in the employment of the physically handicapped. The 81st Congress and the 83d Congress recognized the importance of the work of the Committee and sustained it by appropriations.

By Presidential directive and congressional authorization, the President's Committee has a twofold objective. The first is to provide a continuing program of public information and education for the purpose of achieving equal opportunity in the employment for the physically handicapped in public agencies and private enterprises. The second is to cooperate with all groups in the interest of the employment of the handicapped, including Government agencies, public and private groups and individuals. It is not the function of the Committee to provide employment placement assistance or vocational rehabilitation services for handicapped persons. These services have been assigned by law to the United States Employment Service and affiliated State employment security agencies, the Office of Vocational Rehabilitation and affiliated State rehabilitation agencies, and Veterans' Administration for veterans with service incurred disabilities.

The first Chairman of the President's Committee was Vice Adm. Ross T. McIntire, Medical Corps, United States Navy, retired, who resigned in 1954. Maj. Gen. Melvin J. Maas, United States Marine Corps Reserve, retired, is its present Chairman. Mr. Earl Bunting, former president of the National Association of Manufacturers, is vice chairman.

The Committee's membership embraces approximately 300 national representatives of labor, business, industry, agriculture, religious, civic, fraternal, press, radio, veterans, handicapped, and women's organizations. State and Territorial Governors' committees and local community committees carry out cooperative programs on a year-round basis to enlist citizens' interest and support of the program.

In order to recognize outstanding achievement in arousing public interest and obtaining public understanding, the President's Committee sponsors several informational projects. Among these is the selection of the "handicapped man of the year" to receive the President's trophy. This trophy has been awarded annually during the past 4 years. The recipient this year, Judge Sam M. Cathey, as those in the past, is rightfully entitled to the recognition received.

ARMED SERVICES DAY

Mr. DEANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. DEANE. Mr. Speaker, several days ago this House approved a national-defense budget of $31,488,000,000. As we voted that appropriation it was very difficult for us to analyze the tremendous implications of that many dollars. But on Saturday, during Armed Services Day here in Washington and throughout America, and wherever American forces are stationed, we could see the defense budget on parade.

It is very difficult to breathe life into cold figures, but as one witnessed the parade down Constitution Avenue, re-

viewed by the Vice President, who was there representing the President, and by key leaders of our country, including Members of Congress, and then later saw the challenging exhibits and demonstrations on the ground and in the air at Bolling Field, it made me feel deeply grateful to the officers and men of our Army, Navy, Marine, Air Force, and Coast Guard.

I feel that the RECORD of today should indicate our appreciation of the services of these men who are representing us in every country of the world today.

INTERGOVERNMENTAL COMMITTEE ON MIGRATION

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include a statement I made at a recent meeting of the Intergovernmental Committee on Migration.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the text of a statement I made at the second semiannual session of the Council of the Intergovernmental Committee for European Migration in Geneva, Switzerland, on April 28, 1955:

STATEMENT MADE BY REPRESENTATIVE FRANCIS E. WALTER, ALTERNATE DELEGATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. Chairman, it is with mixed emotions that I address this distinguished gathering this morning. I feel very sad that our distinguished leader and a dear friend of mine, the late Ambassador Hugh Gibson, is no more among those participating in these meetings. On the other hand, I am very happy because of the report that is now under discussion. I wish to congratulate this organization on the splendid progress that it has made. In that connection I should like to inform the delegates and those others interested that the deputy director, Mr. Pierre Jacobsen appeared before the congressional subcommittee of which I happen to be chairman, and made a very fine presentation of the objectives of the organization and its accomplishments. By so doing he has lightened the load on the backs of those of us who are compelled to watch over ICEM legislation in our deliberative body. I wish publicly to thank my friend Mr. Jacobsen.

This organization has demonstrated what cooperation in the field of international affairs can do. It seems to me that we have virtually accepted as our motto, the motto of an organization hurriedly put together in my country at the beginning of the last war, known as the Seabees, a Navy construction battalion recruited from among civilians. This organization had as its motto "Deeds, not words." It seems to me that the accomplishments of this committee has forced us to accept these honored words as our motto.

Those of us who were apprehensive a year ago concerning the type of people that would be moved by ICEM have found that our fears were not sound. It is indeed encouraging to all of us to see that the type of people we are assisting to migrate is the type of people who pioneered in my great Republic and made it the kind of country that it is.

We are indeed very encouraged, but may I add this note: We don't feel that the security barriers should be lowered, nor that we should be less vigilant. After all, we are all faced with the same common foe, communism.

It seems to me that it is in the best interests of all of us to continue the cautious appraisal of ICEM's program that has made it succeed without much criticism thus far. The goal for the 1955 movements, I am afraid, is tied too closely with the program under the Refugee Relief Act of the United States. When this organization was set up, may I remind you that the object was to find new areas of resettlement. I trust that there will not persist an increased reliance on the ability of the United States to absorb greater numbers of people. We have been willing, and shall continue to be willing, to do our fair share in accordance with our ability to absorb people in a community which has already been very thickly populated.

I should like, in closing, to say that I feel that in Mr. Tittmann, our new director, we have a man who will carry on to achieve the same high accomplishments as was done by the late Mr. Gibson. I congratulate you on your selection.

STEAM LOCOMOTIVES

Mr. BAILEY. 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 West Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of my colleagues in the House, I want to protest personally the use of the Interstate Commerce Commission as a propaganda agency. I have before me a release on the stationery of the Interstate Commerce Commission dated May 18 for immediate release in which it says that the ICC will receive a brass engine bell marking the passing of the steam locomotives. This is to be presented to the Interstate Commerce Commission by the diesel oil interests of the Nation. I would just like to remind my colleagues, I think they are jumping the gun. There were 16 million tons of soft coal used by the railroads of the country last year, and I do not think it is any time to kid anybody or any industry by implying that they are dead, and that the steam locomotive is passing out of existence. I want to register a protest in no uncertain language to this kind of procedure and this kind of action on the part of the Interstate Commerce Commission in receiving this bell from an abandoned locomotive formerly fueled by coal. I do not think it is any part of the business of the Interstate Commerce Commission. I protest their action and suggest they cancel their plans.

CONFERENCE REPORT—TREASURY AND POST OFFICE DEPARTMENTS AND TAX COURT APPROPRIATIONS, 1956

Mr. GARY submitted the following conference report and statement on the bill (H. R. 4876) making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments and the Tax Court of the United States for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, and for other purposes:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. No. 610)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4876) "making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments, and the Tax Court of the United States, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, and for other purposes," having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendment numbered 5.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1, 4, and 9, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 2: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 2, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the number proposed, insert "one hundred and seventy-five"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 3: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 3, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$282,250,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 6: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 6, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$1,870,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 7: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 7, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$661,620,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 8: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 8, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$157,400,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

J. VAUGHAN GARY,
OTTO E. PASSMAN,
ALFRED D. SIEMINSKI,
JAMES C. MURRAY,
CLARENCE CANNON,
EARL WILSON,
BENJAMIN F. JAMES,
JOHN TABER,
Managers on the Part of the House.

A. WILLIS ROBERTSON,
HARLEY M. KILGORE,
JOHN L. MCCLELLAN,
DENNIS CHAVEZ,
OLIN D. JOHNSTON,
JOE MCCARTHY,
STYLES BRIDGES,
EVERETT M. DIRKSEN,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4876) making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments and The Tax Court of the United States for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report as to each of such amendments, namely:

TITLE I—TREASURY DEPARTMENT

Amendment No. 1: Appropriates $2,680,000 for the Office of the Secretary as proposed by the Senate instead of $2,650,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 2: Provides 175 passenger motor vehicles for the Internal Revenue Service instead of 150 as proposed by the House and 200 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 3: Appropriates $282,250,000 for the Internal Revenue Service instead of $278,500,000 as proposed by the House and $286,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 4: Deletes House language relating to Assistant Secretaries. It is the expectation of the conferees that this work be liquidated to a point where the additional position of Assistant Secretary will not be required after this fiscal year. It is hoped the Department will plan accordingly in its 1957 budget.

TITLE II—POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT

Amendment No. 5: Eliminates Senate language providing for payments for special services.

Amendment No. 6: Appropriates $1,870,000,000 for "Operations" instead of $1,850,000,000 as proposed by the House and $1,886,363,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 7: Appropriates $661,620,500 for "Transportation" instead of $648,000,000 as proposed by the House and $675,241,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 8: Appropriates $157,400,000 for "Facilities" instead of $155,000,000 as proposed by the House and $159,800,000 as proposed by the Senate.

TITLE III—THE TAX COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

Amendment No. 9: Appropriates $1,170,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of $1,035,000 as proposed by the House.

J. VAUGHAN GARY,
OTTO E. PASSMAN,
ALFRED D. SIEMINSKI,
JAMES C. MURRAY,
CLARENCE CANNON,
EARL WILSON,
BENJAMIN F. JAMES,
JOHN TABER,
Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Speaker, the conferees on the bill (H. R. 4876) making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments have reached agreement. We also agreed, as a special favor, to permit the Senate to consider the report first, and, accordingly, the report appears in the RECORD of Friday, May 20.

Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H. R. 4876) making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments and the Tax Court of the United States for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Speaker, the action of the conferees on the bill (H. R. 4876) making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments results in a bill which totals $3,322,488,500, an increase of $39,935,500 over the House version, a decrease of $36,133,500 in the bill as passed by the Senate, and a reduction of $37,896,500 in the estimates.

For the Treasury Department, the bill provides $599,598,000, an increase over the House bill of $3,780,000, a decrease of $3,750,000 in the bill as passed by the Senate, and a reduction of $4,800,000 in the estimates.

In connection with amendments Nos. 1 and 4, the action of the conferees restores the funds for the third position of Assistant Secretary. The conferees felt that, although substantial progress has been made in disposing of the assets of the former Reconstruction Finance Corporation, the volume, value, and intricacies of the remaining workload may require the services of someone of the caliber and stature of Assistant Secretary. However, in the statement of the managers, the Department is advised that the Congress will not look with favor on a further continuation of the position and expects that the budget for next year will be adjusted accordingly.

Amendment No. 2, as agreed to in conference, provides 175 passenger motor vehicles for the Internal Revenue Service instead of 150 provided in the House bill and 200 provided in the Senate bill. Of these vehicles, 100 are for replacement only.

Funds for the Internal Revenue Service are provided in the amount of $282,250,000. This is $3,750,000 more than the House allowance and the same amount below the Senate bill.

For the Post Office Department the bill provides $2,721,720,500, an increase of $36,020,500 over the House version, a decrease of $32,383,500 in the bill as passed by the Senate, and a reduction of $33,096,500 in the estimates.

The conferees agreed to eliminate language proposed by the Senate, amendment No. 5, which would have established legislative authority for a change in the manner of handling certain phases of the postal deficit. It was felt that the entire matter of financing these special activities of a subsidy nature should more properly be considered by the appropriate legislative committee.

The bill provides $1,870,000,000 for the "Operations" appropriation, an increase of $20 million over the amount provided by the House and a decrease in the estimate and in the bill as passed by the Senate of $16,363,000.

For "Transportation," the bill provides $661,620,500, which is $13,620,500 above the House version and the same amount below the estimates and the Senate bill.

An amount of $157,400,000 is provided for "Facilities," which is $2,400,000 below both the estimate and the Senate bill and an equal amount above the bill as passed by the House.

For the Tax Court of the United States, the bill provides $1,170,000, an increase of $135,000 over the bill as passed by the House, which was contained in Senate Document No. 26 and represents the supplemental requirements resulting from the recent increase in pay for the judiciary.

The following table summarizes the action of the conferees:

	Title I, Treasury	Title II, Post Office	Title III, Tax Court	Total
Appropriations, 1955	$589,955,600	$2,754,877,100	$1,000,000	$3,345,832,700
Estimates, 1956	604,398,000	2,754,817,000	1,170,000	3,360,385,000
House bill	595,818,000	2,685,700,000	1,035,000	3,282,553,000
Senate bill	603,348,000	2,754,104,000	1,170,000	3,358,622,000
Conference bill	599,598,000	2,721,720,500	1,170,000	3,322,488,500
Conference bill compared with:				
House bill	+3,780,000	+36,020,500	+135,000	+39,935,500
Senate bill	−3,750,000	−32,383,500		−36,133,500
Estimates	−4,800,000	−33,096,500		−37,896,500

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARY. I yield.

Mr. GROSS. How much increase or decrease is this over the spending of last year for the same two Departments?

Mr. GARY. The bill is roughly $23 million less than last year.

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARY. I yield.

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. Of course, it is understandable that there should be an increase by virtue of an increase in the volume of mail being handled by the Department; also the item of $11 million, which the House authorized for the purchase of uniforms.

Mr. GARY. That is correct.

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. So it is perfectly understandable that in view of this increased volume of mail, and in view of that authorization, the bill would call for more. I think we cut them a little deeper than we should have. If some of you folks have difficulty getting extensions on your mail routes, do not blame the Postmaster General because we cut his budget to the limit, and he will be back for more money before next year. If you do not want him to have more, that is all right. If you have trouble getting extensions and getting proper mail service, the country is building up, the population is increasing, there are new developments, and we need expanded service, and we need new carriers, and if you folks do not get them just blame yourselves. Do not blame the Postmaster General. I think, if you do get them, he will be back here asking for more money before the fiscal year ends.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Speaker, may I say that the Congress voted the Postmaster General $101 million more than he could spend last year. This year we apparently voted him $52 million more than he can spend. This bill cuts his estimates only $33 million, and in view of the record for the past 2 years, we feel that he can easily stand this cut. In fact, I think the Department could stand a much larger cut; nevertheless, we have agreed on this amount with the Senate and I ask that the House approve the conference report.

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. GARY. I yield.

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. In view of the most recent statement of the gentleman from Virginia, I think we should add this comment, that the Postmaster General did not spend all the money we gave him for the sake of getting rid of it and asking for more.

We have had a policy in some departments in recent years where they rush out and spend all the money we appropriate, in fact, they have people working overtime figuring out ways and means to justify a request for larger amounts. But we have a Postmaster General who last year did not spend the money we gave him. However, due to an increase in population and due to an increase in the mails, he cannot save as much this year. I do not think we should penalize him because he turned back money. He will probably turn money back this year.

Mr. GARY. I commend the Postmaster General for not spending all the money the Congress authorized him to spend last year.

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. We have a new policy in Government, you know.

Mr. GARY. At the same time I think the Congress should be careful not to put too much temptation in the way of department heads, that we should give the heads of the various departments what we think they can reasonably spend, and no more.

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. For 20 years you did not have any money turned back. We are embarking on a different type of program now, and if the gentleman from Virginia will bear with the Postmaster General in trying to do a good job and save a little money he should praise him instead of penalizing him.

Mr. GARY. Does the gentleman insinuate that the gentleman from Virginia has not cooperated with the Post Office Department? I think the gentleman from Indiana will admit that not only the gentleman from Virginia, but also our subcommittee, has cooperated most heartily with the Post Office Department and encouraged every economy program that it has instituted; as a matter of fact, we pointed the way to most of it.

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. Based on the new budget, I think the Postmaster General will be back for more money, and I think there will be enough people of this House screaming for better postal service to assure his getting that money.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARY. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. I wish the head of the Foreign Operations Administration, Mr. Stassen, would take the same attitude that the Postmaster General takes and not spend everything that is thrown into his lap.

Mr. GARY. I think the gentleman will find that he has a very large amount of unexpended funds, too.

Mr. GROSS. If the gentleman will yield further, last year the gentleman's committee pointed out that the head of the FOA, Mr. Stassen, was rushing out and committing hundreds of millions of dollars just before the fiscal year ended, just so he could get rid of it.

Mr. GARY. I think that is probably true, and I am not certain that it was not done by the Post Office Department this year. Anyway, they could not spend all the money we gave them, and for that reason we are now cutting down somewhat.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to; and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

IMPROVED ADMINISTRATION OF PROGRAM FOR UTILIZATION OF SURPLUS PROPERTY

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the 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, with Senate amendments, and agree to the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 1, line 3, after "That", insert "(a)."

Page 1, lines 8 and 9, and page 2, lines 1, 2, and 3, 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."

Page 2, after line 8, 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.' "

Page 2, line 16, after "under", insert "Paragraph (2) of."

Page 3, line 15, strike out "educational purposes or" and insert "educational."

Page 3, line 16, after "health", insert "or memorial."

Page 3, line 23, after "restriction", insert "which occurred prior to the enactment of this act."

Page 3, line 24, after "is", insert "pending at the time of, or."

Page 4, line 10, after "if", insert "(1) such violation occurred prior to the expiration of such 1-year period and (2)."

Page 4, line 11, after "is", insert "pending at the time of enactment of this act or is."

Page 4, line 11, strike out "within" and insert "not later than."

Page 4, line 22, strike out "donated" and insert "disposed of."

Page 5, line 2, after "donated", insert "or disposed of."

Page 5, after line 4, 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'."

Mr. RIEHLMAN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I do not intend to, I think it would be well if the gentleman would explain to the House the changes in the bill that were brought about in conference.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, this is a bill that all Members are interested in relating to the donable or personal property given to our colleges, universities, schools, and hospitals where it has been declared surplus.

The bill also meets the declaration of excess principle by the Defense Department.

Without going into detail, which is unnecessary at this point, may I say that the several amendments put on by the Senate are either clarifying amendments or amendments of a perfecting nature. The bill has been very carefully worked out. The Senate staff kept in touch with the staff of our committee in the House, particularly the special subcommittee and it in no way makes any substantial changes in the bill as passed by the House.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in; and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SUPPLEMENT TO FEDERAL RECLAMATION LAWS

Mr. BOLLING, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 248, Rept. No. 612), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 5881) to supplement the Federal reclamation laws by providing for Federal cooperation in non-Federal projects and for participation by non-Federal agencies in Federal projects. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill, and shall continue not to exceed 2 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be

considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

AMENDING THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA TRAFFIC ACT

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on the District of Columbia, I call up the bill (H. R. 6063) to amend the District of Columbia Traffic Act, 1925, to exempt certain officers and employees of the Senate and House of Representatives from the requirements of such act relating to the registration of motor vehicles and the licensing of operators when they can prove legal residence in some State and ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered in the House as in the Committee of the Whole.

The Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the sixth sentence of subsection (a) of section 8 of the District of Columbia Traffic Act, 1925, as amended (D. C. Code, sec. 40–303 (a)), is amended (1) by striking out "as administrative employees", and (2) by striking out "administrative employees of Senators, Representatives, Delegates, and Resident Commissioners who are legal residents of the State, Territory, or possession from which said Senators, Representatives, Delegates, and Resident Commissioners have been elected or appointed;" and by inserting in lieu thereof "employees of Senators, Representatives, Delegates, and Resident Commissioners, employees of the standing, select, and joint committees of the Senate and House of Representatives, and all other officers and employees in or under the Senate and the House of Representatives;": *Provided*, That such employees are legal residents of some State and entitled to register their motor vehicles in such State.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last word in order to explain this bill.

The purpose of this bill (H. R. 6063) is to grant reciprocity to a few employees on Capitol Hill who are eligible to procure license tags in their home State. This bill only applies to a few people employed on Capitol Hill whose services are only required in the District of Columbia during the session of Congress.

This bill makes it especially necessary that a person be a resident of such State and eligible to purchase license tags from such State.

We found that a few employees on Capitol Hill were not included in the act, granting reciprocity to Members of Congress and their employees, which this Congress enacted last year.

Mr. KEARNS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McMILLAN. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. KEARNS. Mr. Speaker, I have no objection particularly to the bill except I feel that perhaps the personnel that the chairman of the Committee on the District of Columbia wants to include in it should be spelled out, not the individuals but the officers involved. I am afraid that the language as it reads now would leave the door wide open and would extend to the administrative branch of the Government, the judicial branch, or to any other part of the Government.

Mr. McMILLAN. This bill specifically states the legislative branch of the Government.

Mr. KEARNS. Could the distinguished chairman tell me whether or not he had any hearings on this legislation?

Mr. McMILLAN. We did not, because it did not affect any person but employees on Capitol Hill.

Mr. KEARNS. Well, I would like to offer an amendment.

Mr. McMILLAN. I would like to state that we had 16 members at the meeting, and the bill was reported unanimously.

Mr. KEARNS. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. KEARNS:

On page 1, strike out the last 3 words of line 5 and all of lines 6, 7, and 8.

On page 2, strike out lines 1, 2, 3, and the first 4 words of line 4.

Change the rest of the page to read:

"Administrative employees of Senators, Representatives, Delegates, and Resident Commissioners, designated employees of the standing, select, and joint committees of the Senate and the House of Representatives: *Provided*, That such employees are legal residents of some State and entitled to register their motor vehicle in such State."

Page 2, line 4, insert "administrative."

Page 2, line 5, insert "designated."

Page 2, line 7, strike out the last 6 words.

Page 2, line 8, strike out all of the line and on page 2, line 9, strike out the first word.

Mr. KEARNS. Really, the meat of this amendment is the word "designated," whereby the position of whomever we want to put on in this category from the House of Representatives is spelled out. If there are only 10 or 20 people involved, I have no objection to it; but I do not think we should leave the door open by saying "all employees."

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Does the gentleman think his amendment spells out any more than the present language in the bill?

Mr. KEARNS. Yes. My amendment is purely safeguarding.

Mr. McMILLAN. Just what would the amendment do?

Mr. KEARNS. Well, you say you want to take care of 4 to 20 employees of the House, designated by whoever wants to do it, the Speaker or anybody else.

Mr. McMILLAN. Anybody who qualifies.

Mr. KEARNS. Yes.

Mr. McMILLAN. That is included in this bill.

Mr. KEARNS. No; not when you say on page 2, line 7, "and all other officers and employees."

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McMILLAN. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. It seems to me that both the gentleman from Pennsylvania and the gentleman from South Carolina and the committee are in agreement as to what is desired. It seems to me that the committee has given careful consideration to this bill, and it would appear to me that the bill reported by the committee would be the best one to support, with all due respect to my friend from Pennsylvania. His amendment might produce results that we do not desire. I am not in a position of opposing the amendment, but I do think that under the circumstances it would be wise for us to follow the committee in this case and not to adopt the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania, because certainly the committee has given profound consideration to this matter.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

The amendment was rejected.

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.

ADJUST SALARIES OF JUDGES FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, I call up the bill (S. 727) to adjust the salaries of the judges of the municipal court of appeals for the District of Columbia, the municipal court for the District of Columbia, the juvenile court of the District of Columbia, and the District of Columbia tax court, and ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered in the House as in the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the fourth sentence of the sixth paragraph of section 6 of the act entitled "An act to consolidate the police court of the District of Columbia and the municipal court of the District of Columbia, to be known as the municipal court for the District of Columbia, to create 'the municipal court of appeals for the District of Columbia', and for other purposes," approved April 1, 1942, as amended (D. C. Code, sec. 11–771), is amended by striking out "$14,500" and inserting in lieu thereof "$20,000", and by striking out "$14,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "$19,500."

SEC. 2. The fourth sentence of section 2 of such act of April 1, 1942, as amended (D. C. Code, sec. 11–753), is amended by striking out "$13,500" and inserting in lieu thereof "$19,000", and by striking out "$13,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "$18,500."

SEC. 3. Section 19 of the Juvenile Court Act of the District of Columbia, as amended (D. C. Code, sec. 11–920), is amended by striking out the last sentence and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "The salary of the judge shall be $18,500 per annum."

SEC. 4. The first sentence of the second paragraph of section 2 of title IX of the District of Columbia Revenue Act of 1937, as amended (D. C. Code, sec. 47–2402), is amended by striking out "$13,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "$18,500."

With the following committee amendments:

Strike all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following: "That the sixth paragraph of section 6 of the act of April 1, 1942, as amended (11 D. C. Code, sec. 771), is amended by striking out '$14,500' and substituting therefor '$17,500' and by striking out '$14,000' and substituting therefor '$17,000'."

"SEC. 2. Section 2 of the act of April 1, 1942, as amended (11 D. C. Code, sec. 753), is amended by striking out '$13,500' and substituting therefor '$16,500' and by striking out '$13,000' and substituting therefor '$16,000'."

"SEC. 3. Section 2 of title IX of the District of Columbia Revenue Act of 1937, as amended by the acts of May 16, 1938, and June 10, 1952, is amended as follows: By striking out in the second paragraph thereof '$13,000' and substituting therefor '$16,000'."

"SEC. 4. The last sentence of section 19 of the Juvenile Court Act of the District of Columbia (11 D. C. Code, sec. 920) is amended to read as follows: 'The salary of the judge shall be $14,800 per annum'."

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this legislation is to increase the salaries of the judges of the municipal court of appeals for the District of Columbia, the salaries of the judges of the municipal court for the District of Columbia, and the salary of the judge of the tax court for the District of Columbia and the judge of the juvenile court for the District of Columbia.

Under existing law the salary of the chief judge of the municipal court of appeals for the District of Columbia is $14,500 and the associate judges of the same court receive $14,000. Under the proposed bill the salary of the chief judge of the municipal court of appeals would be increased to $17,500, and that of the associate judges of this court to $17,000.

The salary of the chief judge of the municipal court for the District of Columbia, under existing law, is $13,500 and under this proposed legislation the salary would be increased to $16,500. The salaries of the associate judges of the municipal court for the District of Columbia are $13,000. Under this legislation they would be increased to $16,000.

At the present time the judge of the tax court for the District of Columbia is paid at the rate of $13,000 a year. Under the proposed bill he would receive a salary of $16,000.

The salary of the judge of the juvenile court of the District of Columbia, under existing law, is $11,800 and under the proposed legislation would be increased to $14,800.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the requisite number of words.

Mr. Speaker, I should like to know from the chairman of the committee or some member of the committee something about this bill, something about the necessity for it. Will the gentleman give us some information?

Mr. McMILLAN. Yes; the committee reported out a bill increasing the salaries of municipal judges in the District of Columbia by $3,000. That would make their salaries, if the bill is adopted, $17,500.

Mr. GROSS. At the present time their salaries are $14,500 and the committee is proposing to increase them to $17,500 and to $17,000; is that correct?

Mr. McMILLAN. That is right. Ever since there have been district courts here, the municipal judges have received approximately $2,000 less than Federal judges. In this case they will be receiving approximately $5,000 less than Federal judges.

Mr. GROSS. Does the gentleman think that municipal court judges ought to be paid the same salaries as Federal judges?

Mr. McMILLAN. We made a survey of 5 or 6 cities of approximately the same size as the city of Washington and we found the average salary there was $17,500. We adopted the same rate of salary.

Mr. GROSS. May I ask the gentleman what was the basis for this increase? Was it cost of living, or what?

Mr. McMILLAN. We felt that we might improve the quality of the judges we have here if we increased their salaries. We think we ought to have better judges in the District of Columbia. We have some good judges here, but we feel that we should increase their salaries.

Mr. GROSS. Will the gentleman tell us, were hearings held on this bill?

Mr. McMILLAN. Yes, sir.

Mr. GROSS. And what were the salaries paid judges of the municipal courts in comparable cities?

Mr. McMILLAN. We took 5 cities of approximately the size of Washington and we found the average was $17,500.

Mr. GROSS. Would the gentleman tell us what were those cities?

Mr. McMILLAN. Well, New York——

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman knows the District of Columbia is not comparable to New York City; the gentleman understands that.

Mr. McMILLAN. They receive more money there; $19,000, I believe. But we took an average. We took cities like New York, Detroit, Minneapolis; I think there were five of them.

Mr. GROSS. Can the gentleman tell me how much municipal court judges are paid in the State of South Carolina?

Mr. McMILLAN. No, sir; I do not know.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman well knows that this proposed salary is fantastic as compared with the salaries of municipal judges in the State of Iowa or in his own State of South Carolina. Will he not admit that?

Mr. McMILLAN. I believe the salaries of municipal judges in the State of South Carolina are less than proposed here.

Mr. GROSS. Still the gentleman is for this bill to increase the salaries of these judges to $17,500 a year and $17,000, when they are already $14,000 and $14,500 a year. Does the gentleman know of any dearth of candidates for appointment to the municipal bench in the District of Columbia when vacancies occur?

Mr. McMILLAN. No, sir; I think there are plenty of applicants.

Mr. GROSS. And they are qualified men, too, I think the gentleman would say?

Mr. McMILLAN. We hope we can get better applicants, better qualified men, if we increase the salaries.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, this seems to me to be an unreasonable increase in the pay of these municipal court judges and I am opposed to it. If the taxpayers of Iowa and the rest of the Nation were not contributing millions of dollars each year to the support of the District of Columbia, I would be constrained to let the hide go with the horns; to let the taxpayers of the District compete with New York or any other city in the payment of lush salaries. These municipal judges in the District have 10-year appointments. They expend no money in election campaigns as do all judges and justices of the supreme court in Iowa and many of the other States. Throughout the country, State and municipal taxes are being increased but I am unaware of any substantial increase in taxes in the District of Columbia to compensate for additional spending.

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last three words.

Mr. Speaker, in the light of the comments of my friend, the gentleman from Iowa, for whom I have great respect, I call the attention of my colleague to the fact that Congress has repeatedly fixed the policy of setting municipal court judges' salaries at just $2,000 under the Federal courts and the salaries of judges on the municipal court of appeals at $1,000 less. When the municipal court of appeals was created in 1942, the salary was fixed at $9,000. District Federal judges' salaries were then $10,000. In 1949, the municipal court judges' salaries were fixed by Congress at $13,000 and the salaries of municipal court of appeals judges at $14,000, to correspond with the new salary increases of Federal district judges to $15,000.

Mr. Speaker, I want to point out that this municipal court is different from any other municipal court in the country. Nowhere else is there a municipal court having jurisdiction embracing offenses against the United States Government as well as the usual local jurisdiction—general civil jurisdiction, and general criminal jurisdiction to the level of felonies as well as the usual magisterial jurisdiction. For example, in no other municipal court in the country will there be found a United States attorney maintaining a permanent staff of assistants.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. I yield.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Speaker, I have asked the gentleman to yield in order to inquire as to the jurisdiction of the municipal court, and, of course, the gentleman was just about to discuss that aspect.

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. They have general jurisdiction.

Mr. JONAS. Up to what?

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. Up to $3,000 in civil cases, and up to and including felonies, and they are committing magistrates on felonies.

Mr. JONAS. I take it from the statement of the gentleman from Minnesota that the jurisdiction is limited in civil cases up to $3,000 and under.

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. That is up to the present time. May I say in that connection, there is now under consideration, as I understand it, general legislation which will increase that up to $8,000. That is a general change which is being considered all over the country at the present time. We are presently considering before the Subcommittee on the Judiciary of the Committee on the

District of Columbia the question of transferring all domestic-relation cases and divorce cases from the Federal district courts to the municipal court here. So that it is a court which is completely different from the municipal courts of my State and the gentleman's State as well as the State of our colleague from Iowa [Mr. GROSS]. It is not to be compared at all.

Mr. JONAS. If the gentleman will yield further, there is not so much difference between that court and the courts in our State if the jurisdiction is limited to $3,000 in civil cases and limited in its final jurisdiction to misdemeanors.

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. The misdemeanors here would be Federal misdemeanors which are considerably more serious than misdemeanors in most States.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. I yield.

Mr. GROSS. In the State of Minnesota you have either circuit court or district judges; is that not correct?

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. We have district and municipal judges.

Mr. GROSS. You have district judges?

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. Yes.

Mr. GROSS. And the jurisdiction of the district court judges exceeds that probably of municipal court judges in the District of Columbia.

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. May I say to my dear friend that they have been raising their salaries much more in the State of Minnesota than they have in salaries of the circuit court judges in the State of Iowa. The circuit court judges in the State of Iowa are badly in need of an increase.

Mr. GROSS. Yes, but will the gentleman tell me what a circuit judge gets in the State of Minnesota or a district judge?

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. Between $13,000 and $14,000 a year, as salaries as I understand.

Mr. GROSS. And they have greater jurisdiction than the municipal court judges?

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. That is not comparative at all. Courts vary all over the country. There are some municipal courts where the salaries of the judges go as high as $20,000 per year.

Mr. GROSS. Perhaps the gentleman from Minnesota can tell me the basis for this increase.

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. Because it is traditional and in keeping with the salaries of the courts. We just raised the Federal district judges salaries $7,500 per year. Now they are bringing in a raise of only $3,000 a year in this bill.

Mr. GROSS. In other words, this is a case of keeping up with the Joneses.

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. It is a question of having some comparative standard as far as the salaries are concerned. It is traditional and in keeping with the policy followed by the Government. The salaries paid to the judges should be commensurate with the duties of the court. I do not see anything wrong with it. I do not think that they should be overpaid, but neither do I feel that they should be underpaid. They should be fully compensated.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken; and the Speaker announced that the "ayes" appeared to have it.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present, and I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present. The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant-at-Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 283, nays 33, not voting 118, as follows:

[Roll No. 69]

YEAS—283

Abernethy	Dawson, Ill.	Jennings
Adair	Dawson, Utah	Jensen
Addonizio	Deane	Johnson, Calif.
Albert	Denton	Johnson, Wis.
Alger	Derounian	Jonas
Allen, Calif.	Devereux	Jones, Ala.
Allen, Ill.	Dixon	Jones, Mo.
Andresen, August H.	Dolliver	Jones, N. C.
	Dondero	Judd
Andrews	Doyle	Karsten
Arends	Elliott	Kean
Ashmore	Ellsworth	Kearney
Aspinall	Engle	Kearns
Auchincloss	Evins	Keating
Ayres	Fascell	Kee
Bailey	Feighan	Kelley, Pa.
Baker	Fenton	Kilburn
Baldwin	Fernandez	Kilday
Barden	Fisher	Kilgore
Bates	Flood	King, Calif.
Baumhart	Flynt	King, Pa.
Beamer	Fogarty	Knox
Belcher	Forand	Laird
Bell	Ford	Landrum
Bennett, Fla.	Frazier	Lankford
Bennett, Mich.	Frelinghuysen	LeCompte
Berry	Friedel	Lesinski
Betts	Garmatz	Long
Blatnik	Gary	McCarthy
Blitch	Gathings	McCormack
Boland	Gavin	McCulloch
Bolling	Gordon	McDonough
Bonner	Grant	McDowell
Bowler	Gray	McGregor
Boyle	Gregory	McIntire
Brooks, La.	Gubser	McMillan
Brooks, Tex.	Gwinn	McVey
Brown, Ga.	Hagen	Mack, Ill.
Brown, Ohio	Hale	Mack, Wash.
Brownson	Haley	Magnuson
Broyhill	Halleck	Mahon
Burdick	Harden	Mailliard
Burnside	Hardy	Marshall
Bush	Harris	Martin
Byrnes, Wis.	Harrison, Nebr.	Meader
Cannon	Harvey	Merrow
Carlyle	Hayworth	Metcalf
Carnahan	Henderson	Miller, Md.
Carrigg	Herlong	Miller, Nebr.
Cederberg	Hess	Mills
Chatham	Hiestand	Minshall
Chelf	Hillings	Mollohan
Chiperfield	Hinshaw	Morrison
Christopher	Hoeven	Moss
Church	Holifield	Murray, Ill.
Clark	Holmes	Natcher
Clevenger	Holt	Nicholson
Cooley	Hope	O'Brien, Ill.
Cooper	Horan	O'Brien, N. Y.
Cramer	Huddleston	O'Hara, Ill.
Cretella	Hull	O'Hara, Minn.
Crumpacker	Hyde	Ostertag
Cunningham	Ikard	Passman
Curtis, Mass.	Jackson	Patman
Dague	James	Patterson
Davis, Ga.	Jarman	Pelly
Davis, Tenn.	Jenkins	Perkins
Pfost	Rutherford	Thompson, Tex.
Phillips	Sadlak	Thomson, Wyo.
Pilcher	St. George	Thornberry
Poage	Saylor	Trimble
Poff	Schenck	Tumulty
Polk	Schwengel	Udall
Price	Scrivner	Vanik
Priest	Selden	Van Pelt
Prouty	Sheehan	Van Zandt
Quigley	Shelley	Velde
Rabaut	Sheppard	Vinson
Radwan	Sieminski	Wainwright
Rains	Simpson, Ill.	Walter
Ray	Sisk	Westland
Reed, Ill.	Smith, Kans.	Whitten
Reuss	Smith, Miss.	Widnall
Rhodes, Ariz.	Smith, Va.	Wier
Rhodes, Pa.	Smith, Wis.	Wigglesworth
Richards	Spence	Williams, Miss.
Riehlman	Springer	Willis
Riley	Staggers	Wilson, Calif.
Roberts	Steed	Wilson, Ind.
Robsion, Ky.	Talle	Wolcott
Rodino	Teague, Calif.	Wright
Rogers, Colo.	Thomas	Yates
Rogers, Fla.	Thompson, La.	Young
Rogers, Mass.	Thompson, Mich.	Younger
Roosevelt		Zablocki

NAYS—33

Abbitt	Forrester	Rogers, Tex.
Alexander	Gentry	Shuford
Andersen, H. Carl	George	Siler
	Gross	Taber
Bow	Harrison, Va.	Tuck
Budge	Johansen	Vursell
Burleson	Krueger	Watts
Cole	Murray, Tenn.	Weaver
Coon	Norrell	Williams, N. Y.
Davis, Wis.	O'Konski	Winstead
Dies	Rees, Kans.	
Dowdy	Robeson, Va.	

NOT VOTING—118

Anfuso	Durham	Matthews
Ashley	Eberharter	Miller, Calif.
Avery	Edmondson	Miller, N. Y.
Barrett	Fallon	Morano
Bass, N. H.	Fine	Morgan
Bass, Tenn.	Fino	Moulder
Becker	Fjare	Multer
Bentley	Fountain	Mumma
Boggs	Fulton	Nelson
Bolton, Frances P.	Gamble	Norblad
	Granahan	O'Neill
Bolton, Oliver P.	Green, Oreg.	Osmers
	Green, Pa.	Philbin
Bosch	Griffiths	Pillion
Boykin	Hand	Powell
Bray	Hays, Ark.	Preston
Buchanan	Hays, Ohio	Reece, Tenn.
Buckley	Hébert	Reed, N. Y.
Byrd	Heselton	Rivers
Byrne, Pa.	Hill	Rooney
Canfield	Hoffman, Ill.	Scherer
Celler	Hoffman, Mich.	Scott
Chase	Holtzman	Scudder
Chenoweth	Hosmer	Seely-Brown
Chudoff	Kelly, N. Y.	Short
Colmer	Keogh	Sikes
Corbett	Kirwan	Simpson, Pa.
Coudert	Klein	Sullivan
Curtis, Mo.	Kluczynski	Taylor
Davidson	Knutson	Teague, Tex.
Delaney	Lane	Thompson, N. J.
Dempsey	Lanham	Tollefson
Diggs	Latham	Utt
Dingell	Lipscomb	Vorys
Dodd	Lovre	Wharton
Dollinger	McConnell	Wickersham
Donohue	Macdonald	Williams, N. J.
Donovan	Machrowicz	Withrow
Dorn, N. Y.	Madden	Wolverton
Dorn, S. C.	Mason	Zelenko

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Boggs with Mr. Fino.

Mr. Hébert with Mr. Latham.

Mrs. Sullivan with Mrs. Frances P. Bolton.

Mrs. Buchanan with Mr. Avery.

Mrs. Griffiths with Mr. Hill.

Mrs. Knutson with Mr. Short.

Mr. Thompson of New Jersey with Mr. Canfield.

Mr. Fallon with Mr. Bray.

Mr. Eberharter with Mr. Becker.

Mr. Miller of California with Mr. Bentley.

Mr. Madden with Mr. Hoffman of Michigan.

Mr. Macdonald with Mr. Hand.

Mr. Wickersham with Mr. Simpson of Pennsylvania.
Mr. Sikes with Mr. Taylor.
Mr. Kirwan with Mr. McConnell.
Mr. Colmer with Mr. Lipscomb.
Mr. Byrd with Mr. Bosch.
Mr. Hays of Arkansas with Mr. Corbett.
Mr. O'Neill with Mr. Coudert.
Mr. Fountain with Mr. Mumma.
Mr. Dodd with Mr. Nelson.
Mr. Dingell with Mr. Lovre.
Mr. Williams of New Jersey with Mr. Morano.
Mr. Hays of Ohio with Mr. Fulton.
Mr. Dempsey with Mr. Heselton.
Mr. Granahan with Mr. Hoffman of Illinois.
Mr. Green of Pennsylvania with Mr. Utt.
Mr. Barrett with Mr. Tollefson.
Mr. Chudoff with Mr. Hosmer.
Mr. Moulder with Mr. Bass of New Hampshire.
Mr. Lane with Mr. Fjare.
Mr. Philbin with Mr. Curtis of Missouri.
Mr. Donohue with Mr. Chase.
Mr. Zelenko with Mr. Chenoweth.
Mr. Byrne of Pennsylvania with Mr. Vorys.
Mr. Keogh with Mr. Wolverton.
Mr. Klein with Mr. Oliver P. Bolton.
Mr. Fine with Mr. Mason.
Mr. Dollinger with Mr. Reece of Tennessee.
Mr. Delaney with Mr. Reed of New York.
Mr. Holtzman with Mr. Scudder.
Mr. Davidson with Mr. Scott.
Mr. Anfuso with Mr. Miller of New York.
Mr. Celler with Mr. Wainwright.
Mr. Donovan with Mr. Pillion.
Mr. Powell with Mr. Osmers.
Mr. Rooney with Mr. Wharton.
Mrs. Kelly of New York with Mr. Withrow.
Mrs. Green of Oregon with Mr. Norblad.
Mr. Multer with Mr. Scherer.

Mr. COON and Mr. REES of Kansas changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

The title was amended so as to read: "An act to adjust the salaries of judges of the municipal court of appeals for the District of Columbia, the salaries of the judges of the municipal court for the District of Columbia, salary of the judge of the District of Columbia tax court, and the salary of the judge of the juvenile court of the District of Columbia."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDING DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA REVENUE ACT OF 1937

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, I call up the bill (H. R. 2406) to amend subsection (e) of title 47, section 1601 of the Code of Laws of the District of Columbia, 1951 edition, and ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered in the House as in the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That subsection (e) of title 47, section 1601 of the Code of Laws of the District of Columbia, 1951 edition, is amended to read as follows:

"(e) Property transferred exclusively for public or municipal purposes, to the United States or the District of Columbia, or exclusively for charitable, educational, or religious purposes, shall be exempt from any and all taxation under the provisions of this section."

With the following committee amendment:

On page 1 strike out lines 3 through 5 and insert in lieu thereof the following: "That subsection (e) of Sec. 1 of title 5 of the District of Columbia Revenue Act of 1937, as amended (47 D. C. Code, sec. 1601), is amended to read as follows."

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last word.

By way of explanation of the purpose of this bill, I would like to state that our distinguished majority leader the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] has been very much interested in this legislation and has rendered great assistance to the committee in preparing—as well as a number of other Members of the House who have also written and called me in support to it.

The purpose of this legislation is to amend subsection (e) of title 47, section 1601 of the District of Columbia Code, 1951 edition.

Under existing law property transferred exclusively for public or municipal purposes to the United States or the District of Columbia, exclusively for charitable, educational, or religious purposes within the District of Columbia, and property transferred to the American National Red Cross, is exempt from any and all taxation under the provisions of this section.

This legislation would remove the words "within the District of Columbia, and property transferred to the American National Red Cross," which would mean that all estate gifts, made for public or municipal purposes to the United States or the District of Columbia, or made to, exclusively, charitable, educational and religious organizations would be exempt from the estate tax.

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McMILLAN. I yield.

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, I would like to comend to the Members and urge their favorable vote on H. R. 2406, the proposal to provide a reciprocal exemption from District of Columbia inheritance taxes for bequests made to charitable and educational institutions located in States which provide similar exemption for bequests to institutions in the District.

We in California are particularly interested in the enactment of this legislation because our State has long adhered to the policy of providing this assistance to charitable and educational institutions and we are anxious to establish a reciprocal relationship with the District so that the institutions in both areas may benefit.

It is true that the taxing agencies in both the States and the District may be deprived of some direct tax revenue under this proposal, but I believe the benefits to the people as a whole far outweigh the possible tax losses. A great share of our educational and charitable load today is borne by institutions either entirely or partially supported by donations and bequests. The taxpayers are thereby relieved of a tremendous burden. Collection of death taxes on bequests to these institutions substantially reduces the funds available for educational and charitable purposes to be carried on at private expense and thereby increases the public expense.

It appears to me that the over-all beneficial effect of this legislation will be markedly in favor of the people of the District of Columbia. This is a focus point for many of our national educational and charitable organizations. It is likely that the number and amount of bequests by persons residing outside the District to institutions in the District will be far in excess of the bequests by residents of the District to organizations in the several States.

This is our opportunity to encourage a most useful devotion of private funds to education and charity in the District of Columbia and in the several States we represent. In my opinion it is a worthy measure, immediately useful to those States which now already have reciprocal acts, and which will encourage other States to adopt similar laws, to the lasting benefit of the people of the entire country. I sincerely hope this measure will win unanimous approval.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was 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.

The bill was passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "To amend subsection (e) of section 1 of title 5 of the District of Columbia Revenue Act of 1937, as amended."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA DELEGATES TO NATIONAL POLITICAL CONVENTIONS

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, I call up the bill (H. R. 191) to regulate the election of delegates representing the District of Columbia to national political conventions, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That national committeemen and national committeewomen of political parties and delegates and alternates from the District of Columbia to all conventions of political parties nominating candidates for the Presidency and the Vice Presidency of the United States shall be elected as provided in this act.

DEFINITIONS

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this act—

(1) The term "District" means the District of Columbia.

(2) The term "qualified elector" means a citizen of the United States (A) who has been domiciled in the District continuously

since the beginning of the 1-year period ending on the day of the next election or, if such period has not begun, is domiciled in the District and who does not claim voting residence in any State or Territory; (B) who is, or will be on the day of the next election, 21 years old; (C) who has never been convicted of a felony in the United States, or if he has been so convicted, has been pardoned; and (D) who is not mentally incompetent as adjudged by a court of competent jurisdiction.

(3) The term "Board" means the Board of Elections for the District of Columbia provided for by section 3.

CREATION OF BOARD OF ELECTIONS

SEC. 3. There is hereby created a Board of Elections for the District of Columbia, to be composed of three members appointed by the Commissioners of the District of Columbia. The first terms of offices on the Board shall expire, as designated by the Commissioners, one at the close of December 31 of each of the first 3 years which begin after the date of enactment of this act. Subsequent terms of each such office shall be 3 years beginning January 1 following the expiration of the preceding term of such office. Any person appointed to fill a vacant office shall be appointed only for the unexpired term of such office. Until his successor is appointed and has qualified, a member may continue to serve even though the term of the office to which he was appointed has expired.

QUALIFICATIONS AND COMPENSATION OF MEMBERS

SEC. 4. (a) No person shall be a member of the Board unless he qualifies as an elector and resides in the District. No person may be appointed to the Board unless he has been domiciled in the District continuously since the beginning of the 3-year period ending on the day he is appointed. Members of the Board shall hold no other office or employment in the Federal or District government. Not more than two members shall be members of the same political party.

(b) Each member of the Board shall be paid compensation at the rate of $25 per day while performing duties under this act. Except as provided in subsection (a) no person shall be ineligible to serve or to receive compensation as a member of the Board because he occupies another office or position or because he receives compensation (including retirement compensation) from another source. The right to another office or position or to compensation from another source otherwise secured to such a person under the laws of the United States shall not be of compensation as a member of the Board, abridged by the fact of his service or receipt if such service does not interfere with the discharge of his duties in such other office or position.

FUNCTIONS OF BOARD

SEC. 5. (a) The Board shall—

(1) maintain a permanent registry, keeping it accurate and current;

(2) conduct registrations and elections;

(3) print, distribute, and count ballots, or provide and operate suitable voting machines;

(4) divide the District into appropriate voting precincts, each of which shall contain at least 350 registered persons;

(5) operate polling places;

(6) certify nominees and the results of elections; and

(7) perform such other duties as are imposed upon it by this act.

(b) The Board, and persons authorized by it, may administer oaths to persons executing affidavits pursuant to sections 7 and 8. It may provide for the administering of such other oaths as it considers appropriate to require in the performance of its functions.

(c) The Board may prescribe such regulations as it considers necessary to carry out the purposes of this act.

(d) The Board may employ necessary personnel.

BOARD TO BE INDEPENDENT AGENCY

SEC. 6. (a) In the performance of its duties, the Board shall not be subject to the direction of any nonjudicial officer of the District.

(b) The officers and agencies of the District government shall furnish to the Board, upon request of the Board, such space and facilities as are available in public buildings in the District to be used as registration or polling places, and such records, information, services, personnel, offices, and equipment, and such other assistance and facilities, as may be necessary to enable the Board properly to perform its functions.

REGISTRATION

SEC. 7. (a) No person shall vote in any election in the District unless he is a qualified elector and, except as provided in subsection (e), is registered in the District.

(b) No person shall be registered unless—

(1) he is a qualified elector;

(2) he has been domiciled in the District continuously since the beginning of the 9-month period ending on the day he offers to register;

(3) except as prevented by physical disability, he can read and write the English language, as shown by his ability to read and complete the affidavit prescribed by paragraph (4); and

(4) he executes a registration affidavit, completed in his own handwriting (unless prevented by physical disability) and on the form prescribed by the Board pursuant to subsection (c), showing his political affiliation, and that he meets each of the requirements specified in section 2 (2) for a qualified elector as well as the requirement of paragraph (2) of this subsection.

(c) In administering the provisions of subsection (b) (4), the Board shall prepare and use a registration affidavit form in which each request for information is readily understandable and can be satisfied by a concise answer or mark. With respect to each requirement named in or imposed by such subsection, the Board may make such requests for specific information as in its judgment may be necessary or appropriate to show whether a person seeking to register meets such requirement.

(d) The registry shall be kept open except during the 60-day period ending on the first Tuesday in April of each Presidential election year, and except as provided by the Board in the case of a special election. While the registry is open, any person may apply for registration or change his registration.

(e) If a person is not permitted to register, such person, or any qualified candidate, may appeal to the Board, but not later than 3 days after the registry is closed for the next election. The Board shall decide within 7 days after the appeal is perfected whether the challenged elector is entitled to register. If the appeal is denied, the appellant may, within 3 days after such denial, appeal to the municipal court for the District of Columbia. The decision of such court shall be final and not appealable. If the appeal is upheld by either the Board or the court, the challenged elector shall be allowed to register immediately. If the appeal is pending on election day, the challenged elector may cast a ballot marked "challenged," as provided in section 9 (e).

NOMINATIONS

SEC. 8. (a) Candidates participating in an election held pursuant to this act shall be the persons registered under section 7 who have been nominated by a petition—

(1) prepared and presented to the Board in accordance with rules prescribed by the Board, but not later than 60 days before the date of the election; and

(2) signed by not less than 100 voters, registered under section 7, and of the same political party as the nominee.

(b) No person shall hold the office of committeeman, committeewoman, delegate, or alternate unless he has been a bone fide domiciliary of the District of Columbia for 3 years previous to his nomination and is a voter registered under section 7.

METHOD OF VOTING

SEC. 9. (a) Voting in all elections shall be secret. Voting may be by paper ballot or voting machine.

(b) The ballot of a person who is registered as a resident of the District shall be valid only if cast in the voting precinct where the residence shown on his registration is located.

(c) There shall be no absentee voting.

(d) Each qualified candidate may have a watcher at each polling place, provided the watcher presents proper credentials signed by the candidate. No one shall interfere with the opportunity of a watcher to observe the conduct of the election at that poling place and the counting of votes. Watchers may challenge prospective voters who are believed to be unqualified to vote.

(e) If the official in charge of the polling place, after hearing both parties to any such challenge or acting on his own initiative with respect to a prospective voter, reasonably believes the prospective voter is unqualified to vote, he shall allow the voter to cast a paper ballot marked "challenged." Ballots so cast shall be segregated, and no such ballot shall be counted until the challenge has been removed as provided in subsection (f).

(f) If a person has been permitted to vote only by challenged ballot, such person, or any qualified candidate, may appeal to the Board within 3 days after election day. The Board shall decide within 7 days after the appeal is perfected whether the voter was qualified to vote. If the Board decides that the voter was qualified to vote, the word "challenged" shall be stricken from the voter's ballot and the ballot shall be treated as if it had not been challenged.

(g) If a voter is physically unable to mark his ballot or operate the voting machine, the official in charge of the voting place may enter the voting booth with him and vote as directed. Upon the request of any such voter, a second election official may enter the voting booth to assist in the voting. The officials shall tell no one how the voter voted. The official in charge of the voting place shall make a return of all such voters, giving their names and disabilities.

(h) No person shall vote more than once in any election nor in an election held by a political party other than that to which he has declared himself to be a member.

(i) Copies of the regulations of the Board with respect to voting shall be made available to prospective voters at each polling place.

ELECTIONS

SEC. 10. (a) The election of national committeemen and national committeewomen of political parties and of delegates and alternates to national political conventions shall be held on the first Tuesday in April of each presidential election year. Any such election shall be conducted by the Board in conformity with the provisions of this act. Polls shall be open from 8 o'clock antemeridian to 8 o'clock postmeridian on election days.

(b) Candidates receiving the highest number of votes in said election shall be declared the winners.

(c) In the case of a tie, the candidates receiving the tie vote shall cast lots before the Board at 12 o'clock noon on a date to be set by the Board, but not sooner than

10 days following the primary, and the one to whom the lot shall fall shall be declared the winner. It any candidate or candidates, receiving a tie vote, fail to appear before 12 o'clock noon on said day, the Board shall cast lots for him or them. For the purpose of casting lots any candidate may appear in person, or by proxy appointed in writing.

RECOUNT AND CONTESTS

SEC. 11 (a) If, within 7 days after the board certifies the results of an election, any qualified candidate at such election petitions the board to have the votes cast at such election recounted in one or more voting precincts, the board shall order such recount. In each such case, the petitioner shall deposit a fee of $5 for each precinct petitioned to be recounted. If the cost of the recount is less than $5 per precinct, the difference shall be refunded. If the result of the election is changed as a result of the recount, the entire amount deposited by the petitioner shall be refunded. Such recounts shall be conducted in the manner prescribed by the board by regulation.

(b) After the board certifies the results of an election, any person who voted in the election may petition the United States District Court for the District of Columbia to review such election. In response to such a petition, the court may set aside the results so certified and declare the true results of the election, or void the election. To determine the true results of an election the court may order a recount or take other appropriate action, whether or not a recount has been conducted or requested pursuant to subsection (a). The court shall void an election only for fraud, mistake, or other defect, serious enough to vitiate the election as a fair expression of the will of the registered qualified electors voting therein. If the court voids an election it may order a special election, which shall be conducted in such manner (comparable to that prescribed for regular elections), and at such time, as the board shall prescribe. The decision of such court shall be final and not appealable.

INTERFERENCE WITH REGISTRATION OR VOTING

SEC. 12. (a) No one shall interfere with the registration or voting of another person, except as it may be reasonably necessary in the performance of a duty imposed by law. No person performing such a duty shall interfere with the registration or voting of another person because of his race, color, sex, or religious belief, or his want of property or income.

(b) No registered voter shall be required to perform a military duty on election day which would prevent him from voting, except in time of war or public danger or unless he is away from the District in military service. No registered voter may be arrested while voting or going to vote except for a breach of the peace then committed or for treason or felony.

EXPENDITURES

SEC. 13. (a) There is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of the funds of the District of Columbia, such amounts as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this act.

(b) Subject to the penalties provided in this act, a candidate for national committeeman, national committeewoman, delegate, or alternate, in his campaign for election, shall not make expenditures in excess of $2,500.

(c) No independent committee or party committee shall receive contributions aggregating more than $100,000, or make expenditures aggregating more than $100,000 for any campaign covered by this act.

(d) No person shall, directly or indirectly, make contribution in an aggregate amount in excess of $5,000 in connection with any campaign for election of any national committeeman, national committeewomen, delegate, or alternate.

(e) Every candidate and independent committee or party committee shall, within 10 days after the election, file with the Board of Elections an itemized statement, subscribed and sworn to, setting forth all moneys received and expended in connection with said election, the names of persons from whom received and to whom paid, and the purpose for which it was expended. Such statement shall set forth any unpaid debts and obligation incurred by the candidate or independent committee or party committee with regard to such election, and specify the balance, if any, of election funds remaining in his or their hands.

PENALTIES

SEC. 14. Any person who shall register, or attempt to register, under the provisions of of this act and make any false representations as to his place of residence or his voting privilege in any other part of the United States, or be guilty of bribery or intimidation of any voter at the elections herein provided for, or, being registered, shall vote or attempt to vote more than once in any election so held, or shall purloin or secrete any of the votes cast in such elections, or, if employed in the counting of votes in such elections, make a false report in regard thereto or attempt to vote in an election held by a political party other than that to which he has declared himself to be affiliated, and every candidate, person, or official of any political committee who shall make any expenditure or contribution in violation of this act, shall upon conviction, thereof be fined not more than $500 or be imprisoned not more than 90 days, or both.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SIMPSON], the author of the bill, seek recognition on the bill?

Mr. SIMPSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, naturally I am for the bill. This is legislation which I will say I introduced and was passed last year by the House and by another legislative body. It was vetoed by the President. Some revisions were made and the bill was reintroduced this year with the Presidential objections removed. So far as I know, no one is against it. The Republican National Committee in Washington and the Democratic National Committee are for it. I think we ought to support and pass it now, in plenty of time for next year's national election. In addition, the legislation officially sets up election machinery sorely needed for the District of Columbia and affords qualified voters in the District an opportunity to vote.

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last word.

The purpose of this bill is to regulate the election of national committeemen and committeewomen and delegates and alternates from the District of Columbia to all conventions of political parties nominating candidates for the Presidency and Vice Presidency of the United States.

A board of elections, composed of three members appointed by the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, would maintain a permanent registry of electors, conduct the elections, certify nominees and the results of elections, and perform other functions incident to the conduct of such elections.

The bill also regulates expenditures by a candidate, committee, and individuals as follows:

(a) Candidates shall not make expenditures in excess of $2,500.

(b) No independent committee or party committee shall receive contributions aggregating more than $100,000, or make expenditures aggregating more than $100,000 for any campaign.

(c) No individual shall, directly or indirectly, make contribution in an aggregate amount in excess of $5,000.

At the present time elections in the District of Columbia are held under party rules, and there is no law regulating or governing such elections.

The president of the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia, the Democratic National Committeeman for the District of Columbia, and representatives from the following appeared in support of this measure: Democratic Central Committee, Citizens for Eisenhower, District of Columbia, District of Columbia League of Women Voters, Washington Home Rule Committee, Washington Chapter, Americans for Democratic Action, Young Democratic Club of Washington, D. C., Federation of Civic Associations, and Federation of Citizens Associations. The committee also received a communication from the Republican State Committee of the District of Columbia.

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.

REGULATING FARES FOR TRANSPORTATION OF SCHOOL CHILDREN IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on the District of Columbia, I call up the bill (H. R. 3908) to provide for the regulation of fares for the transportation of schoolchildren in the District of Columbia, and I ask unanimous consent that the same be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That notwithstanding provisions of the joint resolution entitled "Joint resolution to authorize the merger of street-railway corporations operating in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes," approved January 14, 1933, and the provisions of the unification agreement incorporated therein, and notwithstanding the provisions of the act entitled "An act to provide for the transportatin of schoolchildren in the District of Columbia at a reduced fare," approved February 25, 1931, the Public Utilities Commission of the District of Columbia shall fix the rate of fare for transportation by street railway and bus of schoolchildren going to and from public, parochial, or like schools in the District of Columbia at not more than one-half the cash fare established from time to time by the Public Utilities Commission for regular route transportation within the District of Columbia, and shall establish rules and regulations governing the use thereof. No fares for schoolchildren shall be avaialable to persons over 18 years of age.

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, this bill permits the Public Utilities Commission to adjust the fares of school children in the District of Columbia.

Mr. KEARNS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McMILLAN. I yield.

Mr. KEARNS. I think the Members of the House should realize that what we do in this bill is to turn it over to the Public Utilities Commission to find out whether the fares are too low and whether they should be increased or not.

Mr. McMILLAN. That is correct.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McMILLAN. I yield.

Mr. GROSS. This legislation does not of itself raise or lower the fares. Is that correct?

Mr. McMILLAN. It does not. It turns over the fare-fixing authority to the Public Utilities Commission, where it should have been all the time.

Mr. GROSS. Obviously there will be an increase in fares if this Commission is established.

Mr. McMILLAN. Well, I have not talked to any of the members of the Commission on that subject whether they intend to increase it or not. I understand they expect to make that request.

Mr. GROSS. Does this legislation provide any means by which the Congress can scrutinize the report before it becomes effective?

Mr. McMILLAN. Well, Congress can always call for a report.

Mr. GROSS. Does it provide that this Commission shall report?

Mr. McMILLAN. No.

Mr. GROSS. It does not provide that they will report back to the District Committee?

Mr. McMILLAN. No.

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McMILLAN. I yield.

Mr. ADAIR. Are there any limits fixed in this act between which the fares may be fixed?

Mr. McMILLAN. No. The original act provides that the fares of school children shall be one-half the adult fare. The children's fare has never been raised.

Mr. ADAIR. Is that provision still in the law if this is enacted?

Mr. McMILLAN. That is correct.

Mr. ADAIR. It would not be more than one-half of the adult fare?

Mr. McMILLAN. That is my understanding, that it cannot be more than half the adult fare.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. McMILLAN. That concludes the business of the Committee on the District of Columbia for today.

AUTHORIZING THE COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION TO PROCESS FOOD COMMODITIES FOR DONATION

Mr. TRIMBLE, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 249, Rept. No. 613) which was referred to the House calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 2851) to authorize the Commodity Credit Corporation to process food commodities for donation under certain acts. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill, and shall continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Agriculture, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. It shall be in order to consider the substitute amendment recommended by the Committee on Agriculture now in the bill, and such substitute for the purpose of amendment shall be considered under the 5-minute rule as an original bill. At the conclusion of such consideration the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and any member may demand a separate vote in the House on any of the amendments adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the bill or committee substitute. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Armed Services may sit this afternoon during the session of the House.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

LETTER FROM VETERANS INDICATE FEAR OF TRICKY DEALINGS OF HOOVER COMMISSION

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in two instances and to include extraneous matter at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, the Hoover Commission has made a lot of recommendations, which, if carried out by Executive order of the President or changes in laws by the Congress, will be shocking to the veterans of all wars of the United States and their dependents. I doubt that the veterans realize the devastating consequences of these recommendations.

Every veteran should belong to some recognized veterans' organization. Every recognized veterans' organization should keep its membership fully informed of what is going on. I do not claim that they are not doing it now. I know that they are. Particularly the American Legion, Veterans of Foreign Wars, and Disabled American Veterans are doing a wonderful job through their contact representatives in Washington, in the States, and their various publications in keeping the veterans advised.

POWERFUL GRASSROOTS LOBBY

The Hoover Commission is so subtle in its approach that it has been successful in the past in getting destructive things done without notice or mention in the press. If there ever was a time when the veterans of all wars and their dependents should be on the alert against the devastating consequences of proposals of the Hoover Commission against their interest, it is now. Remember this group—the Hoover Commission—is a part of one big package that also includes a powerful lobbying organization that is built up from the grassroots with unlimited amounts of money to support it. This powerful lobby group, known as the Citizens Committee for the Hoover Reports, is advertising for contributions from corporations. It has not registered in compliance with the Lobby Registration Act. Corporations making these contributions—and they are making generous contributions judging by expenditures—are allowed to deduct their contributions from their income taxes. So, Uncle Sam is paying 52 percent of every dollar of the money paid by corporations. If an individual, who happens to be receiving a few million dollars a year from a special privilege that he enjoys under the protection of the Government and is required to pay the maximum of 91 percent on income taxes, it is obvious that the individual is out 9 cents of every dollar and Uncle Sam is out 91 cents of every dollar contributed.

INTERLOCKING DIRECTORS

In this way, the Citizens Committee for the Hoover Reports is collecting enormous sums of money. This committee has as its active directors and members prominent persons, who are also identified with the Hoover Commission that was set up by Congress for the purpose of doing a fair and impartial job. Mr. Hoover, himself, is an active participant in the Citizens Committee for the Hoover Reports this lobbying group and allows his name to be carried as honorary president of the group. This group is spending and will spend a lot of money advertising. These advertisements will be read by good citizens who will be misled by them.

In addition, this Citizens Committee for the Hoover Reports is hiring many prominent people over the country to assist in getting the Hoover reports put into effect, either by Executive order of the President or by Congress.

The Hoover Commission's way of pressuring through Executive order, changes, or legislation is not the American way. It is not democracy's way.

PHONY SAVINGS

Mr. Hoover's claims of savings to the taxpayers are largely phony. There is proof that cannot be disputed that a recommendation of the Hoover Commission involving the Post Office Department actually lost 10 percent, instead of a saving.

A $10 million flood-control project that would save valuable soil and preserve

needed water that has been scuttled by the Hoover Commission, is considered a saving by Mr. Hoover. I think it is a great loss instead of a saving. Our country cannot progress or expand under the Hoover philosophy. We should be looking forward to a progressive, dynamic economy. An economy that will provide for a population of 200 million, 10 years hence. The Hoover Commission route is the wrong road.

I am inserting herewith a letter from an adjutant of the American Legion Post at New Boston, Tex., Mr. William B. Coleman. It is as follows:

THE AMERICAN LEGION,
NEW BOSTON POST 488,
New Boston, Tex., May 18, 1955.

Hon. WRIGHT PATMAN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. PATMAN: Members of our Legion post have information to the effect that the Hoover Commission has submitted several recommendations which seriously affect veterans of World War I, World War II, and the Korean conflict. Three of the recommendations made by the Hoover Commission that we are referring to are:

(a) That a system be established which divides career employees into three retention categories:

1. Veterans with compensable service-connected disability.

2. All other veterans and those nonveterans with 15 or more years Federal service.

3. All other career employees.

(b) That disabled veterans presently receiving 30 percent compensation or below be deleted from the roll of disabled veterans and no compensation be paid.

(c) That 15 veterans hospitals presently operating be closed.

It is the concensus of opinion that the Hoover Commission is keeping their recommendations which pertain to veteran legislation hidden or camouflaged to such an extent that veterans are not afforded an opportunity to offer objections to these recommendations through their Congressmen or Representatives. The Army Times has called to the attention of military personnel those recommendations made by the Hoover Commission which adversely affect them while the only source of information the veterans have is civilian personnel news letters from the Department of the Army, Office of Assistant Chief of Staff G1, Office of Civilian Personnel. These letters only refer to those recommendations which are applicable to Federal employees.

At the first district convention held in Jefferson, Tex., May 1, the three Hoover Commission recommendations referred to above were discussed by Department Commander E. L. (Stonewall) Jackson, also by First District Commander Don Harmon. All Legion posts in the first district agreed to contact their Congressman and representatives offering objections to these recommendations. Our post had no knowledge of these recommendations prior to this convention.

Hosiptal facilities at the present are inadequate to afford veterans proper hospitalization and medical treatment which they are justly entitled to in accordance with past legislation. Mentally ill veterans are being denied hospitalization at the present time simply because hospital facilities are not available. It is felt that many of these veterans could and would be restored to good health in a short time if they were afforded proper hospitalization and care. Many of the veterans referred to are unable to earn a decent living, therefore, they cannot afford to pay private doctors for the type of treatment required. Many of these veterans are receiving 10, 20, or 30 percent disability compensation. Is our United States in such a financial condition as to warrant stopping compensation for these veterans? If so, it seems feasible that a part of the billions of dollars we lend to foreign aid should be utilized to partially care for our disabled veterans.

With reference to the Hoover Commission's recommendation for reduction in force procedures being modified, it is apparent that a large number of disabled veterans which would, under the present procedure fall in category 1, under the Hoover Commission's recommendation automatically fall under category 2, which includes those nonveterans with 15 or more years Federal service. We are aware of the fact that the Federal service today is filled with nonveterans who have completed 15 years service. To us, it seems a bit unfair to deny these veterans compensation and at the same time place them in a category with Federal employees who have completed 15 years of Federal service.

All members of our Legion post wish to express their appreciation for services rendered by you in the past, and request that you take necessary action to oppose recommendations of the Hoover Commission referred to above and any other recommendations made by this Commission which adversely affect present legislation. If available to you, we would appreciate you furnishing our post with any legislation pertaining to veterans.

Yours sincerely,

WILLIAM B. COLEMAN,
Adjutant.

It will be noticed in this letter that the veterans realize that the Hoover recommendations are hidden and camouflaged. The veterans also recognize that they are being required to go through special interests—members of the task forces of the Hoover Commission—to get their views over to Congress. This is a disgrace. No citizen, and certainly no veteran, should be required to go through Mr. Hoover or any group set up by Mr. Hoover to get his views considered by the Congress.

It is surprising how little information is printed that is so devastating to the veterans and their dependents that is contained in the recommendations of the Hoover Commission. I am not blaming anyone, because I know how difficult it would be for anyone to get the significance of all these recommendations by a casual reading. That is the reason that the members of the American Legion, who attended the First District convention held in Jefferson, May 1, had no knowledge of the recommendations of any kind prior to the convention.

I desire to congratulate the members of the New Boston Post and the alert officers of the American Legion of the First District of Texas for bringing this matter to the attention of the veterans, the people, and the Congress.

MESSAGES FROM MR. HOOVER TO CONGRESS

Congress is receiving more messages from Mr. Hoover than from President Eisenhower. Our congressional committees will soon be completely bogged down with bills to carry out Hoover Commission recommendations. Current news items indicate that Government agencies are now bogged down trying to pass on the recommendations of the Hoover Commission.

Many people are wondering why the Congress ever gave the Hoover Commission so much power and so much money—$2,500,000—to use it. Congress is now wondering the same thing. This present Hoover Commission got through Congress on the theory that it is a continuation of the first Hoover Commission; that it is bipartisan; that it was to recommend ways to stop any waste or extravagance in government and to expose any duplication of work.

The First Hoover Commission was bipartisan and had a Republican, Mr. Hoover, as Chairman and a prominent Democrat, Mr. Dean Acheson, vice chairman. All the members of the task forces were approved by the 12-member commission composed of 6 Democrats and 6 Republicans.

The present Hoover Commission is strictly a one man show. Mr. Hoover never caused the selection of a vice chairman as required by law. It is therefore not legally organized. It is composed of 7 Republicans and 5 Democrats. It is not bipartisan as the word "bipartisan" was stricken out of the law creating the Commission just before its passage in Congress. The members of the commission are not approved by the 12-man Commission. They were selected by Mr. Hoover and his selection was determined by him to be final. The present Hoover Commission has decided, unlike the first Commission, that it has policymaking powers. It is even preparing bills to be submitted to carry out its recommendations.

The New York Times, Sunday, May 22, 1955, under heading "Final Hoover Reports Face a Real Battle" by W. H. Lawrence, the following paragraphs appeared:

While the administration has two of its highest officials—Herbert Brownell, Jr., Attorney General, and Arthur Flemming, Director of the Office of Defense Mobilization—on the Commission, it has submitted each report from the Hoover group to the most thorough study by Government agencies affected before attempting to fix White House policy on the changes proposed.

Only in the last week has the Bureau of the Budget finished its job of compiling the agency reaction to the first reports, on personnel and paper-work problems. These are slated for Presidential consideration soon.

Still due for Budget Bureau study are reports dealing with medical services, lending agencies, transportation, legal services and procedure, surplus property, governmental food and clothing purchases and business enterprises.

One authority remarked this week that its recommendations with respect to the defense agencies would trade "combat efficiency" for "dollar efficiency."

The recommendations now before the White House deal with explosive political questions, such as curtailing the medical services and job preference rights provided by the Government for the veterans of its wars.

HAS IT DELAYED VACCINE PROGRAM?

It is possible that very important matters in the interest of the people have been held up or pushed aside because of Hoover Commission reports. It is sincerely hoped that the consideration that the departments are forced to give these reports has not caused the delay and confusion in the administration of the Salk vaccine program.

CONGRESS UNDER MISAPPREHENSION

Congress I believe voted for the establishment of the present Hoover Commission, the second, in 1953 under a misapprehension. If Congress had known what Mr. Hoover expected to do as they know now what he has done and how he has accomplished it I am sure that this present Hoover Commission would not have been created.

Members of Congress did not expect a one man commission; the abuse of power; the wrongful use of power or the usurpation and assumption of power that was never intended or anticipated by Congress.

PART OF LEGISLATIVE BRANCH

One of the chairmen of a Hoover Commission task force testified before a House Committee on Government Operations recently that the Attorney General of the United States, who is on the Hoover Commission, has officially ruled that the Hoover Commission is a part of the legislative branch of the Government. This was certainly not intended by Congress.

In other words when a Hoover task force conducts a hearing or investigation it acts as a congressional committee and for Congress according to the Attorney General.

DIFFERENCE IN CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEE AND HOOVER COMMISSION

Members of a congressional committee are elected by the people; they take an oath to faithfully perform their duties in accordance with the United States Constitution; they are paid by the Government; if they do not perform their duties properly they can be punished by the people by suffering defeat at the next election.

The members of the task forces are not elected; they did not take the oath to faithfully perform their duties; most of them were paid by their employers and not by the Government; they cannot be punished by the people if they fail to perform their duties faithfully.

Members of the Hoover task forces were allowed to serve although the interests and the employers they represented—who were paying them their salaries and expenses, were in conflict with the interest of the United States Government. The conflict of interest did not deter Mr. Hoover from selecting them on a task force where they could render the maximum service to their employers even though the service rendered by them would be against the interest of the people, the public interest, and the Government. This is not the way a democracy should work.

I am opposed to any waste or corruptions in government. So are all the Members of Congress and we vote that way.

It is unnecessary to bring into our legislative branch a group of people to supplant elected members in many of their important duties; men who have selfish axes to grind and nothing to lose if they cause wrongs and hardships to be imposed upon the people.

VETERANS WARNED

The most dangerous time for veterans is when Congress adjourns this summer and goes home until next January 3. Executive orders can be written by the Hoover group, which if issued by the President, can deprive war veterans and their dependents of valuable and substantial rights.

It is my plan to again study all the recommendations of the Hoover Commission relating to veterans and their dependents and do everything within my power to stop every one that is hurtful to them. I expect to keep the veterans of the district that I have the honor to represent fully informed by sending information from time to time to every veterans' organization in the First Congressional District of Texas, and support them in their efforts to properly protect veterans' rights and benefits.

CONGRESS HAS DELEGATED POWER OVER MONETARY POLICY WHICH DETERMINES CONDITION OF OUR ECONOMY

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I have received a very interesting letter from Mr. Allan P. Demanovich, of Seattle, Wash. Mr. Demanovich is a pharmaceutical chemist in Seattle and his letter is so full of thought-provoking questions and intelligent suggestions that it is being inserted in connection with my remarks.

The question is often asked, why should unearned interest be paid? Why should private bankers, who are not necessarily students of the science of money, be allowed the privilege by Congress of determining whether or not our country has good times or bad times? Why should the New York Federal Reserve Bank operated by 9 directors, 6 of whom are selected by the private bankers, be allowed to take our Federal Reserve notes—printed money—and trade these notes for United States Government bonds and be permitted to keep the bonds in the name of the 12 Federal Reserve banks and draw interest on them when the interest is due? Why should banks that create money by a bookkeeping transaction be allowed to purchase long-term Government direct or guaranteed bonds with such created money instead of providing for local projects through local loans? Should there be a new look at what has happened under the Federal Reserve System after 41 years of operation without any kind of an investigation of its activities? Should there be a new look at the Federal Open Market Committee, which is known to be the most powerful committee in the United States—even more powerful than Congress—over economic affairs, that is composed of 12 members, only 7 of them public members, and operated by 1 person in the New York Federal Reserve bank after 22 years of operation without any sort of investigation or study by the Congress?

The letter is as follows:

SEATTLE, WASH., *May 18, 1955.*

Hon. WRIGHT PATMAN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN PATMAN: Your illuminating weekly letter No. 1131, April 28, 1955, on banking as printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of April 25, 1955, states that banking should be allowed to operate with a good profit. That is entirely a reasonable statement, but how good is good in reference to banking? Does it mean profits to the extent of interest on most of the national debt?

You also state the privilege of creating money and regulating its value "has been properly farmed out to banking interests under restrictions and limitations." Does the House of Representatives have any voice in confirming the appointments of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve who direct the creating and regulating of money?

Orthodox economics teaches that a purchaser of wealth should give up something equal in value to what he receives and that interest is paid for waiting. When a banker buys a highly secured note with an interest-bearing credit loan, what does he part with and wherein does he do any waiting, since the loan is not real money and unearned? The only observable service performed is that of bookkeeping, for which he is entitled to compensation.

Wealth cannot be created out of nothing. The banking system is allowed to manufacture a money claim to wealth out of nothing. This something for nothing act is contrary to the laws of mathematics, chemistry, physics, and morality. Many believe it contrary to our Constitution. It is also contrary to the laws of agronomy, since the bankers reap where they did not sow.

Aside from the fact that he puts money into circulation interest-free, what is the difference, if any, between a manifest counterfeiter's money and the fictitious loans of the banking system? The only difference seen is that the counterfeiter cannot collapse the monetary system by withdrawing money from circulation at his pleasure and that his act is illegal. If his profits are the greater, so are his risks.

How is it mathematically possible to pay any interest to the banking system since it demands more money be withdrawn from circulation than it allows to be put into circulation, without payment of additional interest? When interest is paid by one individual to another, the title to money merely changes hands and the total amount of money in circulation remains the same, but when interest is paid to the banks, that amount of money represented by the loan and interest is withdrawn from circulation.

Since it is a mathematical impossibility to return more money than received, the interest has to be extracted from someone else and eventually someone down the line loses title to property, if not the original borrower. Behold, "the king is in his countinghouse, counting out his money." What a subterranean swindle. What a beautiful hoodwink. It is significant that the only time Christ used force was when He drove out the moneychangers.

Benjamin Franklin said we had a Republic, if we could keep it. Is our Republic to be lost due to bookkeeping entries?

"If all debts were paid we would not have any money with which to do business," you say. Therefore, interest has to be paid on the debts in order to do business. In plain words, it might be called a tribute. It might also be asked to whom and why? Is not that sufficient to condemn our money system?

A slave is defined as a person held in bondage. Is not our monetary system a form of bondage for all our citizens? Who is optimistic enough to believe that all debts will ever be paid, since their total is greater than the total wealth?

If our monetary system is the root of most of our evils, is not a great part of the work of Congress a hacking at the branches?

When will Congress replace our centralized private money with national interest-free earned money?

Why are banks allowed to advertise their large deposits when in fact the deposits are mostly debts of the people?

Why are they not called debt shops instead of banks, since they deal mostly in debts?

Is the income of the Federal Reserve banks taxed?

Why could not the Government buy, subject to an income tax, the capital and reserves of the Federal Reserve banks with its own interest-free money, exchange all Federal Reserve notes with its own money, and cancel all United States bonds in the possession of the Treasury and Federal Reserve banks?

Your concern for small business is appreciated by all who know of your years of yeoman service.

There seems to be a power in Congress that reason and eloquence cannot sway.

Yours truly,

ALLAN P. DEMANOVICH.

DEBT PAPER

Debt paper and more debt paper is the subject discussed more than any other subject in banking and financial circles. Long-term debt paper at the highest rate of interest possible is best. Furthermore, debt paper that carries the least risk—if possible guaranteed by the Federal Government—is the type that is most desired.

Every discussion of the highway program, the plan that would permit the holders of the bonds to build them, and get more in interest than the cost of the highways, is presented first for consideration.

Every discussion of school facilities brings further plans from those, who want more debt paper that provide for long-term Government bonds. The bonds and interest receive first consideration.

No effort seems to be made to pay off our national debt. There are several good reasons for this, but one in particular and that is people, who have money to invest, want this big backlog of Government bonds for investment purposes.

NO DEBT, NO MONEY

Money is based on debt under our capitalistic system. We believe it is the finest and best system. However, even the capitalistic system does not require unnecessarily high interest be paid on Government riskless securities. If all debts were paid, there would not be sufficient money to transact the business of the country.

Today, our debts are about $700 billion, including both public and private. I do not agree with Mr. Demanovich that our debts exceed the value of all wealth. It is my belief that the total wealth is far in excess of total debts. As our country expands, we cannot afford to have less than $700 billion in debts. Otherwise we will have insufficient money to do business on, since money is based on debt. Furthermore, it will be necessary to increase our debts 3 percent or 4 percent a year, in order to take care of an expanding economy, which is required to provide for increases in population. Our population is increasing tremendously—4 million last year and it is estimated by over 5 million this year. We have a real challenge. It is necessary that we use the limited land that we have—no more land will be produced, we know that—to produce the food and fiber necessary to take care of an expanding population.

PRIVATE DEBT MUST INCREASE TO REDUCE NATIONAL DEBT

If we reduce the national debt, such a move will be deflationary, unless private debts are created immediately in sufficient volume to make up in the decrease of the national debt. I believe we should have a definite policy of decreasing the national debt, in order to pay at least 2½ percent a year so that the entire debt could be liquidated in 40 years. In that way, private debts could be created each year to make up in the reduction in the public debt.

FEDERAL RESERVE BANKS NOT OWNED BY PRIVATE BANKS

Contrary to the beliefs of many people, the 12 Federal Reserve banks are not owned by the bankers. They are owned by the Government of the United States. The money that is issued by these 12 banks is issued upon the credit of the Nation and the stockpile of gold. All of the gold also belongs to the United States Government. The gold is useful in international transactions but serves no useful purpose in our domestic economy. The 12 Federal Reserve banks do not use anything for money except created money or manufactured money.

NOT STOCK—JUST CALLED STOCK

The small amount of so-called stock owned by the private banks in the Federal Reserve banks is not stock at all. It is a token investment upon which the banks receive 6 percent interest used only for the psychological reason of making the banks feel that they are a part of the Federal Reserve System. Insofar as ownership or part ownership is concerned, the investment is "phoney." The 12 banks do not use this little investment of the private banks in so-called stock at all. It is put to no use whatsoever. It is not needed by the 12 Federal Reserve banks. The 6 percent that is paid for its use is out-of-pocket expense, so far as the Federal Reserve banks are concerned and nothing has been received by the Federal Reserve banks in return for this payment. The banks, however, are out the use of the investment in the so-called stock and it is reasonable to pay a fair return for its use. The so-called stock cannot be voted; cannot be sold; cannot be hypothecated. It has no relationship to ownership.

FOR A LOOK AT FEDERAL OPEN-MARKET COMMITTEE

I hope the House will soon pass the resolution, which permits a Subcommittee of the Banking and Currency Committee of the House to take a look at the Federal Open Market Committee. I am sure the Members of the House will be interested in knowing what has happened during the last 22 years by this important committee.

The New York banks are making more money dealing in Government securities than ever before in history. They seem to be able to buy Government securities when they are lowest and sell them when they are highest. The Federal Open Market Committee makes all changes which cause Government securities to go up or down.

DIXON-YATES CONTRACT

Mr. KARSTEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks and include letters.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. KARSTEN. Mr. Speaker, during the hearings before the Committee on Ways and Means on the President's request for an extension of the Renegotiation Act, I raised the question of the Act's applicability to the so-called Dixon-Yates contract. The Renegotiation Act extension has passed the House and is pending in the other body.

The Atomic Energy Commission furnished a report to the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, in response to my request, but it did not contain the answer. I include the letter as a part of my remarks.

Thereupon, I took the matter up with the chairman of the Renegotiation Board. His response, which I am also placing in the RECORD, would indicate there is a rather strong possibility that the Dixon-Yates contract is subject to review and renegotiation. Therefore, I take this means of bringing the matter to the attention of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy. I urge that committee to give careful consideration to the correspondence I have received, with the view of requesting the Renegotiation Board to review the contract after the other body has acted upon the extension of the Renegotiation Authority.

UNITED STATES
ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION,
Washington, D. C., April 27, 1955.

DEAR MR. COOPER: At a hearing before the House Ways and Means Committee on April 25, 1955, George C. Taylor was requested to furnish a statement to the committee as to whether the contract between the Atomic Energy Commission and Mississippi Valley Generating Co. was subject to the Renegotiation Act of 1951, as amended, and whether there was any procedure for recovering excessive profits, if any are realized, in the construction of the generating facilities by that contractor.

The contract provides for the delivery of electric energy to the United States at rates specified in the contract. The generating facilities will be constructed by and with funds provided by the company, and will remain the property of the company. The United States does not pay directly for the construction of the generating station.

For such period as the United States purchases electricity or pays cancellation charges, it will pay a charge for power in which the cost of construction will be reflected to a limited extent. The contract provides for a base capacity charge of $9,052,050 per year, which includes interest and amortization on debt and return on equity. It further provides that this charge will be adjusted so that the effect of any increase in construction cost between the estimate of $104,115,000 and $113,865,000 and of any decrease in construction cost without limit, will be shared equally by the company and the United States. The effect of increases above $113,865,000 will be borne entirely by the company. Cost of construction is to be mutually determined in accordance with the uniform system of accounts prescribed for public utilities and licensees subject to the provisions of the Federal Power Act.

In addition, provision is made for a limitation on earnings derived from the contract.

The contract provides that all revenue derived from service rendered to the United States in excess of that required to provide net income to the company at the rate of $495,000 per annum (9 percent of the equity capital of $5,500,000) will be divided equally between the parties. (The permissible earning rate under this provision is subject to adjustment so that the company's rate of return on equity capital will increase if the cost of construction is less than the estimate and decrease if the cost of construction is more than the estimate.) In addition, there is provision that in any event the amount available to the company as net income during the life of the contract derived from operations under the contract shall not exceed $600,000 per annum (approximately 11 percent on equity capital). Any amounts in excess of that figure are to be deposited in a special fund and upon completion or termination of the contract, such amounts, together with income from the investment of those amounts, will be paid to the United States.

The contract with Mississippi Valley Generating Co. is for the delivery of electric energy and as such may be exempt, under the provisions of 50 U. S. C. A., App. 1216 (a) (4), from the Renegotiation Act of 1951, as amended. For this reason, as in the case of the Commission's contracts with Ohio Valley Electric Co. and Electric Energy, Inc., a renegotiation clause was not included in the contract, it should be noted that the requirements of the Renegotiation Act, if applicable to the contract, would not be affected by not including such a clause, and that the Renegotiation Board is the appropriate agency to determine whether the contract is in fact so exempt.

We feel that the provisions of the contract provide adequate safeguards against excessive profits under the contract.

Sincerely yours,

K. D. NICHOLS,
General Manager.

THE RENEGOTIATION BOARD,
Washington, D. C., May 20, 1955.

Hon. FRANK M. KARSTEN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. KARSTEN: Further reference is made to your letter of April 28, 1955, inquiring as to the status in renegotiation of the so-called Dixon-Yates contract between the Atomic Energy Commission and the Mississippi Valley Generating Co. My conclusions are based upon the statements in your letter and that of General Nichols to Congressman COOPER dated April 27, 1955, a copy of which you enclosed.

Section 106 (a) (4) of the Renegotiation Act of 1951, as amended (50 U. S. C. A. App. 1216 (a) (4)), provides an exemption of any contract or subcontract with a public utility for electric energy when made at rates not in excess of published rates or charges filed with, fixed, approved, or regulated by a State, Federal, or local regulatory body, or at rates not in excess of unregulated rates of such a public utility which are substantially as favorable to users and consumers as are regulated rates. It will thus be seen that this section, providing a mandatory exemption, is divided into two parts, the first applying to contracts and subcontracts at regulated rates and the second part to contracts and subcontracts at unregulated rates.

There is serious doubt whether the contractor, Mississippi Valley Generating Co., from the nature of its operations, is or would later be found to be, a public utility. While a public utility may be variously defined, certain general concepts appear to be essential. The term implies a public use carrying with it the duty to serve the public and to treat all persons alike without discrimination, and it precludes the idea of service which is private in nature whether for the benefit of a few or of many. The true criterion to be applied in determining the character of use of a plant alleged to be a public utility is whether or not the public may enjoy it as of right or by permission. As I understand the contract, the output of power is to be supplied to the United States to satisfy its needs. Any amount over and above that so required may be disposed of commercially. It is not known whether this surplus is to be offered to the public generally or disposed of by contract. On the assumption that the United States will take substantially all of the power, it is difficult to visualize how the public generally can share in the contractor's output. Of course, if the contractor is not a public utility, that disposes forthwith of the exemption provided by section 106 (a) (4).

Even if it is conceded, for the purpose of discussion, that the contractor is a public utility, it is clear from the letter of General Nichols that the electric energy furnished under the contract is not supplied at published rates. The contract is not subject to regulation by a Federal regulatory agency and there is no State regulatory body with authority to regulate the rates at which the Government may obtain the power. There is nothing for a regulatory body to regulate, the contractor's output being primarily for the Government. Whether there will be any surplus power is at the discretion of the Government and will depend upon the needs of the Government.

As I have heretofore pointed out, section 106 (a) (4) also exempts contracts or subcontracts with public utilities for furnishing electric energy at unregulated rates under certain conditions. RBR (Renegotiation Board Regulations) 1453.3 (e) (2), 32 CFR 1453.3 (e) (2), exempts contracts for furnishing services at unregulated rates which are not in excess of regulated rates for the same type of services. But there has been no showing that there are regulated rates for such services or that the price at which the electric energy is to be furnished under the contract would not be in excess of applicable unregulated rates, if any.

Finally, RBR 1453.3 (e) (3), 32 CFR 1453.3 (e) (3), provides an exemption in the case of a public utility furnishing services, including electric energy, to Departments and to other consumers at unregulated rates which are substantially as favorable as regulated rates for comparable services. Obviously, the contractor does not qualify under this subsection, for it is to furnish the service only to the Government and, in any event, there is no showing of regulated rates with respect to which the price to be charged under the contract is substantially as favorable.

In view of the foregoing, and in the absence of an affirmative showing by the contractor (1) that it is a public utility and (2) that the contract otherwise qualifies for exemption under section 106 (a) (4), the mandatory exemption provided in that section will not apply. The fact that the contract does not contain a clause subjecting it to renegotiation will not relieve a contract otherwise subject to the act. See section 104 of the act.

It has been suggested that the contract provides adequate safeguards against excessive profits and may be exempted on that ground. Section 106 (d) (3) of the act and RBR 1455.4 (c) authorize the Board to exempt individual contracts upon receipt of a request from the agency entering into the contract, together with information which would support a conclusion that the provisions of the contract are otherwise adequate to prevent excessive profits. To obtain the benefit of this permissive exemption, there must be reason so clear and compelling that the contractor can be excused even from showing what profit it has realized on the contract. No information has yet been furnished to this Board which would form an adequate reason for exemption on this ground.

You inquire also whether this Board would have jurisdiction to go into the cost of construction. I am not sure that I understand the import of your question. If you are inquiring whether the Board has jurisdiction to renegotiate the contracts and subcontracts covering the construction of the plant to be employed by Mississippi Valley Generating Co. in furnishing the electric energy under the contract with the Government, the answer is in the negative. I understand that such construction is to be financed entirely through the use of private capital. On the other hand, to the extent that the cost of construction has a bearing on a determination whether the contractor realized excessive profits for a fiscal year under the contract with the Government to furnish electric energy, the Board would have jurisdiction to inquire into the costs of such construction.

Very truly yours,

FRANK L. ROBERTS,
Chairman.

UPPER COLORADO RIVER PROJECT

The SPEAKER. Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from Utah [Mr. DAWSON] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. DAWSON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, last Thursday the Representative from southern California [Mr. HOLIFIELD] took a double-barreled blast at the upper Colorado River storage project. As is usual with attacks originating from that section, the blast consisted entirely of distortion and misinformation.

In the first place, it started out with the completely false assumption that if Congress authorized the ultimate billion dollar project this year, its dams and irrigation projects will be constructed and operating by next spring. This is just not so, as anyone who takes time to examine the testimony could learn. The entire project contemplates a construction schedule of more than 25 years.

Using the false assumption of a 1-year lump-sum appropriation and a 1-year construction period as a springboard, the gentleman from southern California then hurled himself to some utterly fantastic conclusions both as to the alleged subsidy to be borne by the Nation's taxpayers and as to the effect of the project on our agricultural surpluses.

I would like to deal with these two misrepresentations separately.

FAVORITE PASTIME

A favorite pastime in southern California these days is inflating the cost of the upper Colorado River storage project in terms of cost per acre of land to be benefited. The figure used last Thursday was $5,000 per acre—a figure as misleading as it is round.

I have been unable to determine exactly how this figure is arrived at. But I think it is obtained by leveling a flat 2½ percent interest charge against the total cost of the project from the moment it is authorized. This amount is then compounded over a period of 50 or 60 years—depending upon the amount of misrepresentation wanted—and the total divided by the number of acres benefiting from the project.

These southern California mathematics are selective mathematics. They

are not ever used in computing the costs of California reclamation projects. They are not even used in computing the costs of reclamation projects elsewhere, unless the projects contemplate using water that would otherwise flow into California. It does not matter whether this water belongs to southern California. Things like rights and titles and compacts mean nothing. Just let any State try to use water it owns which now flows into California and the old subsidy mathematic theory is dusted off, costs are inflated, and a nationwide, high-pressure campaign is on.

POOR PATCH FARMER

It is no coincidence that only three reclamation projects have been subjected to this type of canard. These three are the central Arizona, the upper Colorado, and the Fryingpan-Arkansas projects. What do they have in common? They would permit other States to use their water. It is water to which California has no right, but which—in the absence of upstream development—flows through southern California to waste in the Pacific Ocean.

But let us get back to the subsidy argument and analyze it. I can best illustrate its wrongness by applying it to an imaginary flood-control dam along the Mississippi River. This dam is built to protect a city downstream at a cost of $120 million. In addition to protecting against floods, however, the dam makes it possible for some patch farmer to irrigate 12 acres of bottomland which the dam reclaimed from swamp. What a field day for users of southern Cal math. The project cost $120 million and reclaims 12 acres. That is a cost of $10 million per acre even without figuring the compound interest. And since this is a flood-control project and there is no repayment, you can compound interest to eternity. There is no limit to the amount of subsidy the taxpayer is giving the poor patch farmer for his 12 acres.

SOUTHERN CAL MATH

Let us not limit the application of southern California math to hypothetical cases. That would not be fair. Let us apply it to real cases. Let us apply it to water resources projects constructed, authorized, or proposed for California.

Federal water resource expenditures in California

Reclamation projects constructed or authorized	$563,000,000
Proposed Trinity and San Luis projects	448,000,000
Flood-control projects (nonrepayable)	330,000,000
Total	1,341,000,000

Now, let us invoke the southern California math theory. We find the total cost is not $1.3 billion, but $4.5 billion—a subsidy of $3.2 billion for just one of the 48 States of the Union. This type of figuring is, of course, neither correct nor fair. I have every reason to believe that the costs of reclamation projects, both constructed and proposed, will be paid back to the Treasury by California water and power users. Of course, the flood-control expenditure is something else. They are outright gifts of tax money. This golden giveaway must not be questioned. Interest charges must not be computed and compounded to doomsday. The program is as sacrosanct as rivers and harbors programs are. But can you blame some of us from arid, inland States which seldom benefit, for occasionally wondering why?

NOTHING TO HIDE

Let us leave the southern California mathematical theory. It assumes a lump sum rather than continuing appropriation. It assumes that the entire sum will be interest-free. It completely ignores in computing acreage costs that there are power, municipal and industrial water features which pay interest and help pay the cost of the irrigation projects.

There is nothing to hide in the cost of the upper Colorado River storage project. Our plans are set up on the basis of having the cost of each power unit paid out with interest within 50 years from the time that unit first becomes productive. A similar provision appears in the bills.

Our plans also call for repayment of the irrigation allocations of each unit of the storage project and each participating project within 50 years of the time that unit is completed—exclusive of a development period up to 10 years, where applicable under the reclamation laws. Repayment will be accomplished by the water users paying, up to their ability to repay, for a 50-year period, with the balance paid by the application of excess power revenues from power units of the storage project during the same 50-year period, except in the case of the small Paonia and Eden participating projects, for which special legislative provision has already been made.

WHO PAYS?

The irrigated lands in this project will be subsidized, we do not deny that. They are subsidized to the extent that the money lent is interest-free. This has been part of the reclamation program—in fact it was the reason for its inception—since it was set up under President Theodore Roosevelt in 1902. The irrigator is also subsidized by the purchaser of power. This power will be sold in the four upper-basin States—Colorado, New Mexico, Utah, and Wyoming. Revenue over and above that required to repay power costs with interest to the Federal Treasury will be used to help pay for water. But this is not a charge against the taxpayer in Ohio, New York, or southern California. It is a subsidy paid for by power users in the States that directly benefit from the project. And there is ample expert testimony that these power users are ready, willing, and able to pay this subsidy. It is a small price, they feel, to pay for the continued development of this vast four-State area.

The amount of subsidy per acre to be paid by power users is as follows:

Twelve participating projects, State, and average costs per acre assigned for repayment from net power revenues

Central Utah, Utah	$700
Emery County, Utah	245
Florida, Colo	250

Twelve participating projects, State, and average costs per acre assigned for repayment from net power revenues—Continued

Hammond, N. Mex	$535
La Barge, Wyo	150
Lyman, Wyo	205
Navaho project, Shiprock division, N. Mex.	1,590
Paonia, Colo	255
Pine River extension, Colo	195
Seedskadee, Wyo	305
Silt, Colo	310
Smith Fork, Colo	220

That is the story of the direct cost and repayment program. This is not a reclamation project that has large, hidden nonreimbursable items tucked away in it. We have not written off vast amounts as flood control or harbor improvement. In the entire $1 billion development, less than $7 million is allocated to nonreimbursable items.

This project is one of the most conservative multipurpose reclamation projects ever presented to Congress. That is one of the reasons it has the backing of President Eisenhower. Among the conservative features of the project are: First, for the first time, so far as I am aware, the interest repaid on the power investment goes into the General Treasury rather than the reclamation fund; second, the power features pay interest, not only on the capital investment but also the interest accruing during construction; and, third, the repayment period of 50 years is much less than that for many projects we have heretofore approved in Congress.

TREASURY BENEFITS

The taxpayers of all parts of the Nation also should not overlook the fact that these projects have a conservative useful life of at least 100 years. After their costs are repaid with interest, the National Treasury will be beneficiary of approximately $20 million per year in revenue.

That is a direct benefit. It pains me to realize that due to the unfair attacks on this project some of our eastern friends are forgetting the indirect benefits of the reclamation program. These are vast and they affect every State in the Union.

Each step taken in the development of the Nation's basic resources moves the economy of the Nation to a new and higher plateau. This is strikingly demonstrated in an analysis of Federal tax revenues from Federal reclamation project areas. Based on the projected results of a sample study of 15 reclamation projects, the estimated cumulative return to the Treasury from the 69 projects or divisions of projects receiving water under the Federal reclamation program in 1952 now stands at well over $2.7 billion. This is an amount greater than total reclamation expenditures for all project works either complete or incomplete since the beginning of the Federal reclamation program in 1902.

NATION BENEFITS

The benefits accruing to the Nation through reclamation development are also measured in terms of families served, crop production and value, livestock raised, and acres irrigated. They are expressed in rapidly expanding trade

and business activity, in direct repayment to the Government by the beneficiaries of reclamation in increased population on and adjacent to projects, and in a wide variety of other phenomena. These are all tangible, measurable benefits of a broad and lasting nature. They translate into expanding business activities in the project and surrounding areas. They filter to every State in the Union and every segment of society. They provide through this process additional economic stability to the Nation which is reflected in part by increased revenues to the Treasury in the faraway States and areas, as well as on the projects themselves. The estimate of Federal tax revenues from reclamation project areas is, therefore, only a partial measure of the true contribution of basic reclamation resource development to the Nation's tax structure and to the economy as a whole.

TAXES BOOSTED

In 1952 individual income taxes paid directly by irrigation farmers and by persons of the neighboring towns and villages whose business or employment was affected by the construction of 15 selected reclamation projects were estimated at $105 million. The aggregate individual income tax revenues from this sample study area since 1916 is estimated at over $700 million. In addition to individual tax revenues, an appropriate share of corporation and excise tax revenues collected in the same 15 projects areas is directly attributable to reclamation development. Estimated receipts from these sources total nearly $400 million. The combined returns from individual and corporate tax revenues accordingly are estimated at $1.1 billion. Total Federal project construction cost through June 30, 1952, for the same projects aggregated $264 million. Thus far, Federal taxes collected have exceeded the Federal investment in irrigation features in these projects by 4½ times.

Long after project costs have been repaid by water and power users the new wealth created through Federal reclamation investment will be reflected in a continuous flow of tax revenues from the projects themselves and from the rest of the Nation as well.

FALSE ASSUMPTION

Let us examine this project in relation to our problems with agricultural surpluses. Much was made of this last Thursday by the Representative from southern California [Mr. HOLIFIELD]. Here again, he made the false assumption that should this project be authorized it would be constructed and its irrigation features would be in production by next year in competition with other acreage growing supported crops. Surely, he could not be serious.

The legislation to authorize this project contemplates an orderly development of an entire river basin over a long period of years. We in the States involved do not want nor expect Congress to appropriate $1 billion at once. Before we can use the water we are entitled to, we must store up replacement water in mainstem dams along the Colorado and its tributaries. The construction of these dams will take from 5 to 10 years. Under the present construction schedule, the first irrigation project will not reach full development until 1966. Irrigation features of the central Utah project—largest participating project in the legislation—will not be completed until 1983 if construction were to begin a year from now.

AGAINST EXPERTS

If the Representative from California feels that this Nation's surplus food problem is a lasting one, he is going against every major agricultural economist in the world.

Here is what John H. Davis, Assistant Secretary of Agriculture, said on that subject in a speech at Cedar Rapids, Iowa, on July 31, 1953:

> Looking ahead, say to 1960, we are likely to have a population total close to 175 million people. And if our rate of economic growth continues as it has in the past, the average person should have a level of living at least 15 percent above that of today. Such a rise in the general level of living for this higher population total would mean greatly expanded domestic markets for food and other farm products produced by our agriculture.
>
> And even if the people we will have in our country by 1960 consume food and other farm products at the same rate as in 1952, our domestic consumption of farm products would then be 9 percent higher than in 1952. On this basis alone, by 1960, we would need to have each year about 2 billion more pounds of meat, an additional 500 million dozen eggs, an extra billion pounds of milk solids, and about 8 million tons more of feed grains than we produced in 1952 as well as greatly increased quantities of fruits, vegetables, and other products.
>
> I want to stress that * * * over many years there has been a very distinct trend in this country to upgrade diets. This desire to expand food consumption and improve nutrition will express itself as long as our people continue to have adequate buying power.

Mr. Davis was overconservative in his population estimate of 175 million by 1960. Latest estimates place the figure at 178. And by 1975—when most of the irrigation features of the upper Colorado River storage project will be coming into full production, this Nation will have to produce food for an estimated 207 million citizens.

TABLE FARE

The States that will directly benefit from this project are not the States that have been contributing heavily to agricultural products now in surplus. In my home State of Utah, less than 16 percent of the farm income is from supported commodities. Our valuable irrigated acreage is used to grow vegetables and fruits, perishables needed by the West's rapidly expanding population and perishables which have with rapid transportation transformed the eating habits of America.

In order that the Members might know how dependent they are on the western reclamation States for these commodities, I submit the following table:

Crop production

Year	Crop	Total for United States (million pounds)	17 Western States	
			Total (million pounds)	Percent
1954	Asparagus	307	189	62
1954	Carrots	1,550	1,108	72
1954	Celery	1,496	837	56
1954	Lettuce	2,834	2,527	89
1954	Peas	850	329	39
1952	Olives	114	114	100
1954	Tomatoes	7,390	3,766	51
1952	Apricots	354	354	100
1954	Cantaloups	1,322	1,101	83
1954	Cherries, sweet	200	170	85
1952	Grapes	6,347	6,028	95
1952	Plums	122	106	87
1954	Strawberries	427	265	62

It is not irrigating acreage in Colorado, Wyoming, New Mexico, and Utah some 10 to 15 years from now that threatens to add to our surplus. We need not fear that. But if southern California could steal this water, it would be added to other Colorado River water now being used to grow cotton on vast irrigated tracts of land. Here is a commodity not in short supply and one not needed to feed our expanding population.

I HAVE A LITTLE LIST

The gentleman from California closed his address Friday by submitting a list of organizations allegedly opposing this project. Examination shows that nearly all of these organizations are in southern California. They should be for it. They are the beneficiaries of cheap power generated with water that belongs to the upper Colorado River Basin States. For each I could name a matching organization favoring the project in one or all of the upper basin States, along with such national organizations as the Farmers Union, the Congress of Industrial Organizations and the local private and public utilities serving the four States.

I will not burden the Public Printer with my list, but it is available for any Member who wishes to study it.

I only hope that the membership of this House will look behind the propaganda promoted for selfish reasons by one area in order to see the merits which have won for this project the endorsement of the President and the Department of the Interior, both of this and of the Truman administration.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DAWSON of Utah. I am very happy to yield.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I certainly do not blame the gentleman for answering or attempting to answer the talk which I made on Thursday. He is naturally interested in this matter. I have the highest personal respect for him; however, I believe that the gentleman does me wrong by putting words into my mouth and an interpretation on my language which I did not put in my remarks and which I did not intend. At no place did I seek to create the impression that this

total expenditure would be accomplished by the spring of 1956. Being from the West, and being acquainted with the time it takes to build these great projects, I realize it would take a series of years to build these dams. But I am taking the result which, if carried forward, by the legislation which has recently been passed in the other body, Senate bill 500, and I am taking the figures of the Bureau of Reclamation, both as to estimated costs and also I am taking the Bureau of Reclamation reports on conflicting crops. I have tried to the best of my ability to obtain accurate information to support my position in this matter. I note that the gentleman has not attacked the figures which I have used in my speech, but he has apparently tried to put an interpretation on it, which I honestly did not want to create, and which I do not believe I said.

Mr. DAWSON of Utah. I want to be entirely fair, and I am glad to hear the gentleman make that statement. I have studied the figures the gentleman used in his speech. Of course, you referred to surpluses in certain fields and then go on to say they are in surplus. Take the dairy products, for instance. It is true in dairy products that there will be some dairy products raised in this project, but the big part of it is going to be crops not in surplus.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. How about the grain crops and how about the sugar beets? They are also crops in surplus.

Mr. DAWSON of Utah. Let me say to the gentleman that sugar beets are not in surplus in this country. We produced less than one-third of the sugar in this country which is consumed here.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I recognize that fact, but there have been acreage allotments in sugar-beet land.

Mr. DAWSON of Utah. By reason of the world sugar act.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Yes. Of course, we are faced with a current condition. As to why we have these surpluses, I did not go into that, but we do have the surpluses and they have affected the acreage allotments, both up in the great Federal irrigation projects in Washington, where recent acreage allotments have been cut down, and where the farmers on that Columbia River Basin project and the cotton acreage in Arizona has been cut, and yet the Federal Government is depending upon the income from these areas in order to discharge the liability of those projects—that is, the cost of those projects.

Mr. DAWSON of Utah. All of the agricultural experts estimate we are going to be in shortage by 1975. So we are looking forward.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. But it would not take 20 years to build the dams.

Mr. DAWSON of Utah. No. Not to build the dams, but it will take 20 years before the participating projects get into operation. They are the ones that grow the crops. We need to build the dams now in order to store up the water, because it will take 20 years in some instances to store the water. In reading your speech I think you made the statement that you were not opposed to all reclamation projects.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. That is right.

Mr. DAWSON of Utah. You picked out only two in which California was interested in the water. Will the gentleman tell me whether he is going to be against the Trinity project, a California project, which will come to this floor before the Colorado River project?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. As a matter of fact, the gentleman knows I have over the years supported reclamation projects, and I intend to in the future. The gentleman asked me a question and I will be glad to answer. The gentleman knows that these reclamation projects are planned on a well-known formula which extends much past the payment time of the so-called Hoover Dam project on the Colorado River. There is a long period of time in which the reclamation cost will not be paid off. They will not be amortized.

Mr. DAWSON of Utah. The gentleman is talking about something entirely different. Your talk was based on agricultural surpluses. You asked why this administration was pushing reclamation projects when we already have great surpluses? That same argument applies to the Trinity project in California.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. When the time comes for the Trinity project to come before this House, I will study the project and I will speak my mind on it. But the reason I am speaking my mind on this is because these projects have already passed the other body. That is, a bill authorizing them has passed the other body and I assume that shortly the same type of bill will come from the gentleman's committee. Of course, I have no way of knowing whether the bill will be the same as the one reported by the other body or not. Personally, I hope it is not. I hope it is a modest bill with the type of projects in it which I can conscientiously support. But the gentleman well knows that the people of southern California are at this time before the Supreme Court pleading for a determination of the Colorado River pact. We have invested many hundreds of millions of dollars in those projects——

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Utah has expired.

Mr. DAWSON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Utah?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, I was going to say that southern California people have a case before the Supreme Court seeking to determine what the Colorado compact actually means at this time. We are of the opinion that pending that determination of the rights of the river which are in dispute and which may well go against southern California, but on which we seek a Supreme Court determination, we feel that those rights should not be disturbed, pending a Supreme Court declaration on those rights.

Mr. DAWSON of Utah. I may say to the gentleman that we have testimony in the record from representatives from California, and from southern California, to the effect that all in dispute in the Supreme Court suit is some 2 million acre-feet of water. There is still ample water to provide for all of these participating projects. It was so admitted before our committee.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DAWSON of Utah. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I notice the gentleman from California attacks the project because it would add to crop surpluses. One of the first he places in the record as being opposed to irrigation, is the Imperial Irrigation District in California. I wonder what the Imperial Irrigation District would be if they did not have water to put on that great valley? It is a little amazing when he finally boils it down that he is opposed to two projects, namely the upper Colorado, and the Arkansas-Fryingpan. His arguments in the record are not very consistent when they are based against an irrigation project because of surpluses; as a matter of fact, the crops produced under irrigation projects do not add to the surplus. The wheat is not irrigated and the small grains; it is largely alfalfa and beets, things that are not in surplus.

On the matter of the cost of projects, I may say to my colleagues who have been complaining about reclamation costing so much, we spent about $2,800,000,000 in 50 years on reclamation projects. About $560 million of that has been paid back; eventually all will be paid back. In the State of California, the gentleman's own State, they have had $753,687,914, most of it nonreimbursable projects, flood-control projects that pay back not 1 penny. It seems rather odd that the gentleman comes in and complains about reclamation projects and flood-control projects when he has so many in his own State that pay back not one single penny.

Mr. DAWSON of Utah. I interrupt the gentleman to ask my distinguished chairman if he knows of any reclamation project which in the foreseeable future can result in a surplus.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I think that is quite true.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DAWSON of Utah. I yield.

Mr. GROSS. Can the gentleman from Utah assure the Members of the House that no surplus producing crop will be planted on irrigated projects?

Mr. DAWSON of Utah. Absolutely not.

Mr. GROSS. Can he look that far into the future in a crystal ball?

Mr. DAWSON. Absolutely not; and that applies as much to the reclamation projects in California as in other places. You cannot look ahead and say there will not be some gain or that there might not be something surplus; there is no way of figuring it out, but I again call attention to the fact that the best authority we have indicates that we are

going to need much more agricultural production than we now have by the time these projects are constructed and in operation. The time is coming when we are going to want this production.

I yield again to the gentleman from Nebraska, whom I am afraid I cut off.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. As to surplus, I remember back in the year 1946 in the Foreign Aid bill the gentleman now speaking sponsored an amendment requiring the retention of a backlog of 150 million bushels of wheat, yet today we have a surplus of nearly 1 billion bushels.

Another thing I wish to call attention to is the fact that we are adding about 3 million new mouths to the population every year in excess of deaths each year. The time is not far distant when we shall have a population of two hundred or more million and we are going to need all the food we can produce, not only from the projects the gentleman is speaking about but also from the Imperial Valley project.

What would California be today without water? California would be a desert, yet the gentleman from California comes here with very poor grace arguing against irrigation projects on the ground of producing surpluses. Again I say his own State would be a desert if they did not get water to put upon the soil. Bear in mind also that in California they have many flood control projects that will never pay a cent of money back to the United States Treasury.

THE PRESIDENT'S VETO OF THE POSTAL PAY INCREASE BILL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. MORRISON] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. MORRISON. Mr. Speaker, the Senate on tomorrow will take up the matter of whether or not that body will override the President's veto of the postal pay increase bill. Frankly, I hope that the Senate will override that veto. It will, of course, take a two-thirds vote to override the veto and from what I understand there will be a close vote. However, the postal workers and all of those who have been trying to help the postal workers on both sides of this Capitol are hoping that the two-thirds vote will result when the vote on the veto of the bill comes up tomorrow.

Mr. Speaker, I should like to read at this time an editorial appearing in the Boston Post, a newspaper I understand supported the President in his campaign and I also understand that it supports the President now. Here is what that paper had to say in an editorial about the veto of the postal-pay increase:

POSTAL-PAY VETO

The President's veto of the 8.6 percent postal-pay bill will, we sincerely hope and trust, be overridden. The reasons given for the veto were as devious as it is possible to get without being hypocritical.

To call upon Congress to enact postal-pay legislation in the public interest which will be fair to 500,000 postal workers—a Congress which, incidentally, granted itself a 50-percent increase, is the height of absurdity.

Instead of seeking to have only a part of the postal-service staff patched and shabby it seems rather obvious that the President prefers to have them all looking like Confederate soldiers on the way home after Appomattox.

The discriminations and inequalities mentioned by the President as one of his reasons for vetoing the bill were, strangely enough, not seen by the individuals in need of a pay increase—the postal workers themselves. This veto message is a new low.

Mr. Speaker, we have all heard the arguments pro and con on this bill. We know that the committee spent a great deal of time in studying the measure. The full committee heard testimony in hearings that were held day after day, attended by all those interested in the bill. Especially did that committee hear testimony from the Postmaster General and all of the officials of the Post Office Department who were experts insofar as the Post Office Department was concerned.

The bill as finally sent to the President was a compromise between the House and Senate and was the best and fairest compromise that could have been worked out by both houses. The House passed one version, the Senate passed another, then the conferees of both parties met, agreed to a compromise and by overwhelming vote the recommendations of the conferees were accepted by both the House and Senate in the form of a conference report.

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MORRISON. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. MOSS. It would appear now that the veto is an attempt to enforce upon the Congress the absolute limits of judgment, and outlining exactly what they shall do. It is either the will of the administration, the position of the Postmaster, or it is nothing. Is that the gentleman's understanding of the veto message?

Mr. MORRISON. Yes; that is my understanding.

Mr. MOSS. I wonder if the gentleman would permit me to discuss some of the points mentioned in the veto message.

Mr. MORRISON. I yield to my distinguished friend from California.

Mr. MOSS. I am rather puzzled, frankly, to find a veto offered on such weak and, I believe quite frankly, baseless grounds. There are three of them mentioned. First, that the bill creates new discriminations or inequities which would affect many thousands of postal employees. On the matter of discriminations and inequities, I cannot recall a single case other than the rural mail carriers, and, as the gentleman knows, he joined with me and other members of the committee in an effort to secure some action which would alleviate the unfairness for the rural carriers and give them more money. Their own association urged that the bill be enacted as reported by the committee without change, and it is difficult to aid a group who say they do not want any assistance. But, the fact that there were inequities and that they affected the rural carriers, we readily admit to, but is it not true that in the bill which was presented to the committee last year, the original Frye-Summerfield proposal, an increase was recommended for the general field service employees, but not 5 cents was recommended for the rural carriers? They were completely ignored in the original request, and had the committee acceded to the President at that point and to the Postmaster General, they would have suffered real discrimination, far more than is contained in the legislation which passed the Congress and suffered a veto. It is the only group I can find who suffered discrimination in the version approved by the two Houses of Congress which was not already presented in the version requested by the Postmaster General and by the administration.

The second cause for the veto is that the bill creates grave administrative problems such as the establishment of thousands of individual pay rates. That is not a good or a sound reason, because you create thousands of individual pay rates whenever you have a salary schedule and reclassification. Reclassification was demanded by the Postmaster General. Each man and each woman having different deductions for their dependents are going to have individual pay schedules, and they are going to be in the thousands, and they were increased very little by the actions of the Congress following upon the bill which secured the blessing of the administration in the first place.

The third reason is, of course, a matter of personal opinion. It was the opinion of Congress that the third reason given by the President, at least, was not convincing. It said that the bill imposes a heavier burden upon the taxpayers 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. In connection with the cost of the bill and the amount which might be justified, I think it is well to point out, that consistently, the administration has chosen to base their comparisons on 1945 figures, the time of the first pay increase after World War II. In 1945 the cost of living started rising, but it had risen considerably before 1945. A more accurate comparison would be a 1939 base, and on that base every penny of raise voted by the Congress was fairly justified.

The message goes on with some rather interesting reasons, equally groundless, equally lacking in merit. I am reminded over here that the bill fails to make these criteria specific. First, it discriminates against large groups of postal employees such as rural letter carriers, and that we acknowledge. That discrimination is much less than under the administration recommendations of a year ago. It is the schedule recommended by the administration. It is discriminatory as the entire original bill was discriminatory. Then it says "Special-delivery messengers." That just is not the truth. There is no discrimination against the special-delivery messenger in the bill passed by this Congress. The special-delivery messenger was graded up with a very substantial increase and the proposal to put him on a par with the letter carrier would give him a double increase. Historically the special-delivery messenger has drawn a lesser amount. Orig-

inally he was not in the postal field service classified personnel. It has only been in recent years that he was accorded a classification standard. He does not come in with the same type of examination, it is not required to maintain the same proficiency on the distribution of mail, nor have the same overall knowledge of postal regulations that the carrier or clerk, or the postal transportation worker must maintain. Definitely there was no discrimination there. And any other treatment than that accorded the special-delivery messenger in the bill would be giving to him a far greater percentage increase than would go to the bulk of the other working men and women of the postal field service.

Then as a third group there are mentioned supervisors and postmasters. What kind of discrimination did we bring about by the amendments adopted by the Congress which was not present in the bill presented to our committee in the first place? I think it is well to examine exactly that discrimination mentioned by the President and see how well founded it is.

What did we do that affected the postmasters and the supervisory personnel? We took the unfair increases and cut them from the $440 annual maximum recommended by the Postmaster General and by the administration and brought them to a $250 maximum in order to bring about some degree of conformity between the postal field schedule and the general classified schedule.

It might be interesting to note that in grade 14 of the general schedule the step increase is $200; grade 15 it is $250, and in all of the other grades it is $200. The amendment passed by this House brought the field schedule of the Post Office Department into strict conformity to get away from the inequities existing today between the classified schedule and the postal schedule. And if it is because of that that we have been charged with discrimination, then I, for one, as the author of the amendment, want to plead guilty to that discrimination because it is not discrimination; it is simple justice, it is good business, good administrative policy. If the administration wishes to raise the step increases in the higher scheduled employees, let them be consistent and recommend to the Congress that we do the same thing for the classified employees. That has not been done. So that discrimination charge is a baseless charge.

Now we travel on. And I might point out here that all of us recall last year when a 5-percent-increase postal bill was vetoed after the Congress had gone home. One of the principal reasons given was the failure of the Congress to provide postal revenues to underwrite the cost. Strangely enough, that reason has not again been advanced. I guess someone, somewhere, someone convinced the administration that there is no proper relationship between postal rates and postal salaries, that in the role of the employer in the Post Office Department we should hire men and women and pay them decent wages, wages sufficient to attract a career-service employee.

Postal rates is not their responsibility in any way. The rates are set by the Congress, but the President again refers to them as requiring the attention of the Congress. So, I would like to divert for just a moment and point out that in every recommendation coming through our committee for an increase in postal rates, it has been proposed to take the one class of mail which pays a substantial profit to the Department, that is the first-class mail and increase it by an addition of 1 cent per letter in order to underwrite the extremely heavy deficit incurred by reason of the transportation of second- and third-class mail, mail which is subsidy mail and mail which may well be justified to be carried under a subsidy because, after all, it was the decision of the Congress to subsidize that class of mail. But, if it is to continue in a subsidy class, then I think the Congress should underwrite that cost as a public service but not, as has been proposed by the administration, to try to use that as a means to load the cost of the deficit on the back of individuals who use the first-class mail or to use it as a completely unfair and unrelated excuse for vetoing postal legislation, or as a subterfuge to veto the payment of proper salaries to postal workers. To me, this is an example of the most arbitrary use of the veto power that I have ever heard of because it can only mean that we will be threatened with a veto each time the Congress attempts to exercise independent judgment. I was amazed to read in the Washington Evening Star of Saturday, May 21, an editorial called "Politics and Pay" and, I will admit now, this has entered the realm of politics and put there squarely by the veto message of the President himself and by no one else. I did everything I could, and I know the gentleman from Louisiana did, together with a number of our colleagues on the committee, to arrive at an honest compromise. We did not try to take the politically popular course of 10 percent or nothing and no reclassification. We swallowed reclassification features of which we were very wary, and which I think the entire Congress should view with considerable concern. We went below what we felt was a proper salary increase figure in a sincere effort to effect a compromise. But, we are now told that the measure of what will be approved by this administration is exactly what the Postmaster General will recommend to the President. I blame the Postmaster General a great deal for giving bad information to the President. But I must state very, very firmly that the President shares the responsibility because he appointed the Postmaster General and, if it is bad information, it is from a man of his own choice.

Mr. MORRISON. I thank the gentleman for his very fine contribution.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MORRISON. I yield to my distinguished colleague, and majority whip, the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. ALBERT. It is true that the President has vetoed one bill passed by a Republican Congress and another bill passed by a Democratic Congress.

Mr. MORRISON. That is correct.

Mr. ALBERT. The President has set forth certain objections in his most recent veto message. Do we have any way of knowing whether we have to comply with all those conditions or whether the President will veto any bill which does not follow precisely the language recommended in the veto message?

Mr. MORRISON. That is hard to say because the President has been very inconsistent. First of all, he intimated he would not sign a bill which was over the amount recommended by the Department, which was 6.5 percent or a 5 percent increase with 1½ percent reclassification. Then the committee of the House came out with 7.6 percent, after the Senate committee came out with a 10 percent bill with no reclassification. The press came out with the idea that the President would only sign that bill and nothing more. Then when the bill was amended in the House and went to conference, it came back and was passed by the House overwhelmingly and by the Senate overwhelmingly and the President vetoed that bill which provided for an 8.8 percent pay raise for Federal employees.

Now, the press intimates that they have assurance, evidently from the White House, that the President will sign a straight 8-percent increase bill. How does the Congress know if the President is going to sign 8 percent or what he will sign? He has been quoted by the press as saying he would not sign this and not sign that. He did not sign the 5-percent bill in the preceding Congress. On the other hand, by comparison, we passed a bill that cost the Government far more in salary increases than the 8.8-percent postal bill, which was the Armed Forces bill. There was never any mention made before that bill went before the committee; there was never any mention made before that bill came before the House or the Senate about any veto by the President. He never commented at that time about vetoing that bill. He signed that bill when Congress passed it. It was a good bill and I voted for it and I'm glad the President signed it. However, it seems strange to me why the President, after the postal workers have made a legitimate case, an honest case, a fair case, that they are entitled to 10 percent, the President will not give them 8.8-percent increase, but vetoed this 8.8-percent postal bill.

Mr. ALBERT. Does the Congress have anything officially at all, either in the veto message or anywhere else, that the President will sign an 8-percent increase bill?

Mr. MORRISON. No; only by indirection from the press.

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MORRISON. I yield.

Mr. MOSS. We do not have anything in the veto message that tells us what he would sign. In fact, despite all assurances we received about H. R. 4644, I am intrigued with the statement of the President that subsequently, when the House Committee on Post Office and

Civil Service by a substantial bipartisan majority reported the bill H. R. 4644, which although approximately $30 million more costly than my recommendation, that it embodied the essential elements of the 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 salaries. In other words, despite the assurance that H. R. 4644 had been placed for final passage, we are now told that if it is changed—and do you know what those changes are—it may be vetoed. It is to overcome the shortsightedness of the administration, their failure to deal fairly with rural carriers—and again it seems that they must get for their postmasters and their supervisors who have supported every effort of this Congress to grant to the Postmaster General this tremendous authority—they must get for them a percentage increase ranging up to 58 percent and more. That is the sort of equitable pay they want to give. Down at the bottom, 6.7-percent increase for 60 percent, or the majority, of all the people in the Post Office Department, and up at the top as much as 58- or 60-percent increase to the minority. It is typical of the whole administration's policy. To those who have little we give nothing. To those who have everything we give everything we possibly can.

Mr. MORRISON. I thank the gentleman for his valuable contribution.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MORRISON. I yield to my distinguished colleague from California.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I want to thank the gentleman from Louisiana for obtaining this time in order that we on the minority side of the Post Office Committee—that is the minority side from the standpoint of those who signed the report—might let the public know what we think about this veto message.

On April 20, when this subject was under consideration on the floor, I engaged in the debate very briefly. I made a statement on the floor, and I find I was wrong in the statement I made at that time, at least in part of it, and I want to take this opportunity to correct the statement which I made.

First I would like to read the statement which I made on April 20:

> What does the committee amendment of 7.6 percent increase mean in a week to the average employee in increased wages dollarwise? It means an increase of $5.60. What does the Moss amendment mean? It means 80 cents to $1.20 more a week. It means 16 cents to 20 cents a day more than the committee bill. We are now getting down to the point where the wife of a post-office employee goes to the grocery store to buy a quart of skimmed milk and she will get under the Moss amendment from 16 to 24 cents a day more. She can buy 1 quart of milk for her children with the increase under the Moss amendment.

I want to say I find according to the computation of the committee staff that I should have used a cost of 13 cents a day average increase between the Moss amendment and the committee bill. So I was giving the committee bill a little bit the best of it, from 16 to 24 cents. I should have said 13 cents average. That is the correction I want to make in that part of my remarks.

Then I go on to say:

> Does anyone in this House want to tell me that the President of the United States will veto this bill because the Moss amendment will give to the wife of the postal employee the opportunity to buy 1 quart of milk a day more than under the committee bill? If the President should veto this bill because of the Moss amendment I think that his veto would be known as the quart-of-milk-a-day veto. I do not think the President will veto it.

I did not think the President would veto that bill which provides under the Moss amendment an average of 13 cents a day more than the committee bill. My colleague the gentleman from California [Mr. Moss] has already answered the points made by the President in his veto message to the imbalance in calculations, so now we come down to the very milk of the cocoanut, as we say, or the milk of the argument.

The Moss amendment passed this House by an overwhelming majority. It provided 13 cents a day on the average more to each postal employee in the United States, and the President vetoed it. I did not think he would use the veto on that bill on the basis of that 13 cents a day. I grant to the President the right of the veto, as the Constitution grants it to him—I do not have to grant it to him; I acknowledge that he has the right of the veto, but it seems to me that in times gone by the right of the veto has been exercised only when great principles were involved, principles which were important to the Nation, when vital principles were involved. Now we have noticed over the period of the last year and a half or 2 years that in many cases legislation has gone to the President on things in which he had expressed his viewpoint that were merely changed from his viewpoint. The Congress saw fit to change them. There was the reciprocal trade bill, its time and duration and other things that we can call to mind, yet the President signed the bills and they became law. But here on the postal-pay bill, with 13 cents a day on the average more for the postal employees, goes to the President, and the President uses the great power of the veto. That is as much as saying that a majority of the 435 Members of the House of Representatives were wrong and that a majority of the 96 Members of the other body were wrong, that the President and his advisers were right, that for 13 cents a day he vetoed this piece of legislation and keeps pay raises of something like $5 or $6.50 a week, or $1 a day over their previous wages from getting to these people who need these increases so badly.

I said I did not think the President would veto it. I have to admit that I was wrong; he did veto it. I can only say that in my humble judgment the power of the veto has been used in a case which did not call for a veto but which might have called for an expression of disagreement and at least letting the bill become law without his signature. I say I think the veto was used unwisely in this instance.

Mr. MORRISON. I thank the gentleman for his very fine remarks and the contribution he has made. I yield at this time to my distinguished colleague from Massachusetts the majority leader [Mr. McCORMACK].

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, the country has the unusual spectacle of a President vetoing a pay-raise bill for about 600,000 Federal postal employees where only 13 cents a day is involved. We also have the spectacle of a President twice vetoing the same bill, once last year, but for another reason. The main reason last year was that Congress did not bend to his will and provide as he and the Postmaster General wanted in the same bill for an increase in first-class mail rates from 3 cents to 4 cents. This year he vetoes it, not for that reason but because there is a difference of 13 cents a day between what he insists the Congress pass and what the Congress passed in the bill that was vetoed, applying, as the gentleman from California [Mr. Moss] well said, to at least 60 percent of the postal employees, where they get an increase of about 6½ percent, and some in the supervisory service under the bill that was vetoed, but not for that reason, would receive as high an increase as 58 percent in salary.

We did not see the President veto the tax bill of last year. We now hear unraveled some of the legislative steals involved in that bill. The repeal of two sections has already passed this House upon the recommendation of the Secretary of the Treasury, Mr. Humphrey, a Secretary of the Treasury under the present Republican administration. The gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. MILLS] called attention the other day to another provision of that bill which might involve many, many hundreds of millions of dollars, if not some billions of dollars, that was never understood or contemplated. So he did not say anything about that. But when it comes to the pay-raise bill, and the only difference is 13 cents a day, the bill passed by the Congress being 13 cents a day higher for at least 60 percent of the postal employees, than the bill that the President insists upon, I think the editorial of the Boston Post was fair and mild when it said that was small.

I wonder if the President was acting as the Chief Executive of our Government, which is civilian, or whether for a moment he relaxed to the position that he occupied for so many years in the military, particularly when he was Chief of Staff of the Army? Everyone admits he had an outstanding record in the military field, but the President of the United States is the head of the civilian government and not a military government. To veto this bill simply because of a 13 cents a day difference between his views and the views of Congress seems to me putting 600,000 postal employees on trial and court-martialing them without giving ample opportunity to present their views. Much can be said on this. I do not remember when any President ever vetoed a pay-raise bill. At least, I have no recollection of it in my 27 years as a Member of this body.

It is recognized that the question of pay raises is a very difficult one and involves compromises of divergent views within the Congress as well as with the executive branch.

To veto this bill because of a difference of 13 cents a day is about as unjustifiable an act as any I have ever seen committed.

I am strong for foreign aid as being necessary for the national interest of our country. But, I wonder what the position of those Members will be, if they fail to override the veto, will be when they go before their constituents in 1956, having voted $3.5 billion for foreign aid and not voting to give 13 cents a day more to the postal employees.

Mr. MORRISON. I thank the gentleman for his very excellent contribution.

I yield at this time to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. TUMULTY].

Mr. TUMULTY. Mr. Speaker, during the proceedings leading up this veto, I had numerous occasions to speak on this bill, and I had generally been following the proposition that the President would find it in his heart to sign a bill that was .6 percent higher than the bill that his supporters indicated he would sign. I was very much disillusioned and disappointed when I read that he had vetoed this bill. I could not help but think that the veto message, which supposedly was the result of great study by the President—in fact, since the bill passed, the press daily carried stories of the great agony the President was going through; he had never studied any bill harder while he was out putting golf balls on the lawn in back of the White House—I was wondering whether he was using that excuse for putting them, the postal workers, into a sand trap. I was wondering whether this whole program was not directed by Robert Montgomery, because it was a very splendid piece of dramatic fiction. But, when the mountain labored to bring forth a mouse, I concluded that for the first time in history a Postmaster General outranked a 5-star General. It seems to me that General Summerfield should be called Mr. Winterfield, because of the coldness of his heart, is so great that he cannot listen to the pleas of the wives and children of the postal employees for a .6 percent raise while he sits in arrogant splendor directing the news agencies of the Republican Party. I wonder whether Mr. Winterfield had gone to Mr. Icy or Mr. Summerfield for this language. We were told this bill would be difficult to administer. As a matter of fact, we find many things that are difficult to administer, so that would not be any good reason. Mrs. Hobby's hobbles have been going on now for the past 7 or 8 weeks. I was wondering whether they were loosing their sails to capture the postal employees, to snare them up and carry them away. Of course, I voted originally for a 10-percent raise, and I was willing to compromise, and being a young Congressman, I was not used to the cooing persuasion and was under the impression that the great smile would not turn to a frown when it came to the women and children of postal workers involved in this matter. But, we are convinced now that there are apparently billions of dollars for dubious foreign allies but not 1 cent for a loyal American doing his daily round of duties. So we are told that the reclassification features have inequities. Well, as I said on the committee when I first saw the first bill—and I served 8 years in the New Jersey legislature as preliminary training to coming here, and I am somewhat familiar with bills—the first bill that Mr. Winterfield put in would take an Indian guide to take you through the intricacies of that bill, designed for one purpose, not classification but absolute nonclassification. It would seem that a man could start out as a janitor at 9 o'clock in the morning, one of these highly efficient gentlemen, and wind up almost being postmaster by 6 o'clock at night, and by the time he got home for dinner he would be off the payroll. So, this veto has closed the icebox door. It has slammed the door against the women and children. It has taken the baby carriage away from somebody who has saved up for it. It has taken away the pint of milk. It has taken away the pound of bologna—it is about the size of what the bologna would cost today, and when it comes to the cost of food, as you can see, I am up to the minute on that important item. So, I conclude by voicing my protest and taking off the gloves and calling it for what it is, a veto by the big brass.

Let me just give you a brief history of the legislation. This is taken from the Postal Record. It says that in 1954, before I arrived here, there was an attempt to jam the Rees 6 percent bill through, and that was defeated 228 to 175.

July 21: Discharge petition on Corbett 7 percent pay bill completed.

August 9: House passes Corbett 7 percent pay bill by a vote of 352 to 29.

August 11: Senate passes Carlson amended Corbett bill.

August 20: H. R. 7774 reconsidered in Senate; Senator KNOWLAND's attempt to attach discredited Summerfield amendments defeated 55 to 16.

August 20: H. R. 7774 approved 69 to 4.

August 23: President Eisenhower vetoes pay bill.

That was last year's veto.

Now we come to 1955. Attempt again made in House to jam through inadequate pay bill; H. R. 4644 defeated 302 votes against 120 votes for.

March 25: Senate passes 10 percent pay bill by a vote of 72 to 21.

Attempt to substitute Summerfield proposal defeated 52 to 41.

April 20: House passes Moss amendments 224 to 189; Taber motion to recommit defeated 287 to 125; S. 1 passes House 324 to 85.

May 9: Rees motion to recommit defeated 275 to 118; S. 1 conference bill passes House 328 to 66.

May 11: S. 1 passes Senate 66 to 11.

On May 19 President Eisenhower vetoes the pay bill for a second time.

His theme song, it seems to me, to the postal employees and to all employees, is "No, no, a thousand times no. No pay raise for you under any circumstances."

Mr. MORRISON. I thank the gentleman for his contribution, and at this time I yield to my distinguished colleague, the gentlewoman from Idaho [Mrs. PFOST].

Mrs. PFOST. Mr. Speaker, in my opinion, anyone who is sincerely interested in the wellbeing of the postal worker and his family will vote to override the veto of the postal pay raise bill.

There can be no ifs, ands, or buts about this matter. We all know the postal worker deserves a raise—in fact he deserved it a whole year ago when another Presidential veto deprived him of it.

We all know that the postal worker and his family sharply need such a raise; they are living on humiliatingly low budgets and they should not have to wait any longer for relief.

If an exhorbitant amount of money were involved in all of this quibbling about the size of the raise, it would be different. But there is not. The difference between what we in Congress want to give the one-half million postal workers and what the administration wants to give them is only about $19 million per year. This is a very small sum when stacked up against our overall Government expenditures.

For the postal carrier, the amount involved is just about enough to allow him to enjoy an extra egg, sunny side up, and one extra slice of buttered toast each morning before he starts out on his long hike to deliver the mail. Or it may be enough to put an extra meatless sandwich in the lunch box one of his children takes to school.

The postal worker has been discriminated against for too long a time now. This body should show him that he is not a second-fiddle citizen, but a fine and respected public servant who is appreciated and adequately awarded for the very essential service he performs for all of us.

The veto of the postal pay raise bill should be overridden.

Mr. MORRISON. I thank the gentlewoman for her spendid contribution.

At this time I yield to my distinguished colleague from Pennsylvania [Mr. RHODES].

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. MORRISON] in obtaining time to bring to public attention our side of this important issue. As the gentleman from California [Mr. Moss] pointed out, the Postmaster General has a most favorable press. It couldn't be better for him if he wrote all the news stories and editorials in some of the Washington papers.

Members of Congress have been charged in the Washington press with demagogery on postal pay. It seems to me that it would be very difficult to surpass the demagogery of the press on this issue. Under the pretense of being sympathetic to postal and Federal employees the Washington press has campaigned against the bill passed by the Congress and made the veto less difficult for the President to sign.

Mr. Speaker, I had hoped that the President would, in all fairness, sign the postal pay bill. It was a compromise measure worked out by House and Senate conferees. It had been overwhelmingly adopted in both Houses as a reasonable

solution to a most complicated subject over which there has been sharp differences of opinion.

Few were completely satisfied with all of the provisions of the bill. In my opinion, a pay raise of at least 10 percent was thoroughly justified, and for the life of me I cannot see how any Member of Congress can justly oppose the modest 8.8 increase by supporting the President's veto.

I had serious doubts that the so-called reclassification provisions in the bill would benefit the great majority of the postal workers, or result in increased efficiency in the Post Office Department.

But the pay raise was long overdue so I voted for the compromise. There is a great need for additional income by postal workers. Their pay bill had been vetoed last year. The President was poorly advised then. He insisted on a postal rate increase as a condition. Now again he vetoes a postal pay bill regardless of its overwhelming support in both Houses of the Congress.

I have no doubt but that, like Members of Congress, he has been under strong pressure. But I cannot believe the President really understands the injustice his veto is to hard-working postal employees and their families. His veto statement is but a weak defense of the determined position of the Postmaster General.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MORRISON. I yield.

Mr. McCORMACK. I have heard many stories about the pressure exerted upon Members of the Congress by the Postmaster General, and particularly upon the Republican Members. Can the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RHODES] give us any information in that respect not only with reference to last year but this year also?

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. I think it was true last year as well as this year. I have received complaints from some of my Republican friends. I might say, that on the other side, are some true and sincere friends of the postal employees. They are in favor of this increase, but they are subject to very heavy pressure and threats as I understand from the information which was given to me. It seems to me the President's statement on the veto is a very weak defense for the determined position which was taken by the Postmaster General all along on this bill.

Some of the things that were happening in the postal service caused me to come to a decision on compromise with great reluctance. With the adoption of several safeguarding amendments, I finally voted for the bill which the House passed.

The President had little choice but to veto the bill. His action had been predecided by the adamant position taken by his own Postmaster General and by his Republican leaders in Congress. They had staked their arguments against the bill and even their own leadership reputations on the premise that the President would veto any postal pay legislation granting more than a 7.6 percent increase.

Had the President signed the bill after these desperate and intemperate predictions by his appointed Cabinet officer and his congressional leaders, it would be viewed as a personal rebuke to these individuals and their misguided policies. It would have made it necessary, perhaps, for the Postmaster General to submit his resignation. It also would have cast strong doubt on the further usefulness of his congressional leaders, whose predictions of a veto forced many Republicans to vote the party line on this controversial issue.

Thus, in order to save a few overzealous leaders from embarrassment, the President had little choice but to yield to their pleadings and veto the measure.

Of course, the President had to go through the motions of seriously considering the legislation. To do otherwise would be to admit that the veto message had been prepared in advance.

The emphasis of the veto message was placed on alleged inequities in the bill. This is but a convenient slogan on which to dodge the real objections to the bill and to hide the reactionary thinking and philosophy that motivates the President's advisers.

These same allegations of inequity were made during the debate on the bill in the House. They were effectively answered by the gentleman from California [Mr. Moss], who sponsored the amendments which made the bill palatable to a majority of the House Members. The allegations were repudiated even before the bill left the House and their repetition in the veto message further proves the weakness of the administration's arguments against the bill.

The real inequity involved in this matter is the unwise decision of the President to lend his name to a veto which cannot be morally, economically, or justly defended.

I trust that the Members of both Houses will stand firm on the principle of just and equitable treatment for the postal workers of this country and overwhelmingly vote to override this arbitrary and capricious veto.

This will be a real test and true friends of the postal workers will have the opportunity to stand up and be counted.

I am confident that if we in the House are afforded this chance, the postal workers will surely get the pay raise to which they are entitled.

Mr. Speaker, I can appreciate the position that many of our friends on the other side of the aisle are in. Some of them sharply disagree with the Postmaster General on this veto. They resent the kind of pressure that they have been subjected to. I know that many of them would like to vote for this pay bill despite the President's veto.

They do not like to act like rubber stamps. I do not blame them. They have my sympathy. I trust Members of the Senate will ignore the pressure and continue to support the position previously taken for the bill by the overwhelming vote of 66 to 11 on the conference report. Members of the House will then have a chance to express their independence.

This is not a party issue. It is, as a matter of fact, a question that goes much deeper. It is a difference in thinking and philosophy. It is a conflict between supporters of the veto who believe in the "trickle down" theory and those who want to percolate up.

It is a conflict between those who believe that good government needs a strong civil service, Government employees with dignity and self-respect, and those who believe in the big man theory—the strong man who by unscrupulous tactics would have Federal employees crawl and conform with the thinking and philosophy of those who hold the lash.

Mr. Speaker, if right and fairness is to triumph over might and injustice, then Congress will override the President's veto of the postal salary bill.

Mr. MORRISON. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. FASCELL].

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, I think every Member of Congress would like to follow the leader of his country on matters of domestic and foreign policy. However, when he is confronted with a message of veto, such as was presented by the President of the United States on the postal pay question, it also becomes his solemn duty and obligation to take a good straight look at the message in determining whether or not he can follow the President's views.

I have taken such a look, and, for myself, I cannot follow the President on his message. I have followed this matter very closely since its inception, being a member of the committee. This Congress has put a lot of time and thought and study on the problem of postal pay, and of reclassification at the Administration's request.

I recall very, very impressively the statement of the President of the United States in this Chamber when he said:

> It is my philosophy that with respect to the human values I shall be liberal, but with respect to fiscal matters I shall be conservative.

I respectfully submit that the message sent down on the postal pay problem does not follow his own philosophy.

To point out that this matter is not purely one of emotion, that it is understood by the rank and file, I would like to read a letter which was written by a constituent to the Miami Daily News, May 18, 1955, which summarizes this whole thing:

> LETTERS FROM OUR READERS—OPPOSES VETO OF POSTAL PAY BILL
>
> To the EDITOR OF THE MIAMI DAILY NEWS:
>
> The postal employees are asking President Eisenhower to approve a bill giving them an 8.8 percent increase in wages. I would like to submit the following facts in opposition to a veto by the President.
>
> Congress is overwhelmingly on record for the postal pay bill. On April 20 the House passed the bill 324 to 85, and on May 9 the House accepted a conference agreement with the Senate 328 to 66. On March 25 the Senate approved S. 1, which at that time called for a flat 10-percent increase by a vote of 72 to 21. On May 11 the Senate accepted the conference agreement by a vote of 66 to 11.
>
> Concern over the cost of the bill, quoting from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, page 5860, May 5: "The cost attributable to salary increases and reclassification is $173,200,000 annually, representing 8.59 percent of the

present payroll." This cost is approximately 1 percent more than the 7.6 percent bill on which the threatened veto is predicated. Dollarwise the difference runs from $40 to $70 annually to rank and file employees, in opposing this the administration does not mention that in the original bill it proposed to give up to 58 percent increases to certain supervisory positions.

Comparison of costs between the postal bill and the military bill approved March 31, 1955: The April 2 issue of Army, Navy, and Air Force Journal reports that the military pay bill provides a 12.4 percent average increase for 1,624,638 officers and enlisted men at an annual cost of $750 million. The postal pay bill before President Eisenhower provides an 8.59 percent average increase for 500,000 employees at annual cost of $173 million.

Because of the time involved a veto should necessitate taking the bill back to both Houses. The problem of postal wage increases has been in Congress for the past 17 months. This seems like a long time to postpone something that everyone is in favor of except a small minority who wish to foist their wishes on the majority.

RICHARD E. WOLFE.

MIAMI.

That, to me, is a factual presentation of the whole problem. I do not see any unyielding emotion on the part of an employee, if this is the postal employee, and I do not know that it is. It is signed by Richard E. Wolfe, Miami, Fla. I would like to elaborate on one single point in the postal-veto message which gives me concern regarding the whole message. One of the big issues was the question of discrimination, inequities that would exist and would be made possible in the postal pay bill because of the fact that whereas the original administration bill provided for an average increase of 27 percent for all supervisory personnel—some ran up as high as 58 percent—on the theory that those charged with greater responsibility should be paid more money, but under the bill as sent to the President a flat increase was provided for all those supervisory personnel increasing percentages, and that according to the theory as we understand it, was one of the reasons why this bill was vetoed, because it would create an inequitable situation, and yet I point out that the administration bill on classified personnel contains a flat increase for all supervisory personnel corresponding.

For these reasons, Mr. Speaker, I shall support the overriding of the veto.

Mr. MORRISON. I thank the gentleman for his very excellent contribution. I would like to say at this time that I have been on the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee for many years. I have heard many arguments, pro and con, for pay raises for Federal employees and for postal employees, and the committee during those years reported out many pay-raise bills that were more or less of a compromise, bills that were passed by the House, went to the Senate and to the President; and the Presidents before President Eisenhower always signed and approved the various pay bills which were, in effect, compromises on the part of committees of both Houses, and were passed finally by both Houses.

This particular bill that the President has seen fit to veto, the committee gave it unusual attention, they gave it long attention and, frankly, I think the postal workers made out a reasonable and justifiable and excellent case for a 10 percent increase. I was for a 10 percent increase and felt they deserved a 10 percent increase. I argued before the committee in support of a 10 percent increase, but later yielded to the will of the majority and voted for what did come out of the committee, which was a compromise. On the floor of the House I voted for the Moss amendment. That amendment raised it and made it a little better bill. Then the bill went to conference after the House had passed one version and the Senate had passed another. I was a member of the conference committee. The Senate demanded that the amount be raised to 8.8 percent. I went along with that as I had done on other items. I thought that by giving in to this and by coming out with an 8.8 percent bill—and it was a unanimous vote on behalf of the House conferees and on behalf of the Senate conferees—I felt sure that if both the House and the Senate agreed to it that it would be signed by the President. When I saw how overwhelmingly the 8.8 percent compromise passed both the Senate and the House I thought it was reasonable to believe and hope that the President would sign the bill.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MORRISON. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. When the veto message comes up, it is on exactly the same bill that they voted for when the conference report was adopted?

Mr. MORRISON. That is exactly correct.

Mr. McCORMACK. How are those who voted for the conference report going to reconcile their vote on that occasion, if they vote to sustain the veto? It is on identically the same bill.

Mr. MORRISON. That is correct. If the Senate votes consistently the way they voted for the same bill when they voted for the conference report which their conferees demanded and insisted upon, they will have to vote by more than a two-thirds majority which would override the President's veto.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Louisiana has expired.

(By unanimous consent, on request of Mr. MORRISON, he was allowed to proceed for 5 additional minutes.)

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MORRISON. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. MOSS. Further, is it not true that not only is the bill identical with the issue confronting them at the time of the conference report but the circumstances would appear to be the same, because at the time of the adoption of the conference report each Member was told by the Republican leadership that you will be faced with a veto if this bill is passed? Having voted with the threat of veto hot on their backs, they are now faced with the actual veto. That would be the only changed circumstance.

Mr. MORRISON. That is correct. May I add that it was a unanimous vote by the Senate conferees and a unanimous vote by the House conferees on the exact bill that came out of the conference, which is the exact bill that the President vetoed. It is the same bill that is going before the Senate tomorrow.

Mr. MOSS. I know that the gentleman from Louisiana will join with me and others on our committee in saying that in the event this veto is sustained we will still get out of this House, we hope, a bill that is agreeable and not one that is forced on us and enacted as a result of the blackjacking by the postmaster.

Mr. MORRISON. I do not know how many more bills, if the veto is sustained tomorrow, this House is going to have to come out with. But I am not a quitter and I am sure that the larger number of Members of the committee of the House as well as the Senate are not going to quit. We are going to keep on trying until we come out with some sort of a bill that we hope the President will some day agree to. However if the Senate is consistent in their vote, as we hope they will be, that vote will result in overriding the veto tomorrow and it will give us an opportunity here in the House to vote to override the veto also. I would like to make clear, and I do not think this has been made clear, that if the Senate does not vote to override, the House, unfortunately, will not have an opportunity to vote on overriding the President's veto of this particular bill.

Mr. MOSS. The gentleman is aware of the fact there has been a campaign on by a great part of the press, I know the majority of the press here in the city of Washington, to convince the employees that this fight has hurt them, but unless we had made this fight, and if we had knuckled down to the first position of the administration, the 5 percent with 1½ percent for reclassification would have been the full measure. As it is, we have had a bitter fight, but we have forced upward the amount which they indicate they will accept. I for one am going to continue to make that fight until we get to the point where we are dealing at least halfway fairly with these people.

Mr. MORRISON. Along that same line of reasoning, we made a fight for a higher bill than a 5 percent bill in the last Congress, but we were not able to get more than 5 percent. But the 5 percent bill which was not justifiable nor fair to the postal worker which passed Congress last year was vetoed by President Eisenhower.

Mr. TUMULTY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MORRISON. I yield.

Mr. TUMULTY. Am I correct that the cost of the Moss amendment would have been about $12 million additional? I have just been informed by the gentleman from California that it would be approximately ten to twelve million. Is the gentleman aware that there was testimony before the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries that the U. S. S. *Press Agent*, that the President intends

to send around the world showing peaceful pursuits of atomic power, a ship that contributes nothing directly to the program of nuclear energy and is a ship that is purely a press agent's dream, would cost over $30 million to build, a thoroughly useless ship for the Zulus to look at and the Hottentots to gaze at and the headhunters to get an idea of nuclear power, and the only difference between that ship and any other ship is that it does not have a smokestack? Does the gentlemen think that if the President does away with this useless ship, the *Press Agent*, that will finance the raise, and does not the gentleman think that that will be a good idea?

Mr. MORRISON. I think that would be a splendid idea and perhaps enable us to do something else to further help the postal employees.

Mr. TUMULTY. Instead of that, he ought to call the ship the Postal Veto.

Mr. MORRISON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. LESINSKI] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I also am one of the Members that did not believe the President would veto the postal pay bill. It did not seem possible that he would be so small, as the Boston Post had stated in a recent article.

Such action seems quite typical with this administration when it comes to smallness.

The tax bill passed last session primarily benefits a small few. The administration's juggling on the question of Government bonds hurt the small bank for the benefit of a small group of big bankers. The present farm program hurts the smaller farmers and aids the small minority of large land owners. I can go on—REA and TVA.

All the administration's actions are to help monopolies and large corporations. When it comes to give money to the little guy, the President vetoes it without justifiable reasons. If he had given specific recommendations that Congress could act upon, we certainly would have grounds to either accept or reject the recommendations. As it stands, we will just have to go on fighting as we have been for what we think is proper. This may seem simple, but the administration has put so many roadblocks in the way that it is just impossible to place into a bill what we honestly believe is proper.

I certainly hope the other body overrides the veto, for the bill that was presented to the President is the most equitable one that could be reported out during this session of Congress.

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Speaker, I have listened with considerable interest to the remarks of the gentleman from Louisiana and my other distinguished colleagues concerning the irresponsible use of the veto power by the President in connection with the postal pay raise bill. I was extremely sorry that the President elected to exercise his veto in this instance. This action is to be regretted primarily because it denies again an immediate pay raise to the thousands of persons to whom one has been long overdue. Secondly the veto is to be regretted because, as a reading of the veto message so clearly indicates, it was based on such shallow grounds. I am certain that the overwhelming number of Members of this House, on both sides of the aisle, are disappointed in the President's action in denying benefits so richly deserved for such obviously undeserving reasons.

A further reason for my regretting the veto is in a sense personal and unique. I regret it because it was the handiwork of one of my most distinguished constituents. A constituent who nowadays seems to be enhancing his knowledge and his reputation on how to raise prize-winning beef cattle but shows a discouraging lack of knowledge and appreciation of the problems of the people in this country whose primary concern is putting enough hamburg on the table to feed their family.

In his remarks the distinguished majority leader, the gentleman from Massachusetts, suggested that in vetoing the postal pay bill the President suffered from a reversal to his military character and had forgotten that this is not a military state but a civilian government. That may or may not be true but I would rather suggest that the President's unfortunate action in this instance illustrates the wisdom as well as the rumor in the story that was making the rounds a year or so ago. That story had to do with the reply of the gentleman to the lady who expressed deep and sincere concern over the fact that a professional military man now occupies the White House. As the story goes the gentleman's sage remark was: "Madam, having a professional military man as our President doesn't worry me nearly so much as having an amateur civilian." It is difficult to cite many instances in our history where the veto power was used for a less substantial and more picayune reason than in this instance. I seriously suggest that anyone who really understands the purpose of our Constitution in our form of government would not have abused the veto power as it was last Thursday. Further I would daresay that anyone who truly appreciates the problems of the postal employees of this Government would not have done so. In my opinion this unfortunate veto can only be explained as the action of a man who lacks the fundamental appreciation of the basic problems facing the average American citizen as well as an understanding of the functions of our American democratic government. For these reasons I sincerely hope and trust the Congress of the United States will override the President's veto of the postal pay bill.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts asked and was given permission to address the House today for 10 minutes on two subjects, following any special orders heretofore entered.

SENATOR JOHN F. KENNEDY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I would like at this time to express my deep appreciation to the House that our fine Senator from Massachusetts, JOHN KENNEDY, returns to Washington either today or tomorrow. We have missed him greatly. He had a very serious operation 8 months ago as the result of an injury he received during World War II when he saved the lives of a number of his crew. He was tremendously brave then when he risked his life for others. He has been tremendously patient and brave in his illness. He was getting along well when I understand he had a fall resulting from a defective crutch. But he has won out, and he is coming to Washington to resume his duties. We all admire the brilliance of his mind and his kindliness and his friendliness, and we are delighted that he is back again with us in the Congress. And I would like to pay tribute to his very beautiful and devoted wife, who was with him all during his operation and all through his convalescence in Florida.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. The remarks of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts are consistent with the fine example she has always set, a member of the Republican Party, in making the expressions that she has about our distinguished Senator, JOHN KENNEDY, who is a member of the Democratic Party. It is consistent with the nobility of mind that the gentlewoman from Massachusetts has always evidenced and been an example of, to others. I want to join with the gentlewoman in her remarks. I am very glad to see my good friend, JOHN KENNEDY, able to come back, and I know that the gentlewoman joins with me in my sincere hope that his condition will continue to rapidly improve and that he will quickly regain good health.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I feel sure that he will. I know that the gentleman, the distinguished majority leader, Mr. McCORMACK, was a very gallant veteran of World War I and that JOHN KENNEDY was a very gallant veteran of World War II. It reminds me that we would have no freedom in this country today without veterans like my colleagues from Massachusetts, Congressman McCORMACK and Senator JOHN KENNEDY. I, too, hope that Senator KENNEDY will steadily improve, and I hope that the people will be kind in not asking too much of him on his return. He is so able; we are likely to do that.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. SCOTT (at the request of Mr. MARTIN), for today, on account of illness.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey (at the request of Mr. TUMULTY), for today, on account of official business.

Mr. FOUNTAIN (at the request of Mr. BONNER), for today, on account of official business.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mrs. KEE in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois in two instances.

Mr. ROOSEVELT and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. PRIEST in connection with a program for hearings on the Salk vaccine before his committee on Wednesday.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey (at the request of Mr. FRIEDEL) in three instances.

Mr. SILER.

Mr. WITHROW.

Mr. COON and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. BOLAND and to include an editorial.

Mr. REUSS and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. HINSHAW and to include an article.

Mr. FORD and include remarks made by the Commandant of the Marine Corps.

Mr. RICHARDS and include a newspaper article.

Mr. JONES of Missouri and include a newspaper article.

Mr. FLOOD and include a statement, in support of House Resolution 237 introduced by him for the establishment of international trade centers in the United States.

Mr. KNOX.

Mr. BURDICK.

Mr. BOYKIN (at the request of Mr. MORRISON) and to include a newspaper article.

SENATE BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS REFERRED

Bills and joint resolutions of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 153. An act to amend the Rural Electrification Act of 1936; to the Committee on Agriculture.

S. 1580. An act to regulate subsistence expenses and mileage allowances of civilian officers and employees of the Federal Government; to the Committee on Government Operations.

S. 1805. An act 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.

S. J. Res. 8. Joint resolution to amend the Constitution to authorize governors to fill temporary vacancies in the House of Representatives; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

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

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 4052. An act 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; and

H. R. 4876. An act making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments, and the Tax Court of the United States, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bills of the Senate of the following titles:

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 indemnity 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;

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

S. 1727. An act to authorize certain administrative expenses in the Treasury Department, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 8 minutes p. m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, May 24, 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:

822. A letter from the Director, Office of Defense Mobilization, Executive Office of the President, transmitting the semiannual report on the stockpiling program for the period July 1 to December 31, 1954, pursuant to section 4 of Public Law 520, 79th Congress; to the Committee on Armed Services.

823. A letter from the Director, Office of Defense Mobilization, Executive Office of the President, transmitting the quarterly report on borrowing authority for the quarter ending December 31, 1954, pursuant to section 304 (b) of the Defense Production Act, as amended; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

824. A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting a report on records proposed for disposal and a list covering records proposed for disposal by certain Government agencies, pursuant to the act of July 7, 1943 (57 Stat. 380), as amended by the act of July 6, 1945 (59 Stat. 434); to the Committee on House Administration.

825. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting copies of orders suspending deportation as well as a list of the persons involved, pursuant to Public Law 863, 83d Congress, amending subsection (c) of section 19 of the Immigration Act of February 5, 1917, as amended (8 U. S. C. 155 (c)); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

826. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting copies of orders suspending deportation as well as a list of the persons involved, pursuant to section 244 (a) (5) of the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952 (8 U. S. C. 1254 (a) (5)); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

827. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting copies of orders suspending deportation as well as a list of the persons involved, pursuant to section 244 (a) (1) of the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952 (8 U. S. C. 1254 (a) (1)); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

828. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting copies of orders granting the applications for permanent residence filed by the subjects, pursuant to section 6 of the Refugee Relief Act of 1953; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

829. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to provide for the suspension of certain benefits in the case of members of the Reserve components of the Army, Navy, Air Force, and Marine Corps ordered to extended active duty in time of war or national emergency, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

830. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend the Uniform Code of Military Justice"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

831. A letter from the Under Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to permit a retired officer of the Navy to be employed in a command status in connection with Antarctic expeditions"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

832. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the audit of the Navy industrial fund, Norfolk Naval Shipyard, Bureau of Ships, Department of the Navy, for the period July 1, 1953, to November 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.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, pursuant to the order of the House of May 19, 1955, the following bills were reported on May 20, 1955:

Mr. McMILLAN: Committee on the District of Columbia. H. R. 191. A bill to

regulate the election of delegates representing the District of Columbia to national political conventions, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 606). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. McMILLAN: Committee on the District of Columbia. H. R. 2406. A bill to amend subsection (e) of title 47, section 1601, of the Code of Laws of the District of Columbia, 1951 edition; with amendment (Rept. No. 607). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. McMILLAN: Committee on the District of Columbia. H. R. 3908. A bill to provide for the regulation of fares for the transportation of schoolchildren in the District of Columbia; without amendment (Rept. No. 608). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. SPENCE: Committee on Banking and Currency. H. R. 6227. A bill to provide for the control and regulation of bank holding companies, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 609). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

[*Submitted May 23, 1955*]

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. GARY: Committee of conference. H. R. 4876. A bill making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments, and the Tax Court of the United States, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 610). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. FALLON: Committee on Public Works. H. R. 5923. A bill to authorize certain sums to be appropriated immediately for the completion of the construction of the Inter-American Highway; without amendment (Rept. No. 611). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BOLLING: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 248. Resolution for consideration of H. R. 5881, a bill to supplement the Federal reclamation laws by providing for Federal cooperation in non-Federal projects and for participation by non-Federal agencies in Federal projects; without amendment (Rept. No. 612). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. TRIMBLE: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 249. Resolution for consideration of H. R. 2851, a bill to authorize the Commodity Credit Corporation to process food commodities for donation under certain acts; without amendment (Rept. No. 613). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ASPINALL:

H. R. 6402. A bill to confer jurisdiction on the various States with respect to civil causes of action and criminal offenses committed or arising on Indian reservations within such States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. R. 6403. A bill to amend title 18, entitled "Crimes and Criminal Procedure," of the United States Code, to provide a criminal sanction for the embezzlement or theft of the property of Indian tribal organizations; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 6404. A bill to amend section 4 of the act entitled "An act to supplement existing laws against unlawful restraints and monopolies, and for other purposes," approved October 15, 1914; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 6405. A bill to amend the Federal Deposit Insurance Act to provide safeguards against mergers and consolidations of banks where the effect may be substantially to lessen competition, or to tend to create a monopoly; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. ELLIOTT:

H. R. 6406. A bill to authorize a 5-year program of grants for construction of medical educational and research facilities; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HARRISON of Nebraska:

H. R. 6407. 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.

By Mr. HUDDLESTON:

H. R. 6408. A bill to provide benefits for members of the Reserve components of the armed services who suffer disability or death incident to active duty, active duty for training, or inactive-duty training, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 6409. A bill to provide certain clarifying and technical amendments to the Reserve Officers Personnel Act of 1954; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. JONES of Alabama:

H. R. 6410. A bill to authorize the construction of a building for a Museum of History and Technology for the Smithsonian Institution, including the preparation of plans and specifications, and all other work incidental thereto; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. JUDD:

H. R. 6411. A bill to authorize the coinage of 50-cent pieces to commemorate the centennial of the admission of the State of Minnesota into the Union; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. KING of California:

H. R. 6412. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to the tax on transportation of persons; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LANKFORD:

H. R. 6413. A bill to fix and regulate the salaries of teachers, school officers, and other employees of the Board of Education of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. LOVRE:

H. R. 6414. A bill to amend title V of the Housing Act of 1949, as amended, and to provide for the insurance of loans thereunder; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. PERKINS:

H. R. 6415. A bill to amend the Social Security Act to provide disability-insurance benefits for totally disabled individuals, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SHELLEY:

H. R. 6416. A bill to continue the exemption from the Classification Act of 1949 of certain employees whose compensation is fixed and adjusted in accordance with prevailing rates; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. SMITH of Mississippi:

H. R. 6417. A bill to revise and reenact the act entitled "An act authorizing the Arkansas-Mississippi Bridge Commission, its public successors or public assigns, to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Mississippi River at or near Friar Point, Miss., and Helena, Ark.," approved May 17, 1939; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. UDALL:

H. R. 6418. A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to lease unassigned lands on the Colorado River Indian Reservation, Ariz., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. ASPINALL (by request):

H. R. 6419. A bill to redefine the terms "stepchild" and "stepparent" for the purposes of the Servicemen's Indemnity Act of 1951, as amended; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. DENTON:

H. R. 6420. A bill to provide that the town referred to as "Saffaras, Ind." be referred to in all laws, regulations, documents, and records of the United States as "Sassafras, Ind."; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. J. Res. 311. Joint resolution to erect a memorial to the memory of Albert Einstein; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. SILER:

H. J. Res. 312. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SIMPSON of Illinois:

H. J. Res. 313. Joint resolution relating to sales of Commodity Credit Corporation feed grains; to the Committee on Agriculture.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin: Joint resolution passed by both houses of the Wisconsin Legislature which memorializes the Congress of the United States to enact legislation deepening the connecting channels in the Great Lakes in order to provide the full benefits of the St. Lawrence Seaway project; to the Committee on Public Works.

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Wisconsin, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to enact legislation deepening the connecting channels in the Great Lakes in order to provide the full benefits of the St. Lawrence Seaway project; to the Committee on Public Works.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to authorize the Rural Electrification Administration, Department of Agriculture, to send its representative to Hawaii to investigate the possibility of setting up a rural-electrification cooperative under the Rural Electrification Administration to serve areas without electricity in the county of Hawaii; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to authorize the amendment of certain patents of Government lands containing restrictions as to the use of such lands; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to amend section 73 of the Hawaiian Organic Act to authorize the Commissioner of Public Lands to sell residence lots without further notice or auction after 6 months after said lots were first offered for sale; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to waive certain restrictions with respect to exchanges of public lands for emergency relief to distressed persons in Puna, T. H.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States

to enact legislation to provide that the proceeds of sales of real property owned by estates, trusts, and individuals where owned by said estates, trusts, or individuals for 10 consecutive years prior to said sale or sales be taxed for Federal income-tax purposes as capital gains and not as ordinary income; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BURDICK:

H. R. 6421. 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. CRETELLA:

H. R. 6422. A bill for the relief of Clelia Cusano Puglia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOLIFIELD:

H. R. 6423. A bill for the relief of Juan Jose Sanchez-Villegas, Maria Luisa Gama de Sanchez, Juan Jose Sanchez-Gama, Oscar Fernando Sanchez-Gama, Maria Luisa Sanchez-Gama, and Ruth Sanchez-Gama; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. VINSON:

H. Res. 250. Resolution providing that the bill, H. R. 6401, and all accompanying papers shall be referred to the United States Court of Claims; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

282. By Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin: Resolution supporting in principle the report of the Reserve program committee submitted to and approved by National Council, Reserve Officers Association of the United States, adopted at Madison, Wis., May 7, 1955; to the Committee on Armed Services.

283. Also, resolution unanimously passed at the annual membership meeting of the Racine County Republican Party, Wisconsin, April 28, 1955, supporting and urging passage of an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, which in essence provides that no treaty, or agreement of any kind, or law, shall become superior to or supersede the Constitution and laws of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

284. By Mr. THOMSON of Wyoming: Petition of Mrs. Kenneth Lynn, Newcastle, Wyo., and 27 others, to get alcoholic beverage advertising off the air and out of the channels of interstate commerce; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

285. By Mr. WILLIAMS of New York: Petition of citizens of Herkimer, N. Y., favoring H. R. 4627; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

286. Also, petition of citizens of Ilion, N. Y., favoring H. R. 4627; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Control of Juvenile Delinquency

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STUART SYMINGTON

OF MISSOURI

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 23, 1955

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an address concerning the control of juvenile delinquency, delivered by my distinguished colleague the senior Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS], at the University of Missouri at Columbia, Mo., on April 29, 1955. In my opinion, his address was an important contribution to an understanding of this major social problem.

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

ADDRESS BY HON. THOMAS C. HENNINGS, JR., AT THE UNIVERSITY OF MISSOURI CONFERENCE ON THE CONTROL OF JUVENILE DELINQUENCY, COLUMBIA, MO., APRIL 29, 1955

Senator Noble, distinguished guests, ladies and gentlemen: It is a twofold privilege and pleasure for me to take part, with you, in this tremendously important conference on juvenile delinquency; first, because it affords me an opportunity to speak on a problem that is so close to my heart; and second, because it is a source of real gratification to have this inspiring evidence that you and the people of our own State of Missouri are not sitting back and waiting for someone else to find the answers to this difficult problem for you. You have taken the leadership; you are pointing the way; you are setting an example—an example of democracy in action—an example, I might add, of the kind of action that should be taking place in every State of the Union but that, unfortunately, is not.

All of you who have joined as individuals and as organizations in making this conference possible are performing a real and worthwhile service. You can indeed be proud of your part in this conference and I know it goes without saying that you recognize that the responsibility doesn't end here. We haven't solved the problem of juvenile delinquency because we have met here to talk about it. We have just taken the first step—an important and necessary step, to be sure—but the real job lies ahead of us.

At the outset, I want to make it clear that I do not claim to be an expert in this field. I am sure that the distinguished and able speakers who have preceded me are experts in their fields and have contributed a great deal to your thinking. I also feel sure they would agree with me that just as the causes of delinquency are many and diverse, so the answers must be sought from many and diverse sources. Out of my own experience as a prosecutor and district attorney, and out of my service as a member of the Senate Committee on Federal Penitentiaries and the Senate Committee on Juvenile Delinquency, I have learned—just as you doubtless have learned through your own experiences—that the more we know about this problem, the more we realize that we are not going to find the answer all done up in fancy trimmings and handed to us in a nice neat package. It isn't that easy.

The hard, unpleasant truth is that we are not even holding the line against juvenile delinquency. We are losing the battle. And each day, each week, each month that we procrastinate, we are losing further battles and wasting more of our resources, not just financial resources, but human resources. After all, we are dealing with human lives, and each day more and more young people—more and more children—are coming into conflict with the law.

Our recent committee report, covering more than 16 months of intensive work in this field, minced no words in this respect. We said, bluntly: "If this Nation continues its present feeble attempts to prevent juvenile delinquency, we can be certain that the harvest we will reap in later years will be a bigger and tougher crop of juvenile delinquents and youthful and adult criminals, ultimately requiring more and more prisons." We pointed out that the stream of children through the Nation's juvenile courts grew from 300,000 in 1948 to 435,000 in 1954, and that if it continues to mount at this same rate the figures may well reach 785,000 in the next 5 years. But this is only part of the picture, because we also know that only 1 in 3 cases reported to the police ever reaches the courts. So we have the appalling figure of a million and a quarter youngsters every year coming into conflict with the law. The tragedy is that in a great majority of these situations a youngster could be saved for a happy, productive life and useful work in society.

Much of the problem exists today because of apathy—apathy of the local and Federal Government, apathy of parents, churches, schools, and all the other pillars of our society. This is a blunt statement, but I don't think you invited me here because you wanted to hear some fancy phrases about how well we're doing. This is the way I see the situation today. Now, I do not say all parents, nor all schools, nor all churches, but in every community in our country enough of them are falling down on the job to be contributing factors in this complex problem of juvenile delinquency.

In California a bewildered mother testified before our committee. She told us the tragic story of her son's addiction to narcotics, of his ventures into crime, and of his inevitable conflict with the authorities. "Why?" she asked us. "What was the reason?" We couldn't give her the answer.

Wherever we go we are approached by parents, teachers, social workers, interested citizens, and reporters, and they ask us, "Do comics cause juvenile delinquency? Does television cause juvenile delinquency? Do slums cause juvenile delinquency?" Everyone seems to be searching for a simplified, prepackaged answer, so that we can go right out and correct the situation. We can't give these people a simple answer, either, but the work of our committee is helping to find the answers. What we can do—and what we are doing—is to set the framework within which this many-faceted problem can be solved. We can recommend—and we have—corrective legislation on the part of the Federal Government. We can—and I believe we have—aroused communities to action by focusing the spotlight on those who benefit from the exploitation of youth. And we will make progress, if we are willing to devote our energies and resources to the job.

When our recent report was issued, one national news service commented: "Seldom in the memory of veteran legislators and newsmen here has Congress issued so shocking a report." I'd like to tell you some of the things the report said—and some of the things it did not say.

Last year, we went about our hearings this way: We went north to Boston, south to Miami, west to San Francisco. We studied the problem in the District of Columbia and in New York and Philadelphia, and along our southern border at El Paso, Texas, and San Diego and in many other communities.

What we tried to do was to take a representative sample of the Nation, and by the time the community hearings were completed, we had perhaps not a complete, but certainly a comprehensive picture of the national problem. In community after community, we heard testimony about local conditions that duplicated the problems we found everywhere else. The most disheartening thing, I think, was that so many of the factors contributing to juvenile delinquency could have been prevented.

One of the most distressing factors brought to light by our committee's investigation is the use of narcotics. It is extremely difficult, if not impossible, to get any reliable statistics on the extent to which narcotics, marihuana and dangerous drugs are used by juveniles because the methods of reporting differ from those of other criminal activities. Most of us have been vaguely aware that there exists a narcotics problem, but seldom has this been more clearly illustrated than in our committee's hearings. The readily available evidence that an increasing number of children are becoming drug addicts was presented to us over and over again.

From the evidence presented to our committee, it would appear that this is a major problem in perhaps a dozen of our largest metropolitan areas and in cities close to the Mexican border and in port areas through which narcotics are smuggled into our country. But it is a potential danger in every other community where narcotics syndicates can gain a foothold because State or local statutes are weak or unenforced.

In testimony before our committee, a chief probation officer in California reported frankly that there was an alarming and rapid increase in the use of narcotics by teenagers. In Denver it was revealed that in one section of the population, 80 to 90 percent of the teenagers had used marihuana at least occasionally. In Iowa—yes, in our calm, peaceful midwest—the superintendent of the State training school for girls testified that 25 percent of the girls coming into her institution had used marihuana. One responsible organization estimated that 7,500 youngsters in one city alone were narcotic addicts. In our hearings we found a direct correlation between the users of narcotics and juvenile delinquency. Most of the young people arrested for narcotic offenses already had a police record. Many youngsters turned to criminal activity in order to raise the $20 or $30 a day necessary to keep them in drugs.

There was considerable evidence, too, that many youngsters take to drugs or narcotics just for the thrill of it. Once addicted, the road back is long and doubtful. Only in two cities in the entire United States, for example, are there follow-up centers for the care of cured narcotics addicts, yet some estimates of recurrence run as high as 99 percent.

What about Federal Government activity in this field? It can be summed up in three words: understaffed, overworked, and underpaid. To illustrate, in El Paso, Tex., almost 34 percent of the total narcotics arrests were youngsters under 21 years of age. Yet the Federal Bureau of Narcotics has only one man in El Paso and another in San Diego. These two men not only must police the entire Mexican border—a major entry point for narcotics—but are also responsible for policing the thousands of legitimate outlets for narcotics and drugs as well as for maintaining their own offices and doing their own clerical work. On its face, this is an impossible situation. Is it any wonder that so many youngsters in El Paso come under the influence of narcotics?

As in so many other contributing areas of juvenile delinquency, most middle income families tend to feel that drug addiction is something that can't happen to their children. But sometimes they are abruptly shaken out of their lethargy, like those parents in pleasant Oklahoma City where over 250 juvenile addicts were arrested last year in just one police roundup. All of these children were between 13 and 18; all of them were from middle and upper-middle income homes.

In this connection, our committee made three recommendations to the Congress. We recommended more narcotics agents. We recommended compulsory hospitalization of addicts. And we recommended mandatory graduated sentences without suspension or probation for convicted narcotics peddlers.

Not, perhaps, so sensational an area so far as newspaper headlines are concerned, but nevertheless an important problem in this field is the matter of runaway children. Our committee found that at least 200,000 children became runaways each year and more than half of them go from one State to another. We found tremendous variations among State and local agencies in dealing with children who run away from home. Detention facilities in most cases are grossly inadequate. We found such practices as "border patrols" or "sunset patrols" which consisted of escorting the youngster to the edge of a community or county—sometimes after a night's lodging and a meal—and admonishing him to move on or get home any way he can. We found that one of the major problems was lack of funds to pay for transportation or care for the runaway. It is perfectly understandable that most States are reluctant to spend their limited funds for out-of-State children when these funds are so badly needed for the care of their own children. The result is that thousands of youngsters annually are apprehended as destitute or delinquent and are thrown into jail where they are exposed to every kind of vice and crime until someone works out the puzzle of how to get them home.

With two of my colleagues in the Senate, I have introduced legislation aimed at correcting these situations. One of our proposals would provide Federal assistance to the States on a temporary basis and with a clause for Federal reimbursement, to assist in getting runaway children back to their own communities as quickly as possible.

Narcotics and runaway children are but two of the many contributing causes to juvenile delinquency. There are also the problems of fathers who desert their families, of the traffic in crime and horror comics, and of pornographic literature, and of crime and violence on television. Our committee made intensive investigation into these problems, but I mention these factors now only in passing because there are other matters I would like to talk about.

Now, we know that a child doesn't grow in a vacuum—that his immediate physical environment plays a major role in the development of his attitudes and actions. With this in mind, we went into studies of housing, health, and education.

I am sure that it is not necessary for me to spell out to anyone here the overcrowded conditions prevailing in our classrooms. Nationwide, we need at a minimum 300,000 additional classrooms. Here in Missouri we will need close to 10,000 additional classrooms in the next 5 years. Serious as our situation is here, in some areas it is even more shocking. For example, with 200,000 children now attending school on a part-time basis because of overtaxed and overcrowded facilities, the county of Los Angeles would have to dedicate a new 1,300-pupil school every Monday morning of the year, merely to keep abreast of increased enrollments.

I would like to read you just one sentence from Nation's Business for May. Under the heading "Education: Crisis Will Continue," it stated: "Today more than 600,000 children are attending school on a half-time or part-time basis because of lack of available classrooms, and in 526 urban communities, one-third of the children were in classes of 35 or more."

What happens in these overcrowded schools? The teachers in our elementary and high schools who are in the best position to spot signs of maladjustment and emotional tension are trying desperately to handle large classes and must necessarily plan their programs to meet the needs of the normal, well-adjusted children. The child with problems—and the delinquent child, in the vast majority of cases, has been a problem child in school—is inevitably neglected because in the average school in the average American community today there is no time, there are no funds, and there are no facilities, no special classes, no remedial teachers, no skilled social worker or visiting teacher programs to help families and children with difficulties. Here, where we could identify and help a troubled child before he becomes a delinquent, we are neglecting him instead.

Local school districts simply are unable to meet this problem. If our school facilities are to be anywhere nearly adequate, the Federal Government must assist. I am glad to be a sponsor of legislation to make Federal funds available for school construction. Our schools are in the first line of our Nation's defense against delinquency, and all the arguments about economy, all the false propaganda that Federal assistance means Federal control, all the conferences to review for the 100th time the extent of the need, all the classrooms that we may, perhaps, get around to building 10 or 15 years from now, will not mean a thing to the troubled child who needs help today. Nor will they result in one penny's saving in our annual crime bill and in the funds we pay out each year for prisons. We can make a bold, realistic attack on our shameful school situation, or we can drift along and hope somehow things won't get too far out of hand. The choice is up to us.

What about housing and juvenile delinquency? We have all heard over and over again that slums breed delinquency and crime. That statement, of course, is not literally true. Some of our finest citizens were born and raised in slum areas, but those Horatio Alger stories are the exception, not the rule. The fact is that a disproportionately large number of delinquents do come from slum areas. All children—some more than others—are affected by the sights and sounds to which they are exposed every day. We know that slums have a demoralizing effect on the kind and quality of home life, and we know that they expose children daily to examples of every kind of vice and crime and to the kind of distorted values that make the neighborhood hoodlum the local hero.

We need more slum clearance and more low-cost public housing—a need that is not being met by private builders because other types of home building are more profitable. Here again, we have a choice—are we willing to vote local bond issues or spend Federal funds to wipe out squalid slums and provide better housing, or are we going to spend that money to pay the cost of adult crime and to try to punish or rehabilitate adult offenders.

Treatment services and facilities, including detention homes and after-care services, were found in our hearings to be one of the weakest links in the chain of rehabilitation for juveniles. It is incredible, but true, that so many communities still seem to expect that if they put a delinquent boy behind four walls in an institution lacking adequate facilities and staff, and that if they keep him there for a period of months, by some miracle he will be rehabilitated. Too often, exactly the opposite happens. Yet, every year, over 100,000 boys and girls are confined in ordinary jails with older and hardened criminals as their companions 24 hours a day. Other institutions for the rehabilitation of youngsters are sorely overtaxed, and nationwide there is a severe

shortage of trained personnel to care for such youngster.

Another major problem in the field of delinquency, our committee discovered, lies in the whole complex area of the authority of the juvenile courts and their relationship to probation officers and welfare agencies. I am sure that this was discussed in detail in your sessions yesterday, but I would like to add just one thought. Our committee found an impossible state of confusion in the laws relating to children and the family. For example, we asked numerous juvenile and domestic relations judges to define the legal status of a child who is committed to a training school. What rights remain to the child's parents—what are their obligations? Can a training-school superintendent decide to place a child in a foster home, or must the consent of the parents be secured? The amazing answer was received was: They just don't know; the law isn't clear. In the field of family law—a field that affects the day-to-day lives of so many people—why have we not devoted more thought to codification and restatements of the law? I think this conference could perform a tremendous service if it were to set in motion a real effort for such a codification and restatement.

Another service to youth demanding immediate attention is the area of mental health. Our committee heard considerable testimony as to the value of mental-health clinics in preventing juvenile delinquency. It is estimated that from 10 to 20 percent of the young people who will appear before the juvenile courts this year—and there will be four to five hundred thousand of them—will be in need of residential care under the supervision of a psychiatrist. The emotionally disturbed child can often be saved for a happy and productive life in society if his problems are noted early enough and treatment is promptly available. But all too often, the testimony revealed, treatment is available only after many months of waiting. This is another field in which Federal assistance is needed, and, to this end, I have joined with a number of other Senators in sponsoring legislation to provide for an objective, thorough, and nationwide analysis and reevaluation of the human and economic problems of mental illness by qualified nongovernmental groups. This study should result in a well-knit body of knowledge that will be of incalculable value to us in the study of the mental-health problem.

Another major concern to our committee is the tremendous gap that exists between the amount of money required and the amount actually available for family welfare work, for education, psychiatric treatment, parole work, court work, and recreational facilities. The problem here is so basic that we have to face up to the fact that lack of adequate funds will hamper our efforts to combat juvenile delinquency for some time to come. I have repeatedly said, and I firmly believe, that the emphasis in the delinquency fight must be placed upon local endeavor, but there are many areas—some of which I have mentioned today—where Federal participation is essential. I might say, in this connection, that not a single witness who appeared before our committee nor a single one of the thousands of people who wrote to us suggested that any of the Federal services now in effect be curtailed or discontinued. Rather, the majority expressed a desire for expanded Federal activity.

Now you may say—and I certainly concur—that most of the recommendations we have made will cost money. You can't build schools and clear slums and train personnel and provide additional services with good intentions. These things cost money—and so does crime. For the year 1954, the crime bill of our Nation was $20 billion. This is the appalling figure presented by J. Edgar Hoover when he testified before Congress. This amount would buy 100 supersize aircraft carriers. It represents a cost of $495 for each family in the United States. For every dollar we spend on education, we spend $1.82 on crime. For every dollar contributed to all the churches in America, we spend $10 on crime. In fact, if we combined all the contributions of all Americans to all charities, we would find that crime costs twice that amount. How shortsighted, then, to think that a dollar lopped off our educational budget is a dollar saved.

In all of this, we must remember that delinquency is a product of our very complex society and of the conflicts and tensions that surround all of us all of the time. We must keep ever in mind that there is no one simple solution—that the answer is not to be found merely in more recreational facilities, or in better housing, or in more institutions, or, for that matter, in psychiatric care, although all of these measures are important and will help alleviate the problem. Competition between gangs reflects the sharp social and economic competition in our general culture. Gang fights between children of various ethnic groups reflects the antagonisms and prejudices of adults in a society that preaches democracy for all, but, all too often, practices discrimination against some because of their membership in racial, national, or religious groups. In the final analysis, this problem is a symptom of the weaknesses in our whole moral and social fabric. The responsibility falls upon all of us, for it is the delinquent family, the delinquent community, the delinquent society that breeds a delinquent child—children are not born delinquent.

We do know that delinquent behavior is usually rooted in the home in early deprivation and neglect, and by this, I mean emotional and spiritual deprivation as well as physical. As parents, we must strive to maintain the kind of home life where, irrespective of economic circumstances, our children will feel the warmth of love and affection, will feel that they are an integral part of the family unit and are wanted and understood. We must look also to our churches and to our schools to help impart to our children a feeling of security, a feeling that they really belong.

What can we here in Missouri do?

One of our committee's major findings was the almost complete lack of coordination among agencies interested in the problem. In many areas we found no machinery whatsoever geared to cope with the problem of juvenile delinquency. What you are doing here, today, in this conference, represents one of the most constructive steps in fighting this problem. The coordination and cooperation represented here should be carried on, not only within the State, but by maintaining a liaison with the Senate committee and with other Federal, State, community, and national and local private agencies in the field. Out of this conference can come the leadership not only for groups throughout our State, but for other States. You can keep public attention focused on the problem. I don't suggest sensationalism. The true picture of juvenile crime is altogether too sensational. It is that bad.

Here are some other suggestions that have come out of our committee study: Each police force should have at least one man and woman, and larger cities should have a squad, specially trained in handling juveniles.

Each community should investigate its own detention facilities for young people. They should not be confined indiscriminately with adults.

Physical and psychological examinations should be given to every youngster who comes into serious trouble with the law.

All courts should have an adequate probation staff, and I want to stress here, that we should make sure the caseload does not negate any efficient operation of the system. We should also work out better systems of cooperation between the courts and the social agencies.

We should establish and adhere to fresh, modern standards for institutional care that will insure that training schools are a place for juvenile rehabilitation; not a place for training criminals.

Is the problem so broad, are the efforts and the funds required so great that the situation is hopeless? I heartily reject such a defeatist attitude. We must have the courage and the will to begin where we are, just as did the men who drained the swamps to combat malaria, long before DDT was discovered, just as did Sister Elizabeth Kenny, long before Dr. Jonas Salk found his wonderful vaccine. We can never look forward to finding a DDT or a vaccine to prevent delinquency, but we can, like those courageous citizens, begin where we are.

I realize this is no small order. But this is Missouri. And in Missouri we have the courage, and the heart, and the will to do the job.

Hon. L. Mendel Rivers Honored

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES P. RICHARDS

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 23, 1955

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I insert an article from the Charleston (S. C.) News and Courier of May 17 concerning the festivities at L. MENDEL RIVERS Day in Charleston on May 16.

It is good to know that the people of the First South Carolina District appreciate the outstanding service rendered his district and the Nation by our colleague, MENDEL RIVERS. It has been said that "a prophet is not without honor save in his own country." Rivers Day proves that that is not always the case.

The article follows:

Armed Forces Week started here yesterday with what turned out to be an L. MENDEL RIVERS Day, honoring the Charleston Congressman who is one of this Nation's greatest supporters of the military services.

The words were those of Joseph P. Riley in introducing Mr. RIVERS at a giant luncheon in the Francis Marion Hotel. Arranged by 7 service clubs of the area, it was attended by 457 persons. Included were top echelon Army, Navy, Marine and Air Corps personnel, and civic leaders in all walks of life.

Each service club had a part in the program.

Paul Quattlebaum, Jr., chairman of the Chamber of Commerce Military Affairs Committee, was master of ceremonies. The Reverend Ralph S. Meadowcroft, president of Rotary, pronounced an invocation, after the 6th Naval District Band played the national anthem.

Mr. Meadowcroft first asked 10 seconds of silent tribute to the memory of Gen. Charles P. Summerall, former president of the Citadel, who died Saturday in Washington. He then said two prayers: one for the men and women of the armed services, another for the Nation's men in authority.

The program centered entirely around Mr. RIVERS. He was introduced by Mr. Riley as president of the Lion Club and the response was by T. Frank Simmonite, president of the Charleston Exchange Club.

Harold A. Petit, president of the chamber of commerce, then read a number of tributes to Mr. RIVERS, including letters and telegrams from such persons as Charles E. Wilson, Secretary of Defense, Robert T. Stevens, Secretary of the Army, Adms. Arthur Radford and Robert B. Carney and Gen. Matthew B. Ridgway. All members of the South Carolina delegation in the National House of Representatives also sent tributes to their First Congressional District colleague, and other expressions came from civic and business leaders. The entire collection, mounted in glassine pages in a heavy leather case, was presented to Mr. RIVERS.

Civilian honor guests were next introduced by Julius E. Burges, president of Kiwanis, and military guests were presented by Herbert N. Steinert, vice president of the Uptown Exchange Club. The latter represented commanding officers of all Charleston area and Lowcountry installations, including the Parris Island Marine Base.

Final tribute was presentation to Mr. RIVERS of a handsome silver tray, appropriately engraved. This was done by Richardson M. Hanckel, president of Sertoma.

In addition to expressing his thanks, Mr. RIVERS' address was a general discussion of the military services and their problems, with which he has been connected closely as a member of the Armed Service Committee of the House of Representatives.

He emphasized the great size of military expenditures—65 cents, he said, of every tax dollar—and the deadly nature of war in an atomic age.

"Our armed services have got to be smart," he said. "They play a deadly game."

In two occasions he departed from a prepared text to make side comments on items which have figured recently in the news.

Taking note of disclosure that some of the armed services are heavily overstocked on foodstuffs—including enough hamburger in the Navy, one story has said, to last some 400 years—Mr. RIVERS said the services have to be prepared for any eventuality: "I would rather they had too much than too little."

Of recent cutbacks in the Armed Forces personnel, including an attempt by President Eisenhower to stabilize manpower on a permanent basis just short of 3 million men and women Mr. RIVERS said: "If anybody knows manpower problems, Dwight D. Eisenhower is the man. If he doesn't, nobody does. There have been peaks and valleys in armed services manpower which have been unconscionably costly. If manpower can be stabilized, then we can plan intelligently."

"The world," Mr. RIVERS said, "has seen more dramatic changes in the techniques of warfare in the last 20 years than was witnessed in the 5,000 preceding years. To cope with fantastic developments, amazing discoveries, requires a new type of individual in our Armed Forces.

"Today we have electronics specialists, nuclear physicists, radar experts, sonar operators, engineers fully versed in the problems of supersonic speeds, experts in the defense against biological warfare, men trained in the highly complex field of guided missiles, submariners who are conversant with atomic power—all performing duties unheard of 20 years ago.

"So when you see a member of our Armed Forces today you are not looking at a young man who has merely acquired the simple attributes of a sailor, or a soldier, or a marine, or an airman. You are looking at an individual who must be conversant with weapons and equipment, and techniques that were unknown to mankind 25 or 30 years ago. The intellectual level of our Armed Forces has necessarily increased. We demand more and more from our young servicemen and thus they are entitled to even greater respect and admiration from every American citizen.

"They must be prepared to fight a conventional war or a nuclear war. They must be prepared to combat hydrogen bombs, atom bombs, biological warfare, and all of the newest devices that are capable of destroying. This is a double burden.

"Now we hear a great deal about waste and duplication in our Armed Forces. And we all hate waste just as we are all opposed to sin. But I would caution you against the specious remedy of consolidation, that is usually proposed in the guise of eliminating waste and duplication. There is oftentimes a fine line of distinction between duplication and competition and if we eliminate competition because it involves some bits of duplication, we may be playing with the fate of our Nation.

"We are undergoing a reduction in strength today in our Armed Forces. Next year the end-strength of the Armed Forces is estimated to be 2,859,000 men and women. On December 31, 1954, we had an armed force of 3,180,000 men and women. There, of course, is a savings in manpower and a savings in dollars. Unfortunately, there are few people in the world who are competent to estimate exactly what strength we must maintain to be sure of safety. Obviously, it is better to err on the side of too many, than it is to err on the side of too few. If those who have been trained for the greater part of their lives in the strategy of war can assure us that our commitments can be maintained and the defense of this Nation guaranteed on a force of 2,859,000 men, then it must abide by their decision. In announcing this estimated end-strength for next year, the President has also indicated that for the foreseeable future this strength will not be materially diminished. Thus for the first time in the history of the United States we are entering into a long-range military program of a predetermined size which augurs well for our own security. It means that the days of valleys and peaks are a thing of the past. It will permit orderly planning and orderly procurement."

Federal Aid To Libraries

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VICTOR A. KNOX

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 23, 1955

Mr. KNOX. Mr. Speaker, on Wednesday, May 25, the House Committee on Education and Labor will start hearings on several bills introduced in Congress and referred to the committee to determine what action Congress should pursue in Federal aid to libraries.

I am greatly interested in this program, as I represent a rural area consisting of 16 counties in northern Michigan.

In Michigan at present we have 835,000 persons who are without public library service. However, Michigan has not been derelict in meeting its obligation for library service. State aid to libraries was established in Michigan in 1937 and has continued with appropriations annually since that date; however, we do have this area where no library service exists. This has been brought about mainly by the rapid growth in population and the question of libraries is unsolved.

Michigan Library Service is attempting, at this time, to develop a five county regional library in Grand Traverse, Benzie, Antrim, Leelanau, and Kalkaska Counties. This new service would serve approximately 90,000 people.

I, therefore, recommend favorable consideration of legislation which would bring Federal aid to States where there are areas without public library service. My colleague, the distinguished gentlewoman from Michigan's Ninth Congressional District, Miss THOMPSON, joins me in this request.

An Un-American Labor Practice Which Should Be Curbed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL E. MUNDT

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 23, 1955

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD excerpts from an address which I delivered this morning before the Rock Creek Women's Republican Club, in which I touched on a developing situation which, in my opinion, should command the prompt attention of all liberty-loving Americans. I desire to call this to the attention of the Congress and the country through the insertion of a news release covering my address.

Federal and State laws protect stockholders of corporations from having their resources dissipated by business leaders through contributions to political campaigns in support of candidates selected by these top business officials. Unfortunately, it appears that Federal and State laws are ineffectual in providing the same protection for workers belonging to labor unions whose leaders frequently impose contributions upon union members for use in political campaigns, even though the individual worker may prefer some opposing candidate. Obviously, this is an un-American and an unjustified use of labor-union authority.

The State of Wisconsin last week approved legislation barring these practices. By State and Federal legislation the freedom of the laboring man to support only such candidates as he individually prefers should be restored.

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

EXCERPTS FROM AN ADDRESS DELIVERED MONDAY MORNING BEFORE THE ROCK CREEK WOMEN'S REPUBLICAN CLUB IN WOODWARD & LOTHROP AUDITORIUM, BETHESDA-CHEVY CHASE BRANCH

WASHINGTON, D. C., May 23.—Speaking before the Rock Creek Women's Republican Club here this morning, Senator KARL E. MUNDT, Republican, of South Dakota, urged the assembled women to "use the vantage point of your location here in our National Capital to warn American women everywhere that the great crusade they led in 1952 in electing President Eisenhower must be climaxed by even greater efforts in 1956 in

order to preserve the peace and protect the new moral tone in Government and overall prosperity which have come as dividends from the last Republican victory."

Senator MUNDT warned the women of a "growing menace to freedom" which he said, "is hidden in the increasing tendency of labor bosses in powerful unions to invoke the tyranny of taxation without representation upon their members by forcing them to make involuntary political contributions by the check-off system to campaign war chests created for the purpose of electing leftwing Democrats to office."

The South Dakota Senator continued, "With the sly approval and secret urging of certain national Democratic officials, the recent merger of the AFL and CIO labor organizations is being employed to expand the un-American practice of forcing union members to pay out portions of their hard-earned dollars for the use of big labor bosses in the selection and election of New Deal and leftwing Democrats in State and National campaigns. Like nazism and communism, this pernicious practice denies laboring people their rights of free choice. It makes them captives of the political party they are forced to support with their earnings even though by their votes they frequently prefer to vote for the very candidates their earnings are being taxed to defeat.

"This new menace to freedom has grown so great that such States as Wisconsin, Ohio, Michigan and several others are already considering legislation to make compulsory contributions to political campaigns illegal and other progressive States are certain to pass legislation protecting their people against such perniciously un-American practices. Southern Democrats would do well to join Republicans and all liberty-loving Americans in supporting legislation designed to prevent a labor monopoly from employing strong-arm methods and unlimited campaign war chests to bludgeon and batter the American political climate under the control of power-hungry labor bosses.

"Even the most casual study of the financial records filed with the Clerk of the House of Representatives in the last election gives a startling and shocking picture of the alarming degree to which labor unions have been using vast sums of money to control public elections. It is futile to discuss improvements in our campaign methods and legislation unless we take steps to keep American elections free from this unholy marriage between labor bosses in big cities and the leftwing Democratic officials who work with them to control conventions as well as primary and general elections. Freedom of the ballot must once again be made to mean freedom to decide individually which candidates and which parties, if any, a voter may desire to support with his personal funds."

International Trade Centers in the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 23, 1955

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, the introduction of House Resolution 237 "creating a select committee to conduct an investigation and study of methods of promoting the establishment and improvement of international trade centers, trade fairs and expositions in the United States" was impelled by the overwhelming response to my bill, H. R. 5301, which I have received, and the further confirmation of my convictions that the establishment of an International Trade Commission is vital to the creation of international trading posts within our country, where foreign and domestic traders can meet together.

The time element in world travel is being so reduced that it is now practical for foreign buyers to do their business in this country, as well as to see such an assortment and wide selection of American products as it would be impossible for us to send abroad.

The recent Inter-American Investment Conference in New Orleans during March of this year demonstrated that the foreigner will come to our trade centers, when there is a real reason, and where we have proper foreign trade facilities.

The letters I have received from an eminent cross section of thought in America connected with our industry, and its promotion, both at home and abroad, has borne out my judgment in presenting bill H. R. 5301. Not only have, with two exceptions, these letters been enthusiastic, but they have even waxed poetic. The expressions of opinion from abroad, both personal and in the press, have further added to my resolution of pressing the passage of my bill. Possible replies to my letters have run about 85 percent.

The reactions to my bill have been so favorable that I felt we should begin, immediately, to assemble the most experienced thought in this country, so as to lay a groundwork for the operations of a future International Trade Commission as well as to satisfy the Congress that my request for a $100 million revolving fund was within the realm of reason. I can substantiate this sum, but have certain doubts as to whether the House Appropriations Committee would accept my bare word, without broad and experienced confirmation. Hence my suggestion that we begin assembling the available facts, as soon as possible.

The investigations and studies of a select committee can be of real assistance to the President's program for Government participation in foreign international trade fairs, as well as the United States participation in the Brussels Universal and International Exposition of 1958, where the Belgian Government intends to spend some $200 million in connection with this exposition, which will only last 6 months, although Brussels will get some fine permanent buildings as a result of the exposition. Should we not advance sums, which will be repaid, toward the establishment of permanent centers and other media for the furtherance of our international trade, at home, when one of the smaller nations can spend such a sum for a temporary manifestation?

I regard our participations in foreign international trade fairs and the Brussels Exposition as feeders to the foreign trade media, which my bill, H. R. 5301, is intended to provide in the United States. They are really our salesmen abroad, for the enhancement of our dignity and prestige, and in addition to stimulating our trade throughout the world, have the important mission of bringing the foreigner to our shores, where he can see how these United States really live and function in their daily life and pursuits. Here he can do business in a real American atmosphere, the contacts with which will advance international understanding and help us forward on the rugged road to permanent peace.

Grand Rapids, Mich., Armed Forces Day Exposition

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GERALD R. FORD, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 23, 1955

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, it was my privilege last Friday evening to present Gen. Lemuel G. Shepherd, Jr., Commandant of the Marine Corps, to an audience of 3,000 at the Grand Rapids, Mich., Armed Forces Day Exposition. This exposition was in celebration of Armed Forces Day and of Michigan Week.

On Friday our people gave special attention to the noble heritage which has been bequeathed us, and to all that is being done to preserve and protect that heritage.

General Shepherd spoke of our military strength and its power for peace.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the address of General Shepherd and my own remarks in presenting him:

INTRODUCTION OF GEN. LEMUEL C. SHEPHERD, JR., COMMANDANT, THE MARINE CORPS, BY REPRESENTATIVE GERALD R. FORD, JR., ARMED FORCES DAY, GRAND RAPIDS, MICH., MAY 20, 1955

Mr. Chairman, it is indeed an honor to be able to participate in this Armed Forces Day Exposition in Grand Rapids, my hometown. And, ladies and gentlemen, it is well that this event occurs during Michigan Week, and on our Michigan Heritage Day, for "I'm glad to live in Michigan." It is a State of which we all may be proud, the arsenal of democrary, the powerhouse of victory, a mighty weapon for peace.

Michigan has a long and noble heritage, and Michigan has been foremost among the States in doing what needs to be done to make our country and our heritage secure against any danger from the Godless, atheistic, Communist forces that seek to destroy us. And, my friends, standing between our heritage and every potential danger since our Nation was born, has been the United States Marines. We are highly honored this evening, on the eve of Armed Forces Day, and on Michigan's Heritage Day, to have in our midst the Commandant of the Marine Corps, Gen. Lemuel C. Shepherd, Jr., the first of the Marines.

It is now 150 years since our land, this soil of the Chippewas, the Ottawas, and the Potawatomies became the Territory of Michigan. In that century and a half, through diligent use of its natural resources, and the effective application of its human knowledge and skill, a State of 7 million people has evolved as the arsenal of democracy and as a mighty power for peace.

In our recent conflicts the bulk of Michigan's war production was accounted for by the automobile industry and its skilled and conscientious workers. Yet it was only 59 years ago on March 6, 1896 that the first successful car built in Detroit appeared on the streets of that thriving and dynamic city. Just 1 month before, on February 10, there was born at Norfolk, Va., the man who is today Commandant of the Marine Corps.

In 1917, 5 days after the declaration of war, Lemuel Shepherd was commissioned a second lieutenant. In 1917, our Camp Custer was built at Battle Creek, and Michigan's factories began to turn out the all important Liberty engines, tanks, trucks and shells.

In France, Lieutenant Shepherd was twice wounded at Belleau Wood, and in 1918, for the third time was wounded in the Meuse-Argonne offensive. Michigan-Wisconsin's 32d Division, the Red Arrow, was there too, and its officers and men won 134 Distinguished Service Crosses. Back home, our civilians in Michigan exceeded their quota in the Second Liberty Loan drive by over 140 percent.

In 1928 Captain Shepherd was on duty in China, and Michigan elected to the United States Senate for the first time, our revered and beloved fellow citizen, Arthur H. Vandenberg, of Grand Rapids. During the following year, while Captain Shepherd was a student at the Marine Corps School, the completion of Ambassador Bridge between Canada and the United States expressed two nations' lasting friendship.

Promoted to lieutenant colonel in 1936, our speaker was assigned to the Naval War College at Newport, R. I. The same year in Michigan the UAW-CIO was organized to promote the cause of workmen in the automobile and related industries.

War clouds were again hanging heavily in 1940, and the 32d Division was again mobilized. Many here this evening can well remember how GI after GI marched off to Camp Beauregard. Undoubtedly there are many in the audience tonight who marched with them in the cause of freedom. In 1942, the 32d Division landed in south Australia and New Guinea, and Colonel Shepherd assumed command of the 9th Marine Regiment. In 1943, the Red Arrow Division was back in New Guinea, and Brigadier General Shepherd was helping to dig out the enemy on Guadalcanal. The next year found the 32d Division on Leyte and Luzon, while General Shepherd was leading his brigade in the invasion and recapture of Guam.

Back in Michigan, the MacArthur locks were jammed, bow to stern, at the Soo. Eighty-five percent of the vitally essential iron ore required by American industry passed through this crucial waterway. At Willow Run, 18 powerful bombers were coming off the production line every 24 hours, and the tank arsenal at Detroit turned out General Grants, General Shermans, and General Pershings at the rate of 1,000 a month. And then victory.

In 1945, General Shepherd received the surrender of the Japanese in the area of Tsingtau, China, and Michigan's Senator Vandenberg helped frame the charter of the United Nations to preserve and protect that peace.

Five years later our honored guest was in command of the Fleet Marine Forces in the Pacific with duties which carried him with our troops to Korea during our head-on struggle against the diabolical forces of Soviet Russia and Red China. On January 1, 1952, he was appointed Commandant of the Marine Corps. We are happy, General Shepherd, to welcome you to our State, which during the past 4 years has supplied for the defense of this Nation nearly $9 billion worth of military hardware.

Michigan's arsenal, like the United States Marine Corps, and all the Armed Forces, exists only for the protection of that great heritage which, under God, is ours to have and to hold. General Shepherd, I have the distinct honor of presenting you, a great patriot, to my friends in Michigan, and at the same time introduce my fellow-Michiganders to you.

Ladies and gentlemen, the first of the marines, Gen. Lemuel C. Shepherd, Jr., Commandant.

REMARKS BY GEN. LEMUEL C. SHEPHERD, JR., COMMANDANT OF THE UNITED STATES MARINE CORPS, AT GRAND RAPIDS, MICH., ON ARMED FORCES DAY, MAY 20, 1955

I am both pleased and honored to be here to celebrate this Armed Forces Day with you.

This annual observance has developed into an event of major significance—because Armed Forces Day now symbolizes the bond which exists between the military forces of our Nation and the citizens whom we serve.

In particular, these occasions afford an opportunity for representatives of your armed services to meet directly with you—and to review the status of our national security and some of its problems.

In my own case, I am especially happy to be in Grand Rapids. From personal experience I am aware of the continuous and active attention given to national defense by the citizens of this community.

Furthermore, the strategic nature of this area, associates it closely with the basic elements of our national strength. Your great industrial capacity, coupled with excellent and varied transportation facilities, combine to make Grand Rapids of real importance to our defense.

There is also your direct and personal interest in military affairs which is manifested by the thousands from this vicinity who have and are serving in the various armed services.

You are, moreover, particularly fortunate in being represented in Washington by a man whose own distinguished record as a naval officer provides him with such insight into the complex problems of our national defense. I refer, of course, to Mr. GERALD R. FORD, JR., of the Fifth District.

We of the Marine Corps have a special interest in the Grand Rapids area since it provides some of the finest young men who enter our corps, and it is also the location of one of the elements of the Organized Marine Corps Reserve.

So you can see that my reasons for pleasure at being here are well founded. I have already been made to feel at home in your midst—and there is no need for me to request an interest, which is already so apparent on your part, in the subject of our national security.

On this sixth national Armed Forces Day, all Americans are provided a timely occasion to take a serious look at our preparation for defense. I am with you today for that purpose—not simply as Commandant of the Marine Corps, but as a representative of all the Armed Forces—the Army, Navy, and Air Force as well.

In this capacity, I would like first of all to discuss briefly some of the principal aspects of our defense program in terms of today, or the present. Following this, I wish to offer for your consideration certain basic principles which furnish guidance for future planning.

At the outset let me say that our greatest strength, our real source of security, lies—as it always has—in the intelligent and informal patriotism of the American people.

In any list of the factors of our national power, the awareness, responsibility and determination of our citizens constitute the key upon which all else depends.

I feel no need to describe for you the nature and extent of the threat that confronts us—and all free men—in the world today. Our free press, radio, television—indeed all of our news media—remind us daily of the relentless, determined and enduring efforts of international communism.

Following this knowledge, we as a Nation have been steadily advancing into a position of greater strength. There is ample evidence that in the crucible of three wars, we have at last really learned that freedom and strength are synonymous. Moreover, we have recognized that the father of this country spoke for the centuries when he said,

"If we desire to secure peace . . . it must be known that we are at all times ready for war."

Specifically, we have achieved the hard won realization that our national strength can no longer be sustained through intermittent effort. The individual citizen knows that the wisest course is the steady, consistent endeavor of preparedness for an indefinite period of time.

This understanding is our best hope for the future. And from it, despite some widespread gloomy forbodings, our country has in the last few years achieved defensive capabilities greater than ever before. And with each advance we have made, our aim of peace has been made more possible.

At this point I wish to say that I do not hold with those persons who believe that another catastrophic worldwide war is inevitable. Nor do I hold with those who think that such a war can be prevented simply by the renuniciation of war on the part of those who hate it.

In fact, there is little to choose from between those who would advocate preventive war and those who would put all their trust in the semantics of peace at any price or appeasement. Both groups are apostles of defeat. Historically, their divergent paths have led again and again to disaster.

Our best assurance, therefore, against losing our freedom and way of life lies in a posture of strength—always working for peace—but always being prepared for whatever sacrifices and risks that may confront us.

Working from this understanding, we have achieved a defense program that has resulted in a steady acquisition of enduring military power. Let me list for you some of our key achievements.

First, we have a strong retaliatory capability, and we are going to keep it strong. It is an instrument of infinite power and responsive to instant demand. We have a long-range Strategic Air Command without peer, and we have balanced naval task forces capable of projecting their power ashore wherever needed—unmatched by any other nation. In both of these vital elements we possess a capacity to counter large-scale aggression in a manner never before possible.

Second, we have strong land, sea, and air forces which can be used in a variety of situations and in the manner which special circumstances may require.

Most important, we are not placing undue reliance upon any one weapon or concept. We have not crippled ourselves by anticipating just one kind of war.

As a matter of fact, in recent years new definitions of warfare have evolved from the problems with which our military strategists have been confronted.

We have learned to distinguish clearly between two very different kinds of war; the all-out nuclear war, where the sky is the limit, and the so-called limited war, or cold war.

The all-out war needs no description—but the concept of limited war is something relatively new, something we have not faced before.

We have discovered—the hard way—that the cold war means not only war by proxy and by satellite, but that it includes propaganda, subversion, armed threats, political infiltration, and all the other Communist tactics with which we are familiar.

It is apparent, therefore, that we must be prepared for both kinds of warfare, if we are to avoid defeat which could come by either route. With this in mind, we are maintaining our military forces in a degree of preparedness and flexibility never before attempted as a long-range effort.

We have tactical air forces that can carry a great variety of weapons depending upon what the target requires. We have Army forces in being, equipped and ready to do their part in the accomplishment of military decisions when and where required. We have naval forces that can be tailored into balanced units capable of roaming three-fourths of the earth's surface and able to be exactly fitted to whatever special tasks may arise. We have a Marine Corps—3 divisions and 3 air wings strong—that is kept in instant readiness to move with the fleet to any part of the world where their striking power may be needed.

In short, we have a balanced, powerful Armed Forces team. It represents the greatest defense effort that our Nation has ever undertaken to maintain during a period when we were not actually engaged in a shooting war.

In the precarious and uncertain field of international relations, this fact enables our country to speak from strength instead of weakness.

Third in my list of achievements lies the fact that we have allies. Collectively, the free world has increased its ability to withstand Communist assault. To meet local aggression, a growing reliance can be placed on those allied forces now being strengthened in many parts of the world. At the same time, we stand ready with our forces to continue military assistance and cooperation with our friends. Thus, within admitted limits, the pattern of our own effort conforms to that of various members in several great alliances.

Fourth, we have in the United States an industry-science-military team which, in my opinion, presents an unbeatable combination.

We often hear of the disadvantage which confronts a free society in its need to match the efforts of a dictatorship which can ruthlessly regiment and exploit every resource available. I submit that the achievements of our American system have produced military strength of a kind impossible to a slave state.

To be sure, the Communists have a vast military machine. Certainly they have been able to produce atomic and hydrogen bombs. We must assume, moreover, that they are pressing with all possible speed toward the development of newer and even more effective weapons.

But here in America, a free science and a free industry are the partners, not the servants, of our military forces. Indeed, the services are themselves organized to utilize our national scientific, technological, and productive abilities. Science helps us to devise new weapons and new techniques. Industry makes them for us with speed and dispatch.

It is my firm conviction that no slave society, however ruthlessly administered, can ever in the long run match our system. Inevitably, communism must become the prisoner of its own mistakes.

So far I have been discussing some of our more important sources of military strength. These, of course, are based upon conditions that obtain today.

I would not wish you to believe that we have solved all our problems or that we have achieved absolute security and safety. Indeed, we should review our defensive power with mixed feelings.

We can derive satisfaction and assurance from the strength available to protect our way of life.

We can also be sobered by the contemplation of a modern weapons system in the hands of a callous, ruthless antagonist in the years which lie ahead. In a lawless world, we must be prepared for a fight—of varying proportions—at any time. And we must be prepared with weapons and techniques better than those which may be used against us.

This leads me to what I wish to say concerning the future.

No military man of any experience ever believes that he can see with absolute clarity into the years—or even the weeks—ahead. But there are certain basic principles which do give us some guidance.

We know by its very nature that the Communist threat must be an enduring one. No system that depends upon the acquisition of power for its continued existence, can ever voluntarily change its course or retreat from its fundamental objectives.

We also know that—in the long struggle that stretches out before us—we must press our every natural advantage if we are to survive. Constant vigilance and unremitting effort are to be a long term demand. All of our sources of strength must be utilized to the best and most efficient degree.

In this framwork is found a vital role for each of your Armed Forces.

Our Air Force, with its vast atomic capability, must continue to maintain a superiority that renders it a major deterrent to all-out war. In addition, it must defend our continental air space from aggression and it must continue to provide modern tactical air support of the Army ground forces.

The United States Army—as always—must continue to provide the major elements of those men who fight upon the ground. The men, I might point out, whose presence upon the ground of an enemy continue to represent an indispensable ingredient of military victory.

From the point of view of naval operations, the entire prospect of future strategy has been greatly altered by the realinement of the power balance between nations.

Today, the United States alone possesses adequate functional means for a comprehensive exercise of sea power. Only we have the balanced naval establishment that can fully control the oceans and the air above them—and this situation will obtain for the foreseeable future.

We are, therefore, not faced with the prospect of generating our naval power on the land—as in World War II—and applying it against the fleets of an antagonist on the high seas. Instead, defense of the free world requires that we have the capability of applying great naval power, generated from the sea, against a ponderous, landlocked antagonist—an opponent who is vulnerable the world around to attack from the ocean.

For the Marine Corps, this strategic reality has the deepest significance. It means that amphibious landing operations—our primary responsibility—must inevitably assume a greatly increased importance.

So long as we maintain our naval command of the seas—and the air above them—we are endowed with a form of power and flexibility not available to a continental enemy. It is an area of great superiority—one which if effectively exploited could be decisive.

But all these forces are not sufficient in themselves.

Military forces are at once the product and a measure of the society which they serve. In other words, the true strength of any country lies in the vigor and spirit of the citizens which compose it.

And herein, as I said before, lies the real power of our country.

Each one of us—as citizens—has an obligation and a responsibility in the organization for defense.

Every man who alines his own hopes and aspirations with those of his community—is making a fundamental contribution to the cause.

I am sure that all the citizens of Grand Rapids will agree with this.

In this world of 1955, nothing less than each individual's personal freedom and safety is at stake. And it is at stake 24 hours a day.

That freedom will never be lost, so long as we are willing to pay the price—in willingness to accept whatever sacrifices may be required—in willingness to devote any effort needed to the defense of the ideals we cherish.

That spirit, coupled with close understanding and teamwork between our Armed Forces and the American people—will generate the "Power for Freedom" we must have to defend our heritage of freedom; the heritage which remains the hope and inspiration of all mankind.

Historic Proposals for Cultural Interchange To Meet the Challenge of Communism—No. 1

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK THOMPSON, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 23, 1955

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, in recent weeks both William Randolph Hearst, Jr., and Gen. David Sarnoff have called for the greatest political offensive in history to win the cold war. In a brilliant speech before the National Press Club in Washington, D. C., on February 26, 1955, Mr. Hearst declared that—

> Preparedness alone will not win for us the battle of coexistence * * * the Western program of building armed strength should be widened into a more flexible and imaginative strategy for competitive coexistence with the Communists in every field and on every front.

Mr. Hearst went on to say that our reliance upon armed strength alone as our primary concern is permitting communism to take long strides forward in those fields which we have largely neglected. He pointed out that in Russia and the satellite countries—

> Sports, ballet, the theater, literature—all are shaped toward aiding communism's long-range scheme of world domination. Top artists know they are not only expected to perform, but to give their services at clinics where the plastic minds of youthful visitors can be influenced.

Mr. Hearst advocated the establishment of a permanent planning board commissioned to formulate a strategy on all fronts for meeting the challenge of competitive coexistence. This board should develop plans for getting the peoples of the world on our side. Sports, the theater, educational exchanges—no field should be neglected in this competition of the two conflicting systems.

In a memorandum presented to the White House on April 5, 1955, General Sarnoff, chairman of the board of the Radio Corporation of America, advocated the same strategy which Mr. Hearst urged earlier. He suggested the expenditure of up to $3 billion a year for the kind of political warfare which Mr. Hearst had in mind.

General Sarnoff stated in his memorandum that—

Before essaying a breakdown of cold-war methods and techniques, we should recognize that many of them are already being used, and often effectively. Nothing now underway needs to be abandoned. The problem is one of attaining the requisite magnitude, financing, coordination, and continuity—all geared to the long-range objectives of the undertaking.

The gentleman from California [Mr. ROOSEVELT], the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. REUSS], and I have introduced bills—H. R. 5724, H. R. 4893, and H. R. 5040—which would carry out some of the major proposals advanced by Mr. Hearst and General Sarnoff. These bills are before the Committee on Education and Labor of the House of Representatives.

I am happy to be able to say here that a subcommittee has just been established to consider these and the other bills before the committee calling for increased attention to our American arts and cultures and providing for a program of cultural interchange with foreign countries to meet the challenge of competitive coexistence with communism.

The chairman of the subcommittee is the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KELLEY]. With the challenging proposals of Mr. Hearst and General Sarnoff before us it is my hope that the hearings will be held quickly and that legislation meriting the support of my colleagues from both major parties will be reported to the floor in time for consideration by this Congress.

The administration's plan for the establishment of a Federal Advisory Commission on the Arts was recently introduced in the Congress by the gentleman from New York [Mr. WAINWRIGHT]. The text of the executive communication which accompanied the administration proposal is included here. It is expected that the administration proposal will also be considered by the subcommittee.

There is also included articles from the New York Herald Tribune and the New York Times on the cultural interchange program being carried on by the Department of State and the American National Theater and Academy. Title I of the bills I have mentioned, written by officials of the Department of State, is designed to make this program permanent, a program which is proving to be one of the finest and most important ambassadors our country has ever sent abroad. This program was given an appropriation of $2,500,000 by the 83d Congress at the request of the President.

It seems to me that what General Sarnoff has to say about not abandoning what is already underway, the problem, rather, being one of attaining the requisite magnitude, financing, coordination, and continuity, applies especially to the kind of program which the congressionally-chartered American National Theater and Academy is carrying on.

Senator LYNDON B. JOHNSON of Texas has called for the "greatest political offensive in history to win the cold war." Senator JOHNSON spoke at a meeting called to honor General Sarnoff and urged support for the general's plan for an all-out cold war against communism.

Now Senator ALEXANDER WILEY, ranking minority member of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, in an historic address given at the Wayne University student forum, in Detroit, Mich., has called for all-out support of the congressional proposals for cultural interchange and the rest of the Hearst-Sarnoff program.

The communication and articles follow:

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION, AND WELFARE,
Washington, February 8, 1955.

Hon. SAM RAYBURN,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Enclosed for your consideration is a draft of a bill to provide for the establishment of a Federal Advisory Commission on the Arts, and for other purposes. The proposal is designed to carry out the recommendation of the President, contained in his state of the Union message delivered to the Congress under date of January 6, 1955. In that message he said:

"In the advancement of the various activities which will make our civilization endure and flourish, the Federal Government should do more to give official recognition to the importance of the arts and other cultural activities. I shall recommend the establishment of a Federal Advisory Commission on the Arts within the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, to advise the Federal Government on ways to encourage artistic and cultural endeavor and appreciation."

Encouragement of the arts is a demonstration to itself and to others of a nation's belief in its spiritual resources and creative destiny. Throughout the great epochs of history, civilization has been importantly exemplified by masterworks of art and architecture, music and the dance, drama, and literature. Achievements in these fields represent, of course, one of the enduring criteria by which history appraises any nation.

The United States despite its relative youth is rich in artistic achievement. We have contributed new power of design in architecture, created new rhythms in music, and developed a literature which commands worldwide attention. In the theater and film, and in the ancient form of the dance we show a creative vitality. Our great museums, art galleries, and orchestras are a source of pride for our people. Yet there are many respects in which we lag behind other nations in the general position we accord to the arts in our society. For example, new ways should be sought to bring the enjoyment of and participation in the arts to more of our people. We should also find ways to develop individual talents in the arts. There are in our Nation many persons of talent and genius, whose gifts need the encouragement and recognition which persons in other comparable fields enjoy. Private organizations and individuals and public organizations, at both community and State levels, have provided strong support for the arts, and that is as it should be. On the other hand, our National Government has not lent its encouragement and prestige to the arts to the extent that is desirable.

The enclosed draft legislative proposal would provide for a Federal Advisory Commission on the Arts which would undertake studies of, and make recommendations related to, appropriate methods for encouragement of creative activity in the performance and practice of the arts and of participation in and appreciation of the arts. Such studies would be conducted by special committees of persons, expert in the particular field of art involved. After considering reports on these studies, the Commission would make recommendations in writing to the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare. In the selection of subjects to be studied and in the formulation of recommendations the Commission would obtain the advice of interested and qualified persons and organizations.

Federal encouragement of the arts should go forward in accordance with the traditional principles which the American people believe should guide the relationship of their National Government to them. The draft legislation therefore recognizes three essential governing principles: (a) that the growth and flourishing of the arts depend upon freedom, imagination, and individual initiative; (b) that the encouragement of creative activity in the performance and practice of the arts, and of a widespread participation in and appreciation of the arts, promote the general welfare and is in (the) national interest; (c) that the encouragement of the arts, while primarily a matter for private and local initiative, is an appropriate matter of concern to the United States Government.

The proposed legislation creating the Federal Advisory Commission on the Arts would not supersede the laws or orders vesting certain authority in the Commission of Fine Arts, and the draft bill has been prepared in consultation with that Commission.

We shall appreciate it if you will be good enough to refer the enclosed bill to the proper committee for consideration.

We are advised by the Bureau of the Budget that enactment of the proposed legislation would be in accord with the program of the President.

Sincerely yours,

OVETA CULP HOBBY,
Secretary.

[From the New York Times of May 23, 1955]

SYMPHONY OF AIR ENDS JAPAN VISIT—ORCHESTRA IS HAILED FOR BUILDING GOOD OPINION OF UNITED STATES ON FAR EAST TOUR

By William J. Jorden

TOKYO, May 22.—The Symphony of the Air, formerly Arturo Toscanini's NBC Symphony, will end this week a triumphant 3-week tour of Japan.

Through a series of concerts here and in other major cities, the orchestra undoubtedly has done much to raise Japan's opinion of the United States and to create good feeling.

Performances of the orchestra have won highest critical praise in the Japanese press. There was also a surprising display of enthusiasm from intellectuals and students, the groups who were inclined to be most critical of America and its "materialistic culture."

"I do not believe there have been any musicians from abroad who ever so successfully grasped the heart strings of the Japanese people as did the Symphony of the Air," one critic wrote.

When tickets for the concerts went on sale hopeful music lovers began to line up at box offices as much as a day and a half in advance. Young students and musicians bundled themselves in quilts and slept on the ground rather than lose their chance to hear the symphony, the first to visit Japan since the end of the war.

Thousands of Japanese have been unable to attend 1 of the symphony's 16 scheduled concerts. Tickets bought by scalpers sold for as much as $50, more than most Japanese make in a month.

FREE CONCERTS GIVEN

For the benefit of many others who could not get tickets, including American servicemen at air bases such as Misawa and Tachikawa, the orchestra has given free and unscheduled concerts. Yesterday, the Symphony of the Air played in Tokyo's Hibiya Park, where thousands of young Japanese were able to hear them for only 100 yen (about 25 cents).

After its final appearance in Japan on Tuesday, the orchestra will fly to Korea for both military and civilian concerts and then to Okinawa, where it will play twice for the American Armed Forces and their families. It was announced today that the symphony's Far Eastern tour had been extended 2 weeks and that it would play in Bangkok, Singapore, Colombo, and Kuala Lumpur as well as at Manila and Hong Kong.

The Asian tour of the Symphony of the Air is sponsored by the International Exchange Program operating through the American National Theater and Academy. The Japanese newspaper Mainichi was cosponsor of the orchestra's tour in Japan.

[From the New York Herald Tribune of May 8, 1955]

ARTS PROVE GOOD ENVOY IN BUSY ANTA PROGRAM

(By Paul V. Beckley)

The ambassadorial work of American culture abroad will reach its greatest peak this summer when the international exchange program of ANTA alone will send or take a hand in sending 610 musicians, actors, singers, and dancers to most of the nations of the world. For the first time 3 of this country's major symphony orchestras will go abroad, 2 to Europe and 1 to the Orient.

The symphonic visit to the Orient is already a fact, because the Symphony of the Air made its Tokyo debut—the first American orchestra ever to appear there—on Tuesday night and proved a thorough success. The Tokyo enthusiasts stood in line in front of the box office for 24 hours, and 2 hours after it opened all seats had been sold for the orchestra's 3 performances.

THE MANAGER

General manager of this exchange program is a dark-haired, quick-talking expert in the theatrical business, Robert C. Schnitzer. Mr. Schnitzer stepped to one side of the "series of overlapping crises" which the program naturally entails, long enough to offer some explanations, definitions and statistics.

This summer the program is involved to some degree in the appearances overseas of the New York Philharmonic-Symphony, Philadelphia Orchestra, Ballet Theater, New York City Ballet, and the Symphony of the Air and the Sauter-Finegan Band, as well as the companies which will produce Oklahoma!, Medea, and The Skin of Our Teeth.

RUSSIANS ARE BUSY

The importance of all this cannot be overestimated in terms of good will generated in favor of this country. Mr. Schnitzer pointed out that the Soviet Union has spent $3 million in the last 2 years sending its own artists abroad "as propaganda pure and simple" and then he added, "not so pure, perhaps."

It might be noted that the Soviet effort in this field is not so "simple," either, but is actually a smart play for international prestige in the minds of people who hold such artistic efforts in high esteem. Although willing enough, perhaps, to enjoy an American soft drink or reap the advantages an American tractor may afford, they are more disposed by reason of cultural traditions to reserve their applause for a pas de deux, a Beethoven sonata or—as has been demonstrated—a Porgy and Bess.

Neither Mr. Schnitzer nor anyone else in the program looks on it as a piece of nationalistic propaganda. Although the results may serve that purpose, these displays of this country's spiritual, esthetic and emotional side is mainly intended for what it is—self-expression.

In 1950 the program handled the administration for the Ballet Theater when it became the first American company to make a European tour. But in 1951 came the first large Government allotment. The foreign ministers of America, France and Great Britain had met the previous summer and concluded it would be nice to give a festival in West Berlin when the Russians planned their youth rally in the eastern sector.

This first attempt came off very nicely. ANTA sent over Oklahoma!, Judith Anderson in Medea, the Hall Johnson Negro Choir, Juilliard String Quartet, Angna Enters, the dance mime, and Astrid Varnay (who sang with the Berlin Opera). An RCA-TV group went along, too, to show the Germans what television was doing over here, and put sets in a hundred shopwindows in the Kurfurstendam district. Also in the Potsdamer Platz, where the western sector meets the eastern, they erected a theater-size screen. When they televised Oklahoma!, there were riots in the Platz when 20,000 East Germans tried to get across the border to see it.

HOW IT WORKS

Administratively, the program begins when an American group submits a plan for a foreign tour. Mr. Schnitzer takes it up with 1 of 3 advisory panels of experts on the dance, music, and drama. Nothing further happens unless they agree the project under consideration will best represent the artistic activity of this country.

With the panel approval, Mr. Schnitzer goes to work with the manager of the group involved, setting up a tentative schedule and budget. He looks into the interest shown in the area to be visited.

LAST SAY BY COMMITTEE

The final decision is in the hands of a committee with representatives from the State Department, the United States Information Agency, Defense Department, Foreign Operations Administration, and a few others. "So far," Mr. Schnitzer said, "they've not turned us down on anything we've presented." In addition, they have not and Mr. Schnitzer said they will not force anything on ANTA that its artistic panels opposed. "Anyone saying one can't get Government subsidies without political controls has been disproved," he observed.

Historic Proposals for Cultural Interchange To Meet the Challenge of Communism—No. 2

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK THOMPSON, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 23, 1955

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I include here a brilliant and historic speech by Senator ALEXANDER WILEY, senior Republican of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, which he delivered at the Wayne University Student Forum, Detroit, Mich., on Thursday, May 19, 1955:

THE NEW CHALLENGES OF "COMPETITIVE COEXISTENCE" A PROPOSED THREEFOLD UNITED STATES OFFENSIVE FOR PEACE

(Address by Hon. ALEXANDER WILEY (Republican, of Wisconsin), senior Republican, Senate Foreign Relations Committee, at Wayne University student forum, Detroit, Mich., Thursday, May 19, 1955)

The most important single challenge in the world today is for the free world successfully to combat the new and old strategy and tactics of the Soviet Union, aimed at world domination.

I should like to propose a threefold United States peaceful offensive, designed to fulfill this challenge, an offensive which will entail—invincible United States military preparation—an intensified United States cultural, propaganda effort—and all-out support of effective Eisenhower-Dulles diplomacy. Now, what of the Soviet counterchallenge—new and old?

THE OLD STALINIST APPROACH

The old tactic was, of course, the belligerent, tough unyielding Stalinist approach.

It included naked, direct aggression, such as the brutal invasion of the Republic of Korea. It includes formenting internal civil war, with full outside aid, such as the long and bloody civil war in Indo-China—a war which only ostensibly ended with the Geneva Peace Conference. It included unceasing, worldwide revolutionary agitation, including stirring up of the ferment of nationalism and racialism among under-developed peoples against the Western powers.

THE SOVIET'S NEW MASK

Most of these phases continue. The new tactic of international communism has changed only somewhat. There is only a partial new mask on the Kremlin. It is the mask of "peaceful coexistence," or, as it is sometimes called, competitive coexistence."

But the worldwide revolutionary agitation does continue. The night-and-day espionage, the sabotage, the sedition, the treason by Red Trojan horsemen—throughout the world persist.

What has altered, however, is the previous bluntness, directness, and crudity of Soviet external relations. Moscow and its Peking junior partner are intentionally and slyly showing a somewhat softer face to the world. Why? Principally, no doubt, because of the historic western success in ratification of the Paris Pacts.

FOUR ILLUSTRATIONS OF NEW SOVIET TACTIC

The most dramatic illustration of the new face of the Kremlin is, of course, in the form of the surprisingly concluded Austrian State Treaty.

The agreement on that treaty, ending 9 long years of negotiations, involving more than 400 talks, attests to the fact that the Soviet Union now wants to be regarded by the world as "flexible," as changing its traditional policies, as conciliatory.

A second illustration was quick Soviet acceptance of latest proposals for a meeting in mid-summer of the heads of the four major states, the so-called Meeting at the Summit, involving President Eisenhower, Premier Bulganin, Prime Minister Anthony Eden, and Prime Minister Faure.

A third illustration is the impending visit to Belgrade and to that arch-Communist heretic Marshal Tito on the part of a top-drawer delegation headed by Nikita Khrushchev and Nicolai Bulganin. This visit represents another about face from previous Moscow denunciations of "Titoist Fascist deviationism." It is supposed to further demonstrate Soviet efforts to "normalize" and make more cordial Moscow-Belgrade relations.

A fourth illustration of the new mask of the Kremlin was the conciliatory approach which has been shown at the Bandung Conference and elsewhere by Chou En-Lai and by the Peking government. It consists in part of the indications that the long-imprisoned United States airmen—outrageously imprisoned, I may add—may be "magnanimously" released.

And there are other signs of the new tactic on the part of the Kremlin, such as in the Soviets' new version of disarmament proposals.

SOVIET BEAR WANTS MORE MEAT

Now, I have used the word "mask" and I have used the word "tactic" for very exact purposes.

I say "mask," because the basic fact of the matter is that the Soviet bear may put on a sheep's head or sheeps' clothing, but it is

still obviously an aggressive, hungry beast which desires more human meat.

Already the Russian bear holds under its bloodstained paw almost a billion people on the face of this planet; 1.5 billion people still live in the non-Communist world. But the lips of the bear drool with the desire to take them over as well.

Temporarily, the Soviet bear is following a new tactic. Instead of growling and roaring and uttering defiance, it is meowing like a pussycat. It is purring as though it wants to be stroked gently and as though it is really friendly.

But the basic fact is that nothing has really changed concerning the Kremlin's long-range revolutionary strategy. The Soviet Union is still intent upon complete world domination. Marxist dogma has not changed in that respect.

I should like to point to the words of Nicolai Lenin which are still regarded as atheistic gospel:

"As long as capitalism and socialism exist, we cannot live in peace. * * * We must say that either those who want to cause our destruction must perish * * * or the capitalists will live and in that case the [Soviet] republic will perish."

And Joseph Stalin said: "Who will conquer whom, that is the whole question."

The fact of the matter is that the millennium has not come and is nowhere near coming. The Kremlin has not altered one iota its long-time instructions to the Communist insurrectionists in Malaya, to the Communist saboteurs in southern Viet-Nam, to the Communists agitating in north Africa or in South America or in our own country. The Austrian State Treaty is signed, but no Soviet spy has voluntarily given himself up. The Reds hope to neutralize West Germany. But no Soviet saboteur in the Federal Republic has announced that he is going out of business, so to speak.

OMINOUS SOVIET ARMS BUILDUP CONTINUES

What is more, the massive Soviet military buildup continues. Most ominous in that buildup is the latest grim news of our air intelligence in Moscow. It indicates, as you know, a Soviet formation of latest-type intercontinental jet bombers—equivalent to our B-52's—has already been seen flying over Moscow. Thus, those among us who have been unfortunately smug, those of us who are overconfident have been given a rather rude shock. It has been proven once again that the United States is not nearly as far ahead in the technological race for air superiority as we mght have hoped. On the contrary, the Soviets, by going all-out in long-range air development, by going all-out in nuclear development have been exceeding the buildup schedule which some people had originally anticipated.

Thus, once more, some of us have been wrong in our military estimations of them. Once more some of us have erred, on the dangerous side of underestimating their capacity, underestimating their iron determination to catch up with us and pass us.

Meanwhile, too, far up, facing the Arctic Circle, the Soviets continue to build their series of Siberian rocket-launching sites for what they hope will be intercontinental missiles. These may be both intercontinental ballistic missiles, fired like bullets, or artillery shells, and intercontinental guided missiles controlled by Soviet electronics equipment.

These missiles—with atomic or hydrogen warheads—could, it is estimated, when they are developed (which may only be a matter of 5 or 10 years or so), conceivably reach the city of Detroit a mere 30 minutes after they might be fired. They could blast this and other centers of production and population into radio-active rubble.

So, these basic facts or prospects have not changed. The basic conspiratorial nature of the Kremlin has not changed.

Tactics may be changed, but not long-range Soviet strategy.

Now, then, what should be our answer? I believe that the answer must basically be threefold.

INVINCIBLE UNITED STATES MILITARY PREPARATION

1. In the first place, we must continue our defense preparations at the highest level of efficiency.

This does not mean mere quantity, because a quantity of planes, tanks, or ships can grow quickly obsolescent.

But it does mean quality in the most advanced weapons and training. It does mean having our defense factories tooled up to high efficiency, so that at instantaneous notice, they could go into mass production of the most advanced models of weapons and weapons systems.

We must never again fall asleep. We must never again lay ourself open to another disastrous Pearl Harbor attack. It could be the last such attack suffered in United States history, a fatal attack from which we might not be able to recover.

We must never again overcentralize our production facilities. I am pleased that Secretary of Defense Charles Wilson—an able man, but one with whom I have not agreed in this respect—has begun to decentralize defense procurement. It is long overdue. We offer at present a few key "over-ripe" bomb targets, which, if hit, could result in paralysis of America. We are far too vulnerable, far too centralized.

We must decentralize if we would survive. And we must strengthen our civil defense as well, instead of treating it as an orphan child untended and ignored.

A CIVILIAN "JOINT CHIEFS OF STAFF"

2. Secondly, we must accompany our efforts for military preparation by taking the offensive in the political, cultural, social, propaganda field. Why? Because "man does not live by bread alone," and he will not survive by armaments alone.

Illustrating the type of offensive which I have in mind is the brilliant long-range program outlined by Brig. Gen. David Sarnoff, who has proposed, in what is truly an historic memorandum, a strategy board for political offense—a cold-war equivalent of the Joint Chiefs of Staff on the military side.

General Sarnoff's proposal rightly suggests that this operation be headed up by a leader directly under the President with Cabinet status. The able Chairman of the Board of RCA, one of our foremost leaders in American communications for more than a quarter of a century, suggests, of course, the most modern types of techniques be used, for example, "mobile big-screen television units in black and white and in color" to be used in non-Communist regions where "illiteracy bars the written word and lack of radio bars the spoken word."

He reiterates a striking proposal which he had made some years ago, for mass distribution of cheap, lightweight receivers, tuned to pick up American signals. He suggests "a simple hand-operated phonograph device, costing no more than a loaf of bread" and "records made of cardboard and costing less than a bottle of beverage."

EXPLOITING WEAKNESSES INSIDE IRON CURTAIN

He emphasizes that we exploit the weak link in the Kremlin based on the hunger for facts inside the Iron Curtain and based upon the Soviets own miserable failures at home.

I point out to you, my friends, that for example, Soviet agriculture indeed is in a state of collapse, as attested by redfaced Soviet leaders, themselves. We should exploit the Red farm breakdown to the fullest, but it will take the sort of audacious, imaginative program as General Sarnoff has suggested to penetrate the Iron Curtain and accomplish our goal.

The program, which has been welcomed and commended in principle by President Eisenhower, commands the earnest consideration of the Congress and of the American people.

This in no way depreciates the steps which are now being carried on by the Operations Coordinating Board, by the United States Information Agency, and by other means, but it does signify that we all recognize that infinitely more could and should be done.

Historic Proposals for Cultural Interchange To Meet the Challenge of Communism—No. 3

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK THOMPSON, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 23, 1955

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, the concluding half of the great speech by Senator ALEXANDER WILEY, ranking minority member of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, delivered at the Wayne University Student Forum, Detroit, Mich., on Thursday, May 19, 1955, follows:

USIA PERSONNEL ARE FRONT LINE FIGHTERS FOR PEACE

But it certainly won't be done if the Congress slashes USIA's funds. I say that these USIA information personnel, working in 210 posts and 79 countries are frontline fighters for peace and they should have our fullest support instead of needling, peevish criticism which has too often been their lot.

In 38 languages they faithfully disseminate truth around the world. Over 29 television stations, alone, in 21 countries they are "giving light so that the people will find their own way."

The President's atoms-for-peace program is a particular highlight of USIA's message. This is by far one of the most thrilling, constructive subjects which can be conveyed to the world in our time, particularly as the prelude to the historic UN Geneva Conference, opening in August. Eighty-four nations have been invited to this precedent-breaking assembly on peaceful application of atomic energy—an assembly which may open up whole new vistas for mankind.

But why is it that we are invariably so willing to appropriate billions for aircraft carriers, destroyers, giant bombers. And yet, some people are so reluctant to appropriate far lesser sums for truth dissemination which may help completely to prevent the dark day when the military weapons have to be used at all? Isn't it most important of all to prevent war from coming in the first place, rather than concentrate our efforts almost exclusively on winning a war, if it should come (as crucial as the latter is, under that circumstance)?

I point out now that General Sarnoff's wise war-prevention proposals were paralleled in a most enlightening and significant address which had been made back on February 28 before the National Press Club by Mr. William Randolph Hearst, Jr. He had recommended a competitive coexistence council which would match and surpass the Soviets in every field of human endeavor, whether it be in the 1956 Olympic games in Melbourne, Australia, or in the field of the ballet, theater, art, literature.

Since then, the Hearst newspapers have done an excellent job in amplifying the vital necessity for such a council.

Now there may be differences as to the details of this effort. There may be differences as to the actual level of appropriations for it, particularly in view of the importance of adequate aid under the mutual-security program, as such, for the next fiscal year especially for southeast Asia.

There may be differences as to how the Council is to be organized. But the basic idea, particularly that of all-out effort by private American groups, is fundamentally sound. The Soviet Union does challenge us today in everything from the Olypmics, to cultural exhibitions, trade fair pavilions, and the like.

Recently, for example, at a luncheon meeting which I arranged in the United States Capitol, an eloquent representative of the International Exchange Program, managed by the American National Theatre and Academy, a congressionally-chartered group, pointed out that within 2 years the Kremlin has sent 2,000 performing artists into France alone.

And evidences have poured in from other quarters regarding massive Soviet efforts to win the minds of the world. We cannot ignore this. We cannot sit back and let them beat us by our own smug default.

RESTORE FULBRIGHT FUNDS

Now, of course, there are ceilings to the amount of spending which we can devote to this and similar tasks. The United States Treasury hardly has unlimited resources. We are already running a serious deficit.

But I believe that within reason we could and should greatly step up our programs. I see no justification for the House of Representatives, arbitrary slash of 40 percent in the international student exchange program. To my way of thinking, that is one of the soundest programs that the United States possesses to counteract Soviet lies. It is, in my judgment, exceedingly poor economy to slash what are rightly known as the Fulbright scholarships. Instead of slashing them we should be increasing them. Only 7,000 grants could be made this year. Every single student or other leader who can, after judicious selection, come to the United States, who can gain a better, more accurate, more personal understanding of American culture, of the American home, the American community, can be a potential, vital asset to our cause.

That doesn't mean that everybody who comes here, will automatically thereafter be our friend. On the contrary, you and I know that we could do far more to improve the program so that the 35,000 foreign students who are new here—of all races and creeds—do bring back with them the best possible impression. But at least we have got to bring people over in the first place to give them a chance to see us and understand us.

ENCOURAGING THE LIVING ARTS

Now, there is one further observation which I should like to make on this matter of victory through things of the spirit.

We here in this country should look to our own cultural laurels. There has been a magnificent flowering of the arts in this free country, but we could voluntarily do more—far more—to encourage the creative arts—music, literature, poetry, ballet, the living stage. And if we do so, we will, by that much, be strengthening our foreign policy. Because we will be further demonstrating to the world that, far from being a "crass, materialist civilization," we have a deep and abiding interest in the "things of beauty which live forever."

A FINE ARTS CENTER FOR WASHINGTON, D. C.

Recently, I was delighted to see that the House of Representatives approved a bill, H. R. 1825, to create a Federal Commission to formulate plans for construction in the District of Columbia of a civic auditorium, a center for music, drama, the fine arts, and mass communications. Its counterpart on the Senate side is S. 1321, offered by one of my able colleagues on the Foreign Relations Committee—one of the youngest men in spirit in the Senate, Senator THEODORE GREEN of Rhode Island. On the House side, a leading spokesman for this cause to bring this great asset to our Nation's Capital has been a Congressman from New Jersey—young in years and another Democrat, if you please, Congressman FRANK THOMPSON, Jr., of New Jersey. He has also been in the forefront of the effort to set up a program of cultural interchange throughout the world. Congressman THOMPSON has offered H. R. 5040, which was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor for the latter purpose. It is my intention on my return to the Capital to explore the possibility of companion legislation on the Senate side.

I feel that by steps such as these we can fill in a domestic and foreign program which definitely needs filling in.

The sending of musical troupes like Porgy and Bess over seas—a stage group which met with thundering acclaim everywhere—should not have to be financed out of the President's special funds, but should be gladly authorized on a regular annual basis, as should, for example, United States participation in trade fairs.

And, here in our own country, in the Capital of our Nation, in the shrine to which young and old—in hundreds of thousands—come, I say that there should be a national civic auditorium—a great fine arts center.

I want every American to be prouder than he has ever been before of the Capital of our land. I want every American to feel that not only is the District of Columbia the political center of this great Republic, but that it is a center for the worthiest aspirations and creations of the human spirit. Let the best in the art, the music, the literature, the ballet, the stage in the 48 States—blossom in the city named for the Father of our Country. Let Americans revere the city of Washington as the Frenchman reveres Paris—for far more than governing; for the expression of the essence in national culture.

And so, I turn to the third of the three-pronged proposals for peace.

SUPPORT EISENHOWER-DULLES DIPLOMACY

Now, my third point is that we should all give our support to the wise foreign policy which is being so soundly spearheaded by the statesmanlike President of the United States and by his able Secretary of State.

It has been a troubled foreign policy—not without its difficulties, not without its crises—for that is the very nature of modern diplomacy.

But it has been a bold, forthright, creative policy, carried out in sound cooperation with our allies. And it has numerous spectacular achievements to its credit; one of the foremost of which is the long-awaited, now-fulfilled entry of West Germany into the North Atlantic Treaty Organization.

WE MUST BE WILLING TO NEGOTIATE FURTHER

In carrying out our overall policy further, we should, in my judgment, approach the new Soviet tactic with a sense of realism, a sense of caution, but with a willingness to go halfway.

There are some people who deplore the meeting of the Big Four and who want us completely to shut the door to further negotiations with the Soviets.

These people are falling victim to their own inflexible, unchanging judgments. Their position is not, however, completely without logic. They contend the empty Soviet word isn't worth the paper it is written upon. And it is indeed a fact that out of 52 major agreements which we have made with the Soviets in the last 22 years since we recognized Russia, they have broken 50 of the agreements. They have lived up to only two small agreements. One was for entering the fighting against Japan in World War II, and the other was to permit the Western Allies aerial corridors to Berlin. As you can see, the first of these two agreements was certainly to the U. S. S. R.'s definite advantage, because she came in for a lion's share of the spoils from defeated Japan. And the second is certainly a modest concession on her part, because she should never have been given the right to encircle Berlin by land in the first place. Her previous tactic in sealing off Berlin from direct land access and in requiring us to conduct the costly Berlin airlift was outrageous.

In view of her record of treachery, some impatient people throw up their hands in disgust and say that almost all agreements with the Soviet Union have been futile. That is largely true. But that does not mean that future ironclad commitments, backed up by action, will not work.

These people say that the Soviet Union goes into conferences usually, principally for propaganda purposes or to lull their opponents to sleep. And that is true.

These people say that no one knows whether an overturn in the shaky Soviet hierarchy tomorrow could completely reverse present Soviet tactics and reinstitute the tough Stalinist line. And that is true.

DO NOT BRAND ALL TALK AS APPEASEMENT

But my point is this: that notwithstanding these facts, the United States must very definitely not slam the door on further negotiation. On the contrary, we must prove ourself ready, willing and able to talk, to negotiate, to confer. We must not permit anyone to brand all talk as appeasement. Such criticism is utterly unjustified.

We will not appease, and we never intended to. We will not sell out an ally like Nationalist China or anyone else. And to negotiate does not mean that we are going naively to place faith in an empty Soviet pledge. It does not mean that we are expecting any miracle solutions to our problems overnight.

But it does mean that, as the wise chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, Senator WALTER GEORGE, well said, in effect: the United States is great enough, strong enough to show to the world that, so long as there is the slightest chance of success, we will never slam the door on a peaceful approach.

We have talked for 8 futile years about control of atomic weapons. But I say we should talk more. We have talked for 7 years about overall disarmament, but I say we must talk more. We have talked for 10 years about unifying Germany through free, uncontrolled elections, but we must talk more.

We must talk not for the sake of hearing ourselves talk or to hear the Reds talk, because certainly, we have had our stomach full of Red double talk.

But, rather, we must be patient. We must strive as hard—as unswervingly—for the goal of peace as we strove for the winning of the war. The lives of you young men and women and of all of us are at stake. Why should we be half-hearted or reluctant to do our all?

The world is hungry for signs of peace. The world is desperate that the United States take all possible steps to avoid a nuclear Armegeddon.

LET'S NOT GIVE FUEL TO RED PROPAGANDA

The Soviet Union would like to picture us to the world as a war-mongering, saber-rattling power. The Soviet Union asserts in its propaganda to the world that the United States is "not interested in peace; it is only interested in a so-called preventive war of aggression. It does not want to talk; it wants to bomb."

That is a vicious lie.

But if we were to put ourself in the foolish position of slamming the door on negotiations and hurling all sorts of belligerent, ill-conceived ultimatums, we would simply be providing fuel for Soviet propaganda. We would be estranging ourselves from our allies and from the neutral peoples. I say, therefore, that we must, as we will, sincerely, earnestly, devotedly continue to confer for peace—at the summit and below the summit.

I repeat, however, we must not expect miracles. We must not change our realistic conception of the Soviet bear. We must not be a pawn in Soviet propaganda tricks. But we must leave no stone unturned to try to find some firm, active basis for relieving East-West tension.

We can do so without being soft, for the Soviet Union despises softness.

We can do so without appeasement, because appeasement is utterly futile and self-defeating.

We can do so without naivete or gullibility.

We can and should do so with full confidence in our leaders. Certainly, the President of the United States deserves our confidence. Certainly, the Secretary of State of our country deserves our confidence. There is nothing in either what Dwight D. Eisenhower or John Foster Dulles has ever done which should make us feel the slightest doubt in their ability to conduct negotiations in the most forthright, most constructive manner, with firmness, yet with understanding.

We must not be afraid of conferences. We must not be afraid of ourselves. We must not underestimate our own abilities.

We must not listen to ill-tempered talk of unilateral "blockades" and ill-thought-out angry threats to Moscow and Peking. To be hard and strong is one thing; to put a chip on your shoulder and arrogantly dare someone to knock it off is another.

Avoiding extremes—avoiding half-baked cure-alls—this is essential if we would save the peace.

These, then, are my suggestions for combatting the efforts of the U. S. S. R. to control the world by peaceful or forceful means.

This Nation Under God and Christ

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EUGENE SILER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 23, 1955

Mr. SILER. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced in this great legislative body a resolution seeking to add amendment 23 to our present United States Constitution to the end that the basic and fundamental law of our land might recognize the Master Architect, Creator, and Builder of the Universe, the Almighty God, who hung out the stars and lit the burning taper of the sun and draped the glorious rainbow as a scarf about the shoulders of the storm; and also to the further end that there may be recognized in that same Constitution Jesus Christ as the Son of God and Universal Saviour of all mankind. Many people, I believe, think the greatest deficiency of our present Constitution lies in its failure to recognize specifically God Almighty and America's definite position as a great Christian nation. In this modern day of paganistic and mundane attitudes, when communism and all of its philosophy of atheism and statism and materialism hold full sway in many places of the earth and embrace millions of its peoples, there is surely a great need for America to assert humbly her unalterable dependence upon God and her own daily followership of Christianity as the prevailing ideology of most of her people. As most everyone knows, the Constitution is whatever the people decree it shall be, and since most of the American people are God fearing and Christ following, the Constitution itself should make manifestation accordingly.

This proposed amendment is in no way any encroachment upon the demarcation line of church-state separation that has always characterized our Government, since this amendment would neither recognize nor support with tax revenue any church organization whatsoever. While this amendment would not in anywise establish a church, yet it would in a positive way recognize the authorship and authorityship of the Supreme Being and His Son, Jesus Christ, as the Saviour of mankind.

Mr. Speaker, the Holy Bible tells us:

> Blessed is the nation whose God is the Lord.

And the great Apostle Paul once wrote:

> For other foundation can no man lay than that is laid, which is Jesus Christ.

I hope our great Constitution may come to recognize God as our Lord and may also come to recognize that the Nation's foundation must be laid upon Jesus Christ as the firm Rock of Ages and Saviour of the world.

Rumors About First Lady Are Dispelled

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK W. BOYKIN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 23, 1955

Mr. BOYKIN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to revise and extend my remarks and include a great story by a brilliant writer, Betty Beale, of the Washington Star, telling about some of the experiences—hardships and pleasures—of the First Lady, the great First Lady of the greatest land on earth—Mrs. Dwight D. Eisenhower, the wife of the President of our great Nation; a great woman who has done and is doing such an outstanding job in helping her husband, who is not only the most popular man, in my judgment, at this time, in his own country, but in the world, and who has the love and respect of so many people. So has this wonderful woman. In talking to a great and God-fearing man, Dr. Billy Graham, who is doing such a wonderful job far across the seas, he said that he thought that President Eisenhower and Mrs. Eisenhower were one of the greatest couples and were doing the finest job of any President and any First Lady that he had ever known.

She has had so much to do, but always with that pleasant smile, and she goes out of her way to be nice to the highest and the lowest of this land. She has a way about her that just commands love and respect, and I would like for all of our men and women who read the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, not only in every beat in this Nation and in every library, but in many foreign lands, to know a few things about this wonderful woman whom God gave to our great President to help him along the way.

All of us know that man cannot do much without a good wife, a good mother, a sister, or a good woman to steer him along the way; and that is what this great and wonderful woman has been doing and is continuing to do at this time—in these troublesome times; in the times when we not only need strong men, but strong women; and we have in these two great people just such a couple. We all know that they are doing their best, and their best seems to be mighty, mighty good, and we are thankful that we have such a great man and such a great woman in the White House, to lead us along the way.

It is a real pleasure to see our great leader, Speaker SAM RAYBURN, and other Democrats cooperating and working together with our good Republican friends to put the President's program through, or at least that part of it where the Democrats and the Republicans agree.

God bless this wonderful woman, our First Lady, and this marvelous man, our President of these United States, so I say with millions of other people all over the earth, God bless our President and our First Lady and give them strength to carry on the great work they are doing that has helped to bring us peace, prosperity, and plenty.

The story follows.

RUMORS ABOUT FIRST LADY ARE HEREWITH DISPELLED

(By Betty Beale)

Always a hot caldron of rumors, this town has been boiling with them ever since Mrs. Eisenhower canceled all her engagements for this past week. Here are some of the stories that have been repeated as gospel, and after each, to the best of my knowledge, is herewith the gospel truth.

Rumor: Not 1 but 2 doctors were called in during Mrs. Eisenhower's recent stay at her Gettysburg home.

Truth: A doctor is always in attendance where a President or First Lady is concerned. Maj. Gen. Howard M. Snyder, the White House physician, was up there checking on Mamie as she attempted to recover from a virus infection, and when he left, his assistant took over.

Rumor: The DAR's were furious because Mrs. Eisenhower said last year when she didn't receive them that she would receive the larger organizations every other year. But she didn't receive them this year, after all.

Truth: The DAR's didn't ask to be received this year, says Mamie's secretary, Mary Jane McCaffree, because they may have felt it would be an imposition to do so.

Rumor: Mrs. Eisenhower is refusing to receive all kinds of organizations that used to get the A-1 treatment at the White House.

Truth: Mamie says there are literally hundreds of women's groups that have never been inside the White House or received by any First Lady, and until each has had a chance she is not going to keep on dupli-

cating. According to her staff no group is too small or insignificant to be invited to the White House, providing she can see them on the day requested. * * * She is no longer receiving 600 women daily, as her staff said she did her first year in the White House. Now she receives only on days not already filled with other functions, a state dinner, luncheon, tea, etc. She tries not to tax herself with 2 or 3 things in 1 day.

Rumor: When she gave her luncheon for Senate wives a fortnight ago, before they entertained her first (as has been the custom in years past), she probably had no intention of attending their luncheon this past Tuesday.

Truth: No such thought entered her mind, because her calendar is drawn up months ahead. She picked the earlier date simply because there was room for it on her engagement book.

Rumor: Mary Jane McCaffree is a slave driver who forces sweet, warm, agreeable Mrs. Eisenhower to accept more than she can possibly do.

Truth: This is the most absurd of all. It will even give Mamie and her secretary a good laugh. Mary Jane is a very efficient gal with a mind of her own, but Mrs. E. is one of the strongest-willed women they know, say her close friends. It's true that she's an agreeable warm person, but nobody has ever said she was easy to handle and it would never occur to one of her employees to try it.

Rumor: By withdrawing from the Senate wives' luncheon and the Congressional Club brunch, Mamie was giving another indication that her husband wouldn't run again, said some early this past week. To disappoint these groups that reach back into the grass roots of every State was pretty good proof, they said. Especially since this was the first time in the 47-year history of the club that a First Lady had missed a party in her honor.

Truth: The doctor made the decision, not Mrs. Eisenhower, and the President's appearance at the brunch in her place completely discounted such talk. Better indication that Ike won't run again is his conversation at his stag dinner of 10 days ago. Only 16 were present and Ike spent much of the time pointing out to them that no President has ever lived to be 70—not in the White House. If Ike were reelected he would see his 70th birthday in the White House, if, that is, he were the only President in history to be so lucky. Why should he tempt fate when he has been serving his country, his wife points out to friends, ever since he was 21?

Rumor: Mrs. Eisenhower wastes most of every day playing her favorite card game, Bolivia.

Truth: To say this of any official wife in Washington, least of all the top one, indicates an appalling ignorance of the demands of officialdom. Here's how Mrs. Eisenhower spends an average day:

She breakfasts around 9 o'clock and afterward, between telephone calls that never cease, she discusses the business of running the White House with at least two people—the usher and the housekeeper. Every single thing connected with the house is brought up, whether it concerns a homey thing as the breaking down of the washing machine, or a difficulty with 1 of the 45 servants, or the planning of the meals, or fresh flowers for the Red, Green, and Blue Rooms. Her secretary then sees her and she's presented with the endless requests to appear, to receive, or to patronize.

By that time, it's noon and she gets dressed to: Receive a couple of hundred women; go out to an official 3-hour luncheon; lunch with a member of her family; or lunch alone when she may start tackling her mail. She signs between 100 and 200 letters every day and she has to have some idea what she's signing. Sometimes she can't even get to the mail until late in the day.

In the afternoon, if she is not receiving groups and posing for a picture, she might have a visit from a personal friend or more likely one from her sister, Mrs. Gordon Moore, who likes to bring her little granddaughter, "Peaches," whom they both adore. When her mother is staying at the White House, she spends a part of each day with her. She's lucky if she can find time to play Bolivia one afternoon a week. In fact, and this is meant to be gospel, she hasn't played it for weeks and weeks.

Everybody in this world is subject to some false speculation and unkind comment, but I'll bet there's a new unfounded rumor born every few minutes about the President of the United States and the First Lady, whoever they may be. Apply commonsense and remember it's two decent people you're hearing about and you can automatically dispose of most such talk.

Pertinent Questions on Salk Vaccine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. PERCY PRIEST

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 23, 1955

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, the hearings which will begin on Wednesday, May 25 before the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, are scheduled to deal primarily with two specific bills, namely, H. R. 6286, the administration's $28 million poliomyelitis immunization assistance bill, and H. R. 6207, a bill designed to give authority to the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, through an amendment of the biologics control law, to supervise and control, in the interest of protecting and preserving the health of the American people, the distribution and use of biological products.

I have introduced both of these bills. A companion bill to H. R. 6286, the administration's immunization assistance bill, has also been introduced by Congressman CHARLES A. WOLVERTON, Republican, of New Jersey, ranking minority member of this committee, being H. R. 6287.

On the surface, it might seem as if the subjects covered by H. R. 6286 and H. R. 6207 are related to each other only in an incidental way. A closer study of the bills, however, will make it apparent that the relationship between the two is rather close and direct.

The purpose of this statement is to point up the way in which the subjects covered by these two bills are related to each other and generally to give a proper focus and perspective to these hearings.

The hearings on H. R. 6207 and H. R. 6286 are the first ones to be held by this committee since the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, on April 12, licensed six manufacturers to produce the Salk vaccine. This action was taken by the Secretary under the biologics control law which may be found in section 351 of the Public Health Service Act.

The events which has occurred between April 12 and the present day are too well-known to be repeated in any detail. A summary of these events is contained in the Secretary's report to the President and that summary will probably be brought up to date by one of the witnesses speaking for the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

Being the first hearing on a subject on which many, and perhaps too many, statements have been made which have been interpreted by some people as having a partisan slant, I want to state categorically that this committee never has and I hope never will approach any public health problem in a partisan spirit. Rather, this committee will seek to approach the problems created by the attempt to secure rapid mass application of the new Salk vaccine in such a way that prompt action may be taken on bills dealing with some of the immediate problems. On the other hand, this committee would feel derelict in its duties if it failed to give at the same time close attention to the long-range implications of the Salk situation.

The second point I wish to make is that this committee's interest in and concern with the Salk vaccine situation is not a recent and belated one.

Several weeks before the licensing of the vaccine by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, I contacted Dr. Scheele and Dr. Keefer with respect to any plans which the Department might have to provide for allocating the scarce vaccine so that the vaccine would go to those classes of persons where it would do the most good. Also, the question of making the vaccine available to all children regardless of their parents' ability to pay, was discussed. At that time, I was advised by Dr. Scheele and Dr. Keefer that no legislative action was required.

Two days following the licensing of the vaccine, on April 14, 1955, I addressed a letter to Hon. Oveta Culp Hobby, Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, which summarizes, briefly, the views expressed by Dr. Scheele and Dr. Keefer at that time. The letter also requested the Secretary to review the situation and to advise the committee whether the Department might feel the need for additional legislation granting the Department power to allocate the vaccine.

The bill on which the administration now has requested action is designed to authorize an appropriation of $28 million to assist the States in providing, for a limited period, Salk vaccine immunizations to children of parents who may not be able to pay for the cost of the vaccine. In connection with this bill, the administration has proposed a voluntary system of allocations and priorities to assure that the Salk vaccine, during the initial scarcity period, will be distributed fairly among the several States and will go to the children in those age groups which are most susceptible to the disease. The administration has not sought any additional powers to police this system.

A great deal has been said already by spokesmen for the administration, interested groups, organizations, and Members of Congress, with regard to the adequacy of a voluntary plan. Many

bills have been introduced in Congress to give additional powers to the President for a limited period of time to deal with specific allocation and priority problems arising from the present scarcity of the Salk vaccine.

I have introduced H. R. 6207 for the purpose of raising the question whether permanent legislation is needed granting powers to the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare through an amendment of the biologics control law to control, through regulations, in the interest of public health, the distribution and use of biological products.

I have particularly in mind that these additional powers may be needed in all instances where as, in the case of the Salk vaccine, rapid mass applications are attempted of new biological products.

In this connection, I further desire to raise a question whether there is continued justification for differentiation in responsibilities of the Federal Government with regard to: first, new biological products; two, new drugs; and, three, insulin and certain specified antibiotics.

I want to call to the attention of the departments and agencies of the Federal Government, the State and local governments, the voluntary agencies, the pharmaceutical trade, and the medical and pharmaceutical professions, and last, but not least, the American public generally, the new problems created by the rapid mass application of new wonder drugs as exemplified by recent experiences with the Salk vaccine. Therefore, I have directed the committee staff to prepare a series of questions which will focus attention on some of the problems created by the new phenomenon of rapid mass application of new drugs.

The answers to these questions cannot and will not be forthcoming during the few days of hearings that this committee can hold on the two bills now before it. However, the answers to these questions should be found at a reasonably early date.

The best way, in my view, to secure reasonable answers, including necessary additional Federal legislation, is to conduct an intelligent discussion of these questions. In order to promote an early start of this discussion, I am making the questions public at this time in advance of the hearings in the hope that all interested groups and individuals will give their careful attention to these questions.

In closing, I want to emphasize again that in spite of the broad scope of the committee's inquiry, there will under no circumstances be any delay in taking up H. R. 6286, which contains the administration's proposed authorization of $28 million to assist the States in providing immunization against poliomyelitis for children whose parents are unable to pay the cost of vaccination.

BACKGROUND PROBLEMS RELATING TO H. R. 6207 AND H. R. 6286

A. Responsibilities of Federal Government under present law:

First. Under present law, what are the responsibilities of the Federal Government with respect to new drugs as to (a) production and safety; (b) distribution; and (c) application and use?

Second. Under present law, what are the responsibilities of the Federal Government with respect to new biological products, as to (a) production and safety; (b) distribution; and (c) application and use?

Third. Under present law, what are the responsibilities of the Federal Government with respect to certain new drugs, including insulin, and several specifically enumerated antibiotics, as to (a) production and safety; (b) distribution; and (c) application and use?

Fourth. What accounts for the difference in responsibilities?

Fifth. Is the difference in responsibilities justified?

B. Rapid mass application versus gradual individual application:

Sixth. Are there any public policy considerations which distinguish rapid mass application of new drugs from gradual individual application with regard to (a) production and safety; (b) distribution; and (c) application and use?

Seventh. Do these considerations differ according to whether such drugs are primarily preventive or curative?

C. Respective responsibilities:

Eighth. What are the respective responsibilities—legal and other—in connection with rapid mass applications of new drugs—(a) preventive, or (b) curative of—

(A) Governmental agencies—Federal, State, and local;

(B) Voluntary agencies;

(C) Manufacturers, wholesalers, retailers, and pharmacists;

(D) Medical profession—individually and collectively; and

(E) Others?

Ninth. Are these respective responsibilities the same in the case of rapid mass application and in the case of gradual individual application of new drugs?

Tenth. Are present Federal laws adequate for the discharge of Federal responsibilities in connection with rapid mass application and gradual individual application of new drugs—preventive or curative—with regard to (a) production and safety; (b) distribution; and (c) application and use?

Alien Property Report of the American Legion 36th National Convention

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GARDNER R. WITHROW

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 23, 1955

Mr. WITHROW. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to make it known to my colleagues and my many national-minded constituents the stand which the American Legion has taken in regard to the return of alien property.

From August 30 through September 2 of 1954, the American Legion met in the city of Washington, D. C., at which time the Committee on Foreign Relations of the American Legion stated as follows, and I quote:

> Believing that the American veteran has a vested interest in enemy assets seized by the United States, and that such assets should continue to be devoted to the purpose provided by the Veterans' Claims Act, the American Legion opposes any effort to return these assets to their former owners or their governments.

This resolution as aforementioned was approved with no opposing vote whatsoever by the full Legion assembled. Not only has the American Legion taken a stand in opposition to the return of alien property, but also the other numerous veterans organizations such as the Veterans of Foreign Wars, and so forth. I have noticed in the past few weeks that many of my colleagues in the House and the Senate have introduced numerous bills for the return of this vested property. I believe that we should all be cognizant of the stand that our leading veterans organizations have taken on this particular subject.

Keenotes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ELIZABETH KEE

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 23, 1955

Mrs. KEE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I should like to include my newspaper column, Keenotes, for the week of May 23, 1955, concerning a visit that a number of my colleagues and I had the pleasure of making aboard one of our aircraft carriers, the U. S. S. *Intrepid*, off the coast of Norfolk, Va., to witness some tactical operations. The column follows:

KEENOTES

(By Representative ELIZABETH KEE)

The United States Navy—and God bless those who make it great—has a long and awe-inspiring tradition of fighting on against any and all odds, and of persevering no matter what. Its great names, John Paul Jones, Oliver Hazard Perry, Dewey, Halsey, Lawrence, and the others, are names of men who fought on and won, or who went down fighting to the end.

But the Navy has now demonstrated that, in addition to knowing how to fight on stubbornly, it has finally learned how to give in. Not in battle, of course—never in battle—but about this matter of Congresswomen.

In previous years, invitations to Members of Congress to board fighting ships for demonstration cruises or maneuvers were always carefully limited to Congressmen. Women Members of Congress frequently are outstanding friends of the military services, but while the Navy might have appreciated that very much in the past, it still made certain not to include us in the invitation list for congressional cruises. Our protests went unheeded, until this year.

This year things were different, and a group of Congresswomen went along with the congressional delegation which boarded the U. S. S. *Intrepid*—a 40,000-ton attack aircraft carrier with a flight deck the size of three football fields—for a weekend glimpse up front of carrier tactics in a task force which also included a battleship, four

destroyers, and two submarines. We saw, among other things, jet aircraft takeoffs and landings at sea, a night attack on a submarine, a drone shoot, gunnery practice by the battleship *New Jersey*, and an underway replenishment exercise. We saw the men of Carrier Air Group 4 fly their F9F-8 Cougar and F2H-2 Banshee jet fighters, and AD Skyraider propeller-driven attack planes in a series of exercises designed to help protect America and keep us safe. I was especially lucky to rate an overwater helicopter tour of the task force group, a real thrill.

Enjoyable as all of this was—and indeed it was—it was no junket. For it gave us a much better realization of the problems of the Navy and of Navy personnel, of the needs and requirements of the service, of the demands of modern warfare at sea. We have to provide the funds for the Navy; it is important that we know something of the way the funds are used.

Equally important, it gave us a new insight into the lives of the fine young men who risk their lives to protect the lives of all the rest of us—who proudly wear their Navy uniforms as a badge of courage and of fidelity to country.

There is no doubt about the courage of today's Navy. After all, in defying its previous superstition—for that's all we insisted it was—against Congresswomen on board, the Navy went all the way and took us aboard on Friday the 13th. Truly that ship was well named the *Intrepid*.

Veto of the Postal Pay Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. USHER L. BURDICK

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 23, 1955

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, both Houses of Congress, while admitting that the cost of living to postal workers had risen approximately 10 percent since the last salary raise, decided finally that 8.8 would be the right thing to do. The Senate had decided that a 10-percent raise was not too much and so voted. The House, however, voted 8.2, and the conference came back with an agreement at 8.8 percent, and both Houses again passed the bill. In the debate administration leaders of the House quoted the President as saying that he would veto anything over 7.6. That was used as an argument, but the House refused to be put in a straitjacket.

The administration leaders like JOE MARTIN, CHARLES HALLECK, and ED REES were right. The President did veto the bill.

The veto will be sent first to the Senate, which was the first body to pass the bill and the question will be, "Shall the bill be passed, the President's veto notwithstanding?" This must pass by a two-thirds vote and the veto will probably be sustained. Many Republicans who were willing for a 10 percent raise, and voted for it, will reverse themselves in order to support the President. If the veto is sustained in the Senate, the matter will not come before the House at all.

This muddled situation has all been caused by the representations made by Republican leaders that the President would veto the bill if it carried more than a raise of 7.6. Having told the leaders that this is what he would do, these leaders would be out on a political limb if the President signed the bill.

The fact remains that this is a poor way to legislate, because carrying this policy to the *n*th degree, the President can tell Congress what to do and, if perchance Congress does differently, down comes the veto with a slam. Isn't this a direct interference with the legislative branch?

If the veto is sustained, the administration will then rush a bill up to a congressional vote on a bill just as the President wants it. There is only 13 cents per day difference in the bill the President vetoed and the one he wants. All this talk about the difficulty of administering the vetoed bill is bologna hatched up by Postmaster General Summerfield. He has difficulty in administering the present law.

A bill must be put through—the Republicans in the next Congress can be easily counted if no raise is passed. The Republicans will move heaven and earth to pass the President's bill. Watch the scramble and see if I am right. No matter what is done, the postal workers will remember too much about this situation to be very enthusiastic about electing Republicans. In other words, I think the veto, involving only 13 cents per day, was a blunder regardless of politics. Can any President come within 13 cents of arriving at just pay for postal workers? No, it was not the 13 cents—it was because his leadership had been challenged. The President has done so many good things that my conclusion in this case is that he was poorly advised. He ought not to have been so determined—he should have permitted Congress to work its will.

As a Republican I have always tried to bring about a friendly feeling between organized labor and the Republican Party, for the reason that I knew laborers in many sections of the country were not too well sold on the Republican Party. This veto is not going to make this feeling any better, but probably worse. The way this matter has been maneuvered around, it is doubtful now that the Republican Party will get the credit for any raise.

This issue has never been a Democrat or a Republican issue—it is an issue of justice. These workers are entitled to a raise and all sides know it. When there was such a trifle involved—13 cents per day for 500,000 workers—why was it necessary to arouse all this opposition? Congressmen, at the earliest solicitation of the President, received an increase of $20.50 per day, and here we are fighting a half-million workers who want 13 cents per day more than the President approves. That is not the way I would run the Republican Party if I had any part in directing it. And remember, this extra 13 cents does not exceed in the aggregate enough to cover the full rise in the cost of living to these workers.

Mary McLeod Bethune

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES ROOSEVELT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 23, 1955

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, last Wednesday night, after 79 years of incredibly rich and productive life, Mary McLeod Bethune died at her home in Daytona Beach, Fla. Hers was, indeed, a rare spirit, marked by true greatness of soul, of wisdom, and of heart. Her death is a loss which the whole world will feel.

Life was not easy for Mrs. Bethune, although she would be the last person to say that it was cruel or unjust. She was one of 17 children whose parents had been slaves. Yet despite the seemingly overwhelming obstacles in her path, she has left behind her enduring monuments to her greatness that will forever enrich the lives of the people of her country and will stand as an inspiration to the people of the world.

There is no need here for a detailed discussion of her accomplishments. They are now a permanent part of our national treasure. Suffice it to say that we shall forever be in her debt for the college she founded and served so long and brilliantly, for the organizations which she created and served so well, and for the inestimable services she performed for her Government over a period of many years.

Mary McLeod Bethune held degrees from 14 colleges and universities. Cuba, Haiti, Liberia, and other foreign countries decorated her for her work. She was the recipient of honors and awards too numerous to mention. Certainly no one ever deserved them more.

Mary McLeod Bethune was a woman of great courage, infinite faith, profound wisdom, and boundless determination. No one understood better than she the problems of her race and the ideals of her country. Without these qualities she could never have succeeded; with them she could not fail.

The ultimate tribute that we, the living, can pay to Mary McLeod Bethune is to carry on her work and to strive to attain her ideals. That is the way she would have wanted it. We owe this much to her, and we owe it to ourselves.

Mrs. Bethune was a warm and close friend of both my father and my mother, and I am sure that her many friends in this Congress who perhaps did not read my mother's column of May 20 will appreciate seeing her tribute to Mrs. Bethune. I, therefore, append it to these remarks:

MY DAY

(By Eleanor Roosevelt)

NEW YORK.—I was distressed to read in the newspapers Thursday morning of the death of a really great American woman, Mary McLeod Bethune.

Dr. Bethune started life under conditions which must have made her education seem almost impossible, but both she and her parents had a great desire for her to gain knowledge and they seized on every opportunity.

And the opportunities came, as they so often do, when people are ready to use them.

The newspapers were full of stories of how she led her remarkable life. Beginning with a dollar and a half she built a Negro college in Florida. She fought for the rights of her people but never with resentment or bitterness, and she taught both her own people and her white fellow Americans many a valuable lesson.

I always liked the story of how once a patronizing pullman-car conductor, asking her for her ticket, said: "Auntie, give me your ticket." She let him repeat it twice. Then, looking up sweetly, she said: "Which of my sister's sons are you?" This was a way of turning the tables on a gentleman, which was far more effective than any amount of anger would have been.

She had a deep religious faith, and religion was not academic with her. It was both a weapon and a shield. She has told me very simply how time after time she has prayed for things, never for herself, but she always believed that if they were good things the Lord would hear her prayer. And there must have been many, many times when people were moved to answer her needs just because of this faith. She helped herself and the Lord helped her.

I knew Dr. Bethune best, of course, in the years when she worked for the National Youth Administration and she did good and courageous work for the young people of her race in a difficult period. But I have kept in touch with her all through the years and I will miss her very much, for I valued her wisdom and her goodness.

I would like to be at her funeral but I doubt if that will be possible. I have many commitments that would mean disappointment to various causes, which I think Dr. Bethune would be the first to feel should come before one's personal desires. Nevertheless, I will cherish the spirit she lived by and try to promote the causes that she believed in, in loving memory of a very wonderful life.

Commissioner Slusser Answers National Association of Real Estate Boards

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BARRATT O'HARA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 23, 1955

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I am extending my remarks to include the address of Hon. Charles E. Slusser, Commissioner of the Public Housing Administration, on May 17, 1955, at the annual conference in Galveston, Tex., of the southwestern regional conference of the National Association of Housing and Redevelopment Officials, as follows:

Having said that I want public housing to be a local enterprise, I must tell you that there are also occasions when the Public Housing Commissioner intends to exercise his prerogative to speak for all of you without sideline coaching or prompting. When this program is unjustly attacked, I intend to take the first public opportunity to answer.

To clear up any doubts that might exist in any minds, my remarks are occasioned by an editorial put out by the Washington office of the National Association of Real Estate Boards in their May 2 publication, Headlines, and signed by their president, Henry G. Waltemade.

Less than a year ago I spoke in Philadelphia at NAHRO's annual national convention. I discussed then the almost fanatical campaign directed against public housing by the National Association of Real Estate Boards, of which I am a member. I said I would not let distortion and fraud go unchallenged. Evidently NAREB does not take me at my word, because this newest editorial shows neither regard for facts nor an intelligent understanding of the program. There are methods of supporting a cause or a system. You can lead with the truth or you can mislead with unsupportable propaganda.

Valid, constructive criticism should never be rejected. But we have not had this from NAREB. Instead, behind a thin veneer of respectability, we have had the unlikeliest set of conclusions that were ever based on not wishful, but willful thinking.

I am not unaware that these offensives begin at the time our Congress considers new housing legislation. So be it. Let us examine the previously mentioned May 2, 1955, editorial.

First, they ask, "Does public housing take care of the needy?" Their answer is "Hardly ever. In Washington, D. C., the model of Federal experimentation, a study showed that only 47 of more than 4,000 families receiving welfare aid were permitted in public housing." The propaganda went on from there, but what are the facts? They need to be brought out.

NAREB tells you that there are only 47 Washington, D. C., families receiving relief being benefited by public housing. There are 399 such families in Washington's public housing. A dime local phone call to the National Capital Housing Authority would have established the facts. NAREB's Washington office could spare it.

I give NAREB its poor choice. It has used either faked or negligent statistics. In either case, it owes an abject apology to the National Capital Housing Authority, in particular and the public housing movement in general, and I for one haven't the time to wait for it.

There are more than faked statistics in this matter. Washington, D. C.'s welfare loan wasn't picked at random as an illustrative case. It was used in this instance because it is among the lowest in the country. Washington has only eight-tenths of a person out of a thousand on relief, while the national average is six and a half persons out of a thousand. Not satisfied to use an extreme case that completely distorts the national situation, the writer of this Washington, D. C., editorial had to give false figures, exaggerated by more than eight times.

In this same editorial of May 2, 1955, NAREB charges that "the mayor of Detroit was refused information by the public housing authority in his city." I have had the honor of knowing Mayor Cobo. In addition, I know something, as Public Housing Commissioner, of the operation of public housing in that city and the State of Michigan, which requires all public housing authorities, or commissions as they are referred to there, to operate directly under the control of the city government. Given that as a fact, how could any public housing commission in Michigan refuse information to its mayor, let alone the Detroit Housing Commission, refuse Mayor Cobo?

Not content with the obvious falsity of this charge by NAREB, I have had my office contact that of Mayor Cobo, with regard to this statement. He authorized us to deny its veracity and to state that the Detroit Housing Commission has at no time denied him information, but quite the contrary, has always supplied it. On what figment of imagination NAREB has based this charge, I do not know. I do know, and Mayor Cobo knows, that it is false.

Like many national organizations, NAREB meets annually, and for the most part, much good accrues to the realtor and the real-estate industry from the interchange of ideas at these meetings. But unfortunately, through the years, public housing has become the whipping boy at these annual affairs. We run the gauntlet.

Periodically, all the old housing bogies are dragged out by NAREB for public display—the old chestnuts are refurbished.

Eight years ago NAREB was saying that public housing was a "fascistic, communistic, socialistic doctrine." Public housing, they said then, "is a danger to freedom, a danger to home ownership, and a danger to our form of government." In 1947, a NAREB spokesman told a Senate committee that public housing could destroy the country's entire private housing industry.

They have kept it up. Last year NAREB alleged from Washington, D. C., that public housing failed to house needy families; it was a special privilege and a political racket; it was a Russian custom; it herded families together into ghettos, and it is an unfair burden on homeowners.

In 1955, NAREB's tune is largely the same. The lyrics are but little different in the May 2 editorial. They said this year that public housing is a form of mental sickness. It does not eliminate crime and delinquency. It is not public. Who wants it? And has it done any good?

The passage of time has not had any visible effect on NAREB's public housing views.

Not much. NAREB asked the hackneyed question: "Does public housing take care of the needy?" Earlier in my remarks we examined their statement concerning the National Capital Housing Authority. What is the national picture?

Our records show that during the first half of 1954, the recheck of over 142,000 families living in low-rent public housing showed an average annual income of $1,852 after allowable exemptions. For families admitted during that time, the figure was $1,810. We have no data yet on rechecks for the rest of 1954, but the 30,000 families moving in during October, November, and December 1954 had average annual incomes of only $1,803 after exemptions, $7 less than those admitted in the first half of the year.

These families then were existing on an income of $150 a month. I say they needed help from public housing. Further, 30 percent of the families admitted during the last quarter of 1954 were receiving public or private relief or some form of public benefit.

What is NAREB's definition of need? What are they doing about it? Beyond pious platitudes, have they any practical solution for getting these people out of slums into decent, livable housing?

Take a long look at NAREB's oft-repeated assertion that public housing means the extinction of the private home-building industry. A look at the figures leads me to question the plaintive note in the May 2 tirade, "Public housing strikes down a large element of the construction industry, always a main source of investment and jobs."

What is the record?

The housing census of 1950 showed there were 46 million dwelling units in the United States, a net gain since 1940 of almost 9 million units. Of the total number, 39 million were classified by the census as nonfarm units, with the balance classified as rural farm dwellings.

A large part of the increase in nonfarm housing was accounted for by 5.7 million new units constructed between 1940 and 1950.

How many federally aided low-rent public housing units were started in that decade? About 150,000. Who's being shoved into oblivion?

Now, let's take a look at housing starts for the past 5 years.

Private enterprise started construction on almost 6 million dwelling units in that period.

Local housing authorities started construction on a total of 204,000 low-rent units.

Elementary arithmetic will show low-rent public housing accounted for just about 3 percent of the total nonfarm housing starts. If this 3 percent is scaring 97 percent, it is the wonder of the age. The only people we're really scaring are the slum landlords.

Obviously, public housing is neither throttling private enterprise, nor dooming the private building industry to extinction—a charge trumpeted by NAREB.

NAREB's Washington editorial also asked "Does public housing eliminate crime and delinquency?" And it answered, "All the news we get is that both are on the increase everywhere in our cities, regardless of public housing."

Public housing will not solve every problem of the current age. Just as the police departments, the fire departments, and the welfare departments of your cities do not eliminate crime, fire, and disease entirely. But without any of these municipal agencies, you can conjecture with horror the state we would be in. We have not eliminated crime and juvenile delinquency, either, but we have bettered the record that was in existence before us. Certainly, there is less crime and juvenile delinquency in our projects than there were in the slums that we replaced.

There is also another side to the problem.

As you know, the Congress has been devoting considerable attention to the problems of juvenile delinquency.

The Senate Judiciary Committee selected a subcommittee to investigate juvenile delinquency in the United States. Earlier this year the committee released an interim report on its findings. I believe you will find the following of interest: "Although physically deteriorated and socially disorganized neighborhoods, usually termed slum areas contributed disproportionately to the delinquency caseloads of police and juvenile courts, economically well-to-do communities also produce many juvenile delinquents. As a matter of fact, certain forms of delinquent conduct appear more prevalent in the latter type of neighborhoods." It is not just our problem.

Public housing is not the sole panacea for the Nation's social and economic needs. But as a businessman, a realtor, a former mayor of a good-sized city, I can assure you that public housing is good business, both socially and economically.

You are all too familiar with the pros and cons of federally aided low-rent public housing for me to repeat them. You live with them 7 days a week. I only wish that those who seek to discredit and destroy public housing could spend a week, or at least a day, in a slum house. Or to spare them this mild horror, let them merely tour a slum area on a hot summer day. They'll find out soon enough whether families want to escape from their slum hovels into the decent public housing that NAREB has tagged a ghetto and the cornerstone of the socialistic state.

NAREB has tried through the years to make public housing a synonym for socialism, for communism, for something un-American. Tell me, is it un-American to want to live in decent homes? Do we force families from slums into clean, bright accommodations at rents within their means? Do we hold them in public housing against their will? I know of no pressure—political or otherwise—which binds an American family to a low-rent lease.

Basically, Americans of low income are the same as you and I. We all seek constantly to improve our station in life. We can go as high as our opportunities and our abilities permit us. That's the American way. We all want a decent home for our families.

By the way, the title of NAREB's editorial was "Let's Stop It Now." I agree wholeheartedly.

Roger Lowell Putnam—Advertising Club of Springfield, Mass., Honors Outstanding Citizen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD P. BOLAND

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 23, 1955

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, the William Pynchon medal is an award given by the Springfield Advertising Club to a Springfield citizen for distinguished service to his city. It is the most coveted of civic awards. I am happy to inform the Congress that this year's presentation went to one who is familiar to many Members of this House, Roger Lowell Putnam.

The Springfield Advertising Club is to be congratulated on its choice. There are few men who have served the city of Springfield, Mass., more conspicuously than Mr. Putnam. He has been a "good citizen" in the very best tradition of those words. Whether in peace or in war, he has answered the call of his Nation and his community. And no matter what level in which he served, he has given outstanding, noteworthy service. In a life that has been crammed with private executive functions, he has nonetheless found much time to devote to the public good. Indeed he has been and is an inspiring example not alone to his own city but to the Nation. The father of five children, a graduate magna cum laude from Harvard, studied at Massachusetts Institute of Technology, honorary degrees from Boston College and St. Anselm's College; vice president, president, and chairman of the board of Package Machinery Co.; director of Van Norman Co., American Bosch Corp., Third National Bank & Trust Co., Springfield Chamber of Commerce, New England Council; sole trustee, Lowell Observatory, Flagstaff, Ariz.; member of American Astronomical Association, Petersham, Mass., Memorial Library, Springfield, Mass., Library Association, Commission on Fine Arts and Music, Astronomical Society of the Pacific, Harvard Club of Boston and New York, Colony Club of Springfield, Delta Psi—all of these give testimony to his success in education and in business. Further achievements in behalf of his Nation and community are detailed in his service as an ensign and lieutenant, United States Navy in World War I; lieutenant commander, United States Naval Reserve, 1943; research and development on staff of Admiral Kirk, Deputy Director of Office of Contract Settlement, 1944–46; Economic Stabilization Administrator, 1952; and mayor of Springfield, Mass., 1937–41—the first three-time mayor up to that time in the history of the city.

Roger Lowell Putnam received the William Pynchon Medal at the annual award dinner of the Advertising Club of Springfield on last Tuesday, May 17, 1955. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include an editorial titled "Pynchon Medal Award" that appeared in the Springfield (Mass.) Daily News on May 18, 1955.

PYNCHON MEDAL AWARD

Roger Lowell Putnam last night became the 80th person to receive the William Pynchon Medal, awarded by the Springfield Advertising Club for distinguished service to the city.

The award, named for the founder of Springfield, was given to Mr. Putnam, a former mayor and chairman of the board of the Package Machinery Co., of East Longmeadow, for "his outstanding contributions in the field of humanics which have been dedicated to the betterment of mankind, for his voluntary acceptance of duty in local, national, and international affairs, his business and personal integrity, and his devotion to responsibilities, which have been reflected in higher standards of human values in the civic, industrial, and community life of the Springfield area."

Adm. Alan G. Kirk, former Ambassador to Russia, spoke at the dinner and lauded Mr. Putnam who served on Kirk's staff during two world wars.

There are many in Springfield who can testify to Mr. Putnam's ability and intelligence, who can cite his achievements, and can do honor to his devotion to public causes. However, we are pleased when the judgment of our community is endorsed by someone from another field of service who recognized Mr. Putnam's worth.

Mr. Putnam is honored with the Pynchon Medal, and he adds honor to the award as he joins the roll of distinguished citizens who have served Springfield well.

Keep the Record Straight

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL C. JONES

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 23, 1955

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, in offering for the RECORD an editorial which appeared in the Thursday, May 19, 1955, issue of the Missouri Cash-Book, of Jackson, Mo., I would call attention to the fact that it appears that the Farm Bureau, through its Farm Bureau News, appears to be following the policy set by Secretary of Agriculture Benson in his apparent efforts to widen the breech between consumer and farm groups, is deliberately, purposefully, and maliciously misquoting the record.

In this particular instance I am referring to the misquoting of the distinguished chairman of the House Committee on Agriculture, the Honorable HAROLD D. COOLEY, of North Carolina, who has been misquoted by those who would attempt to leave the impression that Representative COOLEY has said that Mr. Walter Reuther made the best speech that he had ever heard given before the House Committee on Agriculture, and the same people would, also by their misquotations attempt to leave the impression that Chairman COOLEY had said that Mr. Reuther had presented the farmers case better than it had been presented by any witness who had appeared before his committee. The Farm Bureau News, according to the reprint of its article in the Kansas City Daily Drovers Telegram, apparently has dealt in the

use of the superlative to leave the impression that Chairman COOLEY was discrediting the testimony of many outstanding farm leaders who have appeared before his committee.

In my opinion nothing could be further from the truth. I attended the hearing at which Mr. Reuther testified, and I have been present at many other hearings during the time I have been a Member of Congress and during which I have been privileged to serve on this great committee which is working so hard in the face of dogged, determined and persistent opposition of the present Secretary of Agriculture. It was my first time to ever see, meet, or hear Mr. Reuther, and I must confess that before he began I was skeptical of any contribution which might be made by the president of any group of organized labor, even if he did represent an estimated 6 million members, all of whom naturally are consumers of farm products.

Following his talk I said that I concurred with the statement of Chairman COOLEY that Mr. Reuther had made one—and I repeat, one—of the best speeches dealing with the problems of agriculture that I had heard. Likewise, Chairman COOLEY did not say that Mr. Reuther had presented the farmers' case better or more effectively than it had been presented by any farm leader. What he did say, and I quote from the hearings, which I believe were correctly reported:

> We have had many farm leaders in this committee during the 20 years that I have served here on this committee and I want to say that not one of them has surpassed you in the presentation of the farmers' cause.

To those who have been critical of our chairman for inviting representatives of consumers groups to appear before our committee to discuss the proposed changes in the farm bill to restore 90 percent of parity to support prices on basic commodities, which has now been approved in the House, I would only remind them that every person in this Nation is affected either directly or indirectly by the prosperity of agriculture and the millions of farm families who derive their livelihood from the soil. Those consumers who have been led to believe that the high prices they are having to pay for food and fiber are caused by the fixed fair support prices which have been accorded the basic commodities, need to learn the truth. One of the best ways for them to get the true picture is to attend and participate in the hearings on legislation of this type. This is the opportune time to correct the wrong impressions they may have gained from reading propaganda put out by those who contend that they represent agriculture, but who at this very hour are attempting to destroy the agricultural program which we have been attempting to build for years.

It is for this reason that I commend to my colleagues for reading the editorial below, which was written by my good friend, Mr. C. C. Oliver, a contributing editor of the Cash-Book:

MAYBE THEY REMEMBERED

In last week's issue of our Farm Bureau News, there was a reprint in its editorial column from the Kansas City Daily Drovers Telegram in which Congressman HAROLD COOLEY, chairman of the House Committee on Agriculture, was taken to task because he praised a talk made before his committee by Walter Reuther, head of the CIO, in behalf of farmers.

The article was headed "A Scratching of Backs?" Since our experience has been that the Farm Bureau News prints only opinions that meet with its editors' opinions, we assume that it agrees wholeheartedly with the article reproduced from the Drovers Telegram.

The D. T. says the thing that gave it a jolt (and we presume jolted the F. B. News) was Mr. COOLEY's statement that Mr. Reuther "actually made the best farm speech that I have heard in our committee room during the entire 20 years that I have served on the House Committee on Agriculture."

What is there in or about a statement like that to give the Drovers Telegram and in turn the Farm Bureau News, a jolt? Do they think Mr. COOLEY wasn't telling the truth or do they think he's just a poor judge of speeches on farming? If it's the latter view they take, we'd like to inform them that Mr. COOLEY wasn't alone in his appraisal of the speech as the best that he'd ever heard. Our Congressman from this district, PAUL C. JONES, wrote in his newsletter to the papers of this district, the first of last March, saying:

"One of the most impressive witnesses who has ever appeared before the House Committee on Agriculture which is presently considering a proposal to restore the 90 percent price-support program, was CIO President Walter Reuther, whose opening statement was that while he was not appearing as an authority on farm problems nor as an expert on farm policies, that speaking on behalf of the 6 million members of the CIO, he wanted to make it clear that 'American farmers who are making a tremendous contribution to the well-being and the economic progress of our great country ought to be given the kind of support and consideration that will enable farm families to get that measure of economic justice that parity reflects.'

"At the conclusion of Mr. Reuther's statement, made from notes and lasting about 45 minutes, I believe that without exception and regardless of politics or philosophy, the members of the committee concurred with Chairman COOLEY when he stated that in his opinion, Mr. Reuther had made one of the best speeches he had ever heard, and added, 'We have had many farm leaders in this committee during the 20 years that I have served here on this committee and I want to say that not one of them has surpassed you in the presentation of the farmer's cause'."

This appraisal and statement of Congressman JONES would seem to warrant the opinion that Chairman COOLEY expressed following Mr. Reuther's talk.

But quoting the D. T. further as reprinted in the Farm Bureau News it says: "But to say in effect that an outsider has been able to present the farmer's case more effectively than the farmer himself, obviously is to do an injustice to a great many intelligent farmers and conscientious farm leaders."

Where's the injustice? If we're trying to do a job and a fellow comes along who can do better than we can at it, we'd welcome his help instead of considering that he was doing us an injustice.

Doubtless Chairman COOLEY, Mr. JONES and other members of the committee have heard many intelligent farmers and conscientious farm leaders. But they might have been like Allen Kline, former national president of the organization, and H. E. Slusher, present president of the Missouri Farm Bureau, neither of whom in our opinion represent the rank and file of our membership. We've read some of their speeches and heard them talk and when they'd get in stride and go to talking to us about losing our freedom and security if we voted controls on our major crops and got as much as 90 percent of parity on them, it always seemed to us like they were long on verbiage and short on meat.

Maybe Mr. COOLEY, JONES, and the rest of the Committee on Agriculture recalled their kind of speeches when they were passing judgment on Mr. Reuther's talk.

Germany and the United States Are Friends

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY S. REUSS

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 23, 1955

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, I include the following excerpts from my remarks at the annual Founder's Day dinner of the Steuben Society of America at the Hotel Statler, New York, Saturday night, May 21:

The problem of the status of Germany today and its relations with the United States is of the deepest concern not only to members of the Steuben Society but to all Americans.

It is now 10 years since World War II, 10 years that have been as fateful for mankind as any decade in history. Ten years ago hopes for permanent peace were high. We have seen those hopes fade as the Communists made clear their intention to dominate the world. We have seen the advent of the atomic age, with its awesome potentialities for good or evil. We have seen whole societies in flux, as colonial regimes have yielded to pressure, and new states have been launched to fend for themselves. As the conquest of time and space has assumed fantastic proportions, we know, with a sense of utter finality, that geographic isolation is impossible. Thus we have seen our own America emerge as the acknowledged leader of the free world.

During this entire period a crucial problem in American foreign policy has been the problem of Germany. I might almost say the crucial problem—for the trained manpower and the huge industrial complex of Germany represent the greatest prize in the deadly game originated by the men in the Kremlin. In short, the future of Germany and of America are inextricably linked.

Once Soviet intentions toward Germany became clear, our present German policy began to evolve. In his famous speech in Stuttgart in 1946, Secretary of State James F. Byrnes declared that America would help Germany toward economic recovery and political stability.

We merged our occupation zone with that of the British, and when the Marshall plan was inaugurated we made help available to Germany in liberal amounts. That aid sparked the remarkable economic recovery of Germany, a recovery that has aroused the admiration of the world. Under Allied auspices, a constitution for a democratic Federal Government of Germany was drawn up, and that Government was launched in 1949. A few months before, our airlift had called the Soviet bluff designed to push freedom out of West Berlin. Then came the complex negotiations for the rearmament of Germany. They were rendered more urgent by the bold Communist attempt to seize South Korea, the lesson of which for Germany was all too

clear. The current of pessimism which swept the free world at the defeat of the European Defense Community was fortunately replaced by the thrill of hope when the Western European Union became a reality. The salient fact, however, is that today, 10 years after the end of the war, Germany stands again a sovereign state, with democratic political parties, institutions, courts, and press.

This reforging of the bonds of German-American friendship is not solely a product of power politics. It did not arise simply because Russia covets Germany and we oppose Russia. Nor is it completely the result of our desire to keep German economic strength on our side, important as that factor may be. It is also a recognition of the intrinsic virtues of the German people, of their energy and their dedication. Above all, it is an appreciation of the effort by which Germany pulled itself up from the depths. Such a people obviously cannot be treated as a cipher in international politics; they cannot be a purely agricultural people; they cannot be left powerless, tempting prey to Soviet rapacity.

On the surface, then, our policy in Germany has been a success. But beneath the surface are many boiling tensions which may yet defeat the policies on which we have labored so long. Occasionally it seems that we are in danger of converting those policies into ends in themselves, and thus of losing the advantages in Germany and Europe which we now hold.

Lest this all seem cryptic, let me hasten to specify. It is no secret, for example, that not only the French but the other nations of continental Europe as well are lukewarm on German rearmament. They have accepted the idea, but only in the context of a complicated set of alliances in which we are the dominating partner. This attitude, perhaps, is only to be expected, in view of the long memories which war often breeds.

But the interesting thing is that considerable numbers of Germans and anti-Communist Germans at that, likewise oppose rearmament. Some oppose it because they fear renascent militarism. But even more widely held is the conviction that final alinement with the Western bloc through rearmament closes the door on reunification of Germany for as long as those of us alive today can reasonably foresee.

What a trump card this situation gives to Soviet diplomacy. The Soviets have always had it in their power, of course, to bring about German unification. But they have always balked at genuinely free elections. Their ill-concealed desire to communize all of Germany has caused them to forfeit this diplomatic advantage. Not only would the Western Allies not accept unification of Germany on Communist terms, but Germany would not accept it either.

Now the Soviet Union is seeking to turn to central Europe the face of sweet reasonableness. After 10 years of blocking an Austrian treaty, it has suddenly agreed to conditions on which the West had not been able to win acceptance for years. The Russians have agreed to withdraw all troops. Austria, on its part, is not to join any military alliance, or permit military bases on its territory, and is to ask a guarantee from the Big Four against any future attempt by Germany at anschluss, or union. This week the bells of St. Stephen's in Vienna pealed out the glad news of Austria's freedom.

It is apparent, however, that the real object of this not too subtle maneuver is Germany. The Russians are quite plainly saying to Germany: Withdraw from the Western alliance, do not proceed with rearmament, accept the status of neutrality, and we will see to it that you are happily reunited with your 18 million brethren in the East. In the offing are hints of increased trade with Eastern Europe. It is easy to see why this argument should make a powerful appeal to German opinion. It is equally easy to see why it should appeal to European opinion outside of Germany, which is only reluctantly reconciled to the idea of German rearmament. At one stroke the Russians have contrived to put pressure on the Western system of alliances and on the Adenauer government which supports them.

The Russian object still remains the same: to draw a "neutralized" Germany into the Communist orbit. This she intends to do by retaining her hold on Germany's enslaved neighbors in Eastern Europe, and by biding her time for the day when she can swing another Molotov-Ribbentrop pact with a remilitarized Germany.

Far be it from me to suggest that the Bonn Republic is about to leap into the arms of Moscow. The people of West Germany know that the United States is their proven friend. They do not look inward, but outward to a united Europe, and to a Western Union that spans the Atlantic. But they would be less than human if they were not sorely tempted by a Soviet offer of the character I have described.

This situation presents the United States with both a trial and an opportunity. I am afraid that if our policy becomes encased in rigid formulae, we are in for a time of trial. It is all well and good to insist that we favor German unity, as our State Department has done repeatedly; but this insistence must be coupled with a thorough examination of the means to achieve it. It is in just such an examination that our opportunity lies, for it may be possible, in cooperation with West Germany, to arrive at a solution for the problem of reunification that the Russians must either honor, or lose permanently the advantage of the diplomatic trump they now hold. What is required is some imagination, and an ability to take a long, clear look at our German policy, a look marked by detachment and devotion to the national interest, and uncluttered by political slogans. I cannot believe that our country lacks either the brains or the courage to do this.

Having said all this, it is with some trepidation that I offer a few of my own thoughts on this subject. It seems to me that perhaps one fruitful approach would be to do something like this: Let the President tell Western Europe in the clearest terms that Germany is being rearmed because Russia has left the West no alternative; that, however, if Western Europe will agree, and if Russia will withdraw to her historic borders, we would welcome a Germany that is unified in freedom, and a liberated Eastern Europe, all without the capacity to make aggressive war, but with their security guaranteed by the United Nations. I think that in this manner we would give a crystal-clear demonstration to those people of Western Europe who genuinely fear German rearmament that we are not ruthlessly overriding their point of view. At the same time, by dropping our insistence that Germany adhere to the Western bloc for military purposes, we might force Russia to consent to the unification of Germany under what, in the last analysis, would be Western auspices for every purpose other than military. Certainly if Russia refused her consent, on these terms, her diplomatic position in Germany would suffer a heavy blow. She could no longer pose as the champion of German unity.

But I feel this proposal can be pushed even further. It seems to me that a logical solution for Eastern Europe is at least a partial internationalization along the lines now being pursued in the western part of the Continent. Countries such as Poland, the Baltic States, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Rumania and Bulgaria might be free and independent, but linked in a Central and Eastern European community based on a respect for human rights. Who knows? Perhaps one day the Eastern European and the Western European federations could be merged in a real United Europe. And could not the vision of Charlemagne and the dream of Dante then become a reality?

Under such a proposal, the advantages that might accrue to Germany are considerable. The prospects for peace would be vastly greater. The partial internationalization of Eastern Europe offers a constructive opportunity for a just settlement, with German concurrence, of the trans-Oder-Neisse territory now administered by Poland. While no longer a member of the Western military alliance, Germany would not be required to forego membership in the European Coal and Steel Community, the Organization for European Economic Cooperation, the Council of Europe, even of a transatlantic economic and political NATO, nor of the United Nations. Germany would lack arms, but she would be free to form economic, political, and social ties with whom she wished—and I think she would wish them mainly with the West. Lying in the heart of Europe, she would be the natural center of trade within the Continent. Her mighty economy would be devoted toward peace, not war. I refuse to believe that Germany can find greatness only in militarism, or that the prospect of using her economic might to benefit the Free World in peacetime trade and aid does not hold out a higher inspiration to her people.

For ourselves and our NATO allies, the advantages of such a proposal are equally obvious. The worst sources of tension in Europe would be eliminated. True, Russia herself would still be our antagonist in the cold war. But NATO could and should continue its policy of strength. Certainly the NATO position would not be worsened by relinquishing 12 hypothetical German divisions for 60-plus existing satellite divisions. And if Russia means anything by her current disarmament gestures, progressive disarmament on both sides can go hand in hand with a European settlement.

Now I know that to expect Soviet Russia to withdraw to her historic borders is expecting a great deal, and it is easily conceivable that she would turn such a proposition down flat. But that should not deter us from trying, particularly at a time when signs of Soviet stress are beginning to show. If the Soviet Union, offered a meaningful guaranty of her security in Europe, chooses to stand before the world as the force preventing German unification, as the force imprisoning the satellites, as the force blocking the formation of a European federation dedicated to peace, then let her so stand. We at least will have done our share.

Now obviously I do not have the temerity to suggest that these proposals with respect to Germany and Central Europe are the only proposals, or the best proposals, or anything of the sort. I merely offer them because I am concerned, as I believe you are concerned, with the way our policy toward Germany seems to be stuck on dead center.

I think American policy toward Germany needs to assume a more affirmative character. We must not allow ourselves to be led by events. Rather, we must advance positive, constructive suggestions looking to the solution of this problem. To remain complacent is to court disaster.

When the Four Powers meet "at the summit" this summer, it would be well if the West had something positive to talk about. For unless we do, a massive Soviet propaganda victory is in prospect.

In the 10 years since the cessation of hostilities, American policy toward Germany, and indeed Germany itself, have come full circle. At first our policy was stern, specifically designed to destroy Germany's military power. The aggressive pursuit by the Soviet Union of its goal of world communism forced a reconsideration of our aims and methods,

a reconsideration which led to their thorough overhaul.

But it was not only the activities of the Communists which forced this reconsideration. It was the growing realization, as well, that the spirit of Germany was not the spirit of Adolf Hitler, but rather the spirit of Goethe, of Schiller, of Beethoven. It was inspired by the manner in which Germany set to work to erect a new, democratic structure, on the ruins of the old.

On its part Germany, at the end of the war, was stunned and apathetic. But the will to live and grow was strong. Apathy was put aside, and by a great national effort, Germany lifted herself by her own bootstraps, restored her once flourishing economy, and earned the respect of the nations. Once again, she resumed her rightful place in world affairs.

Today Germany is our trusted friend. She looks to us to help her solve the economic and political problems with which she is still beset. We see her as our ally, working toward a peaceful world. It is to the mutual advantage of both nations that this happy relationship should continue.

In my home city of Milwaukee, a statue of Baron von Steuben stands near that of George Washington. It is fitting that these two heroes of freedom should thus be linked. Let the spirit of freedom which both men exemplify light the way for Germany and America, each united in freedom, to stand together against the despotism that threatens to engulf us.

Radioactive Fallout in the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL HINSHAW

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 23, 1955

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, as apprehension over radioactive fallout has been running rife since the AEC authorized publication of a typical diagram and description of so-called fallout patterns, I have thought it might contribute to a completely sobering effect if an article were to be prepared, officially, which would relate the actual facts concerning quantities of radioactive fallout that had occurred in the United States since our country and the U. S. S. R. started testing atomic weapons. Now appears the article following, which was prepared for the weekly publication of the American Association for the Advancement of Science entitled "Science" of May 13, 1955, by two eminent staff members of the Atomic Energy Commission. I presume this is official enough to qualify, although for the lay reader it is a bit technical.

First, it must be understood by us all that every minute of our lives we are receiving radiation from natural sources—from the sun, from outer space, from radioactive isotopes in the earth's crust and atmosphere, and even from the minute quantities of radium in the luminous dials of our watches. That radiation is described as "background radiation." It has existed since time began and will continue. It varies a bit from place to place, depending much on the contents of the earth's crust at the particular place, but, generally speaking, the background radiation our ancestors and we and our descendants absorb constantly is on the order of 160 milliroentgen—0.160r—per year. The total amount laid down by all the atom-bomb tests up to now in the States of the heaviest fallout is the equivalent of scarcely half of that and on the average is not even 10 percent. Compare that small amount with the lethal dosage which is estimated to be on the order of 400,000 milliroentgen and you can see that the total fallout to date would have to be multiplied several thousand times to be dangerous to human life.

To better understand table 2, a person living, for example, in Georgia, which has received approximately 58 millicuries of mixed fission products per square mile from bomb-test fallout, receives 3 times as much radiation each year from natural background-radiation sources. The total radiation from both natural and fallout sources that a person in Georgia receives in a year is scarcely as much as is received by having one chest X-ray. It does not amount to anything.

This entire subject is under constant study and close observation by AEC scientists and we can rest assured that if any danger shows up we will be warned in plenty of time. To date there appears to be none.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from Science of May 13, 1955, entitled "Radioactive Fallout in the United States," by Merril Eisenbud and John H. Harley, Health and Safety Laboratory, United States Atomic Energy Commission, New York:

This report summarizes the data accumulated up to the present time by the fallout monitoring network of the United States Atomic Energy Commission.[1] Having reviewed the information obtained through early 1952 in a previous article,[2] we now add the data obtained in more recent atomic tests, including the Pacific exercises in the fall of 1952 (Operation Ivy), the Nevada tests early in 1953 (Operation Upshot-Knothole), and the Pacific tests in the spring of 1954 (Operation Castle).

The data are representative of the entire area of the United States except that within 200 miles of the Nevada test site. This region is not covered by the monitoring system described here, but the radioactive fallout within this area has been reported in the semiannual reports from the AEC to the Congress.[3,4]

Description of monitoring system: When tests are under way in Nevada, the monitoring network consists of 89 sampling stations,[5] but at other times the number is reduced to 41, a reasonable distribution of sampling sites for the more diffuse radioactive debris that may originate from detonations beyond the continental limits.

Table 1 lists the stations that are operating during the Nevada tests this spring. These stations, with the exception of Cleveland, Ohio, Cape Hatteras, N. C., and Concord, N. H., were also in operation during the 1953 spring tests in Nevada (Upshot-Knothole); those marked with an asterisk were in operation during the Pacific tests conducted in the spring of 1954 (Castle).

The 1-ft^2 gummed surface previously described[2] continues to be used to collect samples. The adhesive is supported on an acetate film mounted horizontally on a frame about 3 feet above the ground. The coating retains its adhesive properties when it is wet, and dust particles that are entrapped in raindrops are collected. The gummed films are changed each day and are mailed to the AEC Health and Safety Laboratory in New York, where their radioactivity is assayed.

The samples are prepared for analysis by ashing at 550° to 600° C. This results in the loss of some volatile isotopes, such as those of iodine and ruthenium, but these comprise less than 10 percent of the total activity. This defect in procedure is justified by the simplicity of the operation.

The small amount of residual ash is transferred to plastic planchets that are sealed between two layers of vinyl tape for automatic beta counting.[6] These counters have a background of 7 to 10 counts/min and efficiencies of the order of 10 percent. Samples are counted for 20 min, or for 640 counts if this occurs before 20 min have elapsed. Blanks and standards are sealed into every tape. The counts are extrapolated using the $t^{-1.2}$ law to express decay.

This method of monitoring fallout is exceedingly sensitive. We have observed that a general rise in the gamma background of 10^{-4} r/hr is associated with fallout of approximately 10^6 disintegrations/min ft.^{2} The counting procedures in routine use in this laboratory permit detection of a daily fallout of as little as 10 disintegrations/min ft.^{2} It is thus possible for us to detect radioactivity that produces a general elevation of background of about 10^{-9} r/hr. The normal gamma background count, which is caused by cosmic rays, radiopotassium, radium, and other natural sources of radioactivity, is quite variable in the range of 5×10^{-6} to 5×10^{-5} r/hr. This method thus makes it possible to estimate minute amounts of radioactivity that are insufficient by far to affect measurably the general gamma radiation background of an area.

It is clear that no one sampling procedure provides the ideal method for estimating the deposition of radioactive dust under all conditions. The deposit on any given area will depend somewhat on the character of the surface presented. For example, when there is no rainfall, dry fallout may drift somewhat with other windblown dusts. In this situation the gummed filter technique may yield a high estimate of the average fallout, because it will tend to collect dust that is being redistributed laterally.

We have compared the collection characteristics of the gummed film (G) and a high-walled pot (P). During a 49-week period we found that the regression of P on G was 1.17 ± 0.19. That is a highly significant relationship that does not differ significantly from 1.

Methods of collection utilizing pots or pans for collection of total rainfall are disadvantageous in practice because of the need to transfer and handle the wet samples preparatory to shipping to a central radiochemical facility. The gummed-film method is uniquely simple—at the end of the sam-

---

[1] The work summarized in this report was performed by many individuals on the staffs of the U. S. Atomic Energy Commission and the U. S. Weather Bureau. We are particularly indebted to J. S. Alercio, A. E. Brandt, J. C. Bugher, N. Halden, H. D. LeVine, D. E. Lynch, and L. Machta.

[2] M. Eisenbud and J. H. Harley, Science 117, 141 (1953).

[3] U. S. Atomic Energy Commission, Thirteenth Semiannual Report (Government Printing Office, Washington, D. C., January 1953).

[4] U. S. Atomic Energy Commission, Fourteenth Semiannual Report (Government Printing Office, Washington, D. C., July 1953).

[5] Together with the stations operated within a distance of 200 miles from the test site, the total number of monitoring locations in the United States is more than 100.

[6] Radiation Safety for A-Weapons Test, Nucleonics 10, No. 5, 10 (1952).

pling period the film is folded and placed with a data card in an envelope for mailing to the Health and Safety Laboratory, where it is processed in the manner described.

The routine operation of this network has been greatly facilitated by the cooperation of the United States Weather Bureau, at the stations of which our collectors are placed. Duplicate samples at all stations provide insurance against loss of samples and also give the advantage of replication.

We have discontinued the routine monitoring of air-borne (suspended) dust at all locations. We have previously reported[2] that the highest daily mean air-borne dust concentration recorded during the Nevada tests in the spring of 1952 was 23×10^{-3} $\mu\mu c/cm^3$ (equivalent to 53,000 disintegrations/min m^3) at Elko, Nev., on June 1. The estimated cumulative dose to the lungs of persons who breathed this concentration is 20 millirads,[7] somewhat less than the dose from a chest X-ray. We now have the experience gained during a more recent Nevada series of tests, those conducted in the spring of 1953. We collected samples of air extensively during that series, but none was as high as this previously recorded maximum level.

Accumulation of radioactive fallout: Table 2 gives our estimates in millicuries per square mile of the total fission products deposited throughout the country since early 1951. These estimates are based on approximately 250,000 samples collected since 1951. The accumulation varies from 21 mc/mi² in Arizona to 120 in New Mexico. The mean of the reported value is 61 mc/mi². The spread is rather narrow in view of the many factors that affect the amount of fallout in any given place. Nevada is not included because gradations in the fallout patterns make it impractical to assign a single value for the State.

The manner in which each of the test series has contributed to the total fallout now estimated to be present in the Northeastern United States is illustrated in Figure 2 [not shown], which continues the type of graphical presentation first used in our earlier report. In order to facilitate the presentation of these data, we have made the simplifying assumption that the debris from each of the detonations of a series of tests originated from a single burst occurring at the midpoint of the series. The total artificial radioactivity continues to be of a low order when it is compared with the radioactivity normally present in the earth's crust. The naturally occurring isotope Ra^{226} is present in amounts that vary between 100 and 1,000 mc/mi², considering only the upper few inches of the earth's crust.

Of the various long-lived constituents present in this radiactive debris, Sr^{90} is of most interest. This is because of its relatively long half-life (25 years) and the fact that its chemical similarity to calcium makes it possible that strontium can enter into biological systems along with calcium and ultimately be deposited in human bone. As is well known, this is also true of radium.

The estimated accumulation of strontium in the soil in northeastern United States is also shown in figure 2. The contribution from Sr^{89} is not shown because of its relatively short half-life (55 days). The ratio of Sr^{89} to Sr^{90} in the accumulated debris from all detonations is estimated to have been about 1.0 on January 1, 1955.

By September 1, 1954, the estimate of accumulated Sr^{90} was 1 mc/mi² This estimate is based on the assumption that Sr^{90} is present in the debris in an amount that can be predicted from the data of Hunter and Ballou.[8] The proportion of Sr^{90} of the debris may vary somewhat from theory, and more or less Sr^{90} may be present. This is consistent with the manner in which Sr^{90} is formed and the general dynamics of the fireball as we presently understand it. The Sr^{90} is derived from a radioactive parent Kr^{90}, which is an inert gas having a half-life of 25 sec. Thus, much of the Sr^{90} that is ultimately present in the debris is formed when the fireball is relatively old and has cooled considerably. This can result in the presence of a disproportionate fraction of Sr^{90} in a given particle of debris. A tentative assumption, supported by incomplete studies, is that the debris which falls out in the immediate vicinity of a detonation is depleted in Sr^{90}. Conversely, the debris that falls out at great distances is likely to be enriched in this nuclide. Recent unpublished analyses from our laboratory suggest that the use of the Hunter and Ballou curves to estimate the radiostrontium content of our samples may yield values that are about 30 percent of the true value. The same reasoning applies to Sr^{89}, which is also derived from a krypton isotope.

However, an upward adjustment, by a factor of 3, of our estimates of the Sr^{90} contribution to the earth's crust does not alter the conclusion that the fallout of long-lived radioactive constituents of the debris has been minute compared with the radioactivity that is normally present in the earth's crust. Bugher[9] recently estimated that the amount of strontium present would have to be increased by the order of 1 million times before the biological effects from this cause could be recognized.

In a few places relatively heavy fallout caused by a combination of meteorological coincidences resulted in elevations of the radiation background that were readily detectable with conventional radiation detection equipment. In each case the fallout was associated with precipitation coinciding with the transport of radioactive dust into the rain-forming levels of the atmosphere. The bulk of this radioactivity is eliminated by decay in a matter of hours or a few days after the fallout. At no place except in the immediate vicinity of the test site in Nevada is there a sustained elevation of the background sufficient to be demonstrable by direct measurement of the gamma background in the area. For example, the deposition of mixed fission products in New Mexico is estimated to have been approximately 120 mc/mi² on January 1, 1955. The gamma radiation from this deposition is of the order of 0.0010 mr/hr; the normal background of the United States varies from 0.005 to 0.05 mr/hr and in any one place may vary by as much as a factor of 5, primarily because of meteorological situations that inhibit the dispersion of the radioactive gas radon and its daughter products. It would be difficult, although possible, to measure the increase in dose rate caused by 100 mc/mi².

An example of relatively heavy fallout was the radioactive rain in Troy, N. Y., of April 1953. This instance was particularly well documented by Clark.[10] Although Troy is located at a great distance from the Nevada test site, the fallout on that city is to our knowledge the highest that has occurred except, as reported elsewhere,[4] for some of the communities located within 200 miles of the Nevada test site. Clark reported that the cumulative dose from Troy fallout was about 100 mr. It is apparent from this and previous descriptions of methods by which we document radioactive fallout at distances from the site of a detonation that the widespread dispersion of radioactive debris is readily demonstrable by rather simple techniques.

It is not surprising that at times anomalously high fallout at great distances from a detonation has been readily observed by conventional radiosensitive laboratory equipment. It will be recalled that fallout from the first atomic detonation in July 1945 was observed as a result of contamination of photographic packaging material.[11] A number of scientists have recently recorded their observations in systematic fashion and a number of excellent scientific publications have resulted. Unfortunately, the calm presentation of the facts, usually many months after the incident, does not erase from people's minds the more sensational statements that have appeared in the press as a result of either pure speculation or superficial and incomplete information.

TABLE 1. *Network of collection stations, February 1955*

(The stations in operation during Operation Castle, the Pacific tests conducted in the spring of 1954, are indicated by an asterisk.)

Mobile, Ala.	Helena, Mont.
Montgomery, Ala.	Kalispell, Mont.
Flagstaff, Ariz.	*Scottsbluff, Nebr.
Phoenix, Ariz.	Elko, Nev.
*Tucson, Ariz.	Ely, Nev.
Yuma, Ariz.	*Las Vegas, Nev.
Fort Smith, Ark.	Reno, Nev.
Eureka, Calif.	Winnimucca, Nev.
Fresno, Calif.	*Concord, N. H.
*Los Angeles, Calif.	*Albuquerque, N. Mex.
Sacramento, Calif.	Roswell, N. Mex.
San Diego, Calif.	Albany, N. Y.
*San Francisco, Calif.	*Binghamton, N. Y.
Colorado Springs, Colo.	*Buffalo, N. Y.
Denver, Colo.	*New York, N. Y. (LaGuardia)
*Grand Junction, Colo.	*Rochester, N. Y.
Pueblo, Colo.	Syracuse, N. Y.
*New Haven, Conn.	*Cape Hatteras, N. C.
*Washington, D. C. (Silver Hill, Md.)	Fargo, N. Dak.
*Jacksonville, Fla.	Williston, N. Dak.
*Miami, Fla.	*Cleveland, Ohio
*Atlanta, Ga.	*Medford, Oreg.
*Boise, Idaho	Portland, Oreg.
Pocatello, Idaho	*Philadelphia, Pa.
*Chicago, Ill.	*Pittsburgh, Pa.
*Des Moines, Iowa	Providence, R. I.
Concordia, Kans.	Charleston, S. C.
Goodland, Kans.	Huron, S. Dak.
*Louisville, Ky.	*Rapid City, S. Dak.
*Wichita, Kans.	*Knoxville, Tenn.
*Louisville, Ky.	Memphis, Tenn.
*New Orleans, La.	Abilene, Tex.
Caribou, Maine	Amarillo, Tex.
Baltimore, Md.	*Corpus Christi, Tex.
*Boston, Mass.	*Dallas, Tex.
Alpena, Mich.	Del Rio, Tex.
*Detroit, Mich.	Port Arthur, Tex.
Marquette, Mich.	Milford, Utah
Grand Rapids, Mich.	*Salt Lake City, Utah
*Minneapolis, Minn.	Lynchburg, Va.
Jackson, Miss.	*Seattle, Wash.
*Kansas City, Mo.	Spokane, Wash.
*St. Louis, Mo.	Green Bay, Wis.
*Billings, Mont.	Milwaukee, Wis.
	Casper, Wyo.
	Cheyenne, Wyo.

TABLE 2.—*Cumulative radioactive fallout in the United States, by States, from the spring of 1951 to Jan. 1, 1955, in millicuries of mixed fission products per square mile (mc/mi²)*

Alabama	72
Arizona	21
Arkansas	86
California	29
Colorado	54
Connecticut	33
Delaware	37
Florida	75
Georgia	58
Idaho	90
Illinois	57
Indiana	55
Iowa	84
Kansas	85

[7] The rad is a unit of dose equivalent to an energy absorption of 100 ergs/g.

[8] H. F. Hunter and N. E. Ballou, Nucleonics 9, C-2 (1951).

[9] J. C. Bugher, Medical Effects of Atomic Blasts, paper presented at the Seventh Annual Industrial Health Conference, Houston, Tex., Sept. 23, 1954.

[10] H. M. Clark, Science 119, 619 (1954).

[11] J. H. Webb, Physics Revised 76, 375 (1949).

TABLE 2.—*Cumulative radioactive fallout in the United States, by States, from the spring of 1951 to Jan. 1, 1955, in millicuries of mixed fission products per square mile* (mc/mi^2)—Continued

Kentucky	53
Louisiana	96
Maine	33
Maryland	40
Massachusetts	33
Michigan	46
Minnesota	59
Mississippi	76
Missouri	84
Montana	35
Nebraska	94
New Hampshire	33
New Jersey	30
New Mexico	120
New York	41
North Carolina	69
North Dakota	56
Ohio	56
Oklahoma	89
Oregon	36
Pennsylvania	35
Rhode Island	33
South Carolina	51
South Dakota	58
Tennessee	72
Texas	110
Utah	96
Vermont	33
Virginia	39
Washington	55
West Virginia	41
Wisconsin	63
Wyoming	49

Awards of William and Noma Copley Foundation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BARRATT O'HARA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 23, 1955

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, by unanimous consent I am extending my remarks to include the announcement of the awards of the William and Noma Copley Foundation. This foundabeen incorporated in the State of Illinois tion is little more than a year old, having on May 3, 1954, as a nonprofit organization for the encouragement of the creative arts.

Its laudable purpose is giving aid to creative individuals of outstanding talent or unusual promise to the end that they may communicate more effectively through their chosen media. It will from time to time select individuals who, in its judgment, are deserving of assistance and will make funds available after a careful study of and commensurate with their specific needs.

Such assistance may include outright grants for living expenses during periods of work or study at home or abroad or outright assistance in arranging performances, exhibitions, recordings, publications. or publicity. The foundation will protect the rights of the artist it is assisting and will not require for itself any copyrights or material gains.

FOUNDATION CAPABLY MANAGED

William N. Copley is a painter and journalist. He is a director of the Copley Press, Inc., which owns a chain of great and influential newspapers in Illinois and California, including the Illinois State Journal and Register of Springfield. The editor of this great newspaper in Springfield is V. Y. Dallman, long and brilliantly active in both the journalist and public life of Illinois.

It will interest my colleagues to be reminded that this is the chain of newspapers developed by the Honorable Ira Clifton Copley, who served with great distinction in this body in the 62d and the 5 succeeding Congresses. Colonel Copley, who died in 1947, was one of the newspaper giants of the period when American journalism was building to the stature of the present day. He was a great American. On his passing the control of the powerful newspaper dynasty that he had built passed to the competent hands of William N. Copley and James S. Copley.

Mrs. William N. Copley, who shares with Mr. Copley the administration of the foundation, has long been interested in the field of music and has worked in the motion picture industry and in publications.

Mr. and Mrs. Copley are assisted in the administration of the fund by the Honorable Barnet Hodes, Chicago attorney and art collector. Mr. Hodes, who served longer as corporation counsel of the city of Chicago than anyone in the city's history, has a distinguished record of cooperation with worthy foundations and is presently serving as chairman of the board of the American Heritage Council. While corporation counsel of the city of Chicago, Mr. Hodes established a pattern for a public law office that has been nationally adopted. He is a member of the Chicago law firm of Arvey, Hodes & Montynband.

OTHER MEMBERS OF THE BOARD

Also serving on the executive board of the William and Noma Copley Foundation are the composers Darius Milhaud, of the Paris Conservatory of Music and Mills College, and the artist, Marcel Duchamp.

Advisers to the foundation in the field of music are Winthrop Sargeant, Carleton Sprague Smith; Richard Jones, of Capitol Records, Inc.; the composer, Samuel Barber; Conductor Walter Hendl; and Concert Singer Jenny Tourel. Advisers in the field of plastic arts are Alfred Barr, Jr., of the Museum of Modern Art; Sidney Janis; Sir Herbert Read; Roland Penrose, of the Institute of Contemporary Art, London; Pierre Roche and Alfred Vallotton, of Paris; and painters Max Ernst and Matta Echaurren.

AWARDS FOR 1954 ANNOUNCED

In keeping with its aims to promote and encourage the creation and development of art and music, the William and Noma Copley Foundation takes great pleasure in announcing awards of $1,000 each for the year 1954 to the following artists in recognition of their achievements in their respective fields: Joseph Cornell, constructionist, for his work in the media of film art; Atillio Salemme, artist; Harris Danziger, conductor; Benjamin Lees, composer.

Also the foundation has awarded three scholarship awards of $100 each to the following students of the Paris Conservatory of Music: Jacques Bondon, Manfred Kelkel, Jean Doue.

The William and Noma Copley Foundation plans to sponsor an exhibition of paintings in Paris for which it will invite resident artists of all nationalities to participate. Mr. Alfred Vallotton of that city has generously offered the use of his gallery for this purpose.

Biographical sketches of the recipients of the above awards follow:

JOSEPH CORNELL

Joseph Cornell is one of the most unique artists in America and it is probably for this reason that his work is neither sufficiently understood nor appreciated. Some 20 years ago he began working in a college media, without benefit of artistic training, unconscious of the fact that his work was destined to fit into the historic showing at the Julien Levy Gallery which launched Surrealism in America. It was at this exhibition that his first two constructions appeared. Since then they have been exhibited widely. The Museum of Modern Art in New York has a Cornell construction in its permanent collection as does the Art Institute of Chicago. Mr. Cornell has always been interested in ballet as subject matter for his constructions and has done several covers for the magazine Dance Index.

He has also worked extensively in the motion picture media and has built up a collection of rare stills of use to film historians, as well as a collection of equally rare early French primitive films. He has several avant guarde films in various stages of completion.

ATTILLIO SALEMME

Attillio Salemme was born in Boston on October 18, 1911 and has been living in New York since 1929. Although he has had no formal art education, he received encouragement and valuable advice from his brother Antonio, a sculptor and painter. He has devoted all of his time to painting since 1940. In 1947, Mr. Salemme received the Flora Mayer Witkowsky prize at the 58th Annual American Exhibition of Abstract and Surrealist Art, and in the same year won the purchase prize at the First National Print Exhibition. He has received commissions to do paintings for the Manhattan House and Moore McCormick Line for the steamer S. S. *Argentina*. Pictures of his art are in the permanent collections of the Museum of Modern Art, the Metropolitan Museum and the Whitney Museum. He has had seven 1-man shows since 1945 and his paintings have been bought by many outstanding collectors. He is married and has two children, both boys. His wife Lucia is also a painter.

HARRIS DANZIGER

Harris Danziger is an American conductor with extensive experience in both symphonic and operatic fields. For the past several years he has been conducting the orchestra of the Manhattan School of Music and in this capacity has been responsible for introducing to New York audiences a number of significant modern works. In recognition of these

concerts he was engaged by the Alice M. Disson Fund and New Music, Inc., to conduct a concert of important American chamber-symphonic works at Columbia University. In 1952 Mr. Danziger was awarded the first Ford Foundation fellowship in music ever granted which enabled him to spend a year in Europe studying and conducting such orchestras as the Vienna Symphony and the Paris National Radio Symphony. As a conductor Mr. Danziger has worked in Broadway operatic productions, was musical director of the Eastern Maine Musical Festival, the Lemonade Opera Co., and the Negro Opera Co. He has been program consultant for the New Friends of Music in New York. He has also been a member of the world famous Manhattan string quartet.

Mr. Danziger has studied under Pablo Cassals, Pierre Monteux, Eduard Van Beinum, conductor of the Concertgebouw, and Karl Bohm of the Vienna Staatsoper.

BENJAMIN LEES

Prize pupil of George Antheil, Benjamin Lees, at the age of 30, is one of America's most promising composers. He received his early musical education at the University of South Carolina. His first string quartet, composed in 1952, has been played by the Israeli quartet at the McMillan Theater of Columbia University, and later again on the American Music Festival program in Town Hall, New York, and broadcast over station WNYC. Recently it was played by the Budapest string quartet. He has also written a first symphony, which is soon to be performed. A profile for orchestra was played by the NBC Symphony last winter. Mr. Lees, who now lives with his wife in New York, has received the Fromm and Guggenheim Foundation awards and will soon be leaving for Europe, where he plans to continue his composition in Florence.

Keenotes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ELIZABETH KEE

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 23, 1955

Mrs. KEE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I should like to include my newspaper column Keenotes for May 26, 1955, concerning the President's statement before the convention of the National Association of Radio & Television Broadcasters to the effect that the broadcasters may have an influence even greater than the press.

The column follows:

KEENOTES

(By Hon. ELIZABETH KEE, of West Virginia)

Yes and no.

Personally, I think it is more no than yes—referring, that is, to the remark by President Eisenhower the other morning in attempting to measure the relative effectiveness of radio and television on the one hand, and the press of the Nation on the other, in influencing public understanding and in disseminating information.

Speaking to 3,000 delegates at the convention in Washington of the National Association of Radio and Television Broadcasters, the President said he thought the broadcasters may have an influence "even greater than the press."

The black-on-white print of a newspaper report is "essentially cold," he said, whereas television and radio "put an appealing voice and an engaging personality into homes."

Yes and no. The voice and personality of radio and TV may be warm and appealing; the newsprint cold. We could say yes to that. But as to the relative effectiveness of their informational work—in not just entertaining but in informing the public—well, on that score I'd have to say no to the President's theory.

How many times have you half heard a radio bulletin, glanced at but not really seen a TV news film clip, and because you hadn't paid sufficient attention to get the facts wished you could hear it or see it again—or read it?

It's not the fault of the voice of the broadcaster—the appealing voice the President referred to. The fault lies in our own senses—or in the impossibility of paying attention to the sounds and sights and calls and demands upon us which seem to fill each moment.

But then the newspaper arrives and we can read the news and think upon it. We can disbelieve it, too, but in reading it we feel more certain we have the facts of the story only because we are less inclined to mistrust our eyes than our ears—because we can read and re-read a news report to doublecheck those same eyes.

This is certainly not meant to disparage radio or TV. There are things the broadcasters can do—and do perform day after day—that make the publishers and editors green with envy. But as one broadcaster who is also an outstanding editor-publisher, Mr. Mark Ethridge, of Louisville, Ky., told the same convention, radio and TV are putting greater emphasis on entertainment and less and less upon the primary things for which readers buy newspapers.

Happily—and for all of us it is, indeed, a happy thing—both media have not just a role in American communications but vitally essential roles, which complement each while competing with each other.

The last thing I'd want as a citizen or as a Congresswoman would be to have to choose between the newspaper, on the one hand, or radio-TV, on the other—to be forced to give up one or the other.

It's just that I can't sit quietly by and let the President go unchallenged when he puts the appealing voice of radio-TV a notch above the cold but solid, re-readable type of a newspaper in conveying information the public.

Now, if you'll excuse me, it's time for the news broadcast and I want to switch on the set.

The John Day Dam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAM COON

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 23, 1955

Mr. COON. Mr. Speaker, I have here a copy of an editorial from the Corvallis (Oreg.) Gazette-Times of May 21 and also a copy of a letter which Senator NEUBERGER wrote to the editor of the Gazette-Times. The letter is in criticism of an editorial explaining the John Day bill, H. R. 5789, and the instant editorial is in answer to that letter.

This letter and answering editorial bring out so many of the unfounded questions which the opposition to this legislation ask and answers them so clearly that I would like for them to become a part of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Therefore, under unanimous consent, I ask for their insertion:

THE NEUBERGER LETTER

We did not contend the Northwest has been getting too much of the Federal public-works budget, but that we have been most fortunate in the past to have received as much money as we did. While this may not have been out of proportion to our needs, it was certainly out of proportion to our population and taxes paid. You know this and so do Congressmen from other sections of the country.

Like you, we would like to see the Northwest get 100 percent of the budget and realize this wouldn't be enough to do the complete job. Everyone, also including you, know that former Senator Cordon and our Republican House delegation did a wonderful thing in getting one-third of this budget for us.

It will be most interesting to see if you, as Senator Cordon's replacement, can equal this record. Since the Republican delegation talked the money out of a Congress dominated for the most part by Democrats, it should be easy for you as a Democrat not only to exceed this record but to improve upon it.

We don't go along with the entire Colorado River program any more than you do. You voted properly, but how could MORSE vote for it? At least the McKay position is consistent—he is willing to spend Federal money where private money cannot or will not do the job.

We don't know how accurate your power sale figures are and will be interested in knowing the answer to your accusation and will write to Mr. COON to see what he says. However, we do know the bill authorizes sale of the power on a prepaid basis to all power outlets—public and private—so it is not just the reactionary political forces who are concerned.

Speaking of the preference clause and your charging yourself with protecting the public interest, will you please explain to a dumb editor just how this preference clause works to the best interests of all of the said public?

The preference clause, as we understand it, governs the sale of Government-produced electric power. Now suppose the Government builds a flood-control dam and has as a by-product a large amount of power to sell. Is it not logical that the Government, after establishing a price for the power, would sell it without discrimination to any distributor who wanted it—whether municipalities, REA co-ops, or the publicly regulated private utilities? But, again as we understand it, the preference clause won't permit that * * * it makes it obligatory that his power must go first to customers of certain public bodies.

We interpret this to mean that "preference" makes sure that certain consumers (distinguished largely by the fact that they do not get power from electric companies—are allowed to buy electricity which all the taxpayers pay for; while other citizen taxpayers who do buy their electricity from electric companies (about 80 percent of all the consumers) may have only what's left over—if any.

Now this 80 percent of the people pay a lot of their taxes through the power companies (20 percent of all private-power utilities income is paid back out in taxes) but

these same taxes are not paid proportionately by users through the REA power companies. So it would seem that the preference clause subsidizes the users of public power and these people pay less in taxes through their power supplier to create the dams which provide the power on which they have a preference.

If the above interpretation is correct, how is it that you, who have charged yourself with looking out for the interests of the people, are only concerned with protecting the unfair advantage of the 20-percent minority?

Perhaps you will straighten us out in our fallacious reasoning on this preference matter because we know you want to represent all of the people as well as the squirrels.

NEUBERGER ON JOHN DAY

To the EDITOR:

I have read your editorial of May 11 criticizing my opposition to the Coon partnership bill for John Day Dam. I believe your readers may be interested in some facts which the editorial did not disclose.

You infer that—because the Northwest gets one-third of the Nation's Federal funds for multipurpose river projects—this is too much. I contend that—because of the power potential and the need in the Northwest—this is too little. We have 42 percent of the Nation's waterpower potential, and the volume of water carried by the Columbia poses one of the worst flood-control problems in the Nation. Would you propose that the money be spent where there is no power potential and no flood-control problem, merely to equalize geographically the distribution of funds

You said there are no funds for John Day as a Federal project. The total cost of John Day as an authorized Federal project would be about $310 million. Yet you do not explain why Secretary McKay is urging Congress to authorize $1,815,000,000 worth of Federal projects on the upper Colorado River.

Evidently, according to McKay and COON, there is not $310 million in the United States Treasury for John Day Dam, but there is 6 times this much for projects on the upper Colorado.

Of course, the real reason for this contrast is easy to see. John Day is a marvelous power site coveted by the private utilities. The sites on the upper Colorado are marginal and of poor quality. McKay is quite willing to have these developed as Federal projects.

The Cordon-Coon John Day bill of 1954 provided that power companies would put up $164 million to get the power facilities for 50 years. The bill was defeated when Senator MORSE and others opposed it. Now, the Coon John Day bill of 1955 provides that the companies put up $273 million. Isn't this a bald confession that the 1954 version tried to deprive the public of $109 million? How much will the 1956 bill offer?

According to the Army Engineers, the power facilities of John Day are worth $25,538,000 annually. Over 50 years this would amount to a total of $1,276,900,000 worth of electricity at wholesale, for the utilities to sell at a profit. No wonder the reactionary political forces in our State are trying so hard to put across the Coon bill for the private power companies. What a bargain they would get.

Partnership power would be high-cost power. Private utilities pay more interest for their money than does the Federal Government. In addition, partnership power would not be pooled as to costs with the extremely cheap energy now obtained from Bonneville and Grand Coulee Dams. Furthermore, piecemeal use of the river reduces administrative efficiency, increases conflicts over use of this great national asset.

Your editorial did not mention the outstanding farmers' rural electric cooperatives, like the Benton-Lincoln Cooperative, which are dependent on the Columbia River Federal dams for their energy. Yet, under the Coon bill for John Day, the preference clause protecting these co-ops will die. The kilowatts will be monopolized by private companies. Where will the co-ops turn for power? They have no generating sources of their own.

As a United States Senator, I regard myself as charged with protecting the public interest. That is why I oppose the Coon bill to surrender the John Day power facilities to private utility companies for half a century.

I appreciate the fine willingness of the editor of Gazette-Times to open his letter columns to discussion of this crucial issue to our State.

RICHARD L. NEUBERGER,
United States Senator.

SENATE

TUESDAY, MAY 24, 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:

Our Father God, for this hallowed moment at the day's beginning we would step aside from the crowded highway, with its clamant voices, to seek the garden of the soul; that we may become conscious of Thee, claiming the assurance that if with all our hearts we truly seek Thee, we shall surely find Thee. As we pause now in reverent silence may this high place of governance, so great a factor in tomorrow's pattern for all men, become the audience chamber of Thy presence. Because there is no solution of the world's ills save as it springs from the hearts of men, where are the issues of life, we pray for ourselves: Cleanse Thou our hearts by Thy grace; feed our minds with Thy truth; guide our feet in Thy paths; teach us that there is no peace save in Thy will. For Thy name's sake. Amen.

ATTENDANCE OF A SENATOR

John F. Kennedy, a Senator from the State of Massachusetts appeared in his seat today.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, May 23, 1955, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF BILLS

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, and he announced that the President had approved and signed the following acts:

On May 6, 1955:

S. 1722. An act to authorize the Atomic Energy Commission to construct a modern office building in or near the District of Columbia to serve as its principal office.

On May 7, 1955:

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

On May 11, 1955:

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

On May 23, 1955:

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

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, its reading clerk, announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 727) to adjust the salaries of the judges of the municipal court of appeals for the District of Columbia, the municipal court for the District of Columbia, the juvenile court of the District of Columbia, and the District of Columbia tax court, with amendments, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

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

H. R. 191. An act to regulate the election of delegates representing the District of Columbia to national political conventions, and for other purposes;

H. R. 2406. An act to amend subsection (e) of section 1 of title 5 of the District of Columbia Revenue Act of 1937, as amended;

H. R. 3908. An act to provide for the regulation of fares for the transportation of schoolchildren in the District of Columbia; and

H. R. 6063. An act to amend the District of Columbia Traffic Act, 1925, to exempt certain officers and employees of the Senate and House of Representatives from the requirements of such act relating to the registration of motor vehicles and the licensing of operators when they can prove legal residence in some State.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message further announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the President pro tempore:

S. 1650. An act to authorize the Territory of Alaska to obtain advances from the Federal Unemployment Act, and for other purposes;

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

H. R. 3322. An act 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.