SENATE

TUESDAY, MAY 31, 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, we come, turning from memorial wreaths and from the fluttering flags on countless grassy mounds, to face once more the never-ending struggle to maintain, preserve, and defend the freedoms which have been bought for us at so crimson a cost. From sea to sea of the homeland this May morning, where the grass has been trod by reverent feet, and in little patches of alien soil where is kept the bivouac of our valiant dead, we are conscious of the crosses and the flags blending in their mute testimony. Knowing that eternal vigilance is the price of liberty in these days of destiny as we fight democracy's battles against cunning foes at home and abroad, may those crosses and flags speak to us of strength that is increased by its spending, of life that is saved by its losing, and of greatness that is measured by its serving. We ask it in the name of that One who gave His life a ransom for many. 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 27, 1955, was dispensed with.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE RECEIVED DURING RECESS

Pursuant to the order of the Senate of May 27, 1955,

The Secretary of the Senate received, on May 27, 1955, the following message from the House of Representatives:

That the House had passed a 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, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled bill (H. R. 3885) to amend the act of April 29, 1941, to authorize the waiving on the requirement of performance and payment bonds in connection with certain Coast Guard contracts, and it was signed by the President pro tempore.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED

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 was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, on May 27, 1955.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES SUBMITTED DURING RECESS

Pursuant to the order of the Senate of May 27, 1955,

The following reports of committees were submitted on May 27, 1955:

By Mr. BYRD, from the Committee on Finance:

H. R. 5223. A bill to continue until the close of June 30, 1956, the suspension of duties and import taxes on metal scrap, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 386); and

H. R. 5559. A bill to make permanent the existing privilege of free importation of gifts from members of the Armed Forces of the United States on duty abroad; with amendments (Rept. No. 387);

By Mr. CHAVEZ, from the Committee on Public Works; without amendment:

S. 1340. A bill to authorize the conveyance by quitclaim deed of certain land to the Brownsville Navigation District of Cameron County, Tex. (Rept. No. 390);

H. R. 625. A bill to provide for the adjustment of tolls to be charged by the Wayland Special Road District No. 1 of Clark County, Mo., in the maintenance and operation of a toll bridge across the Des Moines River at or near St. Francisville, Mo. (Rept. No. 393); and

H. R. 3879. A bill to amend section 2 of the act of March 2, 1945, pertaining to the Columbia River at Bonneville, Oreg. (Rept. No. 392).

By Mr. CHAVEZ, from the Committee on Public Works; with amendments:

S. 414. A bill 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 (Rept. No. 388);

S. 528. A bill to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a toll bridge across the Rainy River at or near Baudette, Minn. (Rept. No. 394);

S. 928. A bill to amend the Water Pollution Control Act in order to provide for the control of air pollution (Rept. No. 389); and

S. 1318. A bill to authorize construction of a highway crossing over Lake Texoma, Red River, Tex. and Okla. (Rept. No. 391).

By Mr. MAGNUSON, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce; without amendment:

S. 1250. A bill to declare Pike Creek above the easterly side of the highway bridge at Sixth Avenue in the city of Kenosha a nonnavigable stream (Rept. No. 395).

By Mr. MAGNUSON, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce; with an amendment:

S. 1469. A bill to declare the portion of the waterway at Bridgeport, Conn., known as the West Branch of Cedar Creek, a nonnavigable stream (Rept. No. 397).

By Mr. MAGNUSON, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce; with amendments:

S. 1300. A bill to declare a certain portion of the waterway at Greenwich, Conn. (in which is located the Greenwich Harbor), a nonnavigable stream (Rept. No. 396).

By Mr. ROBERTSON, from the Committee on Banking and Currency; without amendment:

S. 1187. A bill to amend section 5221 of the Revised Statutes, relating to voluntary liquidation of national banks (Rept. No. 398); and

S. 1188. A bill to amend section 5240 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, relating to the examination of national banks (Rept. No. 400).

By Mr. ROBERTSON, from the Committee on Banking and Currency; with amendments:

S. 1189. A bill to permit national banks to make 20-year real-estate loans and 9-month construction loans (Rept. No. 399); and

S. 1736. A bill to amend section 5146 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, relating to the qualifications of directors of national banking associations (Rept. No. 401).

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF BILL

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, and he announced that on May 27, 1955, the President had approved and signed the act (S. 1006) to authorize the execution of agreements between agencies of the United States and other agencies and instrumentalities for mutual aid in fire protection, and for other purposes.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

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

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

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

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

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

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Selden Chapin, of the District of Columbia, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Iran.

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

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Richard Lee Jones, of Illinois, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Liberia.

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

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

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

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

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

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

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

ORDER FOR TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

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

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

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

RETENTION ON ACTIVE DUTY OF CERTAIN OFFICERS OF REGULAR ARMY

A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Officer Personnel Act of 1947, to provide for the retention on active duty of certain officers of the Regular Army (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT ON RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT IN GOVERNMENT

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

REPORT OF NAVY CLUB OF THE UNITED STATES

A letter from the National Shipswriter, Navy Club of the United States of America, Rockford, Ill., transmitting, pursuant to law, the annual report of that club, dated April 30, 1955 (with an accompanying report); 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:

Resolutions of the House of Representatives of the State of Massachusetts; to the Committee on Armed Services:

"Resolutions memorializing the Congress of the United States to prevent the curtailment of employment or work at the Boston Naval Shipyard in Charlestown, the Boston Naval Shipyard Annex in South Boston, the Naval Ammunition Depot at Hingham, the Boston Army Base in South Boston and the Watertown Arsenal in Watertown

"Whereas cutback in the work at the Boston Naval Shipyard in Charlestown, the Boston Naval Shipyard Annex in South Boston, the Naval Ammunition Depot at Hingham, the Boston Army Base in South Boston and the Watertown Arsenal in Watertown is creating serious unemployment conditions within the areas in which these activities are located; and

"Whereas each community is in part affected by the financial stability of the employees depending upon employment at the several activities above mentioned; and

"Whereas any further cutback in the work at the various activities mentioned would increase unemployment to an untenable degree: Therefore be it

"*Resolved*, That the House of Representatives of the General Court of Massachusetts urges the Congress of the United States to take such action as it deems expedient by legislation or otherwise to prevent the curtailment of work so that employment will continue at the activities mentioned above in a healthy condition; and be it

"*Resolved*, That the secretary of the Commonwealth send copies of these resolutions to the President of the United States, to the Secretary of the Department of Defense, to the presiding officer of each branch of Congress, and to each of the Members thereof from this Commonwealth.

"House of representatives, May 23, 1955, adopted.

"LAWRENCE R. GROVE,
"*Clerk*.

"A true copy. Attest:

"EDWARD J. CRONIN,
"*Secretary of the Commonwealth*."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of California; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

"Assembly Joint Resolution 36

"Joint resolution relative to Federal research of problems relating to chronic alcoholism

"Whereas in 1954 the State of California created an Alcoholic Rehabilitation Commission to undertake a program of research and treatment in the field of chronic alcoholism, and the Honorable Goodwin J. Knight, Governor of the State of California, has stated that in his opinion this commission offers greater hope to more people than any commission in the history of this State; and

"Whereas while some other States, in addition to California, have launched similar programs to attempt to find the solution to the ever-increasing problem of alcoholism, this problem is nationwide in scope and importance and it is felt that the Federal Government should assume its proper burden in the field of research and treatment in connection with the disease of chronic alcoholism, in the same manner as it has done in the case of other diseases, such as narcotic addiction, mental health, cancer, heart disease, dental diseases, arthritis, rheumatism, multiple sclerosis, cerebral palsy, epilepsy, poliomyelitis, blindness, leprosy, and other diseases; and

"Whereas the importance of the problem of alcoholism cannot be overemphasized, since it has a tremendous impact not only on the social or moral standards of the people of this Nation but also upon the Nation's economy; and

"Whereas it has been estimated that the problem of alcoholism costs industry in this Nation in the neighborhood of $1,250,000,000 a year, and in California alone, in 1954, it has been estimated that alcoholism cost the taxpayers of this State $150 million, such costs being represented by the loss to industry due to diminished production and absenteeism and the increased cost of operation of police departments, courts, jails, and hospitals and in providing welfare, aid to needy children, and disability and unemployment insurance, and by the increase in juvenile delinquency caused by alcoholism: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the Assembly and Senate of the State of California (jointly)*, That the Legislature of the State of California respectfully memorializes the President and the Congress of the United States to enact such legislation and make such appropriations as research and treatment with respect to the problem of chronic alcoholism, such program to be administered by the United States Public Health Service, and which program may provide both for assistance to and cooperation with States conducting research and treatment programs with respect to chronic alcoholism; and be it further

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

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

"Joint Resolution 47

"Joint resolution requesting Congress to permit certain exceptions to the laws governing the sale and exchange of public lands in the Territory of Hawaii

"Whereas there are throughout the Territory many small parcels of public land ranging in size from a few square feet to a few acres which are landlocked without any right-of-way thereto and therefrom; and

"Whereas it has been found extremely difficult and cumbersome to sell or dispose of such parcels under the Hawaiian Organic Act which provides for the sale or disposition of public lands by public auction only: 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 legislation permitting the sale by the land commissioner of small parcels of landlocked public lands not exceeding one-half acre to the owners of adjoining lands at their appraised value without the necessity of selling such lands at public auction.

"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 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 25th 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 Finance:

"Joint Resolution 48

"Joint resolution requesting the Congress of the United States to amend the Social Security Act Amendments of 1952 (Public Law 590, 82d Cong.), as amended, relating to veterans' benefits

"Whereas the present laws covering social-security benefits provide that in determining monthly benefits or lump-sum death payments members of the Armed Forces shall be credited with monthly earnings of $160 during their period of service; and

"Whereas many persons who served or are serving in the Armed Forces earned in civilian life amounts in excess of such sum; and

"Whereas the present laws are therefore discriminatory with respect to such persons: Now therefore

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

"SECTION 1. The Congress of the United States is hereby requested to amend subsection (a) of section 5 of the Social Security Act Amendments of 1952 (Public Law 590, 82d Cong.) so that the first paragraph of subsection (e) (1) added to section 217 of the Social Security Act, as amended, will read as follows:

"'(e) (1) For purposes of determining entitlement to and the amount of any monthly benefit or lump-sum death payment payable under this title on the basis of the wages and self-employment income of any veteran (as defined in par. (4)), such veteran shall be deemed to have been paid wages (in addition to the wages, if any, actually paid to him) of $160 in each month during any part of which he served in the active military or naval service of the United States on or after July 25, 1947, and prior to July 1, 1955, provided, that where such veteran's actual wages or average monthly earnings over a 12-month period immediately prior to active service exceeds $160, such actual wages or

average earnings shall be employed in making such determination of entitlement. This subsection shall not be applicable in the case of any monthly benefit or lump-sum death payment if—'

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

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

"Approved this 25th day of May A. D. 1955.

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

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii; to the Committee on Armed Services:

"Senate Concurrent Resolution 52

"Whereas the white wooden crosses have been removed from the National Cemetery of the Pacific which once marked the graves of our honored dead who lie buried there; and

"Whereas the Congress of the United States was petitioned by Joint Resolution 26 of the 27th Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii on May 7, 1953, to restore and maintain at the cemetery crosses and other suitable religious monuments; and

"Whereas the cross has been used both as a religious symbol and as an ornament with different designs from the dawn of man's civilization and in almost every part of the old world including China, India, Syria, Persia, and Egypt, many centuries before the Christian era; and

"Whereas the use of the cross as a religious symbol in pre-Christian times and among non-Christian peoples may probably be regarded as almost universal; and

"Whereas the people of Hawaii, together with the heroes who lie in the National Cemetery of the Pacific, are descendants of those who have come from many lands and whose culture is a blend of those around the earth, but who both in life and death are identified and united as Americans: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate of the 28th Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii (the House of Representatives concurring), That crosses and other appropriate symbols be restored and placed above the graves of our honored dead buried in the National Cemetery of the Pacific as a symbol of this unity of our people under God, regardless of race, creed, or color; and be it further

"Resolved, That the 28th Legislature join the Pacific War Memorial Commission in requesting that the crosses be restored even if in the interest of economy, marble is substitued by new materials, such as plastic, and without inscription, since the present headstones are appropriate for both personal and religious identification; and be it further

"Resolved, That authenticated copies of this Concurrent Resolution be transmitted to the President of the United States, President of the Senate, Speaker of the House of Representatives, Secretary of Defense, Secretary of the Army, Secretary of the Navy, Secretary of the Air Force, chairman of Senate Committee on Armed Services, chairman of House Committee on Armed Services, Delegate to Congress from Hawaii, Chairman of American Battle Monuments Commission, and Chairman of Pacific War Memorial Commission."

A resolution of the House of Representatives of the Territory of Hawaii; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

"House Resolution 94

"Whereas Hawaii became fully and completely united with and incorporated into the United States as an integral part thereof by voluntary agreement as an independent nation, having sovereign powers coequal with those of the United States, through negotiations dating before 1854; and

"Whereas Hawaii's sovereign powers were ceded with the full expectation that Hawaii, as a former independent nation, would be admitted shortly to the Union with full dignity as a State; and

"Whereas the promise of statehood has not yet been fulfilled, and the people of Hawaii have thus been denied a voice in the Government by which they are governed and taxed, contrary to the principle of self-government upon which this Nation was founded, and contrary to the principle it now proclaims as the right of all peoples of the world; and

"Whereas despite the denial of statehood, the people of Hawaii have willingly borne their duties and responsibilities as citizens of, and have given a full measure of devotion and loyalty in peace and war to, our Nation; and

"Whereas as part of their duties as citizens of the United States, the people of Hawaii have been required to pay Federal taxes on a full and equal basis with the people of the several States; and

"Whereas Congress has assumed only a very small part of the expenses of the Territorial government, and none of the expenses of the local government; and

"Whereas taxation without representation is proper and legal only during the period of pupilage of a Territory destined to become a State; and

"Whereas Hawaii has fully served its term of pupilage and has fully met every historic qualification for statehood; and

"Whereas taxation without representation under such circumstances is contrary to and abhorrent to the ideals that were and still are the traditional foundations of the great Nation of which Hawaii is forever a part: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the House of Representatives of the 28th Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii, That the Congress of the United States is hereby requested to grant Hawaii immediate statehood; and be it further

"Resolved, That, until such time as full statehood is granted to Hawaii, the Congress of the United States is hereby requested to take that action necessary to alleviate the Federal tax burden levied against the people of the Territory of Hawaii and eliminate the injustice of the present treatment of the people of the Territory of Hawaii; and be it further

"Resolved, That duly certified copies of this resolution be forwarded to the President of the United States, the Secretary of the Interior, the President of the Senate, and the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States, the chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs of said Senate, the chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs of said House of Representatives, and the Delegate to Congress from Hawaii."

A resolution adopted by the American Council of Christian Churches, at Memphis, Tenn., favoring the enactment of the so-called Bricker amendment, relating to the treatymaking power; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Two resolutions adopted by the American Council of Christian Churches, at Memphis, Tenn., relating to Formosa, and hostilities in the South Moluccan Islands; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

A resolution adopted by the California Association of Airport Executives, Inc., Fullerton, Calif., favoring the enactment of the bill (S. 1855) to amend the Federal Airport Act, as amended; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

DECONTROL OF NATURAL GAS—RESOLUTION OF COMMON COUNCIL, OSHKOSH, WIS.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I was pleased to receive from the Common Council of the City of Oshkosh, Wis., a resolution which had been adopted in opposition to the unwise legislation which would destroy Federal controls over natural gas. I believe that the officials of Oshkosh have acted wisely in the public interest. I present the resolution, and ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD, and appropriately referred.

I may say that I am enheartened by the tremendous grassroots backing which has been given to our fight to preserve the validity of the Supreme Court decision in the Phillips case. I am proud, indeed, that the State of Wisconsin has been in the forefront of the battle to protect the Nation's consumers—dating from the earliest FPC hearings in Bartlesville, Okla.

The outstanding job performed throughout this long battle by able leaders such as Vernon Thompson, attorney general of Wisconsin; James R. Durfee, chairman of the Wisconsin Public Service Commission; and others, has been admired by the entire Nation. I commend, too, my colleagues in the Senate for their continued firm fight, notably my associate from the other side of the aisle, the distinguished senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS].

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

Whereas since the passage of the Natural Gas Act by Congress in June of 1938, many bills have been proposed in the United States Congress which would exempt the rates of producers and gatherers of natural gas on sales they make in interstate commerce for resale, from present provisions of the Natural Gas Act now requiring the Federal Power Commission to pass upon the reasonableness of such rates; and

Whereas the Harris bill, known as H. R. 4560, along with other similar bills is now set for a hearing before a congressional committee beginning on April 22, 1955, at which hearing opposition should be entered, through our representative, in behalf of the city of Oshkosh and the natural-gas consumers therein; and

Whereas it is deemed in the best interest of the public and the users and consumers of natural gas in the city of Oshkosh that the Federal Power Commission continue to retain jurisdiction over such rates for sales of natural gas in interstate commerce: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Common Council of the City of Oshkosh, That it is hereby declared to be the policy of the city of Oshkosh, in behalf of its citizens and the natural-gas consumers in said city, that opposition be made, through our Members in Congress, to the adoption by the congressional committee, or the National Congress, of the Harris bill, H. R. 4560; be it further

Resolved, That a certified copy of this resolution be forthwith, upon its adoption, sent to Senators ALEXANDER WILEY and JOSEPH MCCARTHY, and Representative WILLIAM K. VAN PELT, for their appearance on the hearing of said Harris bill and also to the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee.

NEW VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION HOSPITAL, WOOD, WIS.—RESOLUTION

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I was pleased to receive from a VFW post in my State a resolution on behalf of proposed legislation introduced in the House by my colleague, Representative CLEMENT ZABLOCKI, of Milwaukee, and in the Senate by myself, in the form of S. 1531, to establish a new VA hospital at Wood, Wis.

I ask unanimous consent that the resolution, which I know represents the thinking of a great number of servicemen and their organizations throughout my State, be printed at this point in the RECORD and that the resolution thereafter be appropriately referred.

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

VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS
OF THE UNITED STATES,
DORN-TELL POST NO. 7429,
May 16, 1955.

Senator ALEXANDER E. WILEY,
Senate Chambers,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: Whereas bill H. R. 600 has been introduced in the House of Representatives, having to do with the construction of a new hospital at Wood, Wis., and

Whereas this hospital is very badly needed due to crowded conditions at Wood, Wis., and

Whereas many of the buildings at the present Wood, Wis., Veterans' Hospital are so old and dilapidated that they are a fire hazard, and should have been replaced years ago; and

Whereas we feel this bill warrants passage: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Dorn-Tell Post No. 7429 of the Veterans of Foreign Wars requests your every effort in the passage of this bill H. R. 600.

Passed unanimous in regular meeting of the Dorn-Tell Post No. 7429, Veterans of Foreign Wars, this 5th day of May 1955.

ROBERT W. HUGO,
Commander.
ROBERT H. DAMUTH,
Adjutant.

(Copies of this letter were sent to Senator JOSEPH R. MCCARTHY, Representative HENRY REUSS, and Representative CLEMENT ZABLOCKI.)

NATIONAL SYSTEM OF INTERSTATE HIGHWAYS—RESOLUTION OF WISCONSIN HOUSEHOLD CARRIERS' ASSOCIATION

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I was pleased to receive from Wilbert R. Sweo, president of the Wisconsin Household Goods Carriers' Bureau, a resolution which was adopted at the 11th annual convention of that association, held in Manitowoc, on May 11 and 12. The resolution unanimously supports strengthening the national system of interstate highways.

Unfortunately, the legislation which we, on the Senate side had proposed for this objective, has been replaced by a different version. It is my earnest hope that my colleagues on the House side will bring the final legislation on this subject more in line with the suggestion made by this association and, I know, by countless transportation groups all over my State, as well as by our national administration.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of the resolution be printed in the RECORD, and appropriately referred.

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

RESOLUTION SUPPORTING NATIONAL INTERSTATE SYSTEM OF HIGHWAYS

Whereas at the direction of President Eisenhower a thorough study of our national highway needs has been made by a special study committee of the National Governor's Conference and by the President's Advisory Committee under the chairmanship of Gen. Lucius Clay; and

Whereas the recommendations of the aforementioned special committees, Secretary of Commerce and the Secretary of the Treasury have been reflected in bills S. 1160, H. R. 4260, H. R. 4261, H. R. 4634, and H. R. 4518 all have been referred to appropriate committees of the Senate and House of Representatives; and

Whereas it is our opinion that the Federal Government should enact said bills in order to quickly and immediately rebuild the national system of interstate highways to assure our continued prosperity and to provide for the defense of our Nation all in the public interest; and

Whereas any great expansion of Federal highway aid to the States on a matching basis would work great financial hardships on said States unless the Federal Government grant aids for 90 percent to 98 percent of the costs for the interstate system; and

Whereas it would further ingender increased State taxation from the highway user in Wisconsin: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the members of the Wisconsin Household Goods Carriers' Association, duly convened in Manitowoc, Wis., do hereby indorse the general philosophy of Federal financing of the national system of interstate highways as reflected in the abovementioned bills now pending in Congress and it urges its representatives in the United States Senate as well as the House of Representatives to support such legislation during the present session of Congress; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be transmitted to the Vice President of the United States, to the Members of the Senate and House Committee on Roads, and to the Wisconsin Members of Congress.

Dated at Manitowoc, Wis., this 12th day of May 1955.

WISCONSIN HOUSEHOLD GOODS
CARRIERS' ASSOCIATION,
By LAWRENCE A. BUCK,
President,

Attest:

WILLIAM A. WALKER,
Secretary.

REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

The following report of a committee was submitted:

By Mr. CHAVEZ, from the Committee on Public Works:

S. 1290. A bill to provide for the construction of certain Government buildings in the District of Columbia; with amendments (Rept. No. 402).

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED

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

By Mr. NEELY (for himself, Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, Mr. LANGER, and Mr. PAYNE):

S. 2102. A bill to increase the salary of the Chaplain of the Senate while the office of Chaplain is held by the present incumbent; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. WILEY:

S. 2103. A bill for the relief of Anke Naber; and

S. 2104. A bill for the relief of Charlotte Muhlefeldt; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HUMPHREY (for himself, Mr. NEUBERGER, and Mr. SPARKMAN):

S. 2105. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to establish a system of price reporting for basic forest products for farmers, to provide for the expansion of research in the marketing of such products, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

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

By Mr. KERR (for himself and Mr. HUMPHREY):

S. 2106. A bill to amend the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act so as to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to make loans directly, and insure loans made by private credit sources, to farmers, stockmen, farm partnerships, grazing associations, and irrigation companies in areas where there is a need for such credit as the result of economic conditions or production losses due to natural causes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. CHAVEZ:

S. 2107. A bill to provide for the conveyance of certain mineral rights to Elmer M. Gandy, of Lubbock, Tex.;

S. 2108. A bill to provide for the conveyance of certain mineral rights to Myrtle Golden, of Milnesand, N. Mex.;

S. 2109. A bill to provide for the conveyance of certain mineral rights to Joseph E. Shipp, of Snyder, Tex.;

S. 2110. A bill to provide for the conveyance of certain mineral rights to Richard L. Robinson, of Jal, N. Mex.;

S. 2111. A bill to provide for the conveyance of certain mineral rights to Carl Bedwell, of Yucaipa, Calif.; and

S. 2112. A bill to provide for the conveyance of certain mineral rights to Walter T. Linam, of Hobbs, N. Mex.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. WATKINS (for himself, Mr. IVES, Mr. DUFF, and Mr. CASE of New Jersey):

S. 2113. A bill to amend the Refugee Relief Act of 1953, as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

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

By Mr. WATKINS (for himself and Mr. BENNETT):

S. 2114. A bill to amend section 22 of the Interstate Commerce Act in order to discontinue the authority under such section which authorizes the carriage, storage, or handling of property free or at reduced rates for the United States and the transportation of persons for the United States free or at reduced rates; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ALLOTT (by request):

S. 2115. A bill to amend the act of July 17, 1914, to permit the disposal of certain reserved mineral deposits under the mining laws of the United States; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. CARLSON:

S. 2116. A bill to provide that Government surplus property may be donated to 4-H

Clubs for the construction, equipment, and operation of camps and centers; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Texas (for himself and Mr. DANIEL):

S. 2117. A bill to authorize purchase of a portion of the bonds issued by the Brazos River Authority, an agency of the State of Texas, to finance the early development by it of the water resources of the Brazos River Basin, Tex.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. DOUGLAS:

S. 2118. A bill to provide for the national defense by encouraging the discovery, development, and production of fluorspar in the United States, its Territories and possessions; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

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

By Mr. LEHMAN:

S. J. Res. 73. Joint resolution to establish a commission to formulate plans for a memorial to Franklin Delano Roosevelt; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

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

By Mr. MAGNUSON (for himself, Mr. JACKSON, Mr. CASE of South Dakota, Mr. DIRKSEN, Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. MURRAY, Mr. MANSFIELD, Mr. MORSE, Mr. NEUBERGER, Mr. THYE, Mr. WILEY, and Mr. YOUNG):

S. J. Res. 74. Joint resolution authorizing the erection of a statue of Leif Ericsson in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

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

SYSTEM OF PRICE REPORTING FOR BASIC FOREST PRODUCTS FOR FARMERS

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, timber farming is important to the economy of many of our States. Yet timber farmers now lack the kind of marketing guidance provided for other farmers.

For that reason, on behalf of myself, the Senator from Oregon [Mr. NEUBERGER], and the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to provide such marketing guidance to the Nation's timber farmers.

Mr. President, I ask that the bill be held at the desk for a sufficient length of time to enable other Senators to join in sponsoring the bill, inasmuch as several of our colleagues have indicated their interest in it.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will lie on the desk, as requested by the Senator from Minnesota.

The bill (S. 2105) to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to establish a system of price reporting for basic forest products for farmers, to provide for the expansion of research in the marketing of such products, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. HUMPHREY (for himself, Mr. NEUBERGER, and Mr. SPARKMAN), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, the bill authorizes the Secretary of Agriculture to—

First. Establish a system of price reporting on basic forest products, for information and marketing guidance of timber farmers.

Second. Provide for the expansion of research in the marketing of such products.

Third. Conduct a study of price trends and relationships as the basis for recommending to the Congress within 2 years an appropriate formula for the establishment of parity prices for such products.

All that we are asking is that the benefits of marketing guidance other farmers get from regular market reports, marketing research, and parity price information be extended to the timber products area, to better serve the country's thousands of small timber farmers.

At present, timber farmers are completely at the mercy of timber buyers because they lack any accurate information on prevailing prices elsewhere, or on market and supply conditions that affect prices. They have no standards against which to compare prices which may be offered them for their products.

I believe this is an area of constructive educational activity that the Department of Agriculture should undertake, in cooperation with State foresters or other appropriate State officials or agencies.

In order to provide farmers and other owners of small forest properties with current information on markets and prices and to aid them in more efficiently and profitably marketing forest products, the bill directs the Secretary of Agriculture to establish a price reporting service for basic forest products, including but not limiting it to standing timber and cut forest products such as sawlogs and pulpwood. It provides that the price reports shall be provided at least quarterly, by States or forest regions or by such other areas as the Secretary considers advisable.

In asking expanded research into timber marketing, the bill directs the Secretary to stimulate research and investigations aimed at developing and demonstrating standards of quality, collecting and disseminating useful market information and developing methods for increasing the efficiency of the marketing and distribution processes for forest products as a means of increasing returns to farmers and other owners of forest properties.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a copy of the bill be printed at the conclusion of my remarks in the body of the RECORD.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That for the purpose of improving the management and use of forest resources and in order to provide farmers and other owners of small forest properties with current information on makets and prices and to aid them in more efficiently and profitably marketing forest products, the Secretary of Agriculture is hereby authorized and directed to establish a price-reporting service for basic forest products, including but not limited to standing timber and cut forest products such as sawlogs and pulpwood.

SEC. 2. The price reports made by the Secretary under section 1 of this act shall be as to such species, grades, sizes, and other detail, and shall be made at such intervals, but at least quarterly, as he deems appropriate. Such reports shall be by State or forest regions or by such other areas as the Secretary considers advisable, and may, in his discretion, be made as to one or more areas in advance of other areas.

SEC. 3. In connection with the gathering of price information and the dissemination thereof, the Secretary is authorized to cooperate with the State Foresters or other appropriate State officials or agencies, as well as with private agencies, and under such conditions and terms as he may deem appropriate.

SEC. 4. The Secretary of Agriculture shall make a study of price trends and relationships for basic forest products such as sawlogs and pulpwood and within 2 years from the date of this act shall submit a report thereon to the Congress together with his recommendations as to an appropriate formula for the establishment of parity prices for such products.

SEC. 5. In the conduct of research activities under the act of May 22, 1928 (45 Stat. 699), and the act of August 14, 1946, title II (60 Stat. 1087), the Secretary of Agriculture is directed to conduct and stimulate research and investigations aimed at developing and demonstrating standards of quality, collecting and disseminating useful market information and developing methods for increasing the efficiency of the marketing and distribution processes for forest products as a means of increasing returns to farmers and other owners of forest properties.

SEC. 6. The Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to issue such regulations as he deems appropriate in carrying out the provisions of this act.

SEC. 7. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated for the purposes of this act such sums as may be necessary.

AMENDMENT OF REFUGEE RELIEF ACT OF 1953

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, the Senator from New York [Mr. IVES], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DUFF], and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. CASE], it is my pleasure to introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill proposing several amendments to the Refugee Relief Act of 1953.

These amendments are essentially those proposed by President Eisenhower on this subject on last Friday, May 27.

Since President Eisenhower covered these proposals in some detail, and the reasons for recommending them, I shall not take the time of the Senate on this occasion to discuss the proposed amendments.

Mr. President, I ask that the bill lie on the desk until the close of business on Thursday, next, in order that other Senators who are interested in sponsoring the bill may add their names to it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, that will be done.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, from the experience of several years of service on the Subcommittee on Immigration and Naturalization, I can strongly endorse the proposed amendments as sound and essential to the smooth working of the Refugee Act.

I ask unanimous consent that both the bill I am introducing today, and the President's message, be printed at this

point in the RECORD, so that they may be available together.

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

The bill (S. 2113) to amend the Refugee Relief Act of 1953, as amended, introduced by Mr. WATKINS (for himself, Mr. IVES, Mr. DUFF, and Mr. CASE of New Jersey), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 2 of the Refugee Relief Act of 1953 (67 Stat. 400; 50 U. S. C. App. 1971) be hereby amended to read as follows:

"(a) 'Refugee' means any person in a country or area which is neither Communist nor Communist-dominated, who has not emigrated to another country for permanent residence and who because of persecution, fear of persecution, natural calamity or military operations is or has been in urgent need of assistance for the essentials of life or for transportation and has not reestablished himself under circumstances which assure him reasonable opportunities in the country where he now lives.

"(b) 'Escapee' means any person who, because of persecution, or fear of persecution on account of race, religion, or political opinion, fled from the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics or other Communist, Communist-dominated or Communist-occupied area of Europe including those parts of Germany under military occupation by the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, who cannot return thereto because of fear of persecution on account of race, religion or political opinion, is or has been in urgent need of assistance for the essentials of life or for transportation and who has not been firmly resettled outside of the country of his asylum.

"(c) 'German expellee' means any person of German ethnic origin residing in the area of the German Federal Republic, Western Sector of Berlin, or in Austria who was born in and was forcibly removed from or forced to flee from Albania, Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, Estonia, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, Rumania, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Yugoslavia, or areas provisionally under the administration or control or domination of any such countries except the Soviet Zone of Military Occupation of Germany, who cannot return thereto because of fear of persecution on account of race, religion, or political opinion, is or has been in urgent need of assistance for the essentials of life or for transportation and who has not been firmly resettled outside of the country of his asylum.

"(d) 'The country of his asylum' means that western European country in which an escapee or a German expellee has resided since his departure from one of the countries or areas referred to in subsections (b) or (c).

"(e) 'Administrator' means the Administrator of the Bureau of Security and Consular Affairs established in the Department of State pursuant to subsection (b) of section 104 of the Immigration and Nationality Act."

SEC. 2. Section 3 of the Refugee Relief Act of 1953 (67 Stat. 401; 50 U. S. C. App. 1971 (a)) is hereby amended by deleting the word "them." at the end thereof and by inserting the words "or following to join them."

SEC. 3. Section 4 of the Refugee Relief Act of 1953, as amended (67 Stat. 401; 68 Stat. 1044; 50 U. S. C. App. 1971 (b)) is hereby amended by adding at the end thereof the following subsections (d) and (e):

"(d) Not more than 1,000 aliens in Austria, Germany, Greece, and Italy may be issued visas and be admitted to the United States under the terms and within the numerical limitations of this act, irrespective of the fact that they are found ineligible to receive visas or inadmissible to the United States under section 212 (a) (6) of the Immigration and Nationality Act as far as it relates to aliens afflicted with tuberculosis: *Provided*, That in the case of each such alien arrangements satisfactory to the Attorney General and the Surgeon General of the United States Public Health Service of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare have been made that such alien, when admitted to the United States, will not become a public charge, and will not endanger the public health: *Provided further*, That such alien is a member of a family unit consisting of qualified applicants for a visa under this act whom such alien intends to accompany or follow to join in the United States.

"(e) The provisions of section 7 (a) of this act, as far as they relate to the requirements of assurances or other evidence of employment and housing, shall not be applicable to aliens who are issued visas or admitted to the United States under subsection (d) of this section, and in lieu thereof the administrator shall prescribe such regulations as may be necessary, for a special assurance to satisfy the provisions of subsection (d)."

SEC. 4. Subsection (a) of section 5 of the Refugee Relief Act of 1953, as amended (67 Stat. 402; 68 Stat. 1044; 50 U. S. C. App. 1971 (c) (a)) is hereby amended to read as follows:

"Not to exceed 4,000 special nonquota immigrant visas may be issued to eligible orphans as defined in this act who are under 12 years of age at the time the visa is issued: *Provided*, That not more than two such special nonquota immigrant visas may be issued to eligible orphans adopted or to be adopted by any one United States citizen and spouse, unless necessary to prevent the separation of brothers or sisters: *Provided further*, That any number of visas authorized to be issued under subsection (a) of section 4 of this act and not issued on or before December 31, 1956, may be issued to eligible orphans as defined in this section notwithstanding the provisions of section 20 of this act: *Provided further*, That a determination of the eligibility of such orphans to receive a visa, including the determination of the sufficiency of the assurance required by this section, shall be the sole responsibility of the consular officer notwithstanding the provisions of section 11 (b) of this act."

SEC. 5. Subsection (b) of section 5 of the Refugee Relief Act of 1953 (67 Stat. 402; 68 Stat. 1044; 50 U. S. C. App. 1971 (c) (b)) is hereby amended to read as follows:

"When used in this act the term "eligible orphan" shall mean an alien child (1) who is an orphan because of the death or disappearance of both parents, or because of abandonment or desertion by, or separation or loss from, both parents, or who has only one parent due to the death or disappearance of, abandonment or desertion by, or separation or loss from the other parent and the remaining parent is incapable of providing care for such orphan and has in writing irrevocably released him for emigration and adoption; (2) (a) who has been lawfully adopted abroad by a United States citizen and spouse while said citizen is or was serving abroad in the United States Armed Forces, or is or was employed abroad by the United States Government, or has resided for not less than 12 months in the country in which the orphan has been adopted or (b) for whom assurances, satisfactory to the consular officer to whom a visa application on behalf of the orphan is made, have been given by a United States citizen and spouse that if the orphan is admitted into the United States they will adopt him in the United States and will care for him properly; and (3) who is ineligible for admission into the United States solely because the nonpreference portion of the quota to which he would otherwise be chargeable is oversubscribed by applicants registered on the consular waiting list at the time his visa application is made: *Provided*, That no natural parent of any eligible orphan who shall be admitted into the United States pursuant to this act shall thereafter, by virtue of such parentage, be accorded any right, privilege, or status under the Immigration and Nationality Act: *Provided further*, That in no case shall an adoption by proxy be considered to be an adoption for the purposes of this section."

SEC. 6. The first sentence of section 6 of the Refugee Relief Act of 1953, as amended (67 Stat. 403; 68 Stat. 1044; 50 U. S. C. App. 1971 (d)) is hereby amended to read as follows:

"Any alien who (1) establishes that prior to July 1, 1953, he lawfully entered the United States as a bona fide nonimmigrant and that he is unable to return to the country of his birth, or nationality, or last residence because of persecution or fear of persecution on account of race, religion, or political opinion, or that if outside the United States he would be eligible to receive a special nonquota immigrant visa under this act; or (2) was brought to the United States from other American Republics for internment, may, not later than June 30, 1956, apply to the Attorney General of the United States for an adjustment of his immigration status: *Provided*, that in meritorious cases under clause (1) of this section, the Attorney General may, in his discretion, waive the requirement that such aliens establish lawful entry. If the Attorney General shall, upon consideration of all the facts and circumstances of the case, determine that such alien has been of good moral character for the preceding 5 years and that the alien was physically present in the United States on the date of the enactment of this act and is otherwise qualified under all other provisions of the Immigration and Nationality Act, the Attorney General shall report to the Congress all the pertinent facts in the case. If, during the session of the Congress in which a case is reported or prior to the end of the session of the Congress next following the session in which a case is reported, the Congress passes a concurrent resolution stating in substance that it approves the granting of the status of an alien lawfully admitted for permanent residence to such alien, the Attorney General is authorized, upon the payment of the required visa fee, which shall be deposited in the Treasury of the United States to the account of miscellaneous receipts, to record the alien's lawful admission for permanent residence as of the date of the passage of such concurrent resolution. If, within the above specified time, the Congress does not pass such a concurrent resolution, or, if either the Senate or the House of Representatives passes a resolution stating in substance that it does not approve the granting of the status of an alien lawfully admitted for permanent residence, the Attorney General shall thereupon deport such alien in the manner provided by law: *Provided further*, That the provisions of this section shall not be applicable to any aliens admitted into the United States under the provisions of Public Law 584, 79th Congress, 2d session (60 Stat. 754), Public Law 402, 80th Congress, 2d session (62 Stat. 6): *Provided further*, That the number of aliens who shall be granted the status of aliens lawfully admitted for permanent residence pursuant to this section shall not exceed 10,000."

SEC. 7. Subsection (a) of section 7 of the Refugee Relief Act of 1953, as amended (67 Stat. 403; 68 Stat. 1045; 50 U. S. C. App. 1971 (e) (a)) is hereby amended to read as follows:

"Except as otherwise herein provided, no visa shall be issued to any alien under this

act unless an assurance, in accordance with regulations promulgated pursuant to this act, shall first have been given by a citizen or citizens of the United States that such alien, if admitted into the United States, will be suitably employed without displacing some other person from employment and that such alien and the members of such alien's family who shall accompany such alien and who propose to live with such alien will not become public charges and will have housing without displacing some other person from such housing. The spouse and unmarried dependent sons and daughters under 21 years of age, including stepsons and stepdaughters and sons or daughters adopted prior to July 1, 1953, of such alien, shall not be required to have such assurances made in their behalf. The assurances shall be submitted to the administrator and it shall be the duty of the administrator to verify the authenticity and bona fides of such assurances and such assurances shall be subject to final acceptance and approval by consular and immigration officers. Blanket assurances, or assurances not submitted by a responsible individual citizen or citizens, or assurances not submitted by an organization recognized by the administrator for the purpose of submitting such assurances, shall not be considered as satisfying the requirements of this section. The assurances for employment and housing shall be indexed and filed in such manner so as to show the specific address or addresses in the United States in which both the employment and housing are available, the type of employment and housing which are available, and the conditions and terms of the employment. Each assurance shall be a personal obligation of the individual citizen or citizens or the obligation of the recognized organization giving or submitting such assurances. This subsection shall have no applicability to the alien eligible under paragraph (6), (8), or (10) of section 4 (a) of this act, if such alien provides satisfactory evidence that he will not become a public charge."

SEC. 8. Subsection (d) of section 7 of the Refugee Relief Act of 1953 (67 Stat. 404; 50 U. S. C. App. 1971 (e) (d)) is hereby amended to read as follows:

"No alien shall be issued a visa under this act or be admitted into the United States unless he shall present to the consular officer at the time of making application for a visa or to the immigration officer at the time of application for admission a certificate of readmission guaranteeing his readmission to the country in which he obtains a visa under this act, if it is subsequently found that he obtained a visa under this act by fraud or by misrepresenting a material fact."

SEC. 9. Subsection (c) of section 11 of the Refugee Relief Act of 1953 (67 Stat. 405; 50 U. S. C. App. 1971 (i) (c)) is hereby amended to read as follows:

"No person shall be issued a visa or be admitted into the United States under this act unless the consular officer and the immigration officer, after an inspection and examination of such person abroad, are entirely satisfied upon the basis of affirmative evidence adduced by the applicant that the applicant has established his eligibility for a visa and his admissibility into the United States under the immigration laws and regulations: *Provided*, That the eligibility of an applicant under this act shall be the exclusive responsibility of the consular officer: *Provided further*, That no person to whom a visa shall be issued shall be exempt from inspection and examination at a port of entry."

SEC. 10. Subsection (d) of section 11 of the Refugee Relief Act of 1953 (67 Stat. 405; 50 U. S. C. App. 1971 (j) (d)) is hereby repealed and subsection (e) thereof is redesignated subsection (d)

The message from the President is as follows:

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

To the Congress of the United States:

The Refugee Relief Act of 1953 has now been in effect for almost 2 years.

It was enacted to enable the United States to participate with other nations in a great humanitarian effort for the relief of tragic victims of the postwar world, and for the reduction, in a measure, of overpopulation stresses in friendly nations. Thus we would promote friendly relations with the nations of the world. Beyond this, it was our purpose to further the interests of the United States by bringing to our shores an eminently desirable immigration within the absorptive capacity of this country. The immigrant has brought greatness to our land and a tremendous love for his adopted country. The foreign-born and their descendants—which include all of us—have given devoted allegiance to the United States, in war and in peace, and have helped give to America a unique position of leadership among the nations.

During the last year and a half, substantial progress has been made in setting up the complex organization required to administer the technical requirements of the act. The necessary cooperation of the various governmental agencies, including those related to medical and security matters, has been enlisted. Over 30,000 visas have actually been issued. Nearly 85,000 applicants are in various stages of processing.

Nevertheless, the purposes of the act are not being achieved as swiftly as we had all hoped. As a result of the experience gained in administering the act to date, important administrative instructions designed to expedite the procedures under it have already been issued. The men and women handling the program are fully aware of the urgency of their mission. I am assured by the Secretary of State that further administrative improvements can and will be made.

Experience has demonstrated, however, that administrative improvements are not enough. A number of the provisions of the act require amendment if the act's objectives are to be fully achieved. I urge upon the Congress the following:

(1) The act, at present, contains specific categories of eligibility with specific numbers allotted to each category. It now appears that because of some of the technical requirements of the act and the growing prosperity in Western Europe, there may not be enough applicants to fill the quotas in some categories. I recommend that there be a provision for the use of unused numbers. Such unused numbers might well be used, for example, for orphans on a worldwide basis.

(2) The act limits the term "refugee" to those who have not been "firmly resettled." Experience has shown that this provision tends to exclude the hard-working and the adjustable, the very people we want most as new citizens. Moreover, it appears that "resettlement" is such a vague term as to create conflicts in interpretation and delays in clearing applications.

I recommend that this limitation be withdrawn so that where the refugee otherwise qualifies on a selective basis he will not be barred because he is diligent and competent.

(3) A similar difficulty is presented by the terms of the act which require that an "escapee" or "expellee" also be a "refugee." Under the act, this unduly limits the escapees and expellees who may be admitted. This again serves to exclude some of the most desirable people who have, at great sacrifice, at least temporarily resettled themselves. I am sure it is enough that a person be a qualified "escapee" or "expellee" to meet the standards on which we all agree. They should not also be required to be "refugees" within the narrow definition of the act.

(4) The requirement that a refugee be living away from his traditional home has excluded many tragic victims of disaster whom I am sure the Congress intended to admit. This includes Netherlands' farmers whose land has been ruined by floods of salt water, Greek mountain people whose herds have been despoiled by Communist invaders, and many similar victims of catastrophe. The restriction should be relaxed.

(5) The act contains a salutary provision enacted by the Congress for the benefit of aliens who are here in the United States and who fear persecution if required to return abroad. There is a limitation, however, within this section which has caused undue hardship in some cases. It requires that the person show "lawful entry as a bona fide nonimmigrant" before he is eligible for this humanitarian relief.

I recommend to the Congress that the section be amended to permit the Attorney General to waive this requirement in meritorious cases where the person is otherwise qualified under the act. It is estimated that this would not involve more than a few hundred cases, but in the case of each individual human being such an amendment would satisfy the beneficent purposes of the Congress.

(6) Obviously, people who have risked their lives to escape from totalitarian nations often have no passports. The Refugee Relief Act, however, requires passports, and in many cases this has served to defeat the very purpose of the Congress. I recommend amendment to permit waiver of the need for passports and similar documents in the discretion of the Secretary of State and the Attorney General as is already provided in the basic immigration and nationality laws.

(7) Under the act, no escapee or refugee is entitled to a visa unless there is available complete information regarding his history for 2 years past, except on waiver by the Secretaries of State and Defense, if it is determined to be in the national interest.

No such requirement is applicable in the case of regular immigrants under the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952.

This 2-year history, in the case of recent escapees, is often impossible to obtain. Yet these are the very people who have been actively stimulated to risk the perils of escape by our own information program broadcast through the Iron Curtain.

I have faith in the competence of our security personnel, and I recommend that this inflexible requirement be eliminated from the law, leaving it to the sound discretion of the security officer to make his recommendation on the basis of all the facts available. If he is in doubt, he will not certify the refugee or escapee as a proper security risk.

(8) Another obstacle to the achievement of the purposes of the act is the requirement of individual sponsorship and guaranties of each application for admission. Where responsible, voluntary welfare organizations are prepared to give assurances with respect to applicants by name, it is unnecessary to add the burdensome requirement that individual sponsorship of each such applicant also be provided. I recommend that where such agency assurances are given, individual assurances not be required in addition.

(9) At present, special visas may not be issued to wives, husbands, or children of persons admitted under the act unless they all come to the United States together. If the members of the person's family are following at a later time and are otherwise admissible, then the special visas should be equally available to them.

(10) There are many refugee families in Western Europe whose members would make useful and productive citizens of the United

States, but who would face separation if they should avail themselves of the provisions of the Refugee Relief Act. This they are unwilling to do. They would face separation because of the fact that one of their members is ineligible for admission to the United States under the health standards of our general immigration laws, particularly as respects tuberculosis.

We in the United States no longer regard tuberculosis with dread. Our treatment standards are high and modern treatment is increasingly effective. The United States, to its own benefit, could permit many of these families, within the existing numerical limitations, to enter under safeguards provided by the Attorney General and the Surgeon General of the United States assuring protection of the public health and adequate treatment of the afflicted individual and also assuring that such individual will not become a public charge. I urge that the Congress give consideration to amendments that would enable this to be done.

It is my earnest hope that the changes in the Refugee Relief Act that I have above outlined can be accomplished during the present session of the Congress.

The enactment of these changes will permit effective administration of the act by the executive branch of the Government and greatly aid the success of the program. The persons permitted to enter the country under the program will make a fine contribution to the body of our citizens. And we shall again reaffirm that the great tradition of sanctuary lives on in America.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *May 27, 1955.*

PRODUCTION OF FLUORSPAR FOR NATIONAL DEFENSE

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, war these days is a highly technical operation. Rare elements and minerals in relatively small quantities may hold the balance between victory and defeat. Mr. President, in Illinois and Kentucky there are extensive fluorspar fields, the largest producers in the United States, which produce fluorspar—an essential mineral in the production of steel. Steel cannot be produced without fluorspar, and without a ready and available domestic supply of fluorspar, war might mean a speedy end to American steel production. These fields are in dire need of markets if they are to stay in operation. Our country has a policy of stockpiling rare and necessary elements and minerals, including fluorspar, for any war effort.

In addition, Mr. President, there are hundreds of fluorspar miners whose families depend upon the continued operation of these mines for their living. A large percentage of these families are destitute and constitute a drain upon welfare facilities, and the heads of these families are in many cases leaving the production of fluorspar for other and more promising methods of earning a living.

In the light of these facts I wish to introduce for appropriate reference a bill to require that all Federal agencies which purchase fluorspar for national stockpiling purposes shall make such purchases from domestic fluorspar at prevailing market prices. This action will ensure the continued operation of our fluorspar mines for war readiness and will materially aid the problems of an economically depressed area of our country.

I ask unanimous consent to have the bill printed in the RECORD.

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

The bill (S. 2118) to provide for the national defense by encouraging the discovery, development and production of fluorspar in the United States, its Territories and possessions, introduced by Mr. DOUGLAS, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That this act may be cited as the "Domestic Fluorspar Stockpiling Act of 1955."

SEC. 2. All purchases of fluorspar for stockpiling purposes by Federal departments and agencies shall be made from sources within the United States, its Territories or possessions, to the extent that fluorspar is available from such sources, at prevailing market prices.

COMMISSION TO FORMULATE PLANS FOR MEMORIAL TO FRANKLIN DELANO ROOSEVELT

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference, a joint resolution to establish a commission to formulate plans for a memorial to the late Franklin Delano Roosevelt.

I think it is more than fitting that we have a memorial to the late President Roosevelt to take its place on the banks of the Potomac alongside the memorials to our other great Presidents—Washington, Jefferson, and Lincoln. President Roosevelt has certainly won his place in history alongside those immortal men for what he did for the welfare of the people of the United States and of the world.

It was President Roosevelt who, by his strength of leadership, did so much to win the battle against the forces of depression which, during the thirties, were threatening to undermine the basic structure of our country. He faced a prostrate economy and helped restore its vitality; he faced masses of unemployed, many on the verge of starvation, and gave them hope. He did not listen to the prophets of doom and despair. He saw what was needed and he acted—not by speaking fine words or fancy platitudes—but by firm and decisive steps. The times called for bold measures and he saw that these measures were enacted—public housing, social security, security and exchange regulation, insurance of bank deposits, the 40-hour week, the minimum wage. These items give only a hint of what he did to restore our Nation's vitality and greatness.

It was his courage and foresight that helped win the first round in the worldwide struggle against totalitarianism that threatened at the time to destroy the free world. This fight is still far from won, but if it had not been for his efforts, we would already have been destroyed by the forces of tyranny.

I think we should have this memorial as a living reminder of all that Franklin Roosevelt did for us. I hope the Congress will pass this joint resolution.

I ask unanimous consent that the joint resolution be printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 73) to establish a commission to formulate plans for a memorial to Franklin Delano Roosevelt, introduced by Mr. LEHMAN, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That there is hereby established a commission, to be known as the "Franklin Delano Roosevelt Memorial Commission" (hereinafter referred to as the Commission), for the purpose of considering and formulating plans for the design, construction, and location of a permanent memorial to Franklin Delano Roosevelt in the city of Washington, D. C., or in its immediate environs. The Commission shall be composed of 12 Commissioners appointed as follows: 4 persons to be appointed by the President of the United States, 4 Senators by the President of the Senate, and 4 Members of the House of Representatives by the Speaker of the House of Representatives. The Commissioners shall serve without compensation, but may be reimbursed for expenses incurred by them in carrying out the duties of the Commission. The Commission shall report such plans, together with its recommendations, to the President and Congress at the earliest practicable date, and in the interim shall make annual reports of its progress to the President and Congress.

SEC. 2. The Commission is authorized to—

(a) make such expenditures for personal services and otherwise for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this joint resolution as it may deem advisable from funds appropriated or received as gifts for such purpose;

(b) accept gifts to be used in carrying out the provisions of this joint resolution or to be used in connection with the construction or other expenses of such memorial;

(c) hold hearings, organize contests, enter into contracts for personal services and otherwise, and do such other things as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this joint resolution; and

(d) avail itself of the assistance and advice of the Commission of Fine Arts, the National Capital Planning Commission, and the National Capital Regional Planning Council, and such Commissions and Councils shall, upon request, render such assistance and advice.

SEC. 3. There is authorized to be appropriated not more than $10,000 to carry out the provisions of this joint resolution.

ERECTION OF LEIF ERICSSON STATUE IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I wish to invite the attention of the Senate, which I have done at every session of Congress since I have been a Member, to a joint resolution which I have been unsuccessful in having passed. I wish to reintroduce for appropriate reference, a joint resolution, which is sponsored by myself, my colleague, the junior Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON], the

Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the Senators from Montana [Mr. MURRAY and Mr. MANSFIELD], the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], the junior Senator from Oregon [Mr. NEUBERGER], the senior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE], the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY], and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG].

The joint resolution provides for the erection of a statue of Leif Ericsson in the District of Columbia.

I ask unanimous consent that I may speak on the joint resolution in excess of the 2 minutes allowed under the order which has been entered.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the Senator from Washington may proceed.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 74) authorizing the erection of a statue of Leif Ericsson in the District of Columbia, introduced by Mr. MAGNUSON (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

Mr. MAGNUSON. This Nation annually celebrates Leif Ericsson Day, and yet every Member of this Senate undoubtedly is aware of the fact that there is no statue in our National Capital of the intrepid Viking who set foot on our New England coast in the year 1002 A. D.

I am reminded of the lack of a statue—as are many of you—when those of Scandinavian ancestry visit our beautiful Capital. I can only tell them that several times I have introduced a resolution calling for erection of the Leif Ericsson statue, with apparent support for such action, but so far without further results.

It was in 1952, March 17, to be exact, St. Patrick's Day, and I picked the day deliberately, that I last introduced a joint resolution authorizing the erection of the Leif Ericsson statue. The proposed legislation we introduce today is slightly different. It authorizes the Secretary of the Interior to accept contributions from organizations or individuals to apply toward the cost of preparing the site and building the pedestal. I hope and believe that those of Scandinavian descent throughout the country will be interested in and will contribute toward this project.

The statue itself presents no problem. We have had that for a long time. It is a bronze replica of the statue designed by A. Stirling Calder. The original statue by Mr. Calder was presented to the people of Iceland as a gift from the American people in connection with American participation in the celebration of the Iceland Millennium—or the 1,000th anniversary of the Althing. The site chosen is east of the Parliament Building at Reykjavik, Iceland, and it was set in place in September 1931. As part of their participation in the New York World's Fair of 1940, Iceland had a bronze replica made and presented it as a gift to the American people.

The problems we are seeking to solve are: Where to put the statue, where to obtain a pedestal upon which it can be placed, and how to prepare a site suitable for the installation of the pedestal.

Undoubtedly the best location, and certainly the most fitting, would be the shores of our Potomac River with the eyes of Leif Ericsson gazing toward the water. If Leif Ericsson enjoyed one sight, above all others, it was that of water—regardless of the height of the waves, the peril of crossing, or the distance from his native land.

Placement of the Leif Ericsson statue, which can be done with a simple authorization and appropriation of about $53,000, including the preparation of the land, seems long overdue. Most of us have passed by the statue of Christopher Columbus—which has a prominent position in front of the Union Station in our Capital City, even though he arrived almost 500 years after Leif Ericsson set foot on American soil.

There is no lack of honor for Columbus—even though we of Scandinavian descent will be the first to admit that Columbus had larger ships, traveled an equatorial course, did not face the icebergs and the extreme cold of the northern crossing that Leif Ericsson's hardy crew did. It goes without saying that the Columbus ships being larger could carry more food and had all the navigational safeguards that an additional 400 years of development could provide. For that matter, even the statue of Columbus may be larger than that of Leif Ericsson and certainly at the moment it is placed in a more prominent view of those who visit Washington than that of Leif Ericsson—which so far has not met the public eye in our National Capital.

My remarks will not take very long. I hope the distinguished majority leader will listen to them, because I know he is very sympathetic toward this proposal.

I could go into the tortuous course and arduous adventures of Leif Ericsson from the time King Olav Tryggvesson of Norway commissioned Leif, son of Eric the Red, to Christianize the New World. He had to find the new land and he did it by touching first at Iceland, proceeding on to Greenland, then heading around Cape Cod and marveling much as we do today at the vineyards of the great New England States.

One of the islands which he probably sighted is the one still known to us as Martha's Vineyard.

While many of Ericsson's travels are legend, in later years there has been little dispute that he set foot on New England soil; and historians agree that Norwegians began the development of Greenland. It appears to be certain that Ericsson himself visited New England twice, and once it was visited by a group of his own crew. I personally have helped to read and translate the old Norwegian sagas of those three trips. No historian disputes them today. Neither does any historian dispute the fact that the Norwegians began the development of Greenland. Greenland in those days was exactly what its name implies—a green and probably fertile country.

As one of Scandinavian descent, I, too, will feel a surge of pride as I gaze upon this statue beside the Potomac, if my colleagues decide with me to give Leif Ericsson and those of Scandinavian descent in America, who have helped blend the strength of Scandinavia into the fabric of America, the recognition which he and they who have followed deserve.

His daring exploits deserve recognition by Congress and by visitors, who have every right to see Leif Ericsson on the bank of the Potomac, looking out upon the water he loved so well.

I am proud to have associated with me as sponsors of the resolution the distinguished group of Senators who feel as I do.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the resolution may be printed in the RECORD following my remarks.

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

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I hope I have not taken too much of the time of the Senate on this subject; but, as I have said, I have urged this matter at every one of the past 10 sessions of Congress. I know that the historical interest which the majority leader and the minority leader have in the real, true discoverer of America will help to achieve the passage of the joint resolution.

I do not know whether the name "Johnson" is Scandinavian; nevertheless, I am certain that all Scandinavians will believe that it is when they observe the support which the majority leader and the minority leader will give to this very worthy, long-overdue joint resolution.

EXHIBIT 1

Senate Joint Resolution 74

Joint resolution authorizing the erection of a statue of Leif Ericsson in the District of Columbia

Resolved, etc., That (a) any association or committee organized for such purpose within 2 years from the date of the enactment of this joint resolution is hereby authorized to place on the public grounds of the United States in the District of Columbia a replica of the statue of Leif Ericsson by A. Stirling Calder.

(b) The authority granted by subsection (a) of this section shall cease to exist, unless within 5 years after the date of enactment of this joint resolution, (1) the erection of the memorial is begun, and (2) the association or committee certifies to the Secretary of the Interior the amount of funds available for the purpose of the completion of the memorial and the Secretary determines that such funds are adequate for such purpose.

SEC. 2. The Secretary of the Interior is authorized and directed to prepare a site and erect a pedestal upon which to place such statue. The choice of the site and the design of the pedestal shall be subject to the approval of the National Commission of Fine Arts.

SEC. 3. The Secretary of the Interior is authorized to accept from any source, public or private, donations of funds to reimburse the United States for amounts expended under the provisions of section 2 of this joint resolution. Any such funds shall be covered into the Treasury of the United States as miscellaneous receipts.

SEC. 4. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of $53,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, to carry out the provisions of section 2 of this joint resolution.

APPROPRIATIONS FOR EMERGENCY HURRICANE WARNING SYSTEM—CHANGE OF REFERENCE

Mr. MAGNUSON. I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce be discharged from further consideration of the bill (S. 1932) making an appropriation for the operation of an emergency hurricane warning system by the Weather Bureau, and that the bill be referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

I desire the RECORD at this point to show that there is some proposed legislation involved in the bill which would properly come under the jurisdiction of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, but the bill also provides for an appropriation. In view of the emergency nature of the bill, I think its passage could be expedited if it were referred to the Committee on Appropriations, with the distinct understanding that this action is being taken because of special circumstances, and that the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce does not waive the jurisdiction which it has in such matters.

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

STUDY OF COMMON SYSTEM OF AIR NAVIGATION

Mr. GOLDWATER submitted the following concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 35), which was referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce:

Whereas the Congress has noted that the policy of the United States with respect to an air navigation system to be used as a part of a common system for air navigation is the subject of a controversy among the Air Coordinating Committee, and Air Navigation Development Board, the Civil Aeronautics Administration, and the military departments; and

Whereas effective and forceful planning and cooperation with respect to the adoption of equipment for use in a common system of air navigation is handicapped by controversy among these agencies; and

Whereas there appears to be no clear delineation of authority and responsibility for effective and forceful coordination in planning the development of such a common system; and

Whereas such controversy and poor administrative organization result in uneconomical planning of civil and governmental aviation programs; and

Whereas a potential expenditure, reported to exceed $500 million, depends upon the adoption by the United States of a firm decision as to what equipment shall be used in the common system; and

Whereas, in order to afford the highest degree of safety for life and property, both civil and military, an efficient agency of the executive branch must be organized to assume responsibility for formulation of a national policy with respect to such common system; and

Whereas no recent study has been made to review the functions of the Air Navigation Development Board, the Air Coordinating Committee, and the Civil Aeronautics Administration: Therefore be it

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the President of the United States is requested to review the functions of the Air Navigation Development Board, the Air Coordinating Committee, the Civil Aeronautics Administration, and the military departments which are concerned with the implementation of the common system for air navigation, and to report to the Congress on the results of his review as soon as possible, and he is requested, if the review justifies it, to submit a reorganization plan to create a more logical, simple, and effective organization to carry out the task of planning for, developing, and enforcing a single common system of air navigation.

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

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

By Mr. KNOWLAND:

Commencement address delivered by him at Cumberland College, Williamsport, Ky., on May 30, 1955.

By Mr. McCARTHY:

Address on foreign policies, delivered by him at Appleton, Wis., on May 14, 1955.

Address entitled "The Hoax of Bipartisanship," delivered by him before the Greater Buffalo Advertising Club at Buffalo, N. Y., on May 24, 1955.

By Mr. BUSH:

Article from a recent issue of official organ of the Bicycle Manufacturers Association relating to the subject of unemployment caused by imports of foreign bicycles.

INVESTIGATION OF NARCOTICS TRAFFIC—NOTICE OF HEARING

Mr. DANIEL. Mr. President, the Senate Judiciary Subcommittee authorized by resolution of this body to investigate the narcotics traffic will begin hearings Thursday, June 2.

As chairman of the subcommittee I have asked officials of the Treasury Department to make a full disclosure of all records showing the extent of illicit narcotics traffic in the United States and its concentration by States and cities at the committee's initial hearing.

Our preliminary investigation indicates that the Nation's multimillion dollar drug traffic is concentrated mostly in the big cities and the larger States and that Treasury officials, especially in the Bureau of Narcotics, have statistics heretofore unrevealed which will show this concentration. This information is essential to the success of our nationwide investigation of the problem.

We have asked Commissioner of Narcotics, Harry J. Anslinger, to pinpoint by city and State the actual figures showing the number of drug addicts and narcotic law violations, and he has agreed to do so.

Also to appear before the committee June 2 is Assistant Secretary of the Treasury H. Chapman Rose and Treasury Technical Assistant for Enforcement M. L. Harney. Mr. Rose has supervisory authority over the narcotics and customs bureaus, the two Federal agencies most concerned with enforcement of the narcotics laws, and is also chairman of the President's interdepartmental committee on narcotics.

Witnesses called for June 3 are Commissioner of Customs, Ralph Kelly and Assistant Attorney General, Warren Olney III, chief of the criminal division of the Department of Justice.

The purpose of the initial hearings is to develop the extent of the narcotics problem and to learn what Federal officials are doing to meet the problem under present laws. Other Federal agencies will be heard before the committee holds on the spot hearings in cities and States most involved in the drug traffic.

POLITICAL ACTIVITIES OF LABOR UNIONS—AN ACT OF WISCONSIN LEGISLATURE

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD, as a part of my remarks, a copy of an act recently passed by the State of Wisconsin, relating to labor-union activities in politics.

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

An act to amend 346.12, 346.13, and 346.14 of the statutes, relating to political contributions by labor unions, and providing penalties

The people of the State of Wisconsin, represented in senate and assembly, do enact as follows:

346.12, 346.13, and 346.14 of the statutes are amended to read:

"346.12 (1) No foreign or domestic corporation, * * * no association organized under chapter 185 doing business in this State, and no labor union or labor organization, shall * * * contribute * * * any money or thing of value, directly or indirectly, * * * to any political party, political organization, political committee, or individual candidate for any political purpose whatsoever, * * * or to promote or defeat the candidacy of any person for nomination * * * or election to any political office. No political party, political organization, political committee, or individual candidate shall accept or receive any contribution prohibited by this section.

"(2) Nothing contained in this section shall affect the right of any individual to form, join, contribute to, or participate in voluntary organizations provided for in section 12.09, other than labor organizations or labor unions, to support political candidates and purposes of his own choosing, nor his right to subscribe to a regularly published organization newspaper. Nothing contained in this section shall prohibit the publication by corporations, labor unions, and labor organizations and cooperatives in the regular course of conducting their affairs, of periodicals advising their members, stockholders, or customers of dangers or advantages to their interests of election to office of men espousing certain measures.

"(3) As used in this section and sections 346.13 and 346.14 the terms 'labor union' or 'labor organization' mean any organization of any kind, whether it be a local lodge, or a district, county, State, National, or international federation, or any agency or employee representation committee or plan in which employees participate and which exists for the purposes, in whole or in part, of dealing with employers concerning grievances, labor disputes, wages, rates of pay, hours of employment, or conditions of work.

"346.13. Any officer, employee, agent, or attorney or other representative of any corporation, labor union, or labor organization, acting for and in behalf of such corporation, labor union, or labor organization, who shall violate sections 346.12 to 346.16, shall be

* * * fined not less than $100 or more than $5,000, or * * * imprisoned not less than 1 nor more than 5 years, or * * * both * * * in the discretion of the court or judge before whom such conviction is had and if the corporation, labor union, or labor organization shall be subject to a penalty then by forfeiture in double the amount of any fine so imposed to be collected as other actions by forfeiture are collected, and if a domestic corporation it may be dissolved, if after a proper proceeding upon quo warranto, in either the circuit or supreme court of the State to be prosecuted by the attorney general of the State, the court shall find and give judgment that section 346.12 has been violated as charged, and if a foreign or nonresident corporation, its right to do business in this State may be declared forfeited.

"346.14. The violation of sections 346.12 to 346.16 by any officer, employee, agent, attorney, or other representative of a corporation, labor union, or labor organization shall be prima facie evidence of said violation by such corporation, labor union, or labor organization. All fines or forfeitures recovered under any of the provisions of sections 346.12 to 346.16 shall, when collected, be paid into the proper treasury of the county for the use of the school fund, and it is hereby made the duty of the district attorney of each county to conduct prosecutions under sections 346.12 to 346.16 upon complaint as in other actions."

JUNK MAIL

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, in recent months there has been a great deal of discussion about the policies of the Post Office Department—postage increases, pay raises, the lack of two mail deliveries a day, and the flood of junk mail that has been cluttering up our mail boxes.

There was a sigh of relief when the Postmaster General issued a rescinding order, effective March 31, 1955, halting the delivery in the cities and villages of mail simply addressed "Local Patron," "Householder," and so on. Despite this order, nameless, unsolicited circulars, advertising leaflets, and the like continue to be delivered by postal carriers as third-class mail after nearly 2 months.

This order has merely curtailed to a limited extent the delivery of junk mail. Pieces bearing the name of no addressee whatever—but carrying such a notation as "Occupant," together with a street address—still are being delivered at the special 1½-cent-per-ounce rate.

Moreover, the practice of handling pieces which carry neither a name nor address of any kind goes on in the case of rural routes and boxholders in areas where no city or village delivery is available.

The idea of sending advertising material without names is not new. Unaddressed boxholder mail has been delivered on rural routes for many years. But in August 1953 Postmaster General Arthur Summerfield decided to extend the practice to city dwellers. This system was designed as a timesaver for businesses which advertise by mail and also for postal workers who sort it. If anything, the new system has cost the Federal Government money. The flood of junk mail went on for about 15 months until pressures produced the March 31 order. Former Postmaster General Farley experimented with bulk mailing privileges during his term of office, but he soon rescinded his order.

This type of throwaway mail used to be distributed door to door by children, but now the postman has been trapped into doing a small boy's job.

Postage on nonaddressed mail is only 1½ cents an item, or 14 cents a pound. No wonder advertisers rush at the opportunity, for junk mail generally receives the same treatment as first-class mail at a much lower rate.

This new system has eliminated the expense of preparing and buying mailing lists. The March 31 order made the process a little more difficult, for now they must have a street address, which is simple enough to obtain. Now a piece of junk mail must have no more personalization than "Occupant, 1732 Jones Avenue." Unless the restrictions on junk mail are tightened, we will continue to get this cumbersome and undesirable matter in our mailboxes.

Postal officials concede that the March 31 order did not by any means discontinue delivery of all types of so-called junk mail. Junk mail still flourishes at an annual loss of millions of dollars to the Post Office. The administration is obviously in an economy mood. Elimination of junk mail is the first economy that should be effected in the Post Office Department.

Mr. President, in conclusion, I ask unanimous consent that a letter I have sent to the Postmaster General be printed in the RECORD at the end of my remarks.

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

MAY 27, 1955.

ARTHUR SUMMERFIELD,
Postmaster General,
Post Office Department
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SUMMERFIELD: The Post Office Department rescinding order relative to delivery of unaddressed third-class mail which went into effect on March 31, 1955, was well-received throughout the Nation. My constituents in Montana and people throughout the country envisioned that this order would curb the plague of mail addressed simply "local patron," "householder," and "boxholder."

However the delivery of nameless, unsolicited circulars, advertising leaflets and the like continues. Apparently the so-called "junk mail" continues with merely an additional restriction, an address, but does not require a personal address. I would like to know if the Post Office Department plans any additional restriction on this type of mail which receives the 1½-cent postal rate.

For my own files I would like the following statistical information, relative to third-class mail, for fiscal years 1953, 1954 and the approximate figures for fiscal year 1955. What is the gross income, expenditure, and deficit derived from third-class mail? If available I would like to know the approximate number of pieces of third-class mail put through the mails in the years cited.

I cannot stress too strongly the great inconvenience and annoyance this "junk mail" means to the millions of people who use our postal system. In addition it does not appear to be a financially sound practice. I would appreciate the above information at your very earliest convenience.

With best personal wishes, I am,
Sincerely yours,

MIKE MANSFIELD.

TECHNICAL COOPERATION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an address on technical cooperation, delivered by the Honorable Willard L. Beaulac, United States Ambassador to Chile, on the occasion of his receiving the annual award for distinguished public service from Rhode Island University, Kingston, R. I., on May 19, 1955, be printed in the RECORD at this point as part of my remarks.

I wish to say that Ambassador Beaulac is one of the outstanding diplomats of this country. He has served with distinction and understanding in the dealings between the United States and Chile in recent months, and before that he rendered distinguished service in performing his duties as our representative to various Latin American countries.

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

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

TECHNICAL COOPERATION

(Address by Hon. Willard L. Beaulac, United States Ambassador to Chile, on the occasion of his receiving the annual award for distinguished public service from Rhode Island University, Kingston, R. I., May 19, 1955)

I should like to talk to you today about technical cooperation.

Some 4,400 of our citizens, in the employ of our Government, 1,650 of them in Washington and 2,750 of them abroad, today are helping to teach people in 58 countries and territories such things as how they can wipe out malaria and reduce the incidence of amoebic dysentery; how they can improve the breed of corn they produce and the breed of hogs they raise; how they can speed up and tighten up that new and still unfamiliar industry so that it will turn out a better product more cheaply; how they can increase average per capita income from less than $100 a year, as in the case of a number of our neighbor American Republics, to say, two or three hundred dollars a year, or more; and how they can achieve healthier and more satisfactory living out of whatever they may earn or receive.

This year those 4,400 Americans will spend an estimated $105 million giving technical assistance to other countries. That is not a great deal of money, except perhaps to us taxpayers, but it is nearly as much as it costs to run the State Department and the Foreign Service, which have the responsibility of conducting our foreign relations at a time when it is no exaggeration to say that upon the state of those relations may depend whether we survive as a Nation. The program is certainly big enough that we can expect it to produce important results.

I believe it has produced important results, and that it can be made to produce much more important results in the future when we have painstakingly learned the lessons that our experience already holds for us, and when we have learned to apply those lessons.

Technical cooperation is not a new thing. What is new is the scale on which we are engaged in it. Our Government had had experience in technical cooperation when I entered the Foreign Service more than 30 years ago. For example, we already had the habit of helping other governments in such matters as road building in which we had acquired a fund of knowledge and experience. We thought it was a fine, neighborly thing to teach other countries how to build good roads. We also hoped that good roads in other countries would promote the sale of

automobiles, and we wanted foreigners to own as many automobiles as possible, especially American automobiles. We had already learned two excellent reasons for technical cooperation, years before it was embodied in a bold, new program that was to capture the imagination of the world under the drab name of point 4.

We also had developed the habit of helping other governments in their health problems. Here, again, there were two reasons for our help. We sincerely wanted other peoples to enjoy the superior health standards that we were beginning to acquire. Also, we didn't want our own health to be undermined by epidemics that might start in someone else's territory. We could learn to keep out immigrants whom we didn't want, but yellow fever and malaria mosquitoes carry no passports and are no respectors of political boundaries, so we found that in order to keep our own yard clean we sometimes had to help clean up our neighbor's. We had learned another good reason for technical cooperation.

There are many additional reasons for technical cooperation that are cited by persons who engage in it as an occupation, or who regard it as the solution to all our most urgent problems, or who are charged with the duty of obtaining funds for it from a sometimes reluctant and skeptical Congress. Most of those reasons, it seems to me, are good ones. In fact, it is difficult to argue against technical cooperation in principle. And yet, it is a very difficult, not to say delicate, operation to engage in and one full of pitfalls for the merely starry-eyed and for other unwary persons.

We got our first experience in large scale technical cooperation in the other American Republics during the Second World War. There were a number of reasons for embarking on these wartime programs.

Our war effort required the greatest possible amounts of political and economic support from the other nations in this hemispere. We had to see to it that those nations were not thrown into economic and social chaos by dislocation in their commerce caused by the war. We needed the raw materials and the surplus foodstuffs they produced; the petroleum, copper, rubber, and sugar, and the many other useful things they could provide us with and that we could not get in sufficient quantities from other sources. At the same time we wanted to insure that our neighbors did not drain us of supplies that we needed and they lacked.

Following the end of the war there was a feeling among many people inside and outside our Government that now that the war was over we should wind up these wartime programs. There also was a contrary feeling that to terminate the programs, in which the Latin Americans as well as we had invested large sums of money, just because the war had terminated, and when many of the programs were only beginning to bear fruit, would give the impression that we as a Nation were interested in helping our weaker neighbors when, because of war or other emergency, we might have urgent need of their support, but that as soon as the emergency ended, we were no longer interested in their welfare; that we were foul-weather friends, in other words. These people thought, also, that our unfinished projects in Latin America would be regarded by our neighbors as models not of American cooperativeness but of American incompetence.

I was Ambassador to Paraguay when this problem was being debated here at home, and I gave a long and searching look at our program in that country. I came to the conclusion that I agreed with those who wanted to continue the projects that were still needed. I didn't want the United States to be a foul-weather friend or to be regarded as a foul-weather friend. Furthermore, it seemed to me that in organized technical cooperation we had found a weapon with which to combat poverty and ignorance in many parts of the world, and that we should preserve and strengthen that weapon in our own interest. I have never had reason to change my opinion in that regard.

It is still true that technical cooperation is capable of increasing markets for American goods, of helping to make available the raw materials that the free world requires, and of protecting the health of our people and other peoples. and doubtless it could be justified on those grounds alone. But those are not its real purposes. It has a purpose that is larger than any of those. It is to help strengthen the free world.

All of us recognize, I believe, that we cannot be prosperous in an impoverished world; that we cannot be strong if our neighbors and friends are weak. Technical cooperation is a device to help our neighbors and friends to help themselves. More important, still, it is a device that is capable of creating understanding.

All of us have heard time and time again the expression, "It's a small world." That expression, trite as it may sound, is filled with truth—truth that can lead us into flights of optimism concerning the kind of world which modern techniques can make it possible for all people to live in and enjoy; truth that is ominous and forbidding in terms of the power which our country has, today, in a matter of hours, to annihilate millions of persons in distant places of our choosing, and the power that certain other peoples may well possess to do the same to us.

If it sounds trite to say that it is a small world, it sounds almost as trite to say that we live in a world one part of which is increasingly dependent on other parts. It is this phenomenon, that is clear to anyone who will take the trouble to see, which makes excessive nationalism both anachronistic and perilous to our security and the security of the free world.

We hear a great deal about security nowadays, and there is a temptation even on the part of people who realize that it is indeed a small world to think of security only in terms of atomic or hydrogen bombs and of an Army, Navy, and Air Force more powerful than those of any other country. Few persons are tempted today to undervalue the importance of military strength, but it is easy to forget that security depends on other things besides military strength, and that without those other things we cannot achieve or retain the military strength needed to guarantee our security. Foremost among those other things is understanding. Understanding among peoples is the equivalent of many armies, of many navies, and of many air forces. The United States cannot in any conceivable circumstance, stand alone in the world any more than the rest of the free world can stand apart from the United States. Our security and the security of other free nations depend directly and squarely on international cooperation, cooperation that cannot be exacted but which must be freely given. Cooperation, in turn, flows from understanding; understanding of a country's motives, of its objectives, and of the means it may devise to carry out those objectives. Real cooperation is not possible in the absence of understanding.

One feature of today's world which you students are beginning to be familiar with is its complexity. Not many years ago the Secretary of State of the United States, with only a handful of top assistants, could survey the whole world and feel reasonably confident that he was familiar with the things that were going on that were of importance to the United States. Today, the American Ambassador to a foreign country, who may have helping him as many highly trained and dedicated persons as were in the entire Department of State not many years ago, finds it difficult to keep up with more than a few of the things happening in that one country which are of interest to the United States.

If it is difficult for Americans to know and to understand what is going on in the world, with the unequalled facilities that we have at our command, imagine how difficult, how nearly impossible it must be for the inhabitants of some distant country where ignorance, poverty, and sickness dwell in nearly every household, a country which in this interdependent world may, nevertheless, be of great importance to us, to arrive at that degree of understanding regarding their relations with the United States which is a necessary prelude and basis for cooperation. Think how much more difficult it is for those people to understand us and to understand why it is in their interest to have a cooperative relationship with us when the international Communists are using every device known to totalitarian propaganda to convince those people that their ignorance, poverty, and sickness result from the circumstance that the United States, which has the highest living standards in the world, simply has much more than its share, and that those high living standards have condemned other peoples to want and privation.

It is not enough in the circumstances to preach economics to those people. You know that economics is a difficult subject even for university men and women. You can readily appreciate with what bewilderment, not to say distrust, lessons in economics would be received by those poorly educated and sometimes illiterate people.

What is required, clearly, is improvement in living standards and health and education which will enable those people to arrive at that degree of understanding with us that will serve as a firm basis for the cooperation which is so essential to their security and well-being as well as to ours. Technical cooperation can help to bring this about.

Technical cooperation can help to bring about understanding, and I have seen it lead to understanding, but it is also my observation that it cannot be depended upon to do it. It can even lead to misunderstanding.

Even the effort to explain technical cooperation can lead to misunderstanding. It needs to be explained, of course. If we don't explain it, the Communists will. In fact, they will explain it anyway. The more underprivileged those we try to help, the more they wonder why we are spending our money to help them. If we say we are doing it for selfish reasons we seem to some of them to be confirming what the Communists say about us. On the other hand, if we appear to be acting idealistically, we risk awakening the antagonism which some people feel toward those whom they suspect of acting selflessly or out of altruism or idealism.

Even when technical cooperation is accepted graciously and understandingly by those people in a foreign country who give thought to it, the results sometimes are disappointing. One reason for this is, I believe, the tendency to expect too much of it, the tendency to look for quick and dramatic results which, to be sure, do sometimes occur but which cannot be expected to occur in most cases. Another reason is that we cannot do as much as we would like to do because of the shortage of available competent personnel.

I recall that in one small country where I served our Government agreed to help establish a school for vocational education. The agreement was hurriedly entered into because the end of the fiscal year was approaching and we had some money that hadn't been spent or committed. It was considered a sin in those days to turn any such money back to the Treasury. On the other hand, there certainly was need for a

vocation educational school in that country. Young men who wanted to learn to be carpenters and plumbers had no way of learning except to watch carpenters and plumbers who were themselves untrained and who, in many cases, were trying to conceal the little they knew in order not to have new and younger competition in the trades. There were no building standards worthy of the name. There were no standard sizes for windows or doors. You never knew whether a door was going to open in or open out. You never knew whether to turn a knob to the right or to the left. All these things tended not only to confuse and confound people, including the people living in the America Embassy residence, but also to make building costs high and wages low. They tended to keep living standards down, in other words.

We signed the agreement to start a vocational education school, and then our people in Washington began to look around for someone to take charge of it. It was wartime and we learned a lot about vocational education problems in the United States that we hadn't known before. We learned, for example, that there was a shortage of vocational education teachers in the United States. We learned that there was an acute shortage of competent vocational education teachers. Of the competent teachers, very few spoke Spanish, a necessary requisite for the job our Government had in mind. Of those who spoke Spanish, none, so far as we could find, was willing to go to the country where I was serving. After a delay of months, our people finally sent down a man who could speak Spanish but who was really not fitted for the job. It would have been better if they had waited until they could find the right man, even if that should have required additional years.

Technical cooperation is not an easy job for an American. It is not a particularly well-paid job because our Government is limited, for reasons we can all understand, in what it can offer in terms of salaries and allowances. It involves living in distant places, often under conditions that are primitive by American standards. It usually means difficulties in the way of educating children. It may mean exposing yourself and your family to diseases that are not known in this country. It may mean adaption to an alien culture. Some people rise to the challenge that these things represent, and those people make us very proud that we are Americans. But they are limited in numbers.

Technical cooperation is not the only occupation that presents a challenge worthy of the best people we have. There are many other challenges today and point 4 has to compete for the people capable of meeting them.

The problem of competent personnel may not be unsolvable, of course. With time we can doubtless build up a larger corps of tried and competent people. We may decide to engage foreigners to supplement our supply of Americans, or we may tend more and more to merge our programs with broader programs such as those of the United Nations. But that is another subject. Meanwhile, we cannot hope to get maximum results, in terms of concrete help to other countries or in terms of understanding, unless we send out really competent men to do the job.

Another circumstance that makes it difficult for technical cooperation to achieve the results it is capable of achieving is that it is so often used to treat symptoms rather than causes. For example, if poor health conditions in a given country are due to poverty, and poverty, in turn, is due to faulty economic policies being pursued by the government, then it stands to reason that a reform of those economic policies can do more for public health in the long run than any amount of technical cooperation in the field of public health that we can reasonably be expected to provide.

Countries create higher living standards for their people, which technical cooperation is supposed to help them to do, by developing their economies. They develop their economies, in turn, by utilizing their human and natural resources—by improving the skills of their people; by exploiting their lands, their forests, their minerals, their rivers and seas. There is no other way to do the job.

We should be able to assume, therefore, that a country that wants help in raising living standards will do what it can to insure that its natural resources will be developed and utilized. The least that can be expected is that the country will not place obstacles in the way of doing this. And still there are countries that do just that.

There are varying reasons for this phenomenon but, in general, it can be traced to nationalism, usually abetted by Communist propaganda.

The Communists, as we well know, try to prevent economic development in the free world. They do this, among other reasons, in order to prevent improvement in living standards. They try to prevent improvement in living standards because they feel, as we do, too, that poverty is their ally.

The Communists know, just as we know, that a country can develop its economy only if it utilizes its natural resources, so they do what they can to prevent this from happening.

The Communists know that many countries cannot develop their resources without the help of abundant foreign capital. Therefore, they do what they can to make it impossible for foreign capital to help. They do this by appealing to a country's nationalism; by painting foreign capital as predatory and imperialistic, and by encouraging countries to erect barriers to the entry of foreign capital. When they succeed in their efforts, as they frequently do, they accomplish two objectives that are important to them. First, they keep the country which is the target of their attacks impoverished, and, second, they create dissension and misunderstanding between that country and other countries that are disposed to be friendly and helpful.

In many countries where this sort of thing has been going on our Government has been helping to finance point 4 programs. It is evident that those programs will not produce maximum or even substantial results unless the countries have the political courage to remove the obstacles that they themselves have set up to the efficient utilization of their natural resources.

That is not to say that we should use point 4 as a lever to change the political or social system of a country. On the contrary, if we are to succeed we must work within the framework of the traditions, the customs, the likes and dislikes of the people we are trying to help. But whatever the political or social system of a country, material progress cannot be achieved, with our help or without it, unless a modicum of respect is given to certain basic economic laws that have been well tested and that neither nationalism nor communism, nor indeed socialism, can make invalid.

I suggested earlier that point 4 has to be explained. I should like to revert to that and to add that all our aid to foreign countries has to be explained.

The United States, by giving technical cooperation and other aid to other countries, has voluntarily assumed a degree of responsibility for economic development in those countries. This concept of United States responsibility has been accepted by other countries to the extent that many persons, including some political leaders, have come to the point of implying pretty clearly in their public utterances that the United States has the principal obligation for bringing about economic development. Thus, in countries where private capital is not permitted to make its proper and indispensable contribution to economic progress, one hears it alleged that progress in not being achieved because not enough help is being received from the United States.

Persons who allege this point to the Marshall plan and contrast our vast expenditures in Europe with our small expenditures in other areas. They overlook the circumstance that Europe had to be put on its feet again if the whole free world were not to be plunged into crippling economic depression. They overlook the circumstance, too, that the huge sums we spent in Europe, whether for the reconstruction of war-shattered industries, for the construction of military bases, or for the maintenance of American troops, served to defend the free world against an actual and imminent threat of physical encroachment by Communist imperialism.

We used bombs to throw back the Nazi tyranny, and we used our material wealth to throw back the Communist tyranny. In each case we had to apply the weapon where it was needed, and the results in each case were decisive in insuring the defense of the entire free world, no country excepted.

Technical cooperation and economic aid do not explain themselves, although many of us have proceeded on the basis that they do. They have to be explained if they are to lead to understanding rather than misunderstanding.

There is another way in which technical cooperation and the other new or expanded activities that our Government is carrying on abroad can lead to misunderstanding, and that is if, while we are carrying them on, we should at the same time neglect our traditional diplomatic activities.

Homer said, "Men ever love the song that sings newest in the ear."

It is not an exaggeration to say that our age is an age of disillusionment. We in the United States have fought two great wars well within my lifetime and still we do not have a world that is safe for the things for which we fought. We do not have freedom from fear or freedom from the threat of war. We do not have one world, as many of us used to believe, or at least hope, but two worlds which threaten to collide and explode into no world at all.

We are disillusioned but not resigned, and we are searching desperately for new instruments to meet the new and unexpected dangers that face us. And we are right in doing that. We will not be right if at the same time we neglect the tried and proved instrument of diplomacy which remains and will remain the basic instrument for reaching understanding with other countries, an instrument which we share with other countries and one that nations with long experience and tradition still place their principal trust in.

Such activities as technical cooperation are capable of being an aid to good relations with foreign countries but they are in no sense a substitute for such relations. If badly carried out, or if not properly explained, they may even create complications in our relations with other countries, and thus add to the burden of our diplomacy.

These new or expanded activities have, of course, added to the duties of our diplomatic representatives, since all activities of the United States Government abroad necessarily are carried out under the direction and guidance of the Ambassador, whose other responsibilities, needless to say, also have been greatly increased as a result of the world tensions which all of us are familiar with.

There are few subjects more complicated and with more traps for the uninitiated and the unwary than our foreign relations. It is not possible to talk about technical cooperation except in the context of our foreign relations. In technical cooperation we have found a weapon with which to combat pov-

erty, ignorance and sickness throughout the world—a weapon which can help to create for millions of people the kind of world that communism promises them but can never give them. It is an instrument capable of doing even more, that is, of producing understanding or helping to produce understanding—understanding which is indispensable to the cooperation among nations which the world requires if it is to survive.

It is not a simple instrument to use because nothing related to our foreign relations is simple or easy, but the complications it presents are fewer than the other complications that traditional diplomacy has to deal with. They are complications that can be overcome as we gain experience with technical cooperation and learn to fit it into its proper place in the broader pattern of our foreign relations.

HELLS CANYON DAM

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, the Memorial Day weekend brought forth a misleading and distorted attack against the proposed Hells Canyon Dam project from the so-called research office of the State Council of Chambers of Commerce.

I realize the Members of the Senate do not have the time to hear all the misrepresentations which this propaganda release contains. However, a few of the most glaring should be cited.

The release charged that Hells Canyon Dam would cost $465,470,000. Yet Cecil I. Hoisington, Chief of the Analysis and Estimates Branch of the United States Bureau of Reclamation, told the Senate Interior Committee on May 2 that the cost of Hells Canyon Dam would be $308,472,000.

The chamber of commerce blast charged that Hells Canyon would cost every American taxpayer $9. No mention is made of the fact, of course, that Bonneville and Grand Coulee, which would be companion projects to Hells Canyon, are now about $65 million ahead of schedule in paying for themselves.

If Hells Canyon would cost every taxpayer $9, as the chamber council contends, what about the $20 which every taxpayer would have to pay for the upper Colorado project? Of course, the chamber says nothing about the upper Colorado project, which has the endorsement of Secretary of the Interior McKay. Mr. McKay approves that project, with its $1,800,000,000 cost to the Government, because no private power company covets the upper Colorado sites.

Furthermore, the chamber of commerce council engages in the usual double talk about a Federal power monopoly. According to the New York Times, 81 percent of all energy used in the United States is generated by private utilities, 13 percent by the Federal Government, and 6 percent by city systems. What is the "monopoly"—81 percent, or 13 percent?

The sad thing, Mr. President, is to see the big utilities which dominate the Chamber of Commerce council leading around small-business men, against the best interests of these businessmen.

Between 1939 and 1948, which were the years when Bonneville public power first became available in the Pacific Northwest, our region had the greatest industrial gain in its history. Payrolls in the Northwest soared 329 percent as contrasted with a national average of 284 percent. This was the one time in Northwest history when payrolls in the Northwest registered a greater gain than the national average. It also coincided with the 10-year period when Bonneville low-cost power first came "on the line."

Yet the Council of State Chambers of Commerce would end this low-cost public power program and surrender the great Hells Canyon power site to the Idaho Power Co., which has the highest rate structure in the Northwest. This may be fine music to utility ears, but it is only a dirge for small-business men in the Pacific Northwest.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, to have printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks a dispatch from the Idaho Daily Statesman of May 21, 1955, describing support of Hells Canyon high dam by the Washington County Farm Bureau, and also to include letters and resolutions on this issue from the Southwestern Washington Public Utility Commissioners Association.

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

[From the Idaho Daily Statesman of May 21, 1955]

FARM BUREAU ASKS SUPPORT FOR HIGH DAM

The Washington County Farm Bureau asked Gov. Robert E. Smylie personally and President Eisenhower by letter Wednesday to support a high Federal dam at Hells Canyon.

Everett T. Gunn and Willis Peterson, directors of the farm bureau from Weiser, said the governor gave them a "cordial reception," but indicated he disagreed with them.

Smylie has asked a Senate committee to reject the current proposal for a Federal dam, and indicated he favors the Idaho Power Co. proposal as a means of getting more kilowatts faster.

Gunn said they presented Smylie a petition signed by county farm bureau directors, members of both political parties.

It said Idaho was divided because "the private utility monopoly in order to be 'whole hog or none' has attempted to break down the spirit of cooperation in every possible segment of our organizations and State apparently on the basis of 'divide and conquer'."

Irrigation ranchers in western Idaho, it said, have no quarrel with other ranchers of the State, and wish for west and north Idaho only what is now being done for east Idaho.

The letter to the President requested him to "take the same personal interest in the comprehensive development of the Snake River as you are taking in development of the Columbia River Basin."

The petition was signed by Gunn, Peterson, Evan Moser, C. H. Potter, A. Dawson Gaertner, Dean Hale, W. Clay Sutton, Vernon Chandler and Winifred E. Gunn.

SOUTHWEST WASHINGTON
PUBLIC UTILITY
COMMISSIONERS ASSOCIATION,
Seattle, Wash., May 19, 1955.

HON. RICHARD NEUBERGER,
The United States Senate,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR NEUBERGER: Enclosed herewith for your information are copies of resolutions relative to the John Day and Hells Canyon projects which were adopted by this association at our last meeting held in Vancouver, Wash., May 13 and 14, 1955.

Our association is made up of public utility district commissioners of Benton, Clark, Cowlitz, Klickitat, Lewis, Mason, Pacific, Skamania, and Wahkiakum Counties. Our PUD electric systems serve 92,000 electric customers in these nine southwest Washington counties. Nearly all of the power distributed by our systems is purchased from the Bonneville Power Administration.

We are anxious that new power development shall keep pace with growing power loads, so that there will be an adequate supply in the years ahead for the people in our area and for the region as a whole. We are also interested that the development of our river resources shall be by methods which will result in the greatest benefits for the people of the region. These considerations prompted the resolutions which are attached.

Sincerely yours,

CLYDE RIDDELL,
President.

RESOLUTIONS UNANIMOUSLY ADOPTED BY THE SOUTHWEST WASHINGTON PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSIONERS ASSOCIATION, VANCOUVER, WASH., MAY 13 AND 14, 1955

JOHN DAY DAM

Resolved, That the Southwest Washington Public Utility Commissioners Association endorse the financing and construction of the John Day Dam on the Columbia River as a project of the Federal Government, with the power therefrom to go into the Bonneville pool to be marketed under the provisions of the Bonneville Act. It is urged that money for necessary engineering be appropriated by the Congress this year.

HELLS CANYON DAM

Resolved, That in light of the findings of Federal Power Commission Examiner Costello that a high Federal dam at Hells Canyon would best serve the public interest, this association urges all possible effort be made by the Congress to secure Federal authorization for the high dam during the current session.

JAMES M. MEAD

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, on May 14, the fine weekly newspaper, Labor, published by the Railway Brotherhoods, published an editorial entitled "Ike Ousting Another Friend of the People." The editorial deals with the failure of the President to reappoint the Hon. James M. Mead to the Federal Trade Commission—a failure which I have publicly criticized and deeply regret. The editorial also refers to several other fine public servants whose terms are shortly to expire.

This excellent editorial, paying a high and well-deserved tribute to Jim Mead, expresses my sentiments about the entire situation. I ask that the editorial be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

I think the editorial should be read by every Member of the Senate. I am sure this subject is going to be discussed by a number of us on the floor of the Senate in the weeks and months ahead.

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

IKE OUSTING ANOTHER FRIEND OF THE PEOPLE

When voting for a President, it's important to remember that, by his power of appointment, he can enforce or nullify laws passed by Congress to protect the people. He can make those laws serve

either the public interest or greedy special interests. No law is any better than the men who administer it. They are picked by the President, and they hold office even after he leaves the White House.

That is strikingly illustrated by what is going on now. As Labor has reported, President Eisenhower has "packed" the Government regulatory agencies with reactionaries who are undoing great historic reforms. They are giving to the power trust, natural gas trust, oil trust and other big business and Wall Street interests just about everything they have long wanted but couldn't get before. Few regulators are left to protect the public interest, and they are being ousted as fast as possible.

This week, for example, it was announced that Eisenhower will not reappoint Federal Trade Commissioner James M. Mead when his term expires next September. The man picked to replace Mead is William C. Kern. Back of that is this story:

The FTC was created as one of the great reforms of President Woodrow Wilson's time. It is Uncle Sam's "business policeman." Its job is to protect both consumers and honest businessmen against business crooks, to enforce some of the laws against monopoly and price fixing, and to keep big business from destroying small-business men by unfair methods.

The Commission has five members. No more than three can be of one political party. Three now are Republicans and the other two Democrats. One of the latter is "Big Jim" Mead.

He began life as a waterboy on the Lackawanna, worked at other railroad jobs, and still carries his card in the Switchmen's union. He became a Democratic Congressman and Senator from New York, was chairman of the FTC under Truman, and since then has been a member. Always he stood up for the people and the public interest, and thus incurred the enmity of powerful special interests.

In particular, Mead has proved himself a stanch friend of little and independent businessmen, both as a member of House and Senate Small Business Committees, and on the FTC. That's not the kind of a man the present big business administration wants on that or any other commission.

Ike could not replace Mead with a Republican, because the law says "No." Kern wears the Democratic label. Who is he? Why was he picked? Which side will he take as a member of the FTC?

Since 1941 Kern has been an FTC lawyer. About a year ago, he was selected for promotion by the Commission's Chairman, Edward F. Howrey, a Republican corporation lawyer appointed by Eisenhower and applauded by big business interests.

To promote Kern, Howrey demoted Everette MacIntyre, a top FTC lawyer with a long and devoted record of enforcing the antitrust laws for the protection of consumers and small business.

Kern will be an FTC member for 7 years, regardless of who is elected President next year. It seems sure he will follow the policies set by the man who made him, Chairman Howrey.

Experienced Washington observers were struck by the extraordinary fact that, although Mead's term does not expire until September, selection of Kern to replace him was announced way ahead of time, in May, and Howrey apparently began preparing Kern for that spot about a year before it would be available. The administration knew "Big Jim" was not its kind of man, and lost no time in greasing the skids for him.

One of the next regulators to go is Paul R. Rowen, member of the Securities and Exchange Commission. He was the only member who dared to vote against approving the financial setup of the scandalous Dixon-Yates deal. Rowen did so on the ground that the deal violates the Utility Holding Company Act, which the SEC is sworn to enforce.

Another slated to be ousted soon is Thomas E. Murray, the only Atomic Energy Commission member who disapproved the Dixon-Yates deal.

Still another is Frieda B. Hennock, the only Federal Communications Commission member who has championed the public interest and small independent radio and television stations against the giant chains which seek more and more control of the people's airwaves.

And so it goes. Few friends of the people are left in top posts of the regulatory commissions and other Government agencies, and those few are disappearing fast. Think about that, next time you vote for a President.

MISS FRIEDA HENNOCK

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, a moment ago I submitted, for printing in the RECORD, an editorial from the publication Labor, commenting on some of the appointments being made by President Eisenhower, and criticizing his failure to reappoint the Honorable James M. Mead to the Federal Trade Commission. The editorial also referred critically to the likelihood that President Eisenhower would not reappoint another fine public servant, Miss Frieda Hennock, to the Federal Communications Commission.

On Friday, May 27, Mr. Drew Pearson in his Merry-Go-Round column, described at some length Miss Hennock's record of public service as a member of the Federal Communications Commission, and told of the valiant battles she has fought in the public interest.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that pertinent excerpts from the article by Mr. Pearson be printed at this point in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

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

While one lady in high office who has helped cause confusion in the polio crisis is planning to bow out, another lady who has done a terrific job for the American public in regard to television is being fired.

The first lady, of course, is Oveta Culp Hobby, who will leave the Cabinet when the Salk vaccine confusion has died down and when she will not be retreating under fire.

The second lady is Frieda Hennock, first woman to be appointed to the Federal Communications Commission, who is being dropped as her term expires in June. Her replacement will be Richard Mack, a Florida utilities commissioner, reported to be a friend of the telephone company. His appointment will be the third utilities commissioner and friend of A. T. & T. the President has appointed; the others being John Doerfer, of Wisconsin, and John McConnaughey, of Ohio.

It was Commissioner Hennock who demanded and got 257 TV channels set aside for education. It was Miss Hennock who fought valiantly for the smaller ultra-high frequency stations which have been blanketed out by the big networks.

It was Miss Hennock, alone, who dissented from giving A. T. & T. an $80 million increase in rates. It was Miss Hennock who fought for 800 small daytime radio stations, who campaigned against crime and horror on television, and who opposed the increasing trend toward monopoly of communications.

And it's Miss Hennock who, despite her battles for the public and for the little broadcaster, is now being fired.

NOTE.—It was the late Senator Robert A. Taft who largely put across Miss Hennock's appointment to the FCC. Taft, a Republican, vigorously supported Miss Hennock, a Democrat, because he was a stanch believer in the principle of free competition.

ARMENIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY—ADDRESS BY SENATOR LEHMAN

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, May 28 is usually observed as Armenian Independence Day, celebrating the day of the proclamation of the Republic of Armenia in 1918.

On May 22, I spoke in New York City at a rally sponsored by the Armenian Independence Committee, and addressed myself to the subject of Genocide, Liberation and Peace, as these relate to the subject of Armenian Independence.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that my remarks on that occasion be printed at this point in the RECORD, so that the record of the proceedings of Congress may reflect the observance of a very memorable day indeed—Armenian Independence Day. It is a day to remember; and it will, I trust, come again.

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

GENOCIDE, LIBERATION, AND A FORMULA FOR FREEDOM

(Address by Senator HERBERT H. LEHMAN at observance by Armenian Independence Day, Town Hall, New York, May 22, 1955)

Napoleon is credited with having said, "Happy is the country which has no history." There is more than a kernel of truth in that epigram.

The Armenian nation, the anniversary of whose short-lived independence we are observing today, has a long history—a long and tragic history. But it is a history marked throughout with a resplendent nobility. The unquenchable devotion of the Armenian people to freedom and nationhood has few parallels in the annals of mankind.

This is a people whose national beginnings date back almost 3,000 years. Theirs—and yours—is a tradition as ancient as that of classic Greece and Persia and Babylon. Two centuries before Christ there was a great, thriving, and powerful Armenian kingdom, characterized by a high culture, learning and achievement.

The eminent traditions of that Armenian past have not only been handed down through the centuries from one generation to another, but they have been constantly enriched by new Armenian epics of heroism and devotion to freedom. Armenian history contains an almost endless succession of heroic chapters, reaching down to the present day.

There is one striking parallel to the history of the Armenian people which surely has not escaped notice before, and is of particular interest to me—the parallel with the history of the Jews.

Dispersed over the face of the globe, reunited, and dispersed again and again, the Armenian people, like the Jews, have retained their particular traditions, their culture, their language, and their feeling of community.

Like the Jews, the Armenians were, through the centuries of their dispersal, merchants and traders, in Europe and the Near East. They were the financiers who helped

maintain the stability of kingdoms and empires.

And like the Jews, the Armenians, through the Middle Ages, were among the few peoples who helped keep alive the culture and wisdom of the ancient past, who nurtured poetry and literature during those centuries when an intellectual darkness had settled over the Western World.

Today, we are observing the 37th anniversary of the proclamation of independence of the Armenian Republic. Like the Republic of Israel 30 years later, the Armenian Republic was born in the midst of chaos and as an aftermath of war.

This Republic was created not by international fiat, but by the heroic, the almost unbelievable struggles of the Armenian people. In fact, those struggles were not confined to the months immediately preceding the event, but took place over countless generations and even centuries.

Again like Israel, the rebirth of the Armenian state in 1918 was a true miracle. Out of chaos, order was established. Out of hunger, starvation, and poverty, an economy was organized. In the very midst of despotism, totalitarianism, and tyranny, democracy took root and grew.

The military forces of Armenia's great neighboring powers, Turkey and Soviet Russia, were driven out and defeated. The battles that took place on Armenian soil against Turkish Armies between May 23 and May 28 of 1918 deserve to be numbered among the military epics of the ages.

In the months following the establishment of the Armenian Republic, there took place—again as in Israel 30 years later—an ingathering of Armenians from all over the world who flocked to the rocky hillsides of this historic land to take part in the defense and the building of the new state.

A great renaissance of Armenian culture took place. It was a stirring time—an historic time.

Today we meet to draw—all of us—renewed inspiration from that event and that time.

But Armenia's independence, and the happiness of her people in their new-found freedom, were shortlived.

Except for her legions of individual friends and well-wishers throughout the world, the Republic of Armenia was alone, surrounded by enemies. There was no United Nations—not even a League of Nations—to help preserve Armenia's freedom.

True, the victorious Great Powers recognized Armenia's independence. America sent food by the shipload. The American Government and the American people as individuals contributed to the relief of the Armenian people. But no armies marched and no ships of war sailed to the rescue when the Turkey of Kemal Pasha and the Russia of Lenin and Trotsky joined, despite formal agreement and covenants to the contrary, in a dread conspiracy to destroy the Armenian Republic.

The Turks from the south and the Bolsheviks from the north threw themselves upon the tiny Republic and soon Armenia, despite heroic resistance, ceased to exist as a political entity. Especially marked was the duplicity of the Soviet Government—a habit of duplicity which the rest of the world was to learn more about in the years to come.

There was a treaty signed with Turkey in August 1920, recognizing the Armenian Republic. The Grand Council of the Allied Powers recognized and affirmed that treaty. But it became, like so many other treaties, a scrap of paper. The light of freedom in Armenia was snuffed out.

Thirty-five years have passed since then. But still the precious flame of nationhood which had burned in the hearts of the Armenian people for so many centuries has not been extinguished. In ages past, czars, emperors, mamelukes, and sultans had tried to destroy that flame. They had not succeeded. Neither has the Kremlin. And it never will.

During the past 35 years the Armenian people have been exposed to the same savage treatment which has been meted out to every other national minority behind the Iron Curtain. The crime of genocide has been perpetrated, persistently and brutally, in many parts of the Soviet world. But nowhere more violently and nakedly than in Soviet Armenia. Still the people of Armenia persist in surviving. And despite the Communist blandishments, propaganda, and brainwashing, to which the Armenian people have been intermittently exposed through the years, the fierce hope and restless dream of eventual freedom and independence still persist among this people.

We have good evidence that the Armenians have remained firm in their faith in freedom. The Communist masters continue until this day to inveigh against, and to denounce, Armenian nationalism.

The Armenian people know, in their hearts, that throughout the free world there exists a determination that one day Armenians will again be free, and the cultural values of Armenia again enshrined, in all their glory, in that historic land.

But let us not forget for a moment, while we gaze into the reaches of the future, the present agony which the Armenian people are enduring.

We must not forget the slave-labor camps, the peasantry exploited, the workingmen and women brutalized, the middle class, and the intellectuals exterminated.

We must not forget the murders, the tortures, and the mass deportations. We must not forget the reign of terror now prevalent in that unhappy land.

Nor should we forget these practices in Czechoslovakia, in Poland, in Hungary, in Rumania, in Lithuania, in Latvia, in Estonia, in Caucasia, and in Georgia. Never have so many been oppressed by so few.

Genocide, developed to a science by Nazi Germany, has been practiced on an even vaster scale by Soviet Russia. Although history is not without its long list of instances of genocide, never has the commission of this crime taken place on such a prodigious scale.

It is surely up to the free peoples of the world to give unmistakable notice to the cruel men in the Kremlin that genocide in Armenia, and indeed, throughout the periphery of the Iron Curtain, has not gone unobserved and will not go unpunished. It must surely be accounted for one day at the bar of international justice.

There must be no retreat from this stand. There must be no compromise with this principle. I hope we never condone these crimes as part of any deal, incidental to any negotiations, anywhere.

We in the United States can show our determination in this direction in a very simple and immediate way—by moving promptly to ratify the Genocide Convention which has been gathering dust in a pigeonhole of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee for several years. It is a shameful thing that we have not ratified this covenant. It constitutes a betrayal of the memory of those who have been the victims of genocide, and of those who still face the threat of extinction by it.

A little more than 2 years ago the General Assembly of the United Nations approved a resolution urging speedy ratification of the Genocide Convention by all member governments. The United States voted for that resolution. Yet the Eisenhower administration has thus far made no move to urge the Senate Foreign Relations Committee to act on the genocide pact. Indeed, quite the contrary.

Whenever the genocide pact is mentioned, the President of the United States and the Secretary of State appear to be listening to something else.

Then there is the question of so-called liberation. How cruelly hopes were raised when the political orators of the Republican Party, seeking not strength abroad but votes at home, promised the early liberation of the enslaved peoples. They promised action, not words. And by action, they meant force.

That was a most unfortunate exercise in political demogogy. Hopes that were kindled were just as quickly extinguished when the promise was confronted with the facts of life.

My friends, we all pray for the liberation of the enslaved peoples of Europe and Asia Minor. But we must do much more than pray. We must have a policy and a program to accomplish it.

That program cannot be based on force or war. The free world shrinks from the thought of war, as from the thought of death, itself. In the era of the hydrogen bomb, liberation by war would mean not freedom but total destruction and annihilation.

There are other, surer roads to the goal of freedom. Those roads are hard; they may be long. But freedom was never won by easy formulas or slick slogans. Freedom is won by sacrifice, by heroism, by dedication, and by courageous and unyielding resolve.

The road to freedom is the high road. It is a noble goal. It must be nobly attempted and nobly achieved.

Let us consider the subject of our observance today, the independence gained by Armenia 37 years ago. The First World War has been described by historians as the destroyer of empires. Three great empires of that day—the Ottoman Empire of the Turks, the Austro-Hungarian Empire, and the German Empire—disappeared.

It was a time of birth and rebirth of nations. The banners raised by President Woodrow Wilson were emblazoned with moral principles, to which the hearts and minds of men responded with a mighty outcry. Freedom and self-determination were the watchwords of victory. Imperialism was the enemy. Out of the ferment of those times, Armenian independence sprung.

But the high ideals so nobly expressed were followed by mean actions. Each nation staked out its own interest. Spheres of influence were callously divided. Colonialism received a fresh sanction.

In this atmosphere—the atmosphere of power politics as usual—freedom was an early victim. Idealism passed quickly from the scene. Isolation became the nostrum by which we in the United States sought to insure ourselves against responsibility for what was happening abroad. Armenian freedom, of course, went with the rest.

Today, although the scene is much different, it is still in essence the same.

We in the United States have learned a little from our experience in two world wars, but, I am afraid, not quite enough. We still overvalue power and undervalue principle. We are no longer isolationists—far from it—but we are inclined to discount the power of ideals, which is actually the greatest power we have.

We should and could be preaching freedom from every platform in every world forum. We should and could be denouncing colonialism, wherever it exists and by whomever it is practiced.

I do not mean that we should alienate ourselves from our friends and allies—those which still practice colonialism. But we should never cease to urge them to give heed to the principles of self-determination for minorities and dependent peoples. We should never cease to advocate the principle clearly and consistently.

What a greater moral stature that would give us in confronting our enemies and in opposing the colonialism of the Communist dictatorships, for theirs is the most vicious

colonialism of all. Theirs is the most virulent form—the most oppressive, tyrannous, heartless, and cruel of them all. We could mobilize behind our enlightened leadership the insistent opinion of the overwhelming majority of free mankind. That would constitute a force before which even the Iron Curtain would give way. Physical force can resist physical force, but physical force cannot cope with the force of a moral idea.

Our policy should be to advance that moral idea in every way and on every occasion. We should make ourselves the champions of that moral idea—the idea of freedom for all who seek it, of independence for all who choose it, and world cooperation for the enforcement of the rights of each and of all.

Implicit in this concept are the moral ideals of peace and of justice. There is no deeper yearning in the world today than for these objectives.

If we are to be the champion of these moral ideals, we must, of course, practice them at home, as well as preach them abroad. We must feel free in order to advocate freedom.

We must practice brotherhood in order to urge it on a world scale.

We must assure equal rights to our own minorities in order to advocate those rights for minorities abroad.

We must revise our immigration laws to make them conform to the principles we urge in world affairs. We must open our gates to a fair number of refugees and escapees from abroad.

We must amend the Refugee Relief Act, and completely revise the iniquitous, the cruel and discriminatory McCarran-Walter act.

If we do these things at home, we will be in a position to plant our banners of freedom and justice abroad.

Then we will be able to rally to those banners the millions and hundreds of millions of human beings who wait with eager ear for some clarion call which will unite them all, in their vast and many-tongued multitudes, in a single community of purpose and interest.

Much of mankind has but recently awakened from the long sleep of centuries. Much of mankind comprehends with increasing clarity today the power of mass action—the irresistable force of the collective approach.

They are moved today by many stirrings—some responsible and some irresponsible; some constructive, and some destructive.

Freemen in many lands are aware of the menace of Communist aggression, and disillusioned with the brutality of the Communist practice. They are frightened, too, by the looming threat of massive slaughter—of cosmic suicide.

So they listen for a voice which will speak of peace and of security, and of justice and of freedom in the same breath. It must be a clear voice, sincere and without hypocrisy.

If such a voice is raised, it will echo throughout the world, and it will be answered by such a thunderous response as will bring the men in the Kremlin, and the other despots of the earth, to their knees, and to their end.

God give us strength to speak in such a voice, and to act in such a way as to give hope to the enslaved, and courage to the free.

RICHARD I. BONG AIR FIELD IN RACINE COUNTY, WIS.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, on Sunday, May 22, it was my privilege to be present at the dedication of a new school annex in Douglas County, Wis., in honor of America's ace of aces of World Wars I and II, the late Maj. Richard Ira Bong.

At that time, I made the suggestion that a new $16 million Air Defense Command base to be built in Racine County, near Kansasville, Wis., be named the Richard I. Bong Base, in honor of this immortal hero. I have written to Secretary of the Air Force, Harold Talbott, in regard to this objective, and I earnestly trust that this goal will be fulfilled.

I may say that one of the most moving aspects of the dedication ceremony was the remarks made by Dick Bong's chief, general of the Fifth Air Force, George C. Kenney. General Kenney in postwar years has continued his outstanding service to America. This is particularly exemplified by his continued spearheading of the need for invincible United States air power, especially in his present capacity as chairman of the Board of the Air Force Association. The general serves, moreover, as the president of the Arthritis and Rheumatism Foundation of our country—a group which has done outstanding work in the field of research, care, and rehabilitation of the arthritis-afflicted.

I send to the desk, and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, the text of General Kenney's eloquent comments. By way of background on the man who delivered them, I ask unanimous consent that they be followed by a biographical summary of the splendid career of this fine military leader—Dick Bong's wartime commander.

Finally, I include the text of a heart-warming editorial from the current issue of the Wisconsin VFW News. The VFW is to be congratulated for its pioneering in recommending the honoring of Wisconsin's Dick Bong by a living memorial—a goal which now has been fulfilled.

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

TEXT OF REMARKS BY GEN. GEORGE C. KENNEY, USAF, RETIRED, CHAIRMAN OF THE BOARD, AIR FORCE ASSOCIATION, AT THE DEDICATION OF THE RICHARD I. BONG MEMORIAL, POPLAR, WIS., MAY 22, 1955

It was August 6, 1945. I was on my way to the strip on Okinawa to take off for General Headquarters Southwest Pacific area in Manila, when a radio which had been relayed from there was handed me by my signal officer. I stopped thinking about the atomic bomb which that morning had wiped out Hiroshima; stopped speculating about the effect of the coming entry of Russia into the Pacific war; even stopped thinking of the capitulation of Japan which we all knew was about to take place in a few days. Wherever I landed, I found that the whole Fifth Air Force felt the same way. We had lost someone we loved, someone we had been glad to see out of combat and on his way home, 8 months before.

Maj. Richard Ira Bong of Poplar, Wis., was dead. That was the message that had taken our minds off the war, the Japs, the A-bomb.

Maj. Richard Ira Bong, who had ruled the air from New Guinea to the Philippines; hero and victor in a hundred encounters; officially credited with the destruction in air combat of 40 enemy aircraft and unofficially with at least as many more, and decorated with every medal for valor that his country could give him. He had met the best the Japanese Air Force could send against him, and had won. The kids used to say, "There isn't a Nip in the empire who can get Dick Bong in his sights." You see we not only loved him, we boasted about him, we were proud of him. That was why each of us got a little lump in our throat when we read that telegram.

Maj. Richard Ira Bong, ace of American aces in all of our wars, who is destined to hold that title for all time. With the weapons that man possesses today, no war of the future will last long enough for any pilot to run up a score of 40 victories again. His country and the Air Force must never forget their number one fighter pilot, who will inspire other fighter pilots and countless thousands of youngsters who will want to follow in his footsteps every time that any nation or coalition of nations dares to challenge our right to think, speak and live as a free people.

May this memorial building, donated by the Veterans of Foreign Wars and citizens of this community, serve as a shrine at which we may constantly resolve to see to it that we preserve our country, our ideals and our freedom. May it also constantly remind us of our debt to our youth which has always been willing to make any sacrifice to insure that the rest of us can keep and inherit this freedom. We owe a lot to our youth—youth typified by Dick Bong.

Today, tomorrow and for all time, we salute you, Dick—gallant gentleman—hero—ace of aces.

BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH OF GEN. GEORGE CHURCHILL KENNEY

Gen. George Churchill Kenney, United States Air Force, retired, was a pilot in World War I and Chief of the Pacific Air Command in World War II.

Gen. Douglas MacArthur said, in describing him during the Pacific war: "General Kenney is unquestionably one of the best qualified air officers in the world today."

He introduced skip bombing, lob bombing, and the special bomb fuse which made the Nipponese Navy a duck hunt for his air forces. He scrapped the tech manuals and mounted eight and later twelve .50-caliber guns in the fuselage and nose of his B-25 Mitchells and six in the A-20 Bostons making them the terrors of the Pacific. He invented the destructive parachute bomb and produced countless other bomb improvisations until they, in his own words, "sang all the notes in the scale, cut through trees 2 inches thick and a hundred feet away like a knife, and, when they land in the jungle, slash enough room for a baseball diamond minus Japs."

Kenney was born August 6, 1889, in Nova Scotia where his family was vacationing. They returned to the family in Brookline, Mass., shortly after.

General Kenney attended grade and high school in Brookline, Mass., and spent 3 years at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology. His interest was turned to aviation at that time when he saw a Bleriot being demonstrated over Boston Harbor one day. He and two equally aviation-minded young comrades thereupon began construction on a plane of their own. The result was an aircraft that taxied with all the fury and promise of a modern B-29 but left the ground only when it hit a rock and bounced into a glide.

The start of the First World War found Kenney enrolled in the ranks of aviation cadets. His flying instructor for the brief period that constituted training in those days was Bert Acosta. Kenney shipped overseas with 17 flying hours to his credit and an abundance of self-confidence. He flew 75 missions, shot down 2 German planes and was shot down once himself. He ended the war a captain with the Distinguished Service Cross and the Silver Star.

The years between 1919 and 1939 saw Kenney proceed through the regular steps of advancement open to the peacetime officer. He concentrated on aeronautical development and its application to warfare during this phase of his AAF career. His military

schooling included Air Corps Engineering School, 1920; Air Corps Tactical School, 1925; Command and General Staff School, 1926; and Army War College, 1932.

In 1924 he registered his initial "first" when he became the first man to fix machine-guns in the wings of a plane. He installed two .30-caliber Brownings in the wings of an old DeHaviland and demonstrated this revolutionary method of increasing the fire-power of aircraft.

In the prewar expansion period in 1939, Kenney, a major, became Chief of Production at Wright Field, Ohio. A year later he went to France as assistant military attaché and was promoted to lieutenant colonel. Returning to Wright Field after his tour of duty in France, he became technical executive and later commander of the Experimental Depot and Engineering School with the rank of brigadier general. He never held the rank of colonel, an omission which, the general said at that time, "would probably be corrected on the way down after the war."

In March 1942 he moved up to major general and out to the west coast to assume command of the Fourth Air Force. Four and a half months later, in July, he arrived in the Southwest Pacific to become commanding general of the Allied Air Forces in that theater. The Japs were in complete control of the air, being contested by less than 10 serviceable Fortresses and a handful of fighters. The immensity of the task of building an Allied air fleet was apparent to General Kenney when he remarked with his characteristic candor to a reporter: "Nobody is kidding me about this show."

In a little more than a year after his arrival General Kenney's air forces had beaten off the Japanese aerial attacks in Australia and approaches, bombed Jap bases to the north and during the Papuan campaign, supplied an entire Allied force of two divisions by air with materiel, troops, ammunition, hospitals, etc., driven to cover the portion of the Jap shipping they hadn't sunk, and wrested superiority of the air in the Southwest Pacific. The paratroop operation at Nadzab, New Guinea, and the seizing of the Markham-Ramu Valley during the fall of 1943 with an airborne, air-supplied infantry division are still regarded as models of this type of warfare.

During the 3 years he conducted the successful air war against the Japanese, the general became Commanding General, Far East Air Forces and then Commanding General, Pacific Air Command. He added a third star in September 1942 and a fourth star in March 1945.

Returning to the States after the war, General Kenney served as senior United States military representative on the Military Staff Committee of the United Nations from January 1, 1946, to October 15, 1946. He assumed command of the Strategic Air Command at Andrews Air Force Base, Washington, D. C., on April 1, 1946. On October 29, 1948, he succeeded Maj. Gen. Robert W. Harper as Commanding General of the Air University, Maxwell Air Force Base, Ala.

General Kenney retired from the United States Air Force on August 31, 1951. On October 1, he became president of the National Arthritis and Rheumatism Foundation with headquarters in New York City.

General Kenney has been awarded the Distinguished Service Cross with Oak Leaf Cluster; Distinguished Service Medal with Oak Leaf Cluster; Silver Star; Distinguished Flying Cross; Purple Heart; and Honorary Knight Commander, Military Division, Order of the British Empire.

General Kenney lives with his wife, Alice, at their home in Scarsdale, N. Y. He has a son, William, in the Air Force, and a daughter, Julia.

General Kenney was elected president of the Air Force Association in 1953. He became chairman of the board in 1954.

[From the Wisconsin Veteran of May 1955]

MAJ. RICHARD IRA BONG—A TRIBUTE

(By Charles House)

A farm kid from Wisconsin died in a Shooting Star, and a Nation mourned.

Newspaper presses rumbled strange words onto page one: The farm kid was identified as Richard Bong—greatest combat pilot in the history of the world.

Sidebar stories cited his record of enemy kills with his chattering guns: 40 confirmed and 9 more of the enemy aircraft down in flames, but unconfirmed as "kills."

The news stories listed his military honors. So long was the list, so imposing!

The facts were impressive—but it was almost incomprehensible that young Dick Bong, a pug-nosed young man from Douglas County who had just clambered down from his father's wheezing tractor and became the international ace of aces.

It happened so fast. One year Dick Bong was singing soft and gentle songs in the church choir at the village of Poplar. A few years later, he was an intrepid fighter pilot—the best in the world. His mother still called him "Sonny."

He was born in 1920. He scored his first double kill on his debut over Buna in December 1941. A year later he was the ranking Anglo-American ace. Four years later he was retired as a combat pilot.

On August 6, 1945, Dick Bong climbed into the cockpit of the P-80 Shooting Star, an experimental jet plane, then the fastest in the world.

Moments later he roared into the sky—a good, sweet-minded farmer boy on his date with death. There was a puff of black smoke, the right wing dipped as though in a farewell salute to the world. Then there was a hollow roar. The plane disintegrated. Dick Bong had died instantly.

The Nation mourned his death, for this young man had never displayed the "killer instinct." He was what we like to call "a good guy." The glory which was heaped upon his blond head never took. He was unaffected, sincere, likable, and gentle.

A reporter once asked him how it felt to be the greatest fighter pilot in history. Bong turned his blue eyes on the reporter and said, "Not a darn bit different."

A Nation needed this unassuming young man, needed his kind for our children. We needed him to characterize the fact that ours is a Nation of kind, simple, down-to-earth people, who are basically good. And that—like Richard Bong—we can be stirred to great, heroic deeds in time of war.

We needed Richard Bong, but we lost him, except to history. Now—after 10 years of futility in seeking an adequate monument for this intrepid farmer kid who was terrible in war—we erect to his memory a "living monument." This is being done at the suggestion of the Wisconsin Veterans of Foreign Wars and by VFW work in providing some of the funds for the project, in joint cooperation with hundreds of other persons who believe as we do.

And we believe that the school and gymnasium for the young people of Richard Bong's community is a gentle way to recall a good American boy. Peaceful and good, but great, brave, and terrible in war.

We will remember how our Richard Bong was in peace. Let the sabre-rattling aggressors remember him at war.

THE POSTAL PAY BILL

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I am pleased that the long effort to achieve a pay raise for Government postal workers and classified employees is now drawing to a close. I earnestly hope that the final details can be resolved so that this proposed legislation can, with complete unanimity, be enacted by the Congress with the necessary retroactive features.

I am particularly pleased that the rural letter carriers will be assured justice in the forthcoming proposal. I was pleased to hear today from Mr. Melvin Lemke, secretary of the Wisconsin Rural Letter Carriers Association, whose motto is "Service With a Smile." This association endorses the bill.

I trust that shortly we shall have good news to report to the members of his association and all other postal groups throughout the Nation.

PROPOSED NATIONAL YOUTH REHABILITATION CORPS

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, considerable national interest has been expressed in my recently introduced bill, S. 1832 to establish a National Youth Rehabilitation Corps.

This interest undoubtedly originates from our overall concern with the national problem of juvenile delinquency. My proposal is not to be construed as a panacea for this grave and complicated problem, but it does offer a concrete avenue of attack on part of the problem. Furthermore, it is based on a program already underway in my own State, and can draw on the experience and the accomplishments achieved by the Civilian Conservation Corps in the depression years.

Several editorials on this subject in newspapers throughout the country have been brought to my attention, and I hereby request unanimous consent to have them printed in the RECORD at this point as part of my remarks.

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

[From the Cleveland (Ohio) Plain Dealer]

NEW APPROACHES TO AN OLD PROBLEM

There is no question about it—juvenile delinquency is one of this country's most pressing problems. Together with many another American we have spent sleepless nights wondering what the cure may be. For cure is the important thing—not punishment. We must, somehow, come up with something which will inspire the youngsters to prefer to be good kids rather than bad kids. It must be something they want to do themselves, rather than something they are forced to do.

An editorial in the Deseret News of Salt Lake City has set us thinking that perhaps two pressing problems could be solved at the same time. Most important, of course, is the desire to have our sons grow into self-reliant, law-abiding men. Less important, but worthy of consideration, is the condition of our national forests and parks, where a great deal of work needs to be done.

Since none of the Governmental and private agencies studying juvenile delinquency have come up with any answer other than that it exists and is spreading, it might be well to consider any possible value in a bill sponsored by Senator ARTHUR V. WATKINS, Republican, of Utah.

Senator WATKINS calls his program the National Youth Rehabilitation Corps. It would give young men from the ages of 16 to 25, who have been convicted of a felony or misdemeanor and put on parole or probation, an opportunity to join a group working on resource-conservation on Federal lands.

Such youths would get specified amounts of education along citizenship, vocational,

and military lines, in addition to their work. They would be paid from $25 to $35 per month, and would be subject to losing their parole or probation for violating rules or generally not fitting into the program.

We believe Senator WATKINS has something. There is a definite therapeutic value in working in the open. Men—even young men—begin to be affected by the beauty of God's handiwork, and even though they may fight it they find themselves beginning to think straight. The CCC camps handled some pretty tough customers, and made civilized men of them. The more we consider it, the more we feel sure that Senator WATKINS' bill has much to recommend it.

But what about the youngsters who haven't yet found themselves in bad trouble, but who seem to be headed that way; in short, the borderline cases too young and too tender to fit into a scheme like that of Senator WATKINS? What can be done to save them, outside of repeated admonitions to parents that they must stay with the job 24 hours every day?

A bill introduced in the Ohio Legislature by Representative Leonard Bartunek would provide for the creation in the State department of welfare of a parent-youth program division. George V. Woodling, Rocky River civic leader, is author of the proposal. Under this plan the State would encourage counties to set up parent-youth boards which would seek to bring parents and youth closer together in family interests and recreation. Each county board would consist of 15 members, at least 4 of whom would be 2 boys and 2 girls under 18.

We noted with interest this paragraph:

"The county board, upon becoming aware of any youth groups, clubs, or 'gangs,' shall endeavor to arrange for adult supervision for such groups, as well as to consult and confer with their parents, guardians, or other persons responsible for their welfare to the end of directing their energies into channels for developing good citizenship."

It sound good to us!

[From the Grand Rapids (Mich.) Herald]

RECLAIMABLE RESOURCES

There are real possibilities for invaluable reclamation of our national resources—the most priceless of which is our youth—in a plan presented to Congress by Senator WATKINS, of Utah, in a bill, S. 1832, which would set up a National Youth Rehabilitation Corps.

This would be a 1955 successor to the Civilian Conservation Corps of the 1930's which served young men, and the Nation, so well in a period of unemployment by taking boys from relief families into the forests and the mountains for useful work and training which paid off not only in material improvements but in human values.

There is this difference. The young men of the NYRC, unlike those of the CCC, would be those of 16 to 25 who had been convicted of a felony or a misdemeanor and put on parole or probation. Such young men would have a chance to join. They would be given citizenship, vocational, military, and general education, and put in 25 hours a week at constructive labor. They would be paid $25 a month ($35 for certain leadership responsibilities), and whether they made good would be up to them. Failure would be a violation of probation or parole, of course.

The idea is not unlike that advanced for Michigan by a number of our circuit judges who have advocated probation camps for young men who do not belong in prison, but for whom there is no other place. Sending them back to their old environment on probation would be only to invite further trouble.

It is in line with the modern idea that prevention is better, cheaper, and more promising than a cure.

Here in Kent County, that is the idea behind the emphasis on the need for putting fewer children in Children's Home and more into foster homes, or when that seems advisable, into their own parents' homes under court supervision.

The Deseret News, Salt Lake City, Utah, which is credited with inspiring the idea (Utah is already setting up such a program), notes two great problems. One, the least important but still a great one, is the condition of our national forests and parks. Not since the CCC days, the Deseret News points out, has anything been done toward building permanent recreation or sanitation facilities or in building roads and trails. It calls conditions in some of them a downright disgrace.

"The other problem," the Salt Lake newspaper went on in a recent editorial, "lies in the youngsters of America themselves. The great majority of them are sensible, straightforward, wonderful kids who will make good citizens under almost any circumstances. A very few will go bad under almost any circumstances. And many are borderline youngsters who can go either way. The tragic truth is that an increasing number of them are going the wrong way."

Many have been talking about juvenile delinquency—the Kefauver committee, the more recent Hendrickson committee, the Senate Judiciary Juvenile Delinquency Subcommittee—but here is a specific remedial program.

While no State should wait to pass the buck to the Federal Government, a national program is needed. Some States may not have public forests and parks for such camps. Some have national parks and few people. Michigan, of course, has—and has made small beginnings with establishments for prospective parolees. Probably Michigan could find enough work for all, certainly most, of the probationers and parolees that might be sent to the camps. Other States might not.

As a plan for killing 2 birds with 1 stone, the Deseret News-Watkins plan is a good one. The probationers should earn their keep by preserving and improving natural resources; but more than that they would have an opportunity to put their clouded past behind them and become good, respected, useful citizens.

[From the Racine (Wis.) Journal-Times and Sunday Bulletin]

MOVE TO AID YOUTH AND DO NEEDED JOB

Out of the State of Utah has come an idea that merits special attention of everyone interested in arresting the growing amount of juvenile delinquency and rehabilitating young people who have become involved with the law.

The idea, originated with Salt Lake City newspapers, has been accepted by the State of Utah, and was launched on a national scale a few weeks ago by Senator WATKINS of Utah who introduced legislation in Congress.

Briefly, the Watkins bill would establish a National Youth Rehabilitation Corps open to young men between 16 and 25 who have been convicted of felony or misdemeanor or judged delinquent. They would be placed on parole or probation and assigned to work camps in our national parks, where they would receive a certain amount of education and put to work for 25 hours a week on reclamation or building projects. They would be paid $25 a week, or $35 for those who are qualified for group leadership. Of course, they would be under supervision in their living quarters, schooling and work.

The Deseret News of Salt Lake City points out real possibilities here for invaluable reclamation of our resources—the most priceless of which is our youth.

A second value of the program is the work that could be done in the national forests and parks by such groups of young men. The parks need to develop both existing and new facilities. They have been rapidly falling behind the increased use put on them in the past 10 years.

The idea of a National Youth Rehabilitation Corps harks back to the Civilian Conservation Corps of depression years. In its working operation, the CCC was very similar, although it used young men who were victims of the depression as the source of its working force. The CCC served a double function in solving a social problem and getting valuable work done. Not even the sharpest critics of the New Deal at that time would deny that it did those two jobs well.

We are confronted at present with a similar situation—a social problem and a need for work on our nationally sponsored recreational facilities. The Rehabilitation Corps as outlined in Senator WATKINS' legislation seems to be one answer to both of those problems.

Congress has heard many reports on the delinquency situation in recent years—from the Kefauver committee, the Hendrickson committee, the Senate Subcommittee on Juvenile Delinquency, the FBI, and other agencies in and out of Government. In answer in those reports, Senator WATKINS has put forth a concrete plan of action toward a solution. The proposal should get serious study in Washington.

[From the Camden (N. J.) Courier-Post]

DUAL RECLAMATION PROJECT, "MOUNTAINS MAKE TALL MEN"

One of the happiest creations of the early New Deal days was the Civilian Conservation Corps.

It took hundreds of thousands of young men, unable to find private employment, and put them to useful work all over the country—work that was far from being the leaf-raking type, but was of great value in conservation of our natural resources. For members of the corps it was even more valuable in building up their morale and physique and giving them a practical education that was beyond price.

World War II necessarily brought about the end of the CCC, but it might have been a good idea if it had been revived with the coming of peace. For one thing, it was a preventive of delinquency in the 1930's that should be equally effective at any time. For another, much of the good conservation work the CCC did in its day has been abandoned, much of it undone because to be permanent it must be reasonably continuous. Unempoyment does not enter into the picture the way it did 20 years ago, but there is always enough of it to make the presence of such an organization valuable.

Senator WATKINS (Republican, Utah) has just introduced a bill in Congress to set up an organization patterned on the CCC though unike it in one important respect. Whereas the CCC was in no sense intended as a remedial program for delinquency, the Watkins proposal is. It is an extension on a national scale of a similar program his State has set up. It is designed to attack what the Deseret News-Salt Lake Telegram calls "two great problems in America," and the hope is it "may prove to be a sound, relatively inexpensive way to tackle both of them."

"One problem," says the Salt Lake City newspaper, "the least important of the two but still a great one, is the condition of our national forests and parks. Not since CCC days has anything very substantial been done toward building permanent recreation or sanitation facilities in the forests or in building roads and trails. The condition of many of our national parks is a downright disgrace. Both the parks and forests are under tremendously increasing pressure from public use. We are falling far short of meeting

that pressure. Much work needs to be done."

The other and greater problem, the paper continues, is delinquency. It is not confined to the very few youths who will go bad under almost any circumstances, but includes the many borderline youngsters who can go either way and who, every source of information proves to us, are going the wrong way in increasing numbers.

"One beginning of a solution," the Utah paper says, "may be the National Youth Rehabilitation Corps, as Senator WATKINS has called the program. His bill (S. 1832) would give young men age 16 to 25 who have been convicted of a felony or misdemeanor and put on parole or probation an opportunity to join a group working on resource conservation on Federal lands. The youths would get specified amounts of citizenship, vocational, military, and general education, and be expected to put in 25 hours of constructive labor. They would be paid $25 a month ($35 for certain leadership responsibilities), and would, of course, be subject to losing their parole or probation for violating rules or generally not fitting into the program."

The Deseret News-Telegram says, and we enthusiastically agree, that while "there is no simple cure-all for what ails the small minority of our youngsters who get in trouble * * * there are real possibilities here for invaluable reclamation of our resources—the most priceless of which is our youth."

The Courier-Post joins in hoping that "the proposal will be given thorough congressional and editorial and public discussion throughout the Nation."

Although as far as we are concerned, it doesn't seem to need too much discussion—it seems so eminently sound and wise from any viewpoint that the quicker Congress adopts it the better.

[From the Pensacola (Fla.) News]

YOUTH REHABILITATION CORPS PLAN PROMISING

Full commendation must be accorded legislation introduced by Senator WATKINS, Republican, of Utah, to help overcome the problem of juvenile delinquency with reference to boys. It should receive the approval of other legislators and of the public.

One helpful start toward solution to this problem may be the National Youth Rehabilitation Corps, as Senator WATKINS has called the program. His bill, S. 1832, would give young men age 16–25 who have been convicted of a felony or misdemeanor and put on parole or probation an opportunity to join a group working on resource reservation on Federal lands.

Without going any further the value of the bill is immediately apparent. It doesn't merely halt infection, as it were, it presents a cure, which is what is needed. It is to be hoped the bill will be given full congressional study and that, in the meantime, Utah will provide a good testing ground for national consideration.

[From the Mason City (Iowa) Globe-Gazette]

MOUNTAINS MAKE TALL MEN

Utah's Senator WATKINS is sponsor of a bill which would give young men, 16 to 25 years old, who have been convicted of a felony or misdemeanor and placed on parole or probation an opportunity to join a group working on resource conservation on Federal lands.

Such youngsters would get specified amounts of citizenship, vocational, military, and general education, along with their physical labor in the forests. There would be nominal pay for them and violating the rules would mean loss of parole or probation status.

In Senator WATKINS' home State, the Salt Lake Deseret News is offering vigorous editorial support to his proposal. One of its recent editorials on the subject bore the picturesque heading, "Mountains Make Tall Men."

There is something in this reminiscent of the Civilian Conservation Corps of 20 years ago or so. And it must be admitted that program looks a lot better in retrospect than it did in operation.

[From the Kinston (N. C.) Journal-Times]

A MEASURE WORTHY OF SERIOUS CONSIDERATION

Senate bill 1832, which would set up the National Youth Rehabilitation Corps and was advanced by Senator ARTHUR WATKINS of Utah, is a measure worthy of serious consideration by the Congress. It may well contain a partial answer to the problem of juvenile crime in America.

The measure would give young men from 16 to 25 years of age who are convicted of a felony or a misdemeanor and placed on probation a chance to join a work corps on resource conservation on Federal lands. It is patterned after a successful program in Utah, where a State law has made such a program possible for some time, and is reminiscent of the Civilian Conservation Corps operations in the 1930's.

The youths would get specified amounts of citizenship, vocational, military, and general education and be expected to put in 25 hours of constructive labor per month. They would be paid $25 per month and $35 for certain leadership responsibilities, but would be subject to losing their parole or probation in the event they violated the rules set up for the project and did not fit into the program.

There are few communities which do not have one or more youths who would benefit from such a training program. Properly handled it could be the start of really useful careers for many of these young men. The metropolitan areas have a real problem with growing juvenile crime. Unless something is done speedily, a whole generation of new criminals will be created by these thugs and thrill-slayers. Crime has jumped by nearly 4 times the 7 percent rise noted in the population since 1950.

Something must be done. It would seem that Senator WATKINS' measure is a step in the right direction. We hope it gains the early and enthusiastic support of the entire Congress.

[From the Deseret News and Salt Lake Telegram]

MOUNTAINS MAKE TALL MEN

Usually the best big ideas and big programs start as little ones conceived to fit a local need. The idea being developed by Captain Haight, of the Salt Lake City police, and others is one that could develop into something big and important.

Captain Haight read an editorial on this page recently about the need for more construction and maintenance work in the national forests. He was struck by the idea that sending boys who run afoul the law up into the mountains to do the work could be of great benefit to the boys themselves as well as to the public.

He is right. The conditions that brought the CCC into existence in 1933 were far different than exist today, of course. But today's delinquency has its roots in many of the same problems the CCC was organized to combat—idleness, lack of incentive, lack of a sense of accomplishment. The fact that many of today's leaders are CCC graduates bears witness to how well that organization helped overcome those problems, and, of course, most of the permanent recreation, sanitation, and other facilities in the national forests date back to CCC days.

The plan now being considered is to have older teen-age boys from the Ogden Industrial School—and those who would otherwise be sent there—work in the forests during the summer months. It would not be a chain gang. The assignment would be entirely voluntary, and the boys would be on their honor. They would be given incentive pay—a dollar a day has been suggested—to do an honest day's work.

There are serious problems to be worked out. Chief among them is the financial one. Who would pay the wages? The Forest Service can't under existing laws and directives. State and county welfare budgets have no provision for such costs. There are also problems of transportation, supervision, food and quarters, and support of labor leaders. All these can and should be worked out. And they will be, judging from the enthusiasm of all those who have had anything to do with discussion of the project so far.

This is certainly a worth-while experiment. Those concerned with juvenile delinquency on a national scale, as well as those in Washington who are concerned with maintaining our national forest facilities, might well watch it closely.

[From the Deseret News and Salt Lake Telegram]

MOUNTAINS MAKE TALL MEN—II

We earnestly commend to the attention of the public and our fellow editors the legislation introduced by Senator WATKINS Tuesday to send boys in trouble into the Nation's forests.

Not because this newspaper is credited with inspiring the idea. Not because what Senator WATKINS proposes on a national scale is patterned after the program already being set up in Utah.

But because there are two great problems in America, and this program may prove to be a sound, relatively inexpensive way to tackle both of them.

One problem, the least important of the two but still a great one, is the condition of our national forests and parks. Not since CCC days has anything very substantial been done toward building permanent recreation or sanitation facilities in the forests or in building roads and trails. The condition of many of our national parks is a downright disgrace. Both the parks and forests are under tremendously increasing pressure from public use. We are falling far short of meeting that pressure. Much work needs to be done.

The other problem lies in the youngsters of America themselves. The great majority of them are sensible, straightforward, wonderful kids who will make good citizens under almost any circumstances. A very few will go bad under almost any circumstances. And many are borderline youngsters who can go either way. The tragic truth is that an increasing number of them are going the wrong way.

By coincidence, the FBI annual crime report is just out this week. The picture it gives is not pretty. Major crimes were up 5 percent last year. Since 1950, United States crime has increased 26.7 percent. But, one may say, so has the population increased. True. But only by 7 percent in that period. Crime increased almost four times as much.

Another statistic bearing directly on the problem: Youngsters 17 years of age or under represented 57.6 percent of all arrests for auto theft, 49 percent of all arrests for burglary, and 43.6 percent of all arrests for larceny.

Well, what is to be done about it? Congress has studied the problem. The Kefauver committee found shocking conditions. So did the more recent Hendrickson committee. But neither found a solution. President Eisenhower in his state of the Union message last January recommended Federal help

for States to "strengthen their resources for preventing and dealing with juvenile delinquency." In February, the National Conference on Juvenile Delinquency was formed, and in March the Senate Judiciary Juvenile Delinquency Subcommittee, after 16 months of hearings, released its interim report. It said we have "weak, inadequate, poorly manned" defenses against delinquency and spoke of better schools and more public housing.

All of which is fine, but hardly the basis for any specific remedial program. That has been the trouble. Everyone talks about or studies the problem; no one gets started with specific solutions.

One beginning of a solution may be the National Youth Rehabilitation Corps, as Senator WATKINS has called the program. His bill would give young men age 16 to 25 who have been convicted of a felony or misdemeanor and put on parole or probation an opportunity to join a group working on resource conservation on Federal lands. The youths would get specified amounts of citizenship, vocational, military, and general education and be expected to put in 25 hours of constructive labor a month. They would be paid $25 a month ($35 for certain leadership responsibilities) and would, of course, be subject to losing their parole or probation for violating rules or generally not fitting into the program.

There is no simple cure-all for what ails the small minority of our youngsters who get in trouble. No doubt there are ways to improve the program as it has been presented to Congress. But there are real possibilities here for invaluable reclamation of our resources—the most priceless of which is our youth. We hope the proposal will be given thorough congressional study and editorial and public discussion throughout the Nation.

And meanwhile, we hope Utah will push ahead on its own program fast enough to set it up for this summer and provide a good testing ground for what can be hoped for on a national scale later.

[From the Washington Post and Times Herald]

CONSERVING YOUTH

Senator WATKINS has advanced a most constructive proposal for lending a helping hand to youngsters who have gotten off to a bad start. His idea is to get them away from the city slums where their troubles began and put them to useful work in the country's parks and forests, where they are much more likely to regain physical and spiritual health than in jails or training schools. The idea was originated by the Deseret News, of Salt Lake City, and is now being given a trial on a local scale in Utah.

The Watkins proposal calls for the creation of a National Youth Rehabilitation Corps, patterned apparently on the Civilian Conservation Corps of the early New Deal. It would give men between 16 and 25 who have been convicted of a crime and put on probation or parole an opportunity to join a group working on resource conservation on Federal lands.

The CCC was one of the New Deal's outstanding successes. It did some wonderful work in conserving some of the natural resources and outdoor assets of the United States. And it did an equally wonderful job in conserving an even more valuable American inheritance—a considerable number of young men who might otherwise have been led into bad company and bad habits during the depth of the depression. The country's national parks and forests, because of the vast increase in use, are once again sadly in need of intelligent conservation work. And so, apparently, judging from the juvenile-delinquency statistics, are many of its boys and young men. The Watkins bill would seem to offer a simultaneous solution for both problems.

PROSPECTIVE USE OF ATOMIC ENERGY AS FUEL IN PRODUCING ELECTRICAL ENERGY

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, Members of this body have been subjected to many irresponsible predictions on the imminence of the use of atomic energy as a fuel for the production of low-cost electrical energy.

Some down-to-earth observations on this subject by an acknowledged expert in the field were published recently by the New York Times and the Salt Lake Tribune.

The Times article, published in the issue of May 9, 1955, presented the views of Dr. Robert E. Wilson, chairman of the board of Standard Oil of Indiana and former chief of Standard Oil research and development. The Tribune article appeared March 30, 1955.

I ask unanimous consent to have these news articles printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

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

[From the New York Times of May 9, 1955]

ATOM ENERGY USE SEEN FAR AWAY—FORECASTS OF POWER FOR AUTO, RAILROADS, HOME HEATING DISMISSED AS FANTASTIC

WASHINGTON.—Atomic energy has a long way to go before it can compete with coal and oil in transportation, heating or the production of electricity.

This is the conclusion of Dr. Robert E. Wilson, chairman of the board of Standard Oil of Indiana and former chief of Standard Oil research and development.

Irresponsible predictions of atomic automobiles, locomotives, home furnaces and the like are close to fantastic in their improbability, he says in Technology Review of Massachusetts Institute of Technology. He forecasts that a quarter century, at least, will pass before atomic power can enter such fields, if ever.

The only use in land transportation discussed as a practical possibility, he says, is in large locomotives. "But," he adds, "even if this should prove safe and economical in normal service, which is doubtful, can you imagine either the railroads or the regulatory authorities being willing to risk a wreck of an atomic engine in one of our large cities. A theoretically safe 'package' might be designed, but psychological factors would bar it for many, many years.

"For cars, trucks or buses the idea is fantastic. Even supposing people could afford the minimum conceivable cost of tens of thousands of dollars for an atomic engine, we would have to have at least a three-foot concrete dashboard to protect the passengers from dangerous radiations, and front fenders three feet thick to protect passersby. For commercial airplanes the shielding problem seems to constitute an almost insuperable bar, although the greater distance of the pilot from the power plant would help to some extent."

It has been suggested, he says, that electricity might be manufactured in some central atomic plant and used to charge some new kind of highly efficient storage battery for automobiles. Even if this were practical, he points out, it would be expensive power.

For house and plant heating, he says, "atomic energy seems to be ruled out by its unusual handicaps, the need for heavy shielding, the problem of handling radioactive wastes, and the high cost of equipment."

Either for producing electric energy or heat, he stresses, atomic power would seem to be attractive only for some place like northern Greenland where fuel oil, because of the cost of transportation, may be priced at $1 a gallon instead of a little more than 10 cents.

So far as marine power plants are concerned, he holds that use of atomic energy will be confined for a long time to come to specially-constructed naval vessels. High costs and radiation risks make their installation on commercial ships improbable.

[From the Salt Lake Tribune of March 30, 1955]

ATOMIC POWER THRUST INTO BASIN DEBATE

(By the Shift Boss)

As has been outlined before, despite the progress in atomic power, the utility power companies and public agencies have many millions of dollars worth of hydroelectric and conventional steam powerplants under construction and on the drawing boards for future construction.

This is in line with informed opinion that hydroelectric—and many steam plants—will not be displaced by atomic energized powerplants for many years to come, if ever.

Therefore it is interesting to note a not too highly publicized use of atomic power as an argument by opponents of the upper Colorado River project and hydroelectric powerplants thereon.

It appears that California opponents of the project, at hearings before the Interior Committee, used the argument that such hydroelectric plants would be rendered "useless" and "antiquated" by atomic plants, and that on Government hydroelectric projects the investment therein "would never be recovered."

Mr. WATKINS. One reason for my interest in this subject is that these irresponsible, rosy promises of low-cost atomic power have been used by the rabid and raucous, well-heeled propaganda-pressure groups which have been doing everything they can to confuse the issue and defeat the Colorado River storage project by any means at their disposal.

Because of my interest in this subject, I discussed the problem with some of the Nation's top atomic officials during a recent visit to the Government's atomic plant at Oak Ridge, Tenn. These officials—and they included the celebrated Admiral Rickover—assured me that low-cost atomic-powered electricity was many years away, and that there was no reason to defer any sound hydropower project because of possible atomic competition.

Hence, I can assure this body that the views of Dr. Wilson, as reported in the Times article, are adequately supported by responsible Government experts on atomic energy.

The fact that such irresponsible predictions as Dr. Wilson referred to have been used by the enemies of water development in the arid West is a good indication of the weakness of their case and an indictment of the nature of their opposition in general.

I have shown in a well-documented statement that these people were distorting or ignoring obvious facts on the legal and historical development of Dinosaur National Monument. They were seeking to have the public believe that the pro-

posal to build a dam at Echo Park was an invasion of the monument, whereas it is actually only a legal, planned use for those lands which have never been under National Park Service jurisdiction, but which are, in fact, reserved for water resource development by 11 reclamation and power site withdrawals, valid and in effect since 1925.

It is clear that Dr. Wilson has shown up another of their false claims—that the imminence of cheap atomic electric power would make the project economically unsound.

It is about time for honest men among the enemies of the Colorado River storage project to concede some of these facts, and, like the American Museum of Natural History, effect a policy change to promote information instead of controversy.

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

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

STATE, JUSTICE, JUDICIARY APPROPRIATIONS, 1956

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no further morning business to be transacted, the Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which is H. R. 5502.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 5502) making appropriations for the State, Justice, and Judiciary Departments, 1956.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, I have a few brief remarks I should like to make in connection with the appropriation bill.

First of all let me say the full committees gave careful consideration to the many items contained in the bill, and there appeared no controversy about the committee amendments made to the House bill. Consequently, I shall ask that these amendments be considered en bloc, and then ask that the bill, as amended, be considered as the original text, for the purpose of further amendment, and for points of order with respect to recommended substantive law.

The total of the reported bill is $481,985,418. Of this total the sum of $147,549,608 is for the Department of State, $200,445,000 for the Department of Justice, $30,640,810 for the Judiciary, $88,350,000 for the United States Information Agency, and $15,000,000 for the Emergency Refugee Relief program.

From a comparative standpoint, the bill total is $1,546,494 below the budget estimates total requested for 1956, and although it exceeds the House recommendations by $31,587,191, the reasons supporting the increased sum seems well founded and amply justified.

Let me illustrate, Mr. President, by pointing out to Senators the major items that make up this figure of $31.5 million. Let us take the State Department, where $20.7 million has been added for very worthy purposes, and is mostly reflected in three items. For the educational exchange activities program $10 million was added to provide the $22-million budget estimate; $5.2 million was allowed over the House figure of $7 million to enable expansion of our foreign buildings program and to utilize our foreign credits existing in those countries where the projects are proposed, and thus effect annual savings in rental and allowances of over $1 million. Of this total sum proposed, $12.2 million, $10,036,257 is in existing foreign credits and $2,164,743 in cash; and $4.9 million was provided in the salaries and expenses category to permit the Department to carry out the statutory 2-year home-leave program, to strengthen the training program, expand the economic reporting services work to make current the gathering of statistics and other data vitally needed by the Commerce Department and outside concerns, and the allowance of $600,000 for trade commissioners and their supporting staff to permit American business interests to develop opportunities for foreign trade and investment in the more important commercial centers of the world.

With reference to the 2-year home-leave program, I should like to say that up to this time the State Department has not been granting home leave under 3 years except on health grounds. It has been very much urged all over the country that the 2-year home-leave program be carried out.

Another major increase concerns the United States Information Agency, where all but $150,000 of the $8-million cut made by the House was restored to provide a total sum of $88,350,000. About $3.7 million of the increase concerns the media services, that is, press, motion picture, and information center services, and $2.1 million is for increased overseas missions operations especially in the Far Eastern and Near Eastern areas. The reduction of $150,000 is applied to the costs for publication of the newspaper Vienna Courier in Austria, and the committee requested the director of the Agency to discontinue this newspaper by December 31, 1955.

That request is made because since the House passed the bill the Austrian Peace Treaty has been signed and Austria has again become a free nation. Therefore, it is felt we should not publish a newspaper in that country.

For the Justice Department about $3 million additional funds were recommended. Of this amount, $1.7 million was to expand our legal activities work, both in the field and in the Department, to help clean up the case backlogs existing in the divisions and the United States attorneys offices and involving tax and civil matters and cases pending in the Court of Claims. Six hundred thousand dollars was specifically earmarked for the temporary employment of a mobile task force to be engaged on this particular type of work. These backlog cases are costing the Government millions of dollars, and the committee felt that one means to overcome this situation was through the temporary employment of additional persons.

The Bureau of Prisons was authorized an additional $650,000 to permit the replacement of wornout equipment, to provide for some of the needed special repairs and improvements of existing facilities, and for some construction work at 3 of the institutions—all in the interest of providing adequate care and protection of the increasing population of inmates confined in Federal institutions.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator from West Virginia yield?

Mr. KILGORE. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I understood the Senator to mention that an item for an increase in the number of temporary assistant attorneys had been cut. Was it not felt that, presumably, the program could not get under way in time to cover this year, and that if more money should be necessary later on, the committee would be glad to recommend it?

Mr. KILGORE. The Senator is absolutely correct. The amount of $600,000 was recommended to get the work started, to see how it would progress, and it was decided that if it were found additional matters should be provided for a little later, it could be handled by a supplemental bill. The program is highly necessary in order to save the taxpayers' money which is now being paid out in interest, and also to expedite action on worthy claims which should be settled.

For the Immigration and Naturalization Service, $500,000 was added to the amount contained in the House bill to allow replacement during the year of wornout automobiles and aircraft, and additional funds for essential travel by the border patrol and other segments of the Service.

For the Judiciary, the committee endorsed the increases over the House bill of $824,560 for "salaries of supporting personnel," and $213,000 for the related item of "travel and miscellaneous expenses." By supporting personnel we mean clerks, probation officers, and employees of that kind, the shortage of whom has been slowing up the work of the judges and not permitting them to do as much work as they could otherwise do.

The salary increase will permit the employment of approximately 223 additional officers and clerks, 10 of whom are for the United States District Court for the District of Columbia, where there is a heavy backlog of work.

Testimony of judges and officials of the Court, and expressions made by the Chief Justice of the United States, as well as by individual members of the Judicial Conference, clearly showed the need for these additional funds. The money will be used primarily to improve and strengthen the Federal probation system and to expand the clerk's office, where a heavy workload exists, particularly in areas where there is an increase of naturalization and passport work, and also to permit the performance of essential travel by the Court and its personnel.

Finally, Mr. President, the committee approved $15 million for the refugee relief program, or a cut of $1 million below the House bill and the budget request. The committee recommendation is $7

million above the current year's figure, and was believed sufficient to assure completion of the program within the statutory termination date of December 31, 1956.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the committee amendments be agreed to en bloc, and that the bill as thus amended be considered for the purpose of amendment, as original text; provided, however, that no point of order against any amendment shall be deemed to have been waived by the adoption of this agreement.

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

The amendments agreed to en bloc are as follows:

On page 4, line 2, after the word "advance", to strike out "$63,760,000" and insert "$8,700,000", and in line 20, after the word "Affairs", to insert the following additional proviso:

Provided further, That hereafter the position of Budget Officer of the Department shall be in GS-18 in the General Schedule established by the Classification Act of 1949 so long as the position is held by the present incumbent.

In the subhead on page 5, line 1, to strike out "Representation" and insert "Operations."

On page 5, line 2, after the word "For", to strike out "representation" and insert "operations", and in line 4, after "(22 U. S. C. 1131)", to strike out "$475,000" and insert "$700,000."

Under the subhead "Acquisition of Buildings Abroad", on page 5, at the beginning of line 15, to strike out "$7,000,000" and insert "$12,201,000"; in the same line, after the word "than", to strike out "$6,250,000" and insert "$10,036,257", and in line 19, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$750,000" and insert "$1,000,000."

On page 5, after line 20, to insert:

The authority granted by Public Law 33, April 19, 1945 (22 U. S. C., sec. 300), continues in effect notwithstanding the provisions in section 1415 of Public Law 547 (66 Stat. 662; 31 U. S. C. 724).

Under the subhead "Contributions to International Organizations", on page 6, line 15, after the word "Congress", to strike out "$28,079,977" and insert "$28,247,608, of which $131,703 shall be for contribution to the Pan American Institute of Geography and History for the period July 1, 1951, to June 30, 1955, as authorized by Public Law 736, approved August 31, 1954."

Under the subhead "International contingencies," on page 8, line 4, after the numerals "1949", to strike out "not to exceed $15 per diem in lieu of subsistence" and insert "travel expenses"; in line 7, after the word "business", to insert "not in excess of those authorized for regular officers and employees traveling under this appropriation", and at the beginning of line 14, to strike out "$1,075,000" and insert "$1,500,000."

Under the subhead "International Boundary and Water Commission, United States and Mexico," on page 9, line 3, after the word "boundary", to strike out "fence" and insert "demarcation."

Under the subhead "American Sections, International Commissions," on page 10, line 11, after the word "vehicles", to strike out "$245,000" and insert "$286,000."

Under the subhead "International Fisheries Commissions," on page 11, line 22, after the word "Congress", to insert "including not to exceed $15 per diem in lieu of subsistence, or such higher rates as may be prescribed pursuant to the Travel Expense Act of 1949, for persons serving without compensation while away from their homes or regular places of business"; on page 12, line 1, after the amendment just above stated, to strike out "$425,000" and insert "$455,000", and in line 3, after the word "commissions", to insert a colon and "*Provided further*, That this appropriation shall not be used to pay the expenses of attendance at official international conferences."

Under the subhead "International Education Exchange activities," on page 13, line 5, after the word "appropriation", to strike out "$12,000,000" and insert "$22,000,000", and in line 8, after the word "States", to strike out the colon and "*Provided*, That not to exceed $2,400,000 may be used for administrative expenses during the current fiscal year."

Under the subhead "Government in Occupied Areas," on page 14, line 18, after "(22 U. S. C. 1131)", to strike out "$8,000,000" and insert "$7,750,000."

Under the subhead "General Provisions—Department of State," on page 18, after line 13, to insert a new section, as follows:

SEC. 111. Appropriations under this title available for allowances granted under the authority in part A of title IX of the Foreign Service Act of 1946, as amended, shall be available for the payment of such allowances in advance.

On page 18, after line 17, to insert a new section, as follows:

SEC. 112. Allowances granted under section 901 (1) of the Foreign Service Act of 1946 (22 U. S. C. 1131), may include water, in addition to the utilities specified.

On page 18, after line 20, to insert a new section, as follows:

SEC. 113. The Secretary of State may, notwithstanding the provisions of any other law, prescribe regulations for the payment on a commutated basis in lieu of any other method, of expenses authorized by law for travel of personnel of the Department and its Foreign Service, including travel of dependents and for transportation, or for transportation and storage, of furniture and household and personal effects, and automobiles of such personnel.

Under the heading "Title II—Department of Justice—Legal Activities and General Administration—Salaries and Expenses, General Administration," on page 19, line 14, after the word "Assistant", to strike out "$2,525,000" and insert "$2,615,000: *Provided*, That hereafter the compensation of the Administrative Assistant Attorney General shall be $17,500 per annum so long as the position is held by the present incumbent."

Under the subhead "Salaries and Expenses, General Legal Activities," on page 19, line 24, after "(31 U. S. C. 529)", to strike out "$9,000,000" and insert "$9,600,000."

Under the subhead "Salaries and Expenses, United States attorneys and marshals," on page 20, line 15, after the word "ammunition," to strike out "$17,000,000" and insert "$17,480,000."

At the top of page 21, to insert:

SPECIAL TEMPORARY ATTORNEYS AND ASSISTANTS

For compensation and expenses of special temporary attorneys and assistants to the Attorney General, and to the United States attorneys and other miscellaneous employees not otherwise provided for, employed by the Attorney General and with his approval by the United States attorneys, in special matters and cases without regard to civil-service and classification laws, $600,000: *Provided*, That the amount paid as compensation out of the funds herein appropriated to any person employed hereunder shall not exceed $15,000 per annum.

Under the subhead "Immigration and Naturalization Service—Salaries and expenses," on page 24, line 2, after the word "exceed", to strike out "150" and insert "197"; in line 4, after the word "exceed", to strike out "five" and insert "seven"; in line 13, after the word "files", to insert "and for rental of buildings in the District of Columbia"; in line 19, after the word "General", to strike out "$44 million" and insert "$44,500,000"; and in line 22, after the word "incumbents", to insert a colon and "*Provided further*, That of the amount herein appropriated not to exceed $50,000 may be used for the emergency replacement of aircraft upon certificate of the Attorney General."

Under the subhead "Federal Prison System—Salaries and expenses, Bureau of Prisons," on page 25, line 22, after "(5 U. S. C. 341f)", to strike out "$28,600,000" and insert "$29,000,000", and on page 26, line 8, after the numerals "1949", to insert a colon and "*Provided further*, That hereafter the compensation of the Director of the Bureau shall be $17,500 per annum so long as the position is held by the present incumbent."

Under the subhead "Buildings and Facilities," on page 26, line 15, after the word "account" to strike out "$750,000" and insert "$1 million."

Under the subhead "Office of Alien Property—Salaries and Expenses," on page 27, line 10, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$2,500,000" and insert "$2,800,000."

Under the subhead "General Provisions—Department of Justice," on page 29, after line 4, to insert a new section, as follows:

SEC. 206. Not to exceed 5 percent of the appropriations for legal activities and general administration in this title shall be available interchangeably, with the approval of the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, but no appropriation shall be increased by more than 5 percent and any interchange of appropriations hereunder shall be reported to the Congress in the annual budget.

Under the heading "Title III—The Judiciary—Courts of Appeals, District Courts, and Other Judicial Services—Salaries of Supporting Personnel," on page 33, at the beginning of line 4, to strike out "$13,593,240" and insert "$14,417,800."

Under the subhead "Travel and Miscellaneous Expenses," on page 34, line 18, after the word "case", to strike out "$2,170,250" and insert "$2,383,250."

Under the heading "Title IV—United States Information Agency—Salaries and Expenses," on page 37, line 1, after the word "States", to insert "(and their dependents)"; in line 18, after the word "of", where it occurs the second time, to strike out "caps" and insert "uniforms"; on page 38, line 12, after the word "otherwise", to insert "presentation of American books, including Profile of America"; in line 19, after the word "abroad", to insert "travel expenses for employees attending official international conferences, without regard to the Standardized Government Travel Regulations and to the rates of per diem allowances in lieu of subsistence expenses under the Travel Expenses Act of 1949, but at rates not in excess of comparable allowances approved for such conferences by the Secretary of State"; on page 39, line 1, after the word "organizations", to strike out "$80,500,000" and insert "$88,350,000"; in line 2, after the word "shall", to insert "if possible"; in line 4, after the word "States" to insert "and of which sum not less than $350,000 shall be made available to one or more private international broadcasting licensees for the purpose of developing and broadcasting under private auspices, but under the general supervision of the United States Information Agency, radio programs to Latin America, Western Europe, Africa, as well as other areas of the free world, which programs shall be designed to cultivate friendship with the peoples of the countries in those areas, and to build improved international understanding:"; in line 13, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$35,000" and insert "$150,000", and in line 14, after the word "for", to strike out "representation" and insert "operations allowances abroad as authorized by section 901 (3) of the Foreign Service Act of 1946, as amended (22 U. S. C. 1131)."

Under the heading "Title V—Funds Appropriated to the President—Refugee Relief", on page 42, line 1, after the word "loans", to strike out "$16,000,000" and insert "$15,000,000."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to amendment. If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment of the amendments and the third reading of the bill.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from West Virginia 1 or 2 questions with reference to the United States Information Agency appropriation.

Mr. KILGORE. The House cut on that item was $8 million. We restored $7,850,000. The committee deemed that $150,000 of the House reduction could be saved by discontinuing the newspaper in Austria, which since the passage of the House bill, has become an independent nation. We felt that the newspaper was not necessary there, and in the report we recommend that the service of that newspaper be discontinued or disposed of by December 31 of this year.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Does the Senator indicate by his remarks that the request of the United States Information Agency for funds for the fiscal year has been pretty well met by the Senate Appropriations Committee?

Mr. KILGORE. We met it in full except for the discontinuance of the newspaper to which I have referred. The question was very thoroughly considered and debated in the committee. The amount recommended will take care of the situation amply and, at the same time, not waste any money.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Will the Senator indicate to the Senate the comparative figures between this year's and last year's appropriations for the United States Information Agency?

Mr. KILGORE. It was $77,114,000 last year, and it is $88,350,000 this year.

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is the recommendation of the committee?

Mr. KILGORE. That is correct.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator from West Virginia yield?

Mr. KILGORE. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. In order to be absolutely accurate, the $77 million figure represented a compromise between the House and the Senate figures.

Mr. KILGORE. That is correct.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I wish to commend the Senator from West Virginia, and the members of his subcommittee and of the full committee for the restoration of the funds which had been cut by the House action. It appears to me that the United States Information Agency is entitled to the support of the Congress. I can think of no dollars more profitably and more soundly expended than those which we appropriate and which are ultimately expended in the field of information.

As the Senator from West Virginia may know, during the past year I have been somewhat concerned with what seemed to be a curtailment of certain functions or activities of the United States Information Agency. I have mentioned them in the Senate on several occasions, and have placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD letters which I had received from the Administrator of that Agency in response to some of the inquiries I had made. For example, I was concerned about the folding up or the closing down of the publication of a newspaper in West Berlin; also with reference to our radio communication system in Helsinki, Finland, and also our book program in Japan. Within the past 10 days I have placed in the RECORD information as to what we are doing in providing low-cost publications for Japan. I consider this one of the most important activities into which we can enter in that part of the world, because the information we have received has been to the effect that Japan was being flooded with communistic publications, and we were, in turn, momentarily stymied because of our inability to match that kind of a flood of information. I have been informed that the United States Information Agency has contracted with publishers to provide for the publication of paperback books of American literature and other literature from other countries of the world to be placed in the libraries and information centers in Japan.

I wish to thank the distinguished chairman for what he has done. As he knows, I called his office and talked with him on this subject, and also presented testimony, in the form of a statement, before the subcommittee.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a brief statement I have prepared on the item of the USIA appropriation.

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

STATEMENT BY SENATOR HUMPHREY

The distinguished chairman of the subcommittee handling this appropriation bill, and the committee, are to be congratulated for the thorough and careful study made by the committee of the United States Information Agency's budget request and for their restoration of the funds requested by the Agency.

The work of the USIA must be regarded as an indispensable part of our political offensive against the conspiracy of communism. It very well could play a major role in preventing the outbreak of a hot war. I believe the only way we can prevent war is to carry out a full scale political campaign for peace and freedom.

Now that the committee has restored the severe cuts in the budget request of USIA made by the House, I am sure that when the bill reaches the conference with House Members, the committee will vigorously oppose any reduction in the funds which they have recommended for the United States Information Agency.

The Russians are spending each year large sums on propaganda against the free nations, particularly the United States. They are increasing their propaganda effort against us and all other liberty-loving people. It is in our own self-interest that we provide a reasonable budget for our information services so that they can refute Russian lies and let all the people of the world know what we stand for.

Again, I congratulate the committee for its fine work.

Mr. MILLIKIN subsequently said: Mr. President, the senior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE], who is necessarily absent today, has asked me to have inserted in the RECORD a brief statement in support of the appropriation recommended for the United States Information Service, in whose work the Senator from Minnesota has been keenly interested.

I ask unanimous consent that the statement of the senior Senator from Minnesota be inserted in the RECORD at the appropriate place, which, as I recall, is in connection with the appropriation bill for the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce.

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

STATEMENT BY SENATOR THYE

I should like to congratulate the subcommittee which handled the appropriations bill for the United States Information Agency

and its very distinguished chairman for doing an objective and fair-minded study of this program.

We have heard a great deal of talk lately about the need for the United States to engage in a political offensive against the conspiracy of communism. Only a few weeks ago a distinguished American, Brig. Gen. David Sarnoff, who is known to many Members of Congress, stated that our best chance to avoid a hot war was to engage in an all-out political offensive against the conspiracy of communism. Obviously, the United States Information Agency must play a key role in such an offensive.

I hope that the committee will stand fast in the conference with House Members and resist any reduction in the funds which they have recommended for the United States Information Agency.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the engrossment of the amendments and the third reading of the bill.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read the third time.

The bill was read the third time.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. FULBRIGHT subsequently said: Mr. President, I was delayed in my office a few minutes ago, and so did not reach the Senate in time to ask permission to have printed in the RECORD a statement regarding the administrative costs of the International Educational Exchange Activities which I had prepared for the information of the Senate and the House.

I now ask unanimous consent that a statement I have prepared be inserted in the RECORD just prior to the passage of the appropriation bill for the State Department, because my statement pertains to that item. The question has been raised both in the House and by some Members of the Senate regarding this aspect of the program. I believe this explanation is clear enough to settle that question in the minds of a great many Members.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none.

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

STATEMENT BY SENATOR FULBRIGHT

INTERNATIONAL EDUCATIONAL EXCHANGE ACTIVITIES, DEPARTMENT OF STATE, FISCAL YEAR 1956

Explanation of administrative costs

The items ordinarily considered as administrative costs in an appropriation appear, at first glance, to be unusually high in the case of the International Educational Exchange Activities of the Department of State—being $4,110,377 out of a total appropriation of $22 million.

However, that is not the total picture.

First, these administrative figures cover much more than service to this $22 million grant-dollar program. This is a cooperative program and much service is given by the Department of State to the private exchange programs which are being carried on by our educational and professional institutions throughout the country. Last year the Department of State directly assisted programs of this kind totaling about $10 million, of which none was money from the taxpayer.

Second, there are major contributions by these same private organizations to the direct support of the Government program operated by the Department of State. By actual calculation this amounted to a little over $9 million last year and the people at the Department tell me that it will be even higher—possibly $9.3 in the period covered by this appropriation request. By this, it is plain that we are not talking about a $22 million program but we are talking about a program approaching $40 million for which the taxpayer is being asked to pay for approximately one-half.

Third, in addition to these formalized exchange programs which I have just mentioned, some of the staff services included in this $4.1 million administrative figure are for the purpose of administering other activities of the Department of State both here and abroad not directly related to the grants exchange-of-persons program.

The International Educational Exchange Service, which this appropriation covers, is the cultural and exchange organization in the Department of State which carries out not only the responsibility for exchange of people between this country and other countries but all of the work of the Department related to these activities.

In addition to administering the exchange programs authorized by Public Laws 584 and 402 of the 79th and 80th Congresses, the International Educational Exchange Service also administers the other provisions of law which are related.

For example, Public Law 402 authorizes the Secretary of State to designate exchange programs eligible for exchange visitor visas. These designations facilitate entry and insure return of people who come here on their own for educational purposes. To date over 2,000 such designations have been made. The cost of administering this worthwhile activity is included in this appropriation.

The Smith-Mundt Act sets up a United States Advisory Commission on Educational Exchange and Public Law 584 provides for a Board of Foreign Scholarships. Both of these bodies are appointed by the President and while they serve without compensation the administrative costs, such as travel, per diem, and secretariat services for these two Presidential bodies are included in this figure of $4.1 million.

The Department of State was asked by the Hickenlooper Subcommittee of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee to coordinate the exchange activities of the Government. This appropriation provides the secretariat for the Inter-Agency Committee on Training Programs and Exchange of Persons.

Other administrative services performed by the Department include: backstopping the United States participation in the North Atlantic Treaty Organization Cultural Council; providing similar backstopping to the Cultural Council of the Organization of American States; and the implementation of certain projects of other governments authorized by Public Law 402 under which the other governments pay all of the program funds.

In addition to all of the above, personnel under this appropriation, both here and abroad, devote a great deal of time assisting many private citizens in cultural and other exchange matters involving travel of people from other countries to the United States and educational travel of Americans abroad. In fact, this type of personnel exchange oftentimes is as meaningful in reaching the objectives of the Government's program as the formalized program itself but the value of such exchanges are not included in the approximately $40 million figure I have just referred to in my previous remarks.

Another thing which I would like to emphasize is that this appropriation is absolutely self-contained. There are no hidden costs.

The administrative costs referred to above represent all of the appropriated costs of this program. As I understand it, and I have checked carefully on this item, this administrative figure includes personnel costs both in the Department of State and in our Embassies abroad—even the money which is transferred to the United States Information Service for certain functions which it performs for this program. It includes all of the administrative services performed for this program by the State Department proper, such as fiscal, communications, supplies, equipment, legal, personnel, security, etc., both here and abroad.

Seldom do we find an appropriation request which is so self-contained.

Considering the administration of the Department's exchange program itself, that is, this $22 million program plus the private dollar support of $9.3 million, the administrative cost of $1.4 million runs about 13 percent—which I do not think is excessive.

However, when considering the other $10 million worth of private programs which the Department assists directly, the overall administrative percentage for the entire exchange effort runs to less than 10 percent. That is excellent in itself, but bear in mind that the taxpayer is only paying for about half of the program costs out of the United States Treasury, and much of this private exchange effort is made possible only because of this small administrative overhead which permits our Department of State to provide the leadership and guidance for these worthwhile private projects.

I think it is money well spent and only wish that more of our Government programs were operated on a more cooperative basis with private enterprise.

Of course the nonexchange services which the Department of State performs in this general field are part of its regular functions as a Government bureau and the advisory services which it provides to private citizens overseas are a part of its regular diplomatic mission.

Yet, the Department of State puts these costs in this budget and I think that is where they belong because these services are more directly related to the exchange program than any other part of the department. On the other hand these are services which the State Department would have to pay for and perform even if there were no exchange program whatsoever—they are simply regular functions of our Department of State.

I have developed this information by a careful study of the way this program operates because I must admit that I, too, was a little disturbed when the House debate on this appropriation indicated that it cost $4.1 million to run a $22 million program.

I hope this explanation clarifies this matter and while I believe the Secretary of State is to be complimented for administering this program so frugally, I think the Department of State would do well to present the full story of its subsequent appropriations requests in order that we in the Congress can be advised fully on all aspects of its administration.

The administrators of a program with as much popular support, both here and abroad, as is enjoyed by the international educational exchange program should not jeopardize its very existence by being too modest in presenting the good side of it to the Congress.

International educational exchange activities, Department of State, fiscal year 1956, distribution of program administrative costs

Administrative items ($14.1 million)	Allocated to 7,160 grants direct ($22 million)	Allocated to secure private support of 7,160 grants (estimated $9.3 million)	Allocated to facilitate approximately 3,500 private exchanges (estimated $10 million)	Other State Department activities not limited to grants exchange program	Grand total
Overseas administrative expenses	$1,808,733	$229,222	$161,060	$165,702	$2,364,717
Domestic staff costs	717,511	383,591	161,265	16,271	1,278,638
Staff travel	24,528	10,940	1,000		36,468
Security investigations	16,612	8,883	3,730	385	29,610
Domestic administrative support	203,067	108,592	45,609	4,706	361,974
U. S. Advisory Committee on Educational Exchange	12,665	6,820	4,871	14,614	38,970
Total	2,783,116	748,048	377,535	201,678	4,110,377

Overseas administrative expenses: Includes payment to USIS and embassies abroad and for running the 24 binational foundations under the Fulbright program. The USIS and embassy employees are mostly part time but we pay for 91.8 man-years of American personnel and 140.6 man-years of local personnel as well as for communications, supplies, equipment, and other administrative overhead.

Domestic staff costs: Includes International Educational Exchange Service, Secretariat for the Board of Foreign Scholarships and the 4 reception centers (New York, San Francisco, Miami, and New Orleans)—247 employees.

Staff travel: Normal staff travel here and abroad to supervise our program and assist private programs.

Security investigations: To pay for full field investigations of employees as required by Public Law 402.

Domestic administrative support: Payment to Salaries and Expenses, Department of State, support services such as legal, fiscal, personnel, communications, supplies, and equipment—64 man-years.

United States Advisory Commission on Educational Exchange: Secretariat for this presidentially appointed Commission, travel and per diem for Commission members (they serve without compensation)—5 employees and 5 Commissioners.

Overseas administrative expenses, $2,364,717

Administrative services overseas are performed by the United States Information Agency for program operations and by the regular Foreign Service staff for administrative support to the program. Educational exchange programs are carried out in 79 countries throughout the world. In these 79 countries it is estimated that a total of 91.8 man-years of American personnel and 140.6 man-years of local personnel will be required by the United States Information Agency to conduct the educational exchange program at a total cost for personal services of $1,278,263. Administrative support, involving services related to communications, supplies, equipment, etc., will total $378,758, which amount is reimbursed to the embassies proper.

Overseas administrative services are not only provided to support the grant-in-aid program, but to encourage and facilitate exchanges under non-United States Government auspices. For example, overseas personnel are frequently called on to advise or brief individuals and groups coming to the United States or who wish to come to the United States for educational visits. They are also requested by the Department to assist American citizens and groups who come to their posts for similar purposes and whose visits serve the objectives of the exchange program.

An amount of $707,696 is required for administrative expenses in operating the 24 Binational Foundations and Commissions overseas established pursuant to the Fulbright Act (Public Law 584, 79th Cong., as amended). The administrative cost of these foundations and commissions provides local currency for staff expenses, local travel, communications, supplies, equipment, housekeeping services, etc.

The amounts vary by country from $78,877 for a $1 million foreign-currency program in Italy to $10,360 for a $115,000 foreign currency program in New Zealand. The overall average of administrative costs for these Binational Foundations and Commissions is approximately 8 percent when compared with the total annual foreign currency programs.

Domestic staff costs, $1,278,638

The administrative cost of the staff in the International Education Exchange Service (229), the staff of the Secretariat of the Board of Foreign Scholarships (5), and the 4 reception centers (14) is estimated at $1,278,638 out of a total estimate of $22 million.

The work of this staff is not confined to services directly related to the grant-in-aid program, such as planning, the processing of grants, obtaining private funds to be used in conjunction with many of the Department's grants which are partial in nature, supervision of contract agencies, reporting to the Congress and evaluation. Many other functions are performed.

For instance, the Service devotes much time and effort to encouraging and facilitating worthwhile exchanges under non-United States Government auspices. It is conservatively estimated that during the past year such services helped to bring about some 3,500 exchanges costing their sponsors in the neighborhood of $10 million. Among this group were a hundred or more United Nations fellows for whom training in United States Government agencies was arranged.

The Service is responsible for administration of the exchange-visitor-visa designations under section 201 of Public Law 402. Under this program the Service reviews and certifies new programs and reviews and assists programs already designated. A total of 2,000 programs are active at this time.

The administration of the grant program financed from the repayments by Finland of its World War I debt under Public Law 265 are entirely absorbed by the Service.

Other activities for which administrative services are required include: The negotiation of executive agreements for educational exchange programs; backstopping United States participation in the North Atlantic Treaty Organization Cultural Council and the Cultural Council of the Organization of American States; training of personnel assigned to duties with this program overseas; the implementation of projects authorized by Public Law 402, under which other governments advance the necessary program funds; and research and analysis on nondepartmental exchange activities for planning purposes.

The coordination of other Government programs is also a continuing activity. The Service works constantly with the Operations Coordinating Board, the National Science Foundation, the Atomic Energy Committee, the FOA, and other Government organizations, having comparable problems. It chairs and provides the Secretariat for the Interagency Committee on Training Programs and Exchange of Persons (established in accordance with the recommendation of the Hickenlooper committee, to coordinate governmental exchange activities).

Staff travel, $36,468

Staff travel of $36,468 is based on a $22 million appropriation. Supervision of the work of private contractors in the United States and consultation with Embassy, USIS officials, foreign government officials, and officers of foreign universities is necessary if we are to insure that the program is being efficiently and effectively operated.

Staff travel also covers attendance at meetings called by private organizations interested in the international educational exchange program. Such travel has as its purpose the enlisting of necessary private support and cooperation. Since the Board of Foreign Scholarships is charged with supervision of the exchange program authorized by the Fulbright Act as well as selection of all participants, they must hold several full meetings every year, in addition to special inspection trips by individual members.

Security investigations, $29,610

Public Law 402 prescribes that employees assigned to duties under the act must have a full field investigation prior to entry on duty. It is estimated that the total number of positions to be filled will be 47 (a turnover of 10 percent in the present positions, or 23, and the 24 new positions requested in this estimate). To clear candidates for these positions will require approximately 141 investigations (1954 experience indicates that three clearances are necessary for every position filled) at a unit cost of $210 each.

Domestic administrative support, $361,974

An amount of $361,974 is needed to cover the cost of administrative support services handled by the Department of State for the International Educational Exchange Service. These support services include such items as: (1) Legal assistance; (2) assistance from the Central Finance Office in disbursing funds and in reporting to the Treasury Department regarding funds expended, balances, etc.; (3) assistance in coordinating budget requests with that of the Department and in relating all budget documents and reports with those of the Department as a whole; (4) central recruiting of personnel to keep the staff as near to complement as possible; (5) making security checks on all prospective grantees before grants are awarded; (6) other services such as communications with the 79 countries in which there are exchange programs, mail service, reproduction service, supplies, equipment, and related services. This represents 64 man-years of personnel time in addition to the other services enumerated.

United States Advisory Commission on Educational Exchange, $38,970

The amount of $38,970 requested for the United States Advisory Commission on Educational Exchange is to provide a secretariat staff of five to arrange for and follow up on meetings of the Commission and to keep its members constantly informed on program developments and problems so that they can recommend effective policies and programs to the Secretary and the Congress. The secretariat also prepares the required quarterly reports to the Congress, and maintains liaison between the Department and the Commission, and between the Commission and private groups and organizations working with it.

While the members of the Commission serve without compensation, funds are requested to cover their travel expenses for 4 regular meetings in Washington and 2 overseas trips for 2 of the Commissioners. In addition travel to Washington for three special meetings is provided for members of the Subcommittee on Inter-American Cultural Affairs. This subcommittee reviews educational exchange activities in their area and recommends policies to the full Commission for the use of the Department in all phases of its inter-American educational exchange interests.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill (H. R. 5502) was passed.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, I move that the Senate insist on its amendments, request a conference with the House of Representatives thereon, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. KILGORE, Mr. ELLENDER, Mr. MCCLELLAN, Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. GREEN, Mr. BRIDGES, Mr. SALTONSTALL, and Mr. MCCARTHY conferees on the part of the Senate.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, before the discussion on the bill is concluded, I wish to read in behalf of the senior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] a letter which was addressed to him, as follows:

MAY 31, 1955.

The Honorable STYLES BRIDGES,
United States Senate.

DEAR SENATOR BRIDGES: I am sure effective staff work is just as essential in the legislative process as it is in the Department's operations. From my observations as confirmed by comments of Mr. Carpenter and Mr. Wilber you are particularly fortunate in having Mr. Kennedy and Mr. Merrick to serve your Appropriations Committee.

Attached are copies of notes I have just sent to both men expressing the Department's as well as my personal appreciation for their assistance and guidance.

Sincerely,

LOY W. HENDERSON,
Deputy Under Secretary for Administration.

CONTROL OF AIR POLLUTION

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 392, Senate bill 928.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will state the bill by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 928) to amend the Water Pollution Control Act in order to provide for the control of air pollution.

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

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill which had been reported from the Committee on Public Works, with amendments, on page 1, line 3, after the enacting clause, to strike out:

That the Water Pollution Control Act (33 U. S. C. §§ 466–466j) is amended (1) by inserting the heading "Title I—Water Pollution Control" after the enacting clause; (2) by deleting "That in" at the beginning of the first section and inserting in lieu thereof "SECTION 1. In"; (3) by deleting "this Act" or "This Act" wherever appearing in such act, except in section 12, and inserting in lieu thereof "this title" or "This title" respectively; and (4) inserting at the end of such act the following new title.

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

"TITLE II—AIR POLLUTION CONTROL

"SEC. 201. This title may be cited as the 'Air Pollution Control Act of 1955.'

At the beginning of line 6, to strike out " "Sec. 202. In" and insert "That in"; in line 11, after the word "and", to strike out "perfect" and insert "develop"; in line 14, after the word "pollution", to insert "control", and in the same line, after the word "and", to strike out "to industries" and insert "public or private educational institutions"; in line 16, after the word "abatement", to insert "research"; in line 20, after the word "the", to strike out "responsibilities and"; at the beginning of line 23, to strike out " "Sec. 203." and insert "Sec. 2."; on page 3, line 1, after the word "pollution", to insert "control"; in line 2, after the word "private", to strike out "agencies and" and insert "educational", and in the same line, after the word "institutions", to strike out "and with industries involved" and insert "to"; in line 3, after the word "or", to strike out "adopt comprehensive" and insert "recommend research"; at the beginning of line 8, to strike out " "(b)" and insert "(b)", and in the same line, after the word "General", to strike out "shall" and insert "may"; in line 10, after the word "pollution", to strike out "encourage the enactment of uniform State laws relating to air pollution;"; in line 15, after the word "pollution", to insert "control", and in the same line, after the word "private", to strike out "agencies and" and insert "educational"; in line 16, after the word "institutions", to strike out "and individuals", and in the same line, after the word "and" where it occurs the second time, to strike out "perfect" and insert "develop"; at the beginning of line 19, to insert "control", and in the same line, after the word "private", to strike out "agencies and" and insert "educational"; in line 20, after the word "institutions", to strike out "industries, and individuals"; in line 25, after the word "pollution", to insert "control"; on page 4, line 1, after the word "private", to strike out "agencies and" and insert "educational", and in the same line, after the word "institutions", to strike out "industries, and individuals"; in line 3, after the word "this", to strike out "title" and insert "Act"; at the beginning of line 4, to strike out "Sec. 204" and insert "Sec. 3"; in line 5, after the word "pollution", to insert "control"; in line 8, after the word "confronting", to strike out "any State, community, municipality, or industrial plant" and insert "such State or local government air pollution control agency"; at the beginning of line 12, to strike out "Sec. 205" and insert "Sec. 4"; at the beginning of line 18, to strike out "Sec. 206" and insert "Sec. 5"; on page 5, line 1, after the word "Commerce", to insert "a representative of the Atomic Energy Commission"; in line 5, after the word "Commerce", to insert "the Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission"; in line 7, after the word "and" to strike out "six" and insert "eight"; in line 18, after the word "representative" to strike out "of affected industry" and insert "of local or county government"; in line 24, after the word "Board", to insert "The Board shall meet at the call of the Surgeon General."; on page 6, line 4, after the word "this", to strike out "title" and insert "Act"; in line 9, to strike out "Sec. 207." and insert "Sec. 6."; in line 12, after the numerals "1960", to strike out "such sum as Congress may hereafter determine to be necessary" and insert "not to exceed $3,000,000"; in line 15, after the word "this", to strike out "title of" and insert "Act and to"; in the same line after "(1)" to strike out "making" and insert "make"; in line 18, after the word "private", to strike out "agencies and" and insert "educational"; in line 19, after the word "institutions" to strike out "and individuals,"; in line 20, after "(2)" to strike out "contracting" and insert "or to enter into contract"; in line 21, after the word "private" to strike out "agencies and" and insert "educational"; in line 22, after the word "institutions" to strike out "and individuals"; on page 7, after line 4, to strike out:

(b) There is hereby authorized to be appropriated to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare for each of the 5 fiscal years during the period beginning July 1, 1955, and ending June 30, 1960, such sum as Congress may hereafter determine to be necessary to enable it to carry out its remaining functions under this title.

(c) There is hereby authorized to be appropriated to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare for each of the 5 fiscal years during the period beginning July 1, 1955, and ending June 30, 1960, such sum as Congress may determine to be necessary to enable the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to erect, furnish, and equip such buildings and facilities as may be necessary for the use of the Public Health Service in connection with the research and study of air pollution and the training of personnel in work related to the control of air pollution. Sums appropriated pursuant to this subsection shall remain available until expended.

SEC. 208. (a) Five officers may be appointed to grades in the regular corps of the Public Health Service above that of senior assistant, but not to a grade above that of Director, to assist in carrying out the purposes of this title. Officers appointed pursuant to this subsection in any fiscal year shall not be counted as part of the 10 percent of the original appointments authorized to be made in such year under section 207 (b) of the Public Health Service Act; but they shall for all other purposes be treated as though appointed pursuant to such section 207 (b).

(b) The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare may, with the consent of the head of any other agency of the Federal Government, utilize such officers and employees of such agency as may be found necessary to assist in carrying out the purposes of this title.

(c) The Surgeon General is authorized to prescribe such regulations as are necessary to carry out his functions under this title.

On page 8, line 16, change the section number from "209" to "7"; in the same line, after the word "this", to strike out "title" and insert "Act"; at the beginning of line 17, to strike out " "(a)" and insert "(a)"; in the same line, after the word "term", to strike out " 'State" and

insert " "State"; in the same line, after the world "pollution" to insert "control"; at the beginning of line 18, to strike out "agency' " and insert "agency" "; in line 23, to strike out " "(b)" and insert "(b)"; in the same line, after the word "term", to strike out " 'local" and insert " "local"; in line 24, after the word "pollution" to insert "control"; in the same line, after the amendment just above stated, to strike out "agency' " and insert "agency" "; on page 9, at the beginning of line 5, to strike out " "(c)" and insert "(c)"; in the same line, after the word "term" to strike out " 'State' " and insert " "State" "; in line 6, after the word "of", to strike out "Columbia." " and insert "Columbia."; after line 6, to insert a new section, as follows:

SEC. 8. Nothing contained in this act shall affect any other law relating to air pollution unless such other law is manifestly inconsistent with the provisions of this act. Nothing contained in this act shall limit the authority of any department or agency of the United States to conduct research and experiments relating to air pollution under the authority of any other law.

So as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That in recognition of the dangers to the public health and welfare from air pollution, it is hereby declared to be the policy of Congress to preserve and protect the primary responsibilities and rights of the States and local governments in controlling air pollution, to support and aid technical research to devise and develop methods of abating such pollution, and to provide Federal technical services and financial aid to State and local government air pollution control agencies and public or private educational institutions in the formulation and execution of their air pollution abatement research programs. To this end, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare and the Surgeon General of the Public Health Service (under the supervision and direction of the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare) shall have the authority relating to air pollution control vested in them respectively by this title.

SEC. 2. (a) The Surgeon General is authorized and directed after careful investigation and in cooperation with other Federal agencies, with State and local government air pollution control agencies, with public and private educational institutions to prepare or recommend research programs for eliminating or reducing air pollution. For the purpose of this subsection the Surgeon General is authorized to make joint investigations with any such agencies or institutions.

(b) The Surgeon General may encourage cooperative activities by State and local governments for the prevention and abatement of air pollution; collect and disseminate information relating to air pollution and the prevention and abatement thereof; support and aid technical research by State and local government air pollution control agencies, public and private educational institutions, to devise and develop methods of preventing and abating air pollution; make available to State and local government air pollution control agencies, public and private educational institutions the results of surveys, studies, investigations, research, and experiments relating to air pollution and the prevention and abatement thereof conducted by the Surgeon General and by authorized cooperating agencies; and furnish such other assistance to State and local government air pollution control agencies, public and private educational institutions, as may be authorized by law in order to carry out the policy of this act.

SEC. 3. The Surgeon General may, upon request of any State or local government air pollution control agency conduct investigations and research and make surveys concerning any specific problem of air pollution confronting such State or local government air pollution control agency with a view to recommending a solution to such problem.

SEC. 4. The Surgeon General shall prepare and publish from time to time reports of such surveys, studies, investigations, research, and experiments made under the authority of this title as he may consider desirable, together with appropriate recommendations with regard to the control of air pollution.

SEC. 5. There is hereby established within the Public Health Service an Air Pollution Control Advisory Board (hereinafter referred to as the "Board") to be composed as follows: The Surgeon General or a sanitary engineer officer designated by him, who shall be Chairman of the Board, a representative of the Department of Defense, a representative of the Department of the Interior, a representative of the Department of Agriculture, a representative of the Department of Commerce, a representative of the Atomic Energy Commission, and a representative of the National Science Foundation, designated, respectively, by the Secretary of Defense, the Secretary of the Interior, the Secretary of Agriculture, the Secretary of Commerce, the Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission, and the Director of the National Science Foundation; and eight persons (not officers or employees of the Federal Government) to be appointed annually by the President. One of the persons appointed by the President shall be an engineer who is an expert in air pollution control and prevention, 1 shall be a person who has shown an active interest in the field of air pollution, and, except, as the President may determine that the purposes of this title will be promoted by different representation, 1 shall be a person representative of State government, 1 shall be a person representative of municipal government, and 1 shall be a person representative of local or county government. The members of the Board who are not officers or employees of the United States shall be entitled to receive compensation at a per diem rate to be fixed by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, together with an allowance for actual and necessary traveling and subsistence expenses while engaged in the business of the Board. The Board shall meet at the call of the Surgeon General. It shall be the duty of the Board to review the policies and programs of the Surgeon General as undertaken under authority of this act, and to make recommendations thereon in reports to the Surgeon General. Such clerical and technical assistance as may be necessary to discharge the duties of the Board shall be provided from the personnel of the Public Health Service.

SEC. 6. (a) There is hereby authorized to be appropriated to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare for each of the five fiscal years during the period beginning July 1, 1955, and ending June 30, 1960, not to exceed $3 million to enable it to carry out its functions under this act and to (1) make grants-in-aid to States, for expenditure by or under the direction of their respective State and local government air pollution control agencies, and to public and private educational institutions for research, training, and demonstration projects, and (2) or to enter into contract with public and private educational institutions for research, training and demonstration projects. Such grants-in-aid and contracts may be made without regard to sections 3648 and 3709 of the Revised Statues. Sums appropriated pursuant to this subsection shall remain available until expended, and shall be allotted by the Surgeon General in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare.

SEC. 7. When used in this act—

(a) the term "State air pollution control agency" means the State health authority, except that in the case of any State in which there is a single State agency other than the State health authority charged with responsibility for enforcing State laws relating to the abatement of air pollution, it means such other State agency;

(b) the term "local government air pollution control agency" means a city or other local government health authority, except that in the case of any city or other local government in which there is a single agency other than the health authority charged with responsibility for enforcing ordinances or laws relating to the abatement of air pollution, it means such other agency; and

(c) the term "State" means a State or the District of Columbia.

SEC. 8. Nothing contained in this act shall affect any other law relating to air pollution unless such other law is manifestly inconsistent with the provisions of this act. Nothing contained in this act shall limit the authority of any department or agency of the United States to conduct research and experiments relating to air pollution under the authority of any other law.

The title was amended, so as to read: "A bill to provide research and technical assistance relating to air pollution control."

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I call the attention of the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR] to the fact that the unfinished business is Senate bill 928.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, Senate bill 928, as amended by the committee, authorizes study and research with reference to air pollution. It seeks to promote and encourage cooperation by the Federal Government with States, municipalities, and private agencies toward finding a means to reduce, and then to prevent, the pollution of air.

The bill was long considered by the committee. It was unanimously reported by the subcommittee and then by the full committee, which recommends its passage by the Senate.

I should like the junior Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL], who led in the effort to secure appropriate study, investigation, discussion, and approval of the bill by the committee, to give the Senate his views on the subject at this time.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, the problem of air pollution or air contamination has become so widespread that no section of the United States is immune from it. It has posed a continually growing danger to the health and comfort of our people, a serious and increasing hazard to our Nation's agriculture, and a threat to the orderly growth of our industry.

I was most grateful to find in the state of the Union message a request by the President that the facilities of the Federal Government be enlisted in the field of research and technical study and assistance with a view to finding what we hope may be an early solution of the air-pollution problem. This bill meets that request with a $15 million authorization extending over the next 5 years.

The people of the Nation are indebted to my friend the senior Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR] for the manner in which, as chairman of the subcommittee charged with the responsibility for the bill, he held long hearings and heard

testimony from representatives of State, county, and city governments across the Nation; and also testimony from experts, such as a representative of the American Medical Association—all of whom urged Congress to enact legislation to bring the facilities of the Federal Government into this fight against smog.

I wish to emphasize that it is not the thought that Congress has anything to do with control of air pollution through the proposed legislation or through any contemplated Federal legislation. That problem remains where it ought to remain—in the States of the Union, and in the cities and the counties of our country.

The bill does provide a means of integrating, under the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, all the technical facilities available to the several departments of Government, so that there may be a cooperative effort upon the part of the Government of the United States in the field of research and development with reference to this problem.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the committee amendments be agreed to en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the committee amendments are agreed to en bloc.

The bill is open to further amendment.

If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill (S. 928) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

EXAMINATION AND SURVEY OF THE NEW ENGLAND, LONG ISLAND, AND NEW JERSEY COASTAL AREAS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of order No. 391, Senate bill 414.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will state the bill by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 414) authorizing a preliminary examination and survey of the New England, 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 PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Texas.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Public Works, with an amendment, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That in view of the severe damage to the coastal and tidal areas of the eastern and southern United States from the occurrence of hurricanes, particularly the hurricanes of August 31, 1954, and September 11, 1954, in the New England, New York, and New Jersey coastal and tidal areas, and the hurricane of October 15, 1954, in the coastal and tidal areas extending south to South Carolina, and in view of the damages caused by other hurricanes in the past, the Secretary of the Army, in cooperation with the Secretary of Commerce and other Federal agencies concerned with hurricanes, is hereby authorized and directed to cause an examination and survey to be made of the eastern and southern seaboard of the United States with respect to hurricanes, with particular reference to areas where severe damages have occurred.

SEC. 2. Such survey, to be made under the direction of the Chief of Engineers, shall include the securing of data on the behavior and frequency of hurricanes, and the determination of methods of forecasting their paths and improving warning services, and of possible means of preventing loss of human lives and damages to property, with due consideration of the economics of proposed breakwaters, seawalls, dikes, dams, and other structures, warning services, or other measures which might be required.

SEC. 3. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this act.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, the bill was introduced by the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BUSH], for himself and the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. THURMOND], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH], the Senator from New York [Mr. IVES], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. PURTELL], the Senator from Maine [Mr. PAYNE], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], and the Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN]. I believe the distinguished junior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE] was a joint author and sponsor of the bill.

Mr. President, the bill is very brief. It directs the Corps of Engineers to make an examination and survey, in cooperation with the United States Weather Bureau and other agencies, along the coastal and tidal areas of eastern and southern United States, for the purpose of securing data on the movement and effect of hurricanes, and for the purpose of finding a way, if possible, to reduce the danger of damage by hurricanes, and to develop a means, if practicable and feasible, whereby the bad effects from such occurrences can be minimized, and also whereby better systems of warning can be developed, so that, to the extent possible, people in the affected areas, in the path of the approach of such storms will be able to take such means as are available to them to help themselves to avoid damage.

The bill was the subject of extended hearings by the committee. The distinguished Senators from New England and other States, having in mind similar situations along the eastern seaboard and the Gulf of Mexico, spent long hours of study, and the committee spent several days hearing from persons residing in the affected areas. It was considered unanimously by the members of the subcommittee and the full committee that the bill was one which should be considered and passed by the Congress, in order that anything which could appropriately be done to be of assistance in this field might be developed and brought about.

The distinguished senior Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BUSH] was one of the leaders in securing the consideration and approval of the bill. I should like to ask him to give us the benefit of his views on the bill.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, I shall delay the Senate less than 1 minute. On behalf of myself and all the other sponsors of the bill, I wish to thank the able Senator from Oklahoma for the very fine analysis of the bill he has made.

There is little I can add, except to say, that certain areas have suffered devastating damage, loss of life, and great distress as a result of repeated hurricanes, the worst of them having occurred last year.

The bill now before the Senate is an authorization measure, to enable the engineers to study the situation and make recommendations as to what can be done to deal with the problem, as has been stated by the Senator from Oklahoma, both through giving improved warning service, and, secondly, furnish the physical means to deal with the problem and stop the tidal damage. Very much of the damage is water damage.

The bill is a very modest one. There has been absolutely no opposition to it in the committee.

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

Mr. BUSH. I yield to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I should like to join in extending my thanks to the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma. Passage of the bill will tend to give increased confidence to individuals and businesses located along the New England seaboard.

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

Mr. BUSH. I yield to the Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I wish to associate myself with the statement of the Senator from Oklahoma, because my State is fairly familiar with the damage which can be done by tornadoes. We know, of course, that hurricanes on the east coast have also caused great destruction.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

If there be no further amendment to be offered, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended, so as to read: "A bill to authorize an examination and survey of the coastal and tidal areas of the eastern and southern United States, with particular reference to areas where severe damages have occurred from hurricane winds and tides."

CONVEYANCE OF CERTAIN LAND TO BROWNSVILLE NAVIGATION DISTRICT OF CAMERON COUNTY, TEX.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 393, Senate bill 1340, to authorize the conveyance by quitclaim deed of certain land to the Brownsville Navigation District of Cameron County, Tex. I call this

motion to the attention of the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR].

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KUCHEL in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Texas.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1340) to authorize the conveyance by quitclaim deed of certain land to the Brownsville Navigation District of Cameron County, Tex.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, the purpose of the bill is to authorize the Secretary of the Army to reconvey by quitclaim deed to the Brownsville Navigation District those lands on Brazos and Padre Islands, Cameron County, Tex., including accretions thereto, which were conveyed to the United States by the district by two deeds, both dated October 25, 1932, except for such portions of the lands or interests therein as the Secretary of the Army may determine are needed in connection with river and harbor improvement works at this location.

The bill provides that the Brownsville Navigation District shall pay the United States the same amount of money for the return of the land as was paid to it for the land when it was secured from the Brownsville District. The land has been found to be surplus, and is not needed by the Federal Government, and the local District is improving the land for park and recreational purposes.

The bill was considered by the full committee, and was unanimously approved by both the subcommittee and the full committee; and passage of the bill by the Senate is recommended.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to amendment.

If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill (S. 1340) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Army is hereby authorized and directed to reconvey, by quitclaim deed, to the Brownsville Navigation District of Cameron County, Tex., for a monetary consideration equal to that paid by the United States to such district therefor, all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to those lands located on Brazos and Padre Islands, Cameron County, Tex., including accretions thereto, which were conveyed to the United States by the Brownsville Navigation District by two deeds, both dated October 25, 1932, and recorded in volume 243, pages 260–262, and volume 244, pages 101–103 of the deed records of Cameron County, Tex., except for such portions of the lands or interests therein as the Secretary of the Army may determine are needed in connection with river and harbor improvement works at the location.

SEC. 2. The conveyance authorized by this act shall contain such terms and conditions as the Secretary of the Army, with the concurrence of the Secretary of the Treasury, determines advisable to assure that the use of the land by the Brownsville Navigation District or its transferees will be compatible with the operations of the United States Coast Guard. Such conveyance shall also contain such terms and conditions as the Secretary of the Army determines advisable in the public interest, and particularly such terms and conditions as he determines advisable—

(a) to assure that the use of the land by the Brownsville Navigation District or its transferees will be compatible with the construction, maintenance, and operation of the river and harbor project at the location; and

(b) to assure that the United States, and its employees, agents, and contractors shall have the right to utilize the existing causeway, constructed by Cameron County, Tex., for access to Padre Island, Tex., in connection with governmental activities, without charge.

SEC. 3. The conveyance authorized by this act shall reserve to the United States all right, title, and interest in source material (as defined in the Atomic Energy Act of 1954) in the lands conveyed.

CONSTRUCTION OF HIGHWAY CROSSING OVER LAKE TEXOMA, RED RIVER, TEX. AND OKLA.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 394, Senate bill 1318, to authorize construction of a highway crossing over Lake Texoma, Red River, Tex. and Okla.; and I call the motion to the attention of the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR].

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

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1318) to authorize construction of a highway crossing over Lake Texoma, Red River, Tex. and Okla., which had been reported from the Committee on Public Works, with an amendment, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That the project for the Denison Reservoir on Red River in Texas and Oklahoma, as authorized in the act of June 28, 1938 (52 Stat. 1215), is hereby modified in order to provide for a highway bridge across Lake Texoma, at or near the Willis site, to replace the crossing of Texas State Highway No. 91 and Oklahoma State Highway No. 99. Such bridge shall be constructed under the direction of the Secretary of the Army and the supervision of the Chief of Engineers, in accordance with such plans as may be recommended by the Chief of Engineers.

SEC. 2. The construction of such bridge shall be subject to the condition that the States of Texas and Oklahoma shall each contribute the sum of $606,000 toward the cost of such bridge.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, the bill, as reported, modifies Public Law 761, 75th Congress, 3d session, which authorized the construction of the Denison Dam and Reservoir on Red River, Tex., and Okla. The act has the effect of authorizing the construction of a fixed bridge at the Willis site, Denison Reservoir, Tex. and Okla., and provides that the States of Texas and Oklahoma shall each contribute the sum of $606,000 toward the cost of the work contemplated under this act.

The bill was considered by the subcommittee, and is unanimously recommended by both the subcommittee and the full committee; and passage of the bill by the Senate is urged.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the committee.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to modify the project for the Denison Reservoir on Red River in Texas and Oklahoma in order to provide for a highway bridge across Lake Texoma."

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its clerks, announced that the House had disagreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 103) to provide for the construction of distribution systems on authorized Federal reclamation projects by irrigation districts and other public agencies; asked a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. ENGLE, Mr. ASPINALL, Mr. O'BRIEN of New York, Mr. MILLER of Nebraska, and Mr. SAYLOR, were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message also announced that the House had disagreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2126) to amend the act of July 3, 1952, relating to research in the development and utilization of saline waters; asked a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. ENGLE, Mr. ASPINALL, Mr. O'BRIEN of New York, Mr. MILLER of Nebraska, and Mr. SAYLOR, were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

EXTENSION OF TIME FOR CONSTRUCTION OF TOLL BRIDGE ACROSS THE RAINY RIVER, BAUDETTE, MINN.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 397, Senate bill 528, extending the time for commencing and completing the construction of a toll bridge across the Rainy River at or near Baudette, Minn.

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

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 528) to extend the time for commencing and completing the construction of a toll bridge across the Rainy River at or near Baudette, Minn., which had been reported from the Committee on Public Works, with an amendment, on page 1, beginning in line 3, to strike out:

That the times for commencing and completing the construction of a toll bridge across the Rainy River at or near Baudette, Minn., authorized to be built by the village of Baudette by an act of Congress approved December 21, 1950 (64 Stat. 1115), are hereby extended until 2 and 4 years, respectively, from the date of enactment of this act.

And insert:

That the act approved December 21, 1950, entitled "An act authorizing the village of Baudette, State of Minnesota, its public successors or public assigns, to construct, maintain, and operate a toll bridge across the Rainy River, at or near Baudette, Minn.," be, and is hereby, revived and reenacted: *Provided*, That this act shall be null and void unless the actual construction of the bridge herein referred to be commenced within 2

years and completed within 4 years from the date of approval hereof.

So as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the act approved December 21, 1950, entitled "An act authorizing the village of Baudette, State of Minnesota, its public successors or public assigns, to construct, maintain, and operate a toll bridge across the Rainy River, at or near Baudette, Minn.," be, and is hereby, revived and reenacted: *Provided*, That this act shall be null and void unless the actual construction of the bridge herein referred to be commenced within 2 years and completed within 4 years from the date of approval hereof.

SEC. 2. The right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I call this measure to the attention of the Senator from Oklahoma and the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, the bill is sponsored by the distinguished senior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE], and it is identical with a bill sponsored by the distinguished junior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY].

The bill was considered urgent by the committee, and passage of the bill is urged.

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

Mr. KERR. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I wish to thank the Senator from Oklahoma.

The bill means a great deal to the community of Baudette, Minn. The bill merely authorizes extension of the time for the construction of a toll bridge.

Let me state that the community which was delayed in prosecuting the work because of the difficulties in obtaining materials following the Korean war, is now prepared to move ahead. It will now proceed; and I wish to thank the committee for its expeditious consideration of this measure.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill (S. 528) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "An act to revive and reenact the act authorizing the village of Baudette, State of Minnesota, its public successors or public assigns, to construct, maintain, and operate a toll bridge across the Rainy River, at or near Baudette, Minn., approved December 21, 1950."

INCREASE OF AUTHORIZATION FOR ACQUISITION OF LAND AND FACILITIES TO REPLACE INDIAN FISHING GROUNDS AT BONNEVILLE DAM

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 395, House bill 3879, which calls for increasing the authorization for acquiring land and providing facilities to replace Indian fishing grounds submerged or destroyed at Bonneville Dam.

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

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 3879) to amend section 2 of the act of March 2, 1945, pertaining to the Columbia River at Bonneville, Oreg.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, the purpose of the bill is to increase the authorization for acquiring land and providing facilities to replace Indian fishing grounds, submerged or destroyed as a result of the construction of the Bonneville Dam, Columbia River, from $50,000 to $185,000.

In carrying out this project, it was found that the original authorization was inadequate; and the sum authorized by this bill was agreed upon by the Department of Interior, has been approved by the Bureau of the Budget, and has been declared acceptable by the Indians.

The bill has been passed by the House of Representatives, and has been unanimously approved by the committee; and passage of the bill by the Senate is urged.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the third reading of the bill.

The bill (H. R. 3879) was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

PIKE CREEK, KENOSHA, WIS.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 398, Senate bill 1250, to declare Pike Creek above the easterly side of the highway bridge at Sixth Avenue in the city of Kenosha a nonnavigable stream.

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

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1250) to declare Pike Creek above the easterly side of the highway bridge at Sixth Avenue in the city of Kenosha a nonnavigable stream.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill (S. 1250) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That Pike Creek, in the State of Wisconsin, above the easterly side of the highway bridge at Sixth Avenue in the city of Kenosha is hereby declared to be a nonnavigable stream within the meaning of the Constitution and laws of the United States.

SEC. 2. The right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

ADJUSTMENT OF TOLLS ON BRIDGE ACROSS THE DES MOINES RIVER AT ST. FRANCISVILLE, MO.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 396, House bill 625, providing for the adjustment of tolls to be charged in the maintenance and operation of a toll bridge across the Des Moines River at or near St. Francisville, Mo.

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

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 625) to provide for the adjustment of tolls to be charged by the Wayland Special Road District No. 1 of Clark County, Mo., in the maintenance and operation of a toll bridge across the Des Moines River at or near Saint Francisville, Mo.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, the toll bridge across the Des Moines River was authorized by an act of Congress, approved February 14, 1933 (47 Stat. 802). The bridge was constructed by the Wayland Special Road District No. 1 of Clark County, Mo., and was completed in 1936.

The bonds issued to finance construction of the bridge, dated December 1, 1935, are still outstanding and are held by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation and are now in default. The liquidation of the RFC makes it necessary to refinance the issue.

The purpose of this measure is to authorize the refinancing of the bond issue for a period of 30 years, and adjusting the toll rates to a basis which will be in proportion to the value, and also to produce sufficient revenue in the 30-year period to pay the interest and completely liquidate the bonds, which now are the property of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation.

The bill further provides that after the obligation to the Federal Government, through the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, is liquidated, the bridge shall then become a toll-free bridge.

The bill was unanimously approved by the committee and its passage by the Senate is deserving.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the third reading and passage of the bill.

The bill was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

PAYMENT OF MONEY ORDERS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 388, House bill 4817, relating to the payment of money orders.

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

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, House bill 4817 is similar in many respects to Senate bill 1488, which passed the Senate on May 5, 1955. The bill would establish a statute of limitations barring the payment of any postal money order after 20 years from the last day of the month in which the money order was issued. The proposed legislation, as requested by the Post Office Department, provided a 6-year statute of limitations. The Senate Committee on Post Office and Civil Service changed the period from 6 to 8 years, and the House made a further change, establishing a 20-year statute of limitations. The Senate committee feels that the 20-year provision is more equitable, and that the House version should be accepted.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the third reading and passage of the bill.

The bill was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

VOLUNTARY LIQUIDATION OF NATIONAL BANKS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 401, Senate bill 1187, to amend section 5221 of the Revised Statutes, relating to voluntary liquidation of national banks.

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

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, this bill was requested by the Treasury Department. All it does is to relieve a national bank from the necessity of advertising its liquidation in a New York City newspaper. The old law was enacted when banks issued notes. The law required that they give notice when they were going into liquidation.

There was no opposition to the bill. It was unanimously approved by the committee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 5221 of the Revised Statutes (U. S. C., 1952 edition, title 12, sec. 182) is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 5221. Whenever a vote is taken to go into liquidation it shall be the duty of the board of directors to cause notice of this fact to be certified, under the seal of the association, by its president or cashier, to the Comptroller of the Currency, and publication thereof to be made for a period of 2 months in every issue of a newspaper published in the city or town in which the association is located, or if no newspaper is there published, then in the newspaper published nearest thereto, that the association is closing up its affairs, and notifying its creditors to present their claims against the association for payment."

TWENTY - YEAR REAL - ESTATE LOANS BY NATIONAL BANKS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 402, Senate bill 1189, to permit national banks to make 20-year real-estate loans and 9-month construction loans.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Banking and Currency, with amendments, on page 2, line 15, after the word "exceed", to strike out "60" and insert "66⅔"; in line 22, after the word "exceed", to strike out "60" and insert "66⅔"; on page 4, line 2, after the word "amended" to strike out "by deleting therefrom the word 'six' and by substituting therefor the word 'nine'," and insert "to read as follows:

"Loans made to finance the construction of industrial or commercial buildings and having maturities of not to exceed 18 months where there is a completion and release of lien bond issued by a financially responsible individual, partnership, association, or corporation and a valid and binding agreement entered into by a financially responsible lender to advance the full amount of the bank's loan upon the completion of the buildings, and loans made to finance the construction of residential or farm buildings and having maturities of not to exceed 9 months, shall not be considered as loans secured by real estate within the meaning of this section but shall be classed as ordinary commercial loans whether or not secured by a mortgage or similar lien on the real estate upon which the building or buildings are being constructed: *Provided*, That no national banking association shall invest in, or be liable on, any such loans in an aggregate amount in excess of 50 percent of its actually paid-in and unimpaired capital plus 50 percent of its unimpaired surplus fund. Notes representing loans made under this section to finance the construction of residential or farm buildings and having maturities of not to exceed 9 months shall be eligible for discount as commercial paper within the terms of the second paragraph of section 13 of the Federal Reserve Act, as amended, if accompanied by a valid and binding agreement to advance the full amount of the loan upon the completion of the building entered into by an individual, partnership, association, or corporation acceptable to the discounting bank."

So as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the first paragraph of section 24 of the Federal Reserve Act, as amended (U. S. C., 1952 ed., title 12, sec. 371), is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 24. Any national banking association may make real-estate loans secured by first liens upon improved real estate, including improved farmland and improved business and residential properties. A loan secured by real estate within the meaning of this section shall be in the form of an obligation or obligations secured by a mortgage, trust deed, or other instrument upon real estate, which shall constitute a first lien on real estate in fee simple or, under such rules and regulations as may be prescribed by the Comptroller of the Currency, on a leasehold (1) under a lease for not less than 99 years which is renewable or (2) under a lease having a period of not less than 50 years to run from the date the loan is made or acquired by the national banking association, and any national banking association may purchase any obligation so secured when the entire amount of such obligation is sold to the association. The amount of any such loan hereafter made shall not exceed 50 percent of the appraised value of the real estate offered as security and no such loan shall be made for a longer term than 5 years; except that (1) any such loan may be made in an amount not to exceed 66⅔ percent of the appraised value of the real estate offered as security and for a term not longer than 10 years if the loan is secured by an amortized mortgage, deed of trust, or other such instrument under the terms of which the installment payments are sufficient to amortize 40 percent or more of the principal of the loan within a period of not more than 10 years, (2) any such loan may be made in an amount not to exceed 66⅔ percent of the appraised value of the real estate offered as security and for a term not longer than 20 years if the loan is secured by an amortized mortgage, deed of trust or other such instrument under the terms of which the installment payments are sufficient to amortize the entire principal of the loan within a period of not more than 20 years, and (3) the foregoing limitations and restrictions shall not prevent the renewal or extension of loans heretofore made and shall not apply to real-estate loans which are insured under the provisions of title II, title VI, title VIII, section 8 of title I, or title IX of the National Housing Act or which are insured by the Secretary of Agriculture pursuant to title I of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, or the Act of August 28, 1937, as amended. No such association shall make such loans in an aggregate sum in excess of the amount of the capital stock of such association paid in and unimpaired plus the amount of its unimpaired surplus fund, or in excess of 60 percent of the amount of its time and savings deposits, whichever is the greater. Any such association may continue hereafter as heretofore to receive time and savings deposits and to pay interest on the same, but the rate of interest which such association may pay upon such time deposits or upon savings or other deposits shall not exceed the maximum rate authorized by law to be paid upon such deposits by State banks or trust companies organized under the laws of the State in which such association is located."

SEC. 2. The first sentence of the third paragraph of section 24 of the Federal Reserve Act, as amended (U. S. C., 1952 ed., title 12, sec. 371), is amended to read as follows:

"Loans made to finance the construction of industrial or commercial buildings and having maturities of not to exceed 18 months where there is a completion and release of lien bond issued by a financially responsible individual, partnership, association, or corporation and a valid and binding agreement entered into by a financially responsible lender to advance the full amount of the bank's loan upon the completion of the buildings, and loans made to finance the construction of residential or farm buildings and having maturities of not to exceed 9 months, shall not be considered as loans secured by real estate within the meaning of this section but shall be classed as ordinary commercial loans whether or not secured by a mortgage or similar lien on the real estate upon which the building or buildings are being constructed: *Provided*, That no national banking association shall invest in, or be liable on, any such loans in an aggregate amount in excess of 50 percent of its actually paid-in and unimpaired capital plus 50 percent of its unimpaired surplus fund. Notes representing loans made under this section to finance the construction of residential or farm buildings and having maturities of not to exceed 9 months shall be eligible for discount as commercial paper within the terms of the second paragraph of section 13 of the Federal Reserve Act, as amended, if accompanied by a valid and binding agreement to advance the full amount of the loan upon the completion of the building entered into by an individual, partnership, association, or corporation acceptable to the discounting bank."

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, this is an administration measure, requested by the Federal Reserve Board. It simply changes the restrictions upon national banks with regard to mortgage loans. It enables them to make loans for 20 years instead of 10, provided the loans are amortized at the rate of not less than 5 percent a year. It is a technical change requested by the administration. The bill was recommended unanimously by the Banking and Currency Committee.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, may I ask a question at that point?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Did this recommendation come from the banking authorities in the administration?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. It did. The bill was introduced by request. It embodies a recommendation by an agency.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendments.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended, so as to read: "A bill to permit national banks to make 20-year real-estate loans, 9-month residential-construction loans, and 18-month commercial-construction loans."

EXAMINATION OF NATIONAL BANKS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 403, Senate bill 1188, to amend section 5240 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, relating to the examination of national banks.

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

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, this is a bill requested by the Treasury Department. It simply changes existing law, which requires the Comptroller of the Currency to conduct two examinations of each national bank in each calendar year. This measure would give him discretion to waive 1 of such examinations in a 2-year period. There was no objection to the bill in the committee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to amendment. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the first paragraph of section 5240 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (12 U. S. C. 481), is amended by deleting the first sentence thereof and substituting therefor the following sentences: "The Comptroller of the Currency, with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury, shall appoint examiners who shall examine every national bank twice in each calendar year, but the Comptroller, in the exercise of his discretion, may waive one such examination or cause such examinations to be made more frequently if considered necessary. The waiver of one such examination as above provided shall not be exercised more frequently than once during each 2-year period beginning January 1, 1955."; and by deleting from the second sentence thereof the following: ", or of any other member bank."

SEC. 2. The third paragraph of section 5240 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (12 U. S. C. 482), is amended by deleting the second sentence thereof and substituting therefor the following: "The expense of the examinations herein provided for shall be assessed by the Comptroller of the Currency upon national banks in proportion to their assets or resources. The assessments may be made more frequently than annually at the discretion of the Comptroller of the Currency. The annual rate of such assessment shall be the same for all national banks, except that banks examined more frequently than twice in 1 calendar year shall, in addition, be assessed the expense of these additional examinations."

SEC. 3. The seventh paragraph of section 5240 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (12 U. S. C. 482), is deleted and there is substituted therefor the following: "In addition to the expense of examination to be assessed by the Comptroller of the Currency as heretofore provided, all national banks exercising fiduciary powers and all banks or trust companies in the District of Columbia exercising fiduciary powers shall be assessed by the Comptroller of the Currency for the examination of their fiduciary activities a fee adequate to cover the expense thereof."

QUALIFICATIONS OF DIRECTORS OF NATIONAL BANKING ASSOCIATIONS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 404, Senate bill 1736, to amend section 5146 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, relating to the qualifications of directors of national banking associations.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Banking and Currency, with amendments, in line 5, after the word "words" to insert "three-fourths", and in line 6, after the word "words" to insert "two-thirds", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 5146 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (U. S. C., 1952 ed., title 12, sec. 72), is amended by deleting therefrom the words "three-fourths", "fifty" and "fifty-mile", and substituting therefor the words "two-thirds", "one hundred" and "one-hundred-mile", respectively.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, this is also a bill requested by the Treasury Department. All it does is to permit two-thirds of the directors of a national bank to live within a 100-mile radius of the bank. The present requirement is that three-fourths must live within 50 miles. It simply extends the area in which directors of the bank may live.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendments.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

OPTIONAL RETIREMENT FOR CERTAIN FORMER LIGHTHOUSE SERVICE PERSONNEL

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 380, Senate bill 1419, to lower the age requirements with respect to optional retirement of persons serving in the Coast Guard who served in the former Lighthouse Service.

The motion was agreed to and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. President, this bill would lower the optional retirement age of civilian employees of the Coast Guard who served in the former Lighthouse Service.

The Treasury Department comment on the bill notes that the employees in question often find, on reaching age 60, that it is difficult to perform the heavy duties required in the work they are called upon to do. The Department offered no objection to the enactment of the bill, which would, according to the Acting Secretary of the Department, "make the permissive retirement age of those affected nearer to the age of retirement provided for civil-service employees under the Civil Service Act."

The bill was unanimously reported from the committee, and there was no objection from anyone concerned.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to amendment. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 6 of the act entitled "An act to authorize aids to navigation and for other works in the Lighthouse Service, and for other purposes," approved June 20, 1918, as amended (33 U. S. C., sec. 763), is amended by striking out "who shall have reached the age of 65 years, after having been 30 years in the active service of the Government," and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "who (1) shall have reached the age of 60 years, after having been 30 years in the active service of the Government, or (2) shall have reached the age of 62 years, after having been 25 years in the active service of the Government."

SEC. 2. This act shall take effect on the first day of the second month beginning after the date of enactment of this act.

REMOVAL OF REQUIREMENT FOR OATHS ON VESSEL INSPECTION CERTIFICATES

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 381, House bill 4646, to amend section 4421 of the Revised Statutes, in order to remove the requirement as to verifying under oath certain certificates of inspection, and for other purposes.

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

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. President, this bill was originally introduced at the request of the Treasury Department. It is intended to facilitate administrative procedures in the inspection of steam vessels by the Coast Guard by eliminating the requirement for verification under oath of certificates of inspection.

In asking for removal of the requirement of verification of certificates of inspection under oath, the Treasury Department pointed out that there is at present no such requirement incident to the issuance of temporary certificates of inspection or for amendments altering the provisions of such certificates, or for the issuance of waivers in connection with certificates of inspection.

The bill was unanimously reported from the committee, and there was no objection from anyone.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the third reading and passage of the bill.

The bill was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

AUTHORIZATION OF EARLY DISCHARGES OF CERTAIN COAST GUARD ENLISTED PERSONNEL

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 382, House bill 5224, to amend title 14, United

States Code, entitled "Coast Guard," to authorize certain early discharges of enlisted personnel and preserve their rights, privileges, and benefits.

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

Mr. PAYNE. This bill was introduced at the request of the Treasury Department. It should amend title 14 of the United States Code by authorizing certain early discharges of enlisted personnel.

The enactment of the bill would aid the Coast Guard to achieve a more stable rate of recruitment, and at the same time safeguard the rights, privileges, and benefits of the enlisted men involved.

It would provide that any enlisted man in the Coast Guard may be discharged within 3 months before the expiration of his term of enlistment or extended enlistment without prejudice to any right, privilege, or benefit he would have received, except pay and allowances for the unexpired period not served, or to which he would thereafter become entitled, had he served his full term of enlistment or extended enlistment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to amendment. If there be no amendment to be offered, the question is on the third reading and passage of the bill.

The bill was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I wish to express my deep gratitude to the junior Senator from Maine [Mr. PAYNE] for the very excellent presentation he has made of these bills. He has again demonstrated that he can function on the floor of the Senate as efficiently and effectively as he can when he is presiding over the Senate. The majority leader is very grateful to him, and is proud to be a member of a body that has in it such an able gentleman as the Senator from Maine.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. President, I merely wish to say that I have no words with which to express my appreciation for the kind remarks extended to me by the majority leader.

TO DECLARE A CERTAIN PORTION OF THE WATERWAY AT GREENWICH, CONN., A NONNAVIGABLE STREAM

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Order No. 399, S. 1300. I call the motion to the attention of the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will state the bill by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 1300) to declare a certain portion of the waterway at Greenwich Conn. (in which is located the Greenwich Harbor), a nonnavigable stream.

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

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce with an amendment on page 1, line 8, to strike out "Connecticut Geodetic" and insert in lieu thereof "Corps of Engineers' Harbor Line"; and on page 2, line 11, after the period to insert:

This act shall become effective when the State Highway Department of Connecticut has completed the dredging to a depth of 6 feet of a compensating anchorage area of nine-tenths of an acre, to the satisfaction of the division engineer of the Corps of Engineers in charge of the locality.

So as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the portion of the waterway in which is located the Greenwich Harbor in the town of Greenwich, Conn., lying north of a line extending south 84 degrees 00 minutes and 36 seconds east from a point (365 feet from the northwest corner of the existing Greenwich Harbor bulkhead and pier line) whose coordinates in the Corps of Engineers' Harbor Line System are north 6,244.55 and west 377.41 is hereby declared to be a nonnavigable water of the United States within the meaning of the Constitution and laws of the United States.

SEC. 2. The line hereinbefore described shall be established as a combined pierhead and bulkhead line of the Greenwich Harbor.

SEC. 3. Any project heretofore authorized by any act of Congress, insofar as such project relates to the above described portion of the Greenwich Harbor, is hereby abandoned.

SEC. 4. The right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved. This act shall become effective when the State Highway Department of Connecticut has completed the dredging to a depth of 6 feet of a compensating anchorage area of nine-tenths of an acre, to the satisfaction of the Division Engineer of the Corps of Engineers in charge of the locality.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, the purpose of the bill is to declare approximately 500 feet of an arm of Greenwich Harbor in the town of Greenwich, Conn., to be a nonnavigable water of the United States in order to permit the construction of a section of the Greenwich-Killingly Expressway across a portion of marshland and a portion of the dredged basin, both within the limits of Greenwich Harbor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendments.

The amendments were agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

TO DECLARE THE PORTION OF THE WATERWAY AT BRIDGEPORT, CONN., KNOWN AS THE WEST BRANCH OF CEDAR CREEK, A NONNAVIGABLE STREAM

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Order No. 400, S. 1469.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will state the bill by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 400) to declare the portion of the waterway at Bridgeport, Conn., known as the west branch of Cedar Creek, a nonnavigable stream.

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

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill which had been reported from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce with an amendment on page 1, line 8, to strike out "Connecticut Geodetic" and insert in lieu thereof "Corps of Engineers' Harbor Line", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the portion of the waterway in which is located the west branch of Cedar Creek in the town of Bridgeport, Conn., lying north of a line extending north 78 degrees 56 minutes 01 second east from a point (773 feet from the northwest corner of the existing bulkhead and pier line) whose coordinates in the Corps of Engineers' Harbor Line system are south 937.23 and west 1,108.40, is hereby declared to be a nonnavigable water of the United States within the meaning of the Constitution and laws of the United States.

SEC. 2. The line hereinbefore described shall be established as a combined pierhead and bulkhead line of the west branch of Cedar Creek.

SEC. 3. Any project heretofore authorized by an act of Congress, insofar as such project relates to the above-described portion of the west branch of Cedar Creek, is hereby abandoned.

SEC. 4. The right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, the purpose of the bill is to declare nonnavigable a portion of Cedar Creek at Bridgeport, Conn., and to abandon a previously authorized Federal project to permit construction of a section of the Greenwich-Killingly Expressway.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I wish to thank my delightful friend, the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE], for coming to the floor and so very ably and efficiently handling the bills from his committee. Nobody handles legislation any better than the able junior Senator from Rhode Island. I am grateful to him for his willingness to cooperate with the leadership at all times.

Mr. PASTORE. It is very exhilarating to find our majority leader in such a generous mood.

SUSPENSION OF DUTIES AND IMPORT TAXES ON METAL SCRAP

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Order No. 389, H. R. 5223.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will read the bill by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H. R. 5223) to continue until the close of June 30, 1956, the suspension of duties and import taxes on metal scrap, and for other purposes.

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

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, the purpose of H. R. 5223 is to continue the existing exemption of metal scrap from import duties and taxes for another year, to June 30, 1956, with the proviso that the suspension shall not apply to lead scrap or to zinc scrap.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to amendment. If there be no amendment to be offered, the question is on the third reading and passage of the bill.

The bill was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

THE MUTUAL SECURITY ACT OF 1955

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Order No. 386, S. 2090.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will state the bill by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 2090) to amend the Mutual Security Act of 1954, and for other purposes.

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

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I am sure the bill which is now the unfinished business of the Senate will not be passed as rapidly as the preceding bills have been passed. As Senators know, it is the mutual-security bill.

RIGHT-TO-WORK LAWS

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I read a question propounded by the American Press:

Eighteen States now have laws forbidding compulsory union membership even in union shops, thus permitting employers to hire nonunion men to fill vacancies. The unions are seeking revision of the Taft-Hartley law to take away from the States the power to pass such laws. Do you think the Taft-Hartley law should be amended in this manner?

That question was propounded in the April 1955, issue of the American Press, an independent magazine for home-town newspapers.

I read that question because it pertains to a matter of vital interest in all the States of the Union and will unquestionably be one of the issues in the 1956 campaign. It is interesting to note that 86.1 percent of the country's editors favor right-to-work laws, and oppose any Federal action against such legislation.

I ask unanimous consent that the question I have read and the answers received to the question from country editors be printed in the RECORD at this point, as a part of my remarks.

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

86.1 PERCENT OF COUNTRY EDITORS FAVOR "RIGHT TO WORK" LAWS—OPPOSE ANY FEDERAL ACTION AGAINST THEM

Editors of weekly newspapers are almost unanimously in favor of the so-called right-to-work laws, now in force in 18 States, forbidding compulsory union membership, according to the American Press' poll on the subject.

The unions are trying to get these laws repealed by getting the Taft-Hartley law amended to forbid such State legislation. But they will get practically no support from the country newspapers, the survey indicates.

The American Press' question read:

"Eighteen States now have laws forbidding compulsory union membership even in union shops, thus permitting employers to hire nonunion men to fill vacancies. The unions are seeking a revision of the Taft-Hartley law to take away from the States the power to pass such laws. Do you think the Taft-Hartley law should be amended in this manner?"

To the question, 86.1 percent of the 1,050 editors responding said, "No"; 10.6 percent said, "Yes"; and the rest didn't answer.

Chief argument of the opposition was that it is un-American for any man to have to join any group in order to get a job. Some objected primarily on the grounds that States should be able to make what laws they favored. Comments of some of the editors follow:

"No. Let the States run their own affairs with less power and control from Washington." (Stanley R. Kent, Chrisman (Ill.) Courier.)

"It's a terrible state of affairs when a man must 'pay off' to work or go hungry." (J. Roy Hooke, Ferdinand (Ind.) News.)

"A nonunion man in a union shop always creates an unhappy situation. The union has done a lot for its members and for the United States. Same rights for all will insure rights for each of us." (E. E. Jebousek, Conrad (Iowa) Record.)

LORD HELP THE CAPITALISTS

"No; I am regarded as prolabor, but I believe that no man should ever be required to join an organization merely to get a chance at working for a living." (Jackson N. Baty, Osage (Iowa) Press-News.)

"Will the union's greed for power never be satiated? Lord help our poor, downtrodden, sweatshop capitalists." (Bernard Y. Wickstrom, Stanton (Iowa) Viking.)

"Iowa has such a law and it is a good one. Who wants to clear with a union agent to qualify for a job?" (George Ver Steeg, Pella (Iowa) Chronicle.)

"Compulsory union membership should be against the Constitution." (James R. Whittaker, Lancaster (Ky.) Central Record.)

"I am against State right-to-work laws but am not sure they should be outlawed by Congress. Maybe it should be left to States." (Landon Wills, Calhoun (Ky.) News.)

"Consider these laws good to maintain proper balance between labor and capital." (K. L. Morelock, Haynesville (La.) News.)

"Not until unions are required to give strict accounts of use of funds and union racketeering is cleaned out by FBI." (F. E. Wells, Williams (Ariz.) News.)

"No. Great danger now is increasing the dictatorial power of unions with Government blessing." (James Cuzner, Novato (Calif.) Advance.)

"I disapprove of so-called right-to-work laws. But I don't think the Federal Government should interfere with the right of a State to pass such a law, even if it is a bum law." (Si Casady, El Cajon (Calif.) Valley News.)

"The right-to-work bills seem typical of measures advocated by employers who can't handle their own employer relations. Generally speaking, employers get the labor relations they deserve." (John S. Gilmore, Nucla (Colo.) Forum.)

"Both companies and unions in all except a few Southern States apparently have found some form of maintenance of union membership worth while." (Bob Bobroff, Auburndale (Fla.) Star.)

"No. If anything, T-H should be amended to make union membership noncompulsory. Unions are okay, but should be controlled for the good of rank-and-file members." (Lowell Nye, Harvard (Ill.) Herald.)

"When a free American has to buy his job he will soon become a dishonest worker. No law in America should compel a worker to join a union, a church, or a fraternal society." (T. P. Dunn, Auburn (Ill.) Citizen.)

"Hell, no. Who got that crazy idea? Make unions desirable to workers." (R. G. Starr, Norris City (Ill.) News.)

AS BAD AS SLAVERY

"I think compelling a man to join a union is just as bad as slavery." (Robert Ehlert, Liberty (Ill.) Bee.)

"I oppose taking any more rights from the States and giving them to an all-powerful Federal Government." (Robert Angers, Jr., Franklin (La.) Banner-Tribune.)

"Unions were needed to put labor in a place to bargain. Today the pendulum has swung too far in the other direction." (Dorothy E. Roberts, Damariscotta (Maine) News.)

"Yes. Let's not make martyrs of union leaders. Besides, why penalize the other 31 States?" (John Benson, Proctor (Minn.) Journal.)

"When a contract is made with a union, the employer gives away his right to hire and expects the union to furnish him with skilled men. There cannot be two bosses." (Grant Utley, Cass Lake (Minn.) Times.)

"Each State should set up its own labor laws." (T. Ballard Watters, Marshfield (Mo.) Mail.)

"Why talk of freedom, liberty, Americanism, and then permit a group to impose restrictions on a man's right to work?" (D. H. Moreau, Flemington (N. J.) Democrat.)

"More States should adopt laws similar to those 17 which already have them." (John T. Wilson, Jr., Rutherford (N. J.) South Bergen News.)

"Any rewording of the Taft-Hartley law should contain a provision outlawing the high-powered union bosses." (Karl Guthman, Roy (N. Mex.) Record.)

"Yes. If union and employer agree they have conditions to warrant employment of union members only, then that's a working agreement, pure and simple. It's up to both sides to keep their skirts clean so it works right, rather than prohibit by law." (Hubert D. Bliss, Wellsville (N. Y.) Democrat.)

"The unions are becoming too powerful and will be the ruination of this great country if the brakes are not put on soon." (William D. Denton, Elizabethtown (N. Y.) Valley News.)

"Compulsory union membership would eventually mean an ultimate society of a completely organized working class running everything for themselves and eliminating independence of thought and action." (William W. Willson, Benson (N. C.) Review.)

"Yes. 'Right to work' bills are nothing more than 'right to starve' bills." (Roy Parker, Jr., Jackson (N. C.) News.)

"The Taft-Hartley law truly is labor's bill of rights and should not be amended to suit any group of labor bosses. I am a union man myself, having carried a card for more than 30 years, but it's contrary to the American Constitution, the American way of life, and pure common decency to tell any workingman that he must join a union in order to work." (George W. Hall, Myrtle Point (Oreg.) Herald.)

"This involves the line we must draw between State and Federal control. We favor protection of the worker and his free choice of affiliation with unions, but we believe the Federal Government should provide the protection." (W. Robert Walsh, Warren (Pa.) Observer.)

FEW REMAINING FREEDOMS

"Since the Federal Government lacks the courage to enforce the Federal Constitution guaranteeing equal rights to all our citizens, the States should clearly have the power to make such laws. There is nothing

in the guise of freedom in requiring a person to pay tribute to any organization as the price of holding a job." (Karl R. Bierly, Apollo (Pa.) News-Record.)

"The end result of forbidding compulsory union membership weakens the rights of our working people." (Abraham Beter, Irwin (Pa.) Times-Observer.)

"The right to work is one of our few remaining freedoms. I definitely oppose any further expansion of labor union powers which take away from our democratic heritage." (R. Glen Coward, Belton (S. C.) News.)

"If a labor union can sell itself to a worker, well and good. He must not, however, be compelled to join for any reason except his own free will." (Tom O'Connor, Hampton (S. C.) Guardian.)

AGAINST COMPULSORY ANYTHING

"Oppose compulsory anything, whether religion, business monopoly or labor monopoly." (Casper Nohner Hayti (S. D.) Herald-Enterprise.)

"I think the District of Columbia and the other States should enact similar laws." (W. Mat Jones, Gatesville (Tex.) News.)

"Texas has had this law and it is working favorably. Labor racketeers are continually trying to rule by force." (Clyde W. Warwick, Canyon (Tex.) News.)

"Compulsory union membership is absolutely un-American and contrary to the foundation stones on which America was founded." (James A. Williams, Wytheville (Va.) Enterprise.)

"T-H law should not be tampered with at all. We've had less strikes the past year. Under Truman we had strikes so often it got to be commonplace news." (Raymond S. Davis, Crewe (Va.) Chronicle.)

"Believe States should control their own economy. Centralized government with autocratic control has always led people to losing their liberties." (C. S. Musser, Shepherdstown (W. Va.) Independent.)

"Yes, the lesser of two evils. While the unions are far from perfect, the 'right to work' laws could eventually be used to break the unions." (Joe Davis, Okanogan (Wash.) Independent.)

"The right-to-work laws are just; I think they will become as important an issue as union organization laws were back in the late 1930's. I would favor national legislation stating the right-to-work principle." (Walter S. Brovald, Cadott (Wis.) Sentinel.)

"Yes, if it keeps labor off the unemployment compensation rolls." (Verle E. Evans, Markesan (Wis.) Herald.)

"If any shop votes 100 percent to keep it closed, it can be kept closed. Otherwise, let it be open. Keep it on a shop basis—not union basis. A 100 percent shop would have to solve its own labor problems in the union." (M. H. Johnson, Fountain City (Wis.) Republican.)

PROGRAM FOR THE WEEK

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, if no other Senators desire the floor at this time, before I suggest the absence of a quorum, I should like to inform the Senate of our plan, as much as we know it now, for the remainder of the week.

Following the quorum call, the Senate will be addressed by the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, the senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE].

After his address, the Senate will continue this afternoon with a general discussion of the mutual security bill.

We hope that we may be able to work out an arrangement whereby early tomorrow we can have a yea-and-nay vote on the Fisheries Convention. The majority leader and the minority leader have discussed the matter, and we think that the vote may be possible after the morning hour.

It is also hoped that we may be able to reach an agreement with respect to time for the discussion of the postal pay bill, which has been reported by the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. I have discussed the matter with the very able chairman of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, the distinguished Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON], and with the able ranking minority member. They are now canvassing the situation. It may be that we will be able to take some time tomorrow to consider the postal pay bill.

It is my understanding that the Committee on Banking and Currency has ordered reported a housing bill. The report on the bill will not be printed and available to Senators until perhaps Thursday of this week. It is my hope that we can consider that proposed legislation in the early part of next week. I had hoped that perhaps we could bring the housing bill up for discussion in the Senate this week. However, because of the long weekend, and the fact that the Printing Office did not print the report, and it will not be available until Thursday, I doubt that it would be wise to ask the Senate to consider the housing bill this week.

There may be a few minor bills considered by the Senate from time to time this week if the committees report them, and after conference with the minority leader, so he may have an opportunity to discuss them with Members on his side of the aisle.

That is all we can say at this time so far as the program for this week is concerned.

We will continue to debate the mutual security bill today and also tomorrow. I hope that we may also discuss it on Thursday. If a sufficient number of Senators wish to get away over next weekend, perhaps we can vote on that bill by Thursday. After a measure of that kind has been discussed for 3 days, the majority leader certainly will not try to stop a vote on it.

Mr. POTTER. Mr. President, I wish to state to the majority leader that his record of expedition in handling legislation is one of good progress, and I am sure that this proposed legislation will be disposed of in the same expeditious manner.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I appreciate my friend's generosity. However, it is not the majority leader's record of expedition; it is the record of every Member of the Senate, because at any time any Member of the Senate may well wish to take the floor under circumstances which would not help expedite matters too much.

I appreciate the attitude and the cooperation of all Members on both sides of the aisle.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MANSFIELD in the chair). The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

SALARIES OF TEACHERS, SCHOOL OFFICERS, AND OTHER EMPLOYEES OF THE BOARD OF EDUCATION OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Order No. 384, Senate bill 1093; and with reference to it I invite the attention of the acting minority leader, and the able Senator from Nevada [Mr. BIBLE] who reported the bill from the Committee on the District of Columbia.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (S. 1093) fixing and regulating the salaries of teachers, school officers, and other employees of the Board of Education of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on the District of Columbia with an amendment, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

TITLE I—SALARY SCHEDULES

SECTION 1. That the following are the salary schedules for teachers, school officers, and certain other employees of Board of Education of the District of Columbia whose positions are included therein:

Salary class and position	Service step 1 minimum	Service step 2	Service step 3	Service step 4	Service step 5	Service step 6	Service step 7	Service step 8	Service step 9	Service step 10	Service step 11	Service step 12	Service step 13
Class 1: Superintendent of schools	$18,000												
Class 2: Deputy superintendent	11,600	$11,900	$12,200	$12,500	$12,800	$13,100	$13,400						
Class 3: Assistant superintendent; president, teachers college	10,000	10,300	10,600	10,900	11,200	11,500	11,800						
Class 4	9,400	9,600	9,800	10,000	10,200	10,400	10,600	$10,800	$11,000				
Class 5:													
Group B, master's degree	8,500	8,700	8,900	9,100	9,300	9,500	9,700	9,900	10,100				
Group C, master's degree plus 30 credit hours	8,800	9,000	9,200	9,400	9,600	9,800	10,000	10,200	10,400				
Class 6:													
Group A, bachelor's degree	7,600	7,800	8,000	8,200	8,400	8,600	8,800	9,000	9,200				
Group B, master's degree	8,100	8,300	8,500	8,700	8,900	9,100	9,300	9,500	9,700				
Group C, master's degree plus 30 credit hours	8,400	8,600	8,800	9,000	9,200	9,400	9,600	9,800	10,000				
Director, department of food services													

Salary class and position	Service step 1 minimum	Service step 2	Service step 3	Service step 4	Service step 5	Service step 6	Service step 7	Service step 8	Service step 9	Service step 10	Service step 11	Service step 12	Service step 13
Class 7:													
Group B, master's degree	7,600	7,800	8,000	9,200	8,400	8,600	8,800	9,000	9,200				
Group C, master's degree plus 30 credit hours	7,900	8,100	8,300	8,500	8,700	8,900	9,100	9,300	9,500				
Chief examiner													
Director													
Principal, senior high school													
Class 8: Professor, teachers college	7,600	7,800	8,000	8,200	8,400	8,600	8,800	9,000	9,200				
Class 9:													
Group B, master's degree	7,100	7,300	7,500	7,700	7,900	8,100	8,300	8,500	8,700				
Group C, master's degree plus 30 credit hours	7,400	7,600	7,800	8,000	8,200	8,400	8,600	8,800	9,000				
Principal, vocational high school													
Principal, junior high school													
Principal, Americanization school													
Class 10:													
Group B, master's degree	6,700	6,900	7,100	7,300	7,500	7,700	7,900	8,100	8,300				
Group C, master's degree plus 30 credit hours	7,000	7,200	7,400	7,600	7,800	8,000	8,200	8,400	8,600				
Director, department of school attendance and work permits													
Supervising director													
Principal, elementary school													
Principal, laboratory school													
Class 11: Associate professor, teachers college	6,700	6,900	7,100	7,300	7,500	7,700	7,900	8,100	8,300				
Class 12:													
Group A, bachelor's degree	6,200	6,400	6,600	6,800	7,000	7,200	7,400	7,600	7,800				
Group B, master's degree	6,700	6,900	7,100	7,300	7,500	7,700	7,900	8,100	8,300				
Group C, master's degree plus 30 credit hours	7,000	7,200	7,400	7,600	7,800	8,000	8,200	8,400	8,600				
Assistant director, department of food services													
Class 13:													
Group B, master's degree	6,000	6,200	6,400	6,600	6,800	7,000	7,200	7,400	7,600				
Group C, master's degree plus 30 credit hours	6,300	6,500	6,700	6,900	7,100	7,300	7,500	7,700	7,900				
Assistant director													
Principal, Capitol page school													
Assistant principal, senior high school													
Class 14: Assistant professor, teachers college; chief librarian, teachers college	6,000	6,200	6,400	6,600	6,800	7,000	7,200	7,400	7,600				
Class 15:													
Group B, master's degree	5,800	6,000	6,200	6,400	6,600	6,800	7,000	7,200	7,400				
Group C, master's degree, plus 30 credit hours	6,100	6,300	6,500	6,700	6,900	7,100	7,300	7,500	7,700				
Assistant principal, vocational high school													
Assistant principal, junior high school													
Class 16:													
Group B, master's degree	5,600	5,800	6,000	6,200	6,400	6,600	6,800	7,000	7,200				
Group C, master's degree, plus 30 credit hours	5,900	6,100	6,300	6,500	6,700	6,900	7,100	7,300	7,500				
Class 17:													
Group B, master's degree	$5,300	$5,500	$5,700	$5,900	$6,100	$6,300	$6,500	$6,700	$6,900				
Group C, master's degree plus 30 credit hours	5,600	5,800	6,000	6,200	6,400	6,600	6,800	7,000	7,200				
Assistant													
Supervisor													
Chief attendance officer													
Class 18:													
Group A, bachelor's degree	3,800	3,960	4,120	4,280	4,440	4,600	4,760	4,920	5,080	$5,240	$5,400	$5,560	$5,700
Group B, master's degree	4,300	4,460	4,620	4,780	4,940	5,100	5,260	5,420	5,580	5,740	5,900	6,060	6,200
Group C, master's degree plus 30 credit hours	4,600	4,760	4,920	5,080	5,240	5,400	5,560	5,720	5,880	6,040	6,200	6,360	6,500
Instructor, teachers college													
Librarian, teachers college													
Teacher, senior high school													
Teacher, vocational high school													
Teacher, junior high school													
Teacher, elementary school													
School librarian													
Counselor													
Research assistant													
Class 19:													
Group A, bachelor's degree	3,800	3,960	4,120	4,280	4,440	4,600	4,760	4,920	5,080	5,240	5,400	5,560	5,700
Group B, master's degree	4,300	4,460	4,620	4,780	4,940	5,100	5,260	5,420	5,580	5,740	5,900	6,060	6,200
Attendance officer													
Child labor inspector													
Census supervisor													

TITLE II—CLASSIFICATION AND ASSIGNMENT OF EMPLOYEES

SEC. 2. (a) The Board of Education on written recommendations of the superintendent of schools is authorized to establish the eligibility requirements and prescribe methods of appointment and promotion for teachers, school officers, and other employees. The Board of Education is authorized and directed, on written recommendation of the superintendent of schools, to classify and assign all teachers, school officers, and other employees to the salary classes and groups in section 1 of this act. Teachers, school officers, and other employees on probationary or permanent status shall not be required to take any examinations, either mental or physical, to be continued in the positions in which they are employed on June 30, 1955, or to which they may be transferred and assigned under the provisions of section 4 and section 5 of this act. No teacher, school officer, or other employee shall be appointed or promoted to any position in section 1 of this act on probationary or permanent status unless he possesses a master's degree, except that a person possessing a bachelor's degree may be appointed on probationary or permanent status as director of food services, assistant director of food services, supervising director of the department of military science and tactics, teacher of military science and tactics, teacher of driver training, shop teacher in the vocational high schools, teacher in the junior high schools, counselor in the vocational high schools, counselor in the junior high schools, teacher in the elementary schools, research assistant, attendance officer, child labor inspector, or census supervisor. No teacher, school officer, or other employee shall receive compensation at a rate less than his annual compensation as of June 30, 1955.

(b) Notwithstanding any provision of this act the Board is authorized on a written recommendation of the superintendent of schools, to appoint or promote vocational high school shop teachers to salary class 18, group B, without a master's degree if they submit evidence of equivalent training and experience in accordance with the rules of the Board. A vocational high school shop teacher may not be appointed, assigned, or promoted to salary class 18, group C, who does not possess a master's degree granted in course plus 30 credit hours.

(c) When used in this act, the words "master's degree" mean a master's degree granted in course by an accredited higher educational institution and the words "plus 30 credit hours" mean the equivalent of not less than 30 graduate credit hours in academic, vocational, or professional courses beyond a master's degree, representing a definite educational program satisfactory to the Board of Education. Graduate credit hours beyond 30 which were earned prior to obtaining a master's degree may be applied in computing the "plus 30 credit hours." The terms "Board" or "Board of Education" mean the Board of Education of the District of Columbia. When used in this act, the term "Salary Act of 1947" means "District of Columbia Teachers' Salary Act of 1947, as amended."

SEC. 3. For other than temporary employees and the superintendent of schools, the first 2 years of service in each position covered by section 1 of this act shall be probationary regardless of any change in title or numbers used in classifying the position. Teachers, school officers, and other employees who have satisfactorily completed the probationary period in any position covered by section 1 of this act and whose permanent appointments have been approved by the Board shall be considered employees of the Board on permanent tenure.

TITLE III—METHOD OF ASSIGNMENT OF EMPLOYEES TO SALARY SCHEDULES

SEC. 4. Each teacher, school officer, and other employee in the service of the Board on July 1, 1955, who occupies a position formerly assigned in accordance with the provisions of title I of the Salary Act of 1947 shall be placed in a salary class covered by section 1 of this act as indicated at the end of this section. Any employee in group A of his salary class on June 30, 1955, shall be assigned to group A of the class to which he is transferred on July 1, 1955. Any employee in group C of his salary class on June 30, 1955, shall be assigned to group B of the class to which he is transferred on July 1, 1955, except that an employee possessing a master's degree plus 30 credit hours shall be transferred to group C. Any employee not in a group A or a group C on June 30, 1955, shall be assigned to group A on July 1, 1955, if his new salary class contains such a group, except that an employee possessing a master's degree or an employee in salary classes 7, 9, 10, 13, 15, and 17 on July 1, 1955, who does not possess a master's degree shall be assigned to group B if his new salary class contains such a group and an employee possessing a master's degree plus 30 credit hours shall be assigned to group C if his new salary class contains such a group.

Title and class of position in Teacher's Salary Act of 1947		*Title and class of position in Teacher's Salary Act of 1955*	
Title	*Class*	*Title*	*Class*
Superintendent of schools	29	Superintendent of schools	1
First assistant superintendent	28	Deputy superintendent	2
Assistant to the superintendent (in charge of business administration)	27	Deputy superintendent	2
Associate superintendent	26	Assistant superintendent	3
Chief examiner	24	Chief examiner	7
Director	22	Director	7
Divisional director	23	Director	7
Director, department of school attendance and work permits	30	Director, department of school attendance and work permits	10
Director of department of food services	35	Director, department of food services	6
Assistant director of department of food services	36	Assistant director, department of food services	12
Head of department	17	Supervising director	10
Assistant director	21	Assistant director	13
Assistant	13A	Assistant	17
Supervisor	13A	Supervisor	17
President of teachers college	25	President, teachers college	3
Principal of senior high school	20	Principal, senior high school	7
Principal of vocational high school	19	Principal, vocational high school	9
Principal of junior high school	18	Principal, junior high school	9
Principal in Americanization school	13	Principal, Americanization school	9
Principal in elementary school	13	Principal, elementary school	10
Associate professor in teachers college (in charge of laboratory school)	11	Principal, laboratory school	10
Assistant director (in charge of Capitol page school)	21	Principal, Capitol page school	13
Assistant principal in senior high school	16	Assistant principal, senior high school	13
Assistant principal in vocational high school	15	Assistant principal, vocational high school	15
Assistant principal, junior high school	14	Assistant principal, junior high school	15
Professor in teachers college	12	Professor, teachers college	8
Associate professor in teachers college	11	Associate professor, teachers college	11
Assistant professor in teachers college	10	Assistant professor, teachers college	14
Instructor, teachers college	15	Instructor in teachers college	7
Chief librarian, teachers college	14	Chief librarian in teachers college	9
Librarian, teachers college	18	Librarian in teachers college	8
Teacher, senior high school	18	Teacher in senior high school	3
Teacher, vocational high school	18	Teacher in vocational high school	5
Teacher, junior high school	18	Teacher in junior high school	2
Teacher, elementary school	18	Teacher in elementary school	1
School librarian	18	School librarian	4
Counselor	18	Counselor	6
Research assistant	18	Research assistant	6
Chief attendance officer	17	Chief attendance officer	31
Attendance officer	19	Attendance officer	32
Child-labor inspector	19	Child-labor inspector	34
Census supervisor	19	Census supervisor	33

SEC. 5. (a) This act applies to all positions under the Board which require at least a bachelor's degree in an appropriate field, and in addition—

(1) involve classroom or other instruction or the supervision and direction of classroom and other instructional activities; or

(2) involve activities, other than teaching, which require the incumbents to possess academic credits in educational theory and practice at least equivalent to those required of a teacher with a bachelor's degree; or

(3) involve activities which are so directly related to the educational process that the positions have characteristics of the educational field to a marked degree, even though academic credits in educational theory and practice are not required; or

(4) involve the management or direction or organizational units or school services which, though not directly involved in the educational process, require the incumbent to deal so extensively with employees who are directly involved in the educational process on problems that require an understanding of the aims, methods, and points of view of educators and educational philosophy, that it becomes impractical, insofar as salary treatment is concerned, to attempt to distinguish between them and positions covered under paragraph (1), (2), or (3) of this subsection. This paragraph (4) shall apply only to such positions as are necessary to coordinate such noneducational units or services with the educational activities of the school system.

(b) The Board, with the concurrence of the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia, is authorized to determine which positions meet the criteria specified in subsection (a) of this section and to establish or transfer positions covered under other wage or salary fixing acts or authorities to the coverage of this act. Similarly, the Board, with the concurrence of the said Board of Commissioners, is authorized to determine that positions covered under this act do not meet the criteria specified in subsection (a) of this section and to remove any such position from the coverage of this act: *Provided*, That any employee occupying any position covered by this act on the effective date of this act, but which is later determined not to meet the criteria specified in subsection (a) of this section, shall continue to be entitled to the salary and other benefits of this act as long as he remains in such position. The Board, subject to the concurrence of the said Board of Commissioners, is authorized to specify for any position to be brought under this act, the class and group as established in this act which shall apply to such position: *Provided*, That such class shall be selected on the basis of the difficulty, responsibility, and qualification requirements of such position. Positions brought under this act in accordance with this section shall be subject to the provisions of this act to the same degree and in all respects as if such positions were specifically named in this act. The Board is authorized to conduct such studies as are required to apply the criteria specified in subsection (a) of this section.

TITLE IV—METHOD OF ADVANCEMENT AND PROMOTION OF EMPLOYEES

SEC. 6. On July 1, 1955, each permanent employee assigned to a salary class in accordance with section 4 and section 5 of this act shall be assigned to the numerical service step on the schedule for his class, or class and group, under this act next above the numerical service step occupied by him on June 30, 1955, under the provisions of the Salary Act of 1947 and each such employee shall advance one numerical service step each year thereafter until he reaches the highest step provided on the schedule for his class, or class and group, except that each employee under this act who was on a service step under the Salary Act of 1947 which was numerically as high or higher than the top step provided for the salary class, or class and group, to which he is assigned under section 1 of this act shall be assigned on July 1, 1955, to the highest step provided for his salary class, or class and group, under section 1 of this act. The superintendent of schools, salary class 1, shall be assigned on July 1, 1955, to the salary provided for that position in section 1 of this act. Any permanent employee serving in a position not covered by the Salary Act of 1947 but which may be later established under section 5 of this act shall be given service credit for the purpose of salary placement under this act equivalent to the number of years of satisfactory service rendered within the school system in the position then occupied by such employee and shall be assigned to the numerical service step on the schedule for his class, or class and group, under this act next above the numerical service step corresponding to his years of service under his previous classification. If such employee is on a service step in his previous classification which is numerically as high or higher than the top service step provided for his salary class, or class and group, under this act, he shall be assigned to the highest service step provided for his salary class, or class and group, under this act. Each employee transferred and assigned to salary class 18 under this act, and on permanent tenure on July 1, 1955, who on June 30, 1947, was a permanent employee of the Board of Education in either

group B or group D of salary classes 1–8, inclusive, in the District of Columbia Teachers' Salary Act of 1945, as amended, shall be placed one service step higher than he would otherwise be entitled to under the provisions of this section except that in no case shall his salary be higher than the maximum salary provided for his class and group.

SEC. 7. (a) Each employee appointed under this act who has not had prior service under the Board or who may be reappointed or reinstated, shall be assigned to the service step numbered next above the number of years of service with which he is credited for the purpose of salary placement. The Board, on the written recommendation of the superintendent of schools, is authorized to evaluate the previous experience of each new appointee to determine the number of years with which he may be credited for the purpose of salary placement. Credit for service rendered either inside or outside of public schools of the District of Columbia shall be effective on the date of the regular Board meeting immediately preceding the date of approval by the Board or on the date of appointment, whichever is later. Such credit shall apply to all positions in salary classes 18 and 19, and to the positions of chief librarian and assistant professor, salary class 14; and to the position of associate professor, salary class 11; and to the position of professor, salary class 8. Such placement credit shall not be granted in excess of 5 years.

(b) In crediting previous experience of any teacher who has been absent from his duties because of naval or military service in the armed forces of the United States or its allies, the Board is hereby authorized to include such naval or military service as the equivalent of approved experience.

(c) No provision in this act shall be interpreted as preventing any teacher, school officer, or other employee of the Board who has been granted leave to enter the armed forces of the United States or its allies from receiving any annual service increment or increments to which he would have been entitled had he remained continuously in the service of the public schools.

SEC. 8. (a) Each teacher, school officer, and other employee appointed or promoted on probationary tenure to a position covered by section 1 of this act shall receive his first increase in salary in that position on the beginning day of his second year of probationary service in the position; he shall receive his second increase in salary in that position on the date when his appointment or promotion to the position is made permanent; and he shall receive all subsequent increases in salary to which he is entitled in that position on July 1 of each year, beginning with the July 1 next after the date of his permanent appointment or promotion to the position in accordance with section 6 and section 7 of this act.

(b) Any employee in the service of the Board on the effective date of this act appointed or promoted on probationary tenure during the period from July 1, 1952, to June 30, 1955, inclusive, to a position covered by section 4 of this act shall be compensated for salary increases in accordance with subsection (a) of this section and shall receive his first increase effective as of the first day of his second year of probationary service based upon the rates of pay currently in effect on that date and such employee shall be assigned on July 1, 1955, to the numerical service step in the salary schedule for his class, or class and group, in section 1 of this act corresponding to his number of years of creditable service.

(c) The Board is authorized to terminate the services of any probationary employee in the class to which appointed, upon the written recommendation of the superintendent of schools, at any time during the 2-year probationary period: *Provided*, That if an employee so terminated has permanent status within the school system he shall be returned to the salary class he last occupied on permanent status, and placed on the step which would have been occupied by him.

SEC. 9. The Board is hereby authorized to appoint and assign temporary employees within the salary structure of section 1 of this act, whenever such action is necessary and recommended in writing by the superintendent of schools. Such appointments shall be for periods not to extend beyond June 30 of the fiscal year in which the appointments are made and the Board is authorized to terminate the appointment of any temporary employee at any time upon the written recommendation of the superintendent of schools. Each temporary employee shall be assigned to a numerical service step and receive an annual rate of compensation in accordance with section 7, but he shall receive no annual service increments and may be credited with not more than 5 years of service either inside or outside the public schools of the District of Columbia for the purpose of salary placement.

SEC. 10. (a) On and after July 1, 1955, each promotion to group B, or group C, within a salary class shall become effective on the date of the regular Board meeting immediately preceding the date of approval by the Board or on the effective date of the master's degree or the completion of 30 credit hours beyond the master's degree, whichever is later.

(b) Any employee in a position covered by section 1 of this act who is promoted to group B or group C of the same salary class shall be assigned to the same numerical service step on the schedule for his new group as he would have occupied on the schedule from which promoted.

SEC. 11. Any employee in a salary class covered by section 1 of this act, when promoted to a higher paid salary class, shall be assigned to the lowest numerical service step on the schedule for his new class, or class and group, which will give him an immediate increase in annual salary rate at least equal to the sum of the following:

(1) Any annual service increment to which the employee would have been entitled in his former salary class at the time of his promotion; and

(2) The annual service increment scheduled for his new class and group: *Provided*, That no such employee shall be assigned to a higher numerical service step on the schedule for his new class, or class and group, than he would have occupied on the schedule from which promoted.

TITLE V—ACCOMPANYING LEGISLATION

SEC. 12. Notwithstanding any law or regulation to the contrary, the Board, on the written recommendation of the superintendent of schools, may employ not more than 15 retired members of the armed services of the United States as teachers of military science and tactics in the public high schools of the District of Columbia, and such teachers so employed shall be entitled to compensation in accordance with the salary schedules in section 1 of this act, in addition to their retired pay and allowances.

SEC. 13. The Board is hereby authorized to conduct as parts of the public school system, evening schools, summer schools, and Americanization schools, under and within appropriations made by Congress, and on the written recommendation of the superintendent of schools to fix and prescribe the salaries of teachers in the evening and summer schools.

SEC. 14. Each employee assigned to salary class 18 in the foregoing schedules, and to the position of attendance officer, salary class 19; each chief librarian and each assistant professor in class 14; each associate professor in class 11; and each professor in class 8 shall be classified as a teacher for payroll purposes and his annual salary shall be paid in 10 monthly installments in accordance with existing law.

SEC. 15. On and after the effective date of this act, the act entitled "An act to provide that the Board of Education of the District of Columbia shall have sole authority to regulate the vacation periods and annual leave of absence of certain school officers and employees of the Board of Education of the District of Columbia," approved March 5, 1952, as amended, shall apply to employees of the Board of Education whose salaries are fixed in salary classes 7–17, inclusive, under this act. However, such act shall not apply to the following employees: Chief examiner, class 7; and professor, class 8; associate professor, class 11; assistant director, department of food service, class 12; assistant professor and chief librarian, class 14.

SEC. 16. On and after the effective date of this act, the act entitled "An act to provide cumulative sick and emergency leave with pay for teachers and attendance officers in the employ of the Board of Education of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes," approved October 13, 1949, as amended, shall apply to employees of the Board whose salaries are fixed in salary class 18, and the position of attendance officer, salary class 19; and to the following employees in the salary classes indicated: Professor, class 8; associate professor, class 11; chief librarian and assistant professor, class 14, under this act.

SEC. 17. On and after the effective date of this act, the act entitled "An act to provide educational employees of the public schools of the District of Columbia with leave of absence, with part pay, for the purposes of educational improvement, and for other purposes," approved June 12, 1940, shall apply to employees of the Board whose salaries are fixed under section 1 of this act.

SEC. 18. On and after the effective date of this act, the act entitled "An act to permit the Board of Education of the District of Columbia to participate in the foreign teacher exchange program in cooperation with the United States Office of Education," approved September 28, 1950, shall apply to employees of the Board whose salaries are fixed under section 1 of this act.

SEC. 19. On and after the effective date of this act, the act entitled "An act for the retirement of public schoolteachers in the District of Columbia," approved August 7, 1946, as amended, shall apply to probationary and permanent employees of the Board whose salaries are fixed under section 1 of this act, and all references in the said act of August 7, 1946, to the Salary Act of 1947 shall be interpreted to apply to this act. Nothing in this section shall require the recomputation of the annuity of any person retired under the act of August 7, 1946, as amended, prior to the effective date of this act, or of any person retired prior to the effective date of the act of August 7, 1946, as amended, whose annuity is computed in accordance with the provisions of that act.

SEC. 20. The District of Columbia Teachers' Salary Act of 1947, approved July 7, 1947, as amended, is hereby repealed.

SEC. 21. Section 1 of the Act for the Retirement of Public School Teachers, approved August 7, 1946, as amended, is amended by striking out "June 30" wherever it appears in such section and inserting in lieu thereof "December 31", provided that interest shall not be compounded as of December 31, 1955.

SEC. 22. Section 6 of the District of Columbia Teachers' Leave Act of 1949, as amended, is amended by adding thereto the following new sentence: "Service rendered by such substitutes shall not be regarded as service within the meaning of the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended."

SEC. 23. The proviso in section 5 of the act of August 7, 1946, entitled "An act for the retirement of public schoolteachers in the District of Columbia," as amended by the

act approved March 6, 1952 (66 Stat. 17), is hereby repealed.

SEC. 24. This act may be cited as "District of Columbia Teachers' Salary Act of 1955."

SEC. 25. This act shall become effective on July 1, 1955.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, I should like to make a brief explanation of the bill.

It was reported unanimously by the Committee on the District of Columbia.

The purpose of the bill is to fix, regulate, and increase the salaries of teachers, school officers, and other employees of the Board of Education of the District of Columbia, and to readjust the salary schedule of employees.

The bill provides for a minimum salary of $3,800 annually for teachers having a bachelor's degree, which is a 10.4-percent increase, and a minimum of $4,300 annually for teachers having a master's degree, which is an increase of 7 percent. The superintendent of schools would receive a salary of $18,000 per annum.

The Senator from Maryland [Mr. BEALL] has been very active in this particular type of legislation. He sponsored a bill to accomplish this reclassification.

Hearings were conducted upon his bill, as well as upon the bill introduced by the Senator from Michigan [Mr. MCNAMARA] and the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE]. Hearings were held on May 4 and 5, at which all interested parties were heard. At the conclusion of the hearings, it was suggested that a conference be held with representatives of all interested groups for the purpose of resolving the differences in classification, both as to school salary increases and the method of classification. This was done, with the resulting bill which is now before the Senate for consideration.

The cost of the pending bill will be approximately $2,500,000. The report accompanying the bill contains a table which shows the minimum and maximum salaries of all employees covered by the bill.

Mr. President, I wish to pay special tribute to the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BEALL] for his very careful and diligent work upon this proposed legislation.

I recommend the passage of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

THE SALK VACCINE—STATEMENT BY THE PRESIDENT

Mr. PURTELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed at this point in the RECORD a statement just issued by the President relating to the Salk vaccine. I call attention to this paragraph in the President's statement:

For these reasons I do not believe that regulatory legislation in this field is necessary.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Connecticut?

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

STATEMENT BY THE PRESIDENT

I would like to issue the following statement about the polio vaccine situation. The last week has been both eventful and encouraging.

A committee of scientists is now screening polio vaccine before it is released for public use. The Surgeon General of the Public Health Service tells me that it is hoped to release some vaccine within a few days. Batches of vaccine must pass the most careful tests that scientists can devise and be as safe and effective as man can make the vaccine.

According to Dr. Francis' report on last year's field tests, the child who was vaccinated had a three-times-better chance of avoiding polio than the child who was not vaccinated.

There has been delay in the vaccination program. But remember—we are dealing in this field with the lives of our children and our grandchildren. Because of scientific work that was done during that delay, science has learned new things about the way viruses behave in large-scale manufacture and about the way we should make vaccine. Scientists have been able to design testing techniques of greater sensitivity and production techniques which build in a greater factor of safety and additional checks on the final product. So, from that delay science has gained new knowledge, new safeguards.

I want to caution the people of our Nation about two things:

First. No vaccination program can prevent all cases of the disease against which it is directed. Let us not forget that Dr. Francis reported the polio vaccine as used in the 1954 field trial was found to be 60 to 90 percent—not 100 percent—effective in the field trials last year.

Second. Although the manufacturers are now moving toward full-scale production and distribution of this vaccine, it will take them varying periods of time to "retool" to meet the revised producing standards. During the months immediately ahead we must be patient while our limited supply of vaccine is used first to help protect those who need it most.

Every parent and every child should be grateful to those scientists who have been working without rest and without relief during recent weeks to find answers to the problems that caused the delay. They have found these answers and another battle in the continuing fight against polio has been won.

DISTRIBUTION

Since April 12 the National Foundation for Infantile Paralysis has been furnishing free vaccine for children in the first and second grades, and for children in the third grade who participated in the field tests of vaccine last year. More than 5½ million children have been vaccinated—including 1 of my grandchildren, a first grader. This free vaccination program is the initial method for getting the vaccine to our children. No vaccine is now being distributed in any other way.

Sufficient vaccine to complete the foundation's program should be released within 60 days. Until it is finished all vaccine produced will go to the foundation.

The fact that some children do not get their second injection promptly will not reduce the effectiveness of the first injection. Dr. Salk, himself, stated last week that the level of immunity developed by the first injection would last many months.

DISTRIBUTION WHEN THE FOUNDATION PROGRAM IS COMPLETED

As soon as the foundation program is completed, distribution must continue to proceed in a fair and orderly manner. The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare presented to me 2 weeks ago a sound plan for the distribution of the vaccine. I promptly endorsed that plan and made it public.

Briefly the voluntary-control plan for distribution will work as follows:

1. Priorities: The vaccine must be used first for those most susceptible to polio. Not only is this just, but also by reducing the incidence of the disease among those most likely to get it we increase the protection for all of us. The National Advisory Committee on Poliomyelitis Vaccine and the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare have recommended that the vaccine be administered first to children of the ages of 5 to 9, inclusive.

I strongly endorse this recommendation and call upon our people to adhere strictly to the age 5 to 9 priority during the months ahead. No person not in the 5 to 9 age group should be vaccinated until the children of these age groups have received two vaccinations. The doctors of the country, through the American Medical Association, have pledged their support of these priorities.

The age group of second priority will be established and announced in due course.

2. Output of the manufacturers: Each of the manufacturers of the vaccine has individually agreed to distribute his entire output of vaccine in accordance with this overall plan adopted by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare on the recommendation of the National Advisory Committee.

3. Allocation to States: The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare will compile reports on the total output of the manufacturers and allocate the vaccine to each State on the basis of its population of unvaccinated children within the 5-through-9 age group, and subsequently for other age groups.

4. State responsibility: The States will advise the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare as to their general plans for distribution of the vaccine and, specifically, their shipping instructions for manufacturers. This information then will be transmitted to the manufacturers.

5. Vaccination programs: To assure that no child is denied vaccination by reason of its cost, some States and localities may operate mass free public vaccination programs for all children.

Other States may provide free vaccination only for children whose parents are unable to pay, through clinics, schools, and preschool programs, or by furnishing free vaccine to private physicians. In those States, a portion of the State allocation of vaccine will flow into normal drug-distribution channels for the exclusive use of children in the priority-age brackets—to be administered by family doctors.

To assist the States in providing free vaccinations, I have recommended that the Congress enact legislation making $28 million available to the States for the purchase of vaccine. This legislation is now being considered by the appropriate committees of the Congress and I urge its immediate adoption.

6. Keeping of records: Doctors, as well as all manufacturers and distributors of the vaccine, will keep records of the vaccine they handle. Cooperation to this end has been pledged by the doctors, the manufacturers and the distributors.

This plan for distribution of the vaccine can go into effect as soon as the free vaccination program of the National Foundation for Infantile Paralysis is completed. Under

it, the Federal Government will assume responsibility for the equitable allocation of the vaccine among the States, and the States will assume responsibility for the direction of distribution within their borders.

The program will operate in a sure and orderly way, given the full cooperation of the State officials, the manufacturers, the distributors, the medical profession, and the people of the Nation. I am confident that the program will receive that support.

For these reasons I do not believe that regulatory legislation in this field is necessary.

We all hope that the dread disease of poliomyelitis can be eradicated from our society. With the combined efforts of all, the Salk vaccine will be made available for our children in a manner in keeping with our highest traditions of cooperative national action.

AMENDMENT OF MUTUAL SECURITY ACT OF 1954

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 2090) to amend the Mutual Security Act of 1954, and for other purposes.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I rise to present to the Senate S. 2090, the Mutual Security Act of 1955. This is an original bill, reported from the committee. It is therefore subject to amendment as original text, and when I complete my discussion of the bill, it will be open to amendment.

This is one of the most important foreign policy items that will be before the Senate this session. In the critical days ahead, our action here will be of vital importance.

The pending bill has been favorably reported to the Senate by a committee vote of 13 to 2, following some 14 days of committee consideration. It recommends the authorization of a total of $3.408 billion for military, economic, and technical assistance for the fiscal year 1956. The committee report sets forth in detail, on page 2, the principal sums authorized by the legislation.

The four general types of assistance are as follows:

First. Military assistance funds, total, $2.5 billion. For the most part, this amount will cover the cost of supplying military items to friendly foreign nations. Included within this amount are sums for direct forces support—$317 million—and defense support—$1.0 billion used to buttress the economic strength of countries maintaining large military establishments.

I need not digress at this point, Mr. President, other than to say that the recipient countries are, so far as military establishments are concerned, South Korea, or the Republic of Korea, with some half million troops who are trained, and Formosa, with some four to five hundred thousand troops.

Second. Development assistance funds, total $165 million. They will be used to help underdeveloped countries in Asia, the Near East, and Latin America to purchase supplies and equipment. None of these countries receives military assistance.

Third. Technical cooperation funds, total $172 million. These sums are used primarily for training purposes. They are not used for the purchase of commodities and materials except in limited quantities for training purposes.

Fourth. Finally, there are special funds, totaling $475 million. These are for particular programs such as the Children's Fund, Palestine Refugees, Assistance to Berlin, the President's Fund for Asia, and other like funds.

I have given these figures, which will be found in detail in the committee report, so that they can be contrasted with our past foreign-aid programs. They deserve careful attention because they illustrate the changing nature of the programs.

When the Marshall plan was first inaugurated in 1948, it was exclusively an economic aid program for Europe. It was conceived as a 4-year operation to rebuild war-devastated Europe so that the people there could live in freedom. As I recollect, it was recommended in that program that some $17 billion be used, over a 4-year period, for Marshall aid. That purpose would have been accomplished by the 1952 deadline had the Communists seen fit to live at peace. But in the light of growing insecurity in the western world and the Communist attack on South Korea in June of 1950, it became apparent that renewed economic strength in Europe was not enough. It was necessary to buttress economic strength with military strength. This we proceeded to do.

The second phase of our foreign assistance program—the military-defensive phase in Europe—delayed the achievement of our economic goals. But I am able to report to you today that those economic goals have now been achieved, or substantially achieved. From a peak economic aid program of $3.5 billion in 1950, we have now reduced European economic aid to $95 million, most of which is to go for assistance to Berlin, Spain, and Yugoslavia. I can also report that our military assistance program to Western Europe has passed its peak. Of the $1.4 billion which this bill contains for straight military end-use items, less than half is for Western Europe, and much of that is for spare parts.

In recent years the third phase of our aid program has developed. It has involved increasing amounts of military assistance to free Asian countries, particularly South Korea and Nationalist China. But this year we are beginning to see that phase of our aid program leveling off.

We are now beginning the fourth phase—the phase which emphasizes technical and economic assistance to Asia, the Near East, and Latin America.

In the space of 7 years, Western Europe with our assistance has achieved virtually complete economic recovery from the aftermath of the war. We have assisted many of those nations which might have succumbed to communism riding to power on economic chaos. The record of the Marshall plan in Europe is the answer to those on this floor who repeated, year after year, that economic assistance to Europe was money wasted. It was not. It was assistance which helped build the foundations that today underlie a free Europe.

I think it is not remiss for us to pause a moment in our deliberations to pay our deep respect to Gen. George C. Marshall, the man who had the foresight and the faith to press ahead with a job that needed doing. At that time, it was not pleasant to propose to the American people that they reach down into their pockets to dig up money to send to Western Europe. But they did just that, with wide support from both sides of this aisle.

Now that the principal burden of economic assistance to Western Europe is over, the American people are asked to support an economic-type program in Asia. I believe the sums we now put to work to help Asia learn how free enterprise operates and how the power of free men can speed their economic growth and freedom, are eminently worth while.

If there are on this floor today any who would reduce the economic assistance funds in this bill—who would ask India, or Pakistan, or the Near Eastern countries, to look elsewhere for assistance in moving ahead hand in hand with the free nations—let them weigh the consequences. Every point of the arc of free Asia abuts the core of world communism. That arc of freedom will either hold communism within its present bounds or will absorb the doctrine of communism. I propose to do all I can to help keep those nations free and strong.

I wish it were not necessary to include military-assistance funds in this bill. But so long as we constantly face the threat of Communist use of military force, the free nations must be ready to defend themselves. Communist threats toward Formosa emphasize the good judgment of years past in providing military and economic assistance for Nationalist China. A weakening of resolution in Asia would be an open invitation to Communist penetration.

I do not propose here to give detailed information on the military-assistance program. Much of it, of course, is secret. The general outlines of the program are given in the committee report. I want to emphasize two things, however, about the military-assistance program.

First, this assistance is not given for any aggressive purpose. Nations receiving military aid are helped only because we believe their strengthened defense is essential to the security of the United States. Before any assistance is granted to any nation, it is required to agree to a number of provisions relating to supervision of the items received. But, most important of all, military assistance is made available, and I quote from the act:

> Solely to maintain the internal security and legitimate self-defense of the recipient nation, or to permit it to participate in the defense of its area or in collective-security arrangements and measures consistent with the Charter of the United Nations.

One reason I emphasize this point is because some questions have been raised about military assistance being given to certain of the Arab countries, whereas no military assistance has been given to Israel. Mr. Stassen was questioned directly on this point. He emphasized, and I quote him, that—

> We are not furnishing arms to any country that borders on Israel, nor to Israel. We are furnishing arms to the countries that are up against the Soviet.

Mr. Stassen then emphasized that it is United States policy "to endeavor to establish peace in the Near East."

The second point I must emphasize about military assistance is that these dollars are spent for the defense of the United States. Admiral Radford told the committee:

> We cannot be secure without our allies and they cannot be secure without us. It is clearly a case of interwoven self-interest. * * * The expenditures made for equipping and maintaining United States forces at strategic areas abroad are never called aid. Neither should essential expenditures which support these alliances and enable our allies to equip and maintain their own national forces in these same strategic areas be looked upon as aid. It would be more correct to label them defense-alliance expenditures, designed to safeguard in the most effective manner, and at times in the only possible way, the security of the United States and of the other free nations of the world.

Assistant Secretary of Defense Hensel remarked:

> A dollar abroad buys more front-line defense (for the United States) than a dollar spent at home.

If there are among us those who would drastically reduce these military assistance funds, they must assume the burden of proving that defenses of the United States would be stronger without foreign bases, without allies, and without foreign troops to fight at our side should necessity so dictate.

We must never forget that the principal purpose of the Soviet Union during the past 7 or 8 years has been to drive wedges of suspicion and distrust between us and our allies. If they let up temporarily in their drive for world domination it may be merely for the purpose of raising the hopes of the free world and then dashing them to the ground again. They will be back tomorrow trying to destroy our unity and our teamwork.

A case in point is the recent suggestion that Germany be neutralized. This is at once a seductive, dangerous, and unrealistic doctrine. It is seductive because it may have a wide appeal to many people who do not want Germany to become a strong military power again. It is dangerous because it would take the heart out of our western defense system. It is unrealistic because no nation with Germany's strategic location and potential power could long remain neutral.

Sometimes we Americans become impatient with our allies because they do not behave exactly as we would have them behave. Let us remember, however, that there are only about three types of foreign policies from which we can choose. We might choose isolationism, or, on the other extreme, we might even try to dominate the world as a dictator. The only other alternative is to build an alliance of equal partners jointly dedicated to the task of keeping the free world free. This is the course we have chosen.

That is exactly why our role of leadership in the world is so difficult. We do not want satellites. We are a part of an alliance of free and independent nations. In such an alliance honest differences of opinion are bound to arise, and such differences are played up by all the devices known to Communist propaganda.

That is precisely why we must not relax our efforts now. Largely because of our mutual aid program the Soviet policy of preventing European unification has collapsed. Now that we are in sight of our goal we cannot afford to heed the command to halt.

In consideration of the pending bill there were several matters that were of special concern to the committee. I shall touch upon them briefly.

Administration: First was the matter of administration.

It will be recalled that last year the Congress provided that the Foreign Operations Administration was to be terminated not later than June 30 of this year, and that the technical assistance program was to be administered by the Department of State.

Early this month, in conformity with the congressional act, the President issued an Executive order which abolished the Foreign Operations Administration. Matters relating to the furnishing of military items to foreign countries are to be transferred to the Department of Defense. Such functions of an economic nature that remain are for the most part to be administered by the Department of State.

These are good moves. These steps were taken because the Congress has felt that the continuation of an independent agency whose life depends on the continuation of aid programs was undesirable. There must never be a breath of possibility of suspicion that mutual assistance, whether it be economic, technical, or military in character, is justified for any other reason than that it promotes the national interest of the United States. There must be no possibility of such programs being planned to keep agencies alive. They must be rooted in the defense or the foreign policy interests of this Nation. Hereafter, they will be presented to the Congress by the regular departments of this Government charged not with responsibility for foreign aid as such, but charged instead with principal responsibility for the defense and the foreign policy of the United States.

In connection with the transfer of FOA functions to the Department of State and the Department of Defense, questions were raised about section 10 of the bill. That section provided for the termination prior to January 1, 1956, of the employment of any person above the grade of GS–9, notwithstanding the provisions of any other law except legislation with respect to veterans' preference. The argument in support of this position is set forth in a letter which I received from the Secretary of State.

In brief, the Secretary noted that a period of administrative chaos would ensue if in the process of transferring FOA functions and personnel to the State Department it were necessary to follow the normal civil service procedures in terminating employment. He noted that the technique of "bumping" meant that prolonged uncertainty of employment for large numbers of employees would be hard on morale.

The committee felt that waiver of the provisions of law would be equally disruptive of morale. It declined to accept the language proposed by the Executive. The committee version of section 10 provides that the President's authority to transfer or abolish functions of the FOA is to be administered in accordance with applicable laws and regulations relating to the civil service and veterans' preference.

Unobligated and unexpended balances: As is usual, questions were raised about the perennial problem of unexpended and unobligated balances. The argument was made that these funds are so excessive that Congress would be justified in slashing the requests for new funds.

Without going into great detail on this matter, I refer Members to the committee report which gives the figures on both unobligated and unexpended balances. Then let me emphasize that the figures related to unexpended balances are of interest solely because they indicate the quantities of goods and services which have been earmarked or ordered, but as yet are undelivered, and hence are not yet paid for. The unexpended balances will be large so long as we authorize substantial programs of items which take more than a year between the date of their being ordered and the date of their delivery.

That is true whether we are dealing with mutual security programs or national defense programs.

The unobligated figure is important because if this figure grows too large it indicates that funds have been appropriated for programs too large for the Executive to obligate during a year. But this year the unobligated figure is relatively small. The Department of Defense has estimated that by the end of the current fiscal year the unobligated and unreserved amount will be in the vicinity of $100 million. Other military assistance funds will either have been obligated in the form of definite contracts or will have been set aside by the Secretary of Defense as reserves to be used in the payment of goods which have been ordered through the services.

The committee took the assurances of the Executive that the unobligated figure by June 30 would be in the vicinity of $100 million. On the chance that there might be some variations in the estimates, the committee provided that any unobligated sums in excess of $200 million could not be carried over.

The President's fund for Asian development: One important request considered by the committee called for the authorization of $200 million of no-year funds for the President to use at his discretion to promote regional cooperation in Asia and to develop economic strength

in that area. Although the funds were to be allocated on a country by country basis, the idea behind the fund would be to use it on projects which would benefit not one country only, but several countries. Thus, one of the tentative projects would be to develop the Mekong River which is of potential value to Cambodia, Laos, and Thailand. Other projects would be concerned with improvement of fisheries, transportation, minerals, and communications in the region.

Members of the committee were concerned at the wide-open nature of the President's request, although we did approve in general the idea of seeking to encourage projects that would be of a regional as well as of a country by country value. We amended the proposed legislation in section 8 (k), to limit the availability of the funds authorized to 3 years, recognizing that projects of this nature must not be rushed, yet at the same time that a bad precedent would be established if they were to be made available without any limitation of time. The committee also amended this section to provide that the projects aided by this fund should, in part at least, be of the type which recipient countries would be willing to finance. Thus, 50 percent of the funds, or $100 million of the $200 million, are to be on a loan basis. The committee also tightened up the language relative to the breadth of the President's authority in making grants or loans of the funds.

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

Mr. GEORGE. I shall be through in a minute with this portion of my statement. Then I shall be glad to yield.

Mr. President, I want to emphasize the tremendous importance I attach to the assistance to be given to Asian countries. In recent weeks our eyes have been focused on Europe, but it is in Asia where there are vast areas and vast numbers of people with new, but tenuous, freedom. It is intensely important to the United States that these areas remain free and independent. The people of Asia want freedom and independence; they want recognition as first-class citizens; they want to develop their countries. These are concepts we recognize because they are so American in content. This bill will help to make clear that the United States makes common cause with these people as they struggle to retain their newly found freedom against the danger of Communist colonialism.

I now yield to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. Before I ask the question, I wish to commend the Senator from Georgia for the great statesmanship he evidenced in the committee in drafting the bill, particularly the work he did in connection with strengthening the bill in regard to the so-called loan provisions. The bill this year, in contrast with previous bills, has been greatly strengthened because of the greater stress it places on the loan provisions of the foreign-aid program. I am satisfied the bill would not have been strengthened in this respect had it not been for the leadership shown by the Senator from Georgia in the committee. He stressed the importance of the fact that, after all, we were trying to build up the economic productive power of the people of Asia by making available to them funds which can go into investments in their natural and other resources, so that they themselves may build up their own standards of living.

As the Senator knows, I put it in a little different language in arguing the importance of our exporting enlightened capitalism. What we must do is to export economic freedom of choice for the individual. I believe the Senator from Georgia is strengthening just that kind of export program in strengthening the loan program.

The question I rose to ask the Senator from Georgia is one I ask only for clarification of the record.

Is it not true that so far as Asiatic aid programs are concerned, all the funds are earmarked, except the $200 million which we make available to the President in the so-called emergency fund, but that even as to the $200 million, the final conclusion of the committee was that the President should be called upon to make a report every 6 months of the amounts expended?

Mr. GEORGE. The Senator from Oregon is correct. The existing law requires that the President report every 6 months as to the expenditure of any part of the money appropriated for this purpose. The committee recognized the validity and strength of the objections urged by the distinguished Senator from Oregon to a rather open-ended or blank-check grant to the President. But in this kind of an enterprise, if I may so describe it, in this kind of an adventure for the strengthening of the free peoples of the world and those who wish to become free, it is very difficult to give a strict bill of particulars. I think there was no difference in point of principle, but a difference in point of view, as to how far we could specify, by way of a rigid bill of particulars, the things which the President could or should undertake to do. But we did say to him, "The $200 million must be, at least to the extent of 50 percent, in the form of loans, and not more than 25 percent shall go to any one country in the Asian area. This fund also comes under the limitations of the general law, which is still left intact, obliging you to report every 6 months to the Congress, setting forth precisely and exactly what is done with the money entrusted to you for expenditure."

It is not altogether a satisfactory way, but in the circumstances, and in view of the fact that we are engaging now, and have been for the past several years since 1948, in an adventure in trying to aid the world to get back on its feet and to strengthen the free peoples and those who wish to be free, it is quite difficult to be more specific with a rather limited amount of money, though considerable within itself, as measured by the general background of the grants which this country has made during the past 8 years.

Mr. MORSE. I was going to mention to the Senator from Georgia that the limitation reads better in the committee report than it sounded in our discussions in committee. I think that when it came to writing some limitations upon the President in the committee report a remarkably fine job was done by the committee staff. I wish to compliment the staff of the committee for framing effective wording in placing checks upon the President, and still leaving the money subject to grant by the President. I think we have adopted limitations in the committee report as much as the matter can be tied down by language. I shall now support the limitations as written by the committee staff.

The second question which I wish to raise, and it is to emphasize what the Senator from Georgia has already said—emphasis which I think is needed, in view of some negative comments about our foreign-aid program—is this: Is it not true that in this year's foreign-aid bill a larger percentage of the aid money will go by way of loans than has been the case in any other previous foreign-aid bill?

Mr. GEORGE. Undoubtedly, that is true. I unquestionably think much of the aid money will be in the form of loans. It was the general sense of the committee that as large a percentage of it as is possible should be in the form of loans rather than of grants.

Mr. MORSE. May I say that I think that is probably true because of the assistance and attitude of the chairman in some of our committee discussions rather than for any other one reason?

Mr. GEORGE. I thank the Senator. I claim no credit for it. I have the profoundest conviction that the Asian people to whom we are directing our attention prefer this method. I have a profound conviction that it shakes the dignity of the Asian people to regard themselves as the recipients of alms.

Mr. MORSE. I should like to ask one more question. I may say that tomorrow for a few minutes I shall discuss the bill in its overall aspects, and will emphasize 1 or 2 points which I think need to be emphasized, concerning the matter of exporting enlightened capitalism, so-called. But there was some discussion in the committee concerning aid to India. I think there is some misconception about aid to India because of the fact that India has followed a neutral course of action in international affairs which has caused concern in the minds of some persons. There are those in this country, but, I think, very few, comparatively, who raise a question about aid to India. In the course of their arguments, they make two points on which I should like to have the Senator's comment.

First, that India is not asking for any funds; and, second, that if we grant any funds to India, they should be for the most part loan funds. Is it not true that we have not been making aid grants to India except upon the request and full cooperation of the officials of the Government of India?

Mr. GEORGE. That is quite true. We have not made them except upon the request and full cooperation of responsible officials of India.

Mr. MORSE. To put it very bluntly, we have not been ramming aid down their throats, but we have been willing to

negotiate with them on the basis of their own requests for funds?

Mr. GEORGE. The Senator is quite correct. That has been our attitude.

Mr. MORSE. Is it not true also that so far as India is concerned, in this particular bill we have stressed very much the loan provisions rather than the grant provisions, our feeling being that India must develop her own economy and must do so by way of investment based upon the loan principle?

Mr. GEORGE. The Senator is quite correct. Much of the assistance given by us to India has been in the form of loans. That has been not only our wish, but I am happy to say it has been in accord with the expressed desires of the Indian Government itself.

Mr. MORSE. I thank the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Georgia yield for a brief comment?

Mr. GEORGE. I shall be happy to yield to the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. WILEY. Apropos of the Senator's discussion of conditions in the Far East, it was my privilege recently to hear General Carlos Romulo in Milwaukee make one of the greatest speeches I have ever heard. He said that when he went to the Bandung Conference, he went with fear, with doubt, and with trepidation. He said he did not know what was going to happen; he thought that perhaps Africa and Asia were going to join. He said, "I came back exalted. I heard representatives of those nations quote the language of our Declaration of Independence, quote from the Magna Carta, and from the Gettysburg Address. In fact, they said nothing of ill against the United States. Their representatives were representing the ferment of great ideas."

Because of his forceful and logical way of expressing himself, he strengthened me in my resolve that here was an opportunity for us to add to the ferment which he said was there. It was not a ferment of communism, but of liberty, of courage.

He stated that Mao Tse-tung came prepared with a speech, but he could not deliver it until he had had time to rewrite it. Apparently he had come with the idea that the opportunity to unite Asia and Africa was at hand, but instead of that Asia and Africa expressed themselves as being in thought and in act one with the West. To me it was a great moment, listening to a little man, physically, but a man with a big soul and a great purpose. To my mind he showed that we were presented another opportunity, such as we had in Europe, to administer to people who were reaching out for freedom and for spiritual insight, and, as General Romulo said, were expressing their faith in God. They repeatedly spoke of God, a name which the Communists never used, and never expected to use.

I thought this might be apropos a certain remark which the Senator from Georgia made to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Georgia yield?

Mr. GEORGE. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. I am certain the Senator from Wisconsin did not mean to refer to Mao Tse-tung; he meant Chou En-lai, did he not?

Mr. WILEY. Yes.

Mr. BARKLEY. Chou En-lai was the man who went to the conference with a speech he could not deliver. Mao Tse-tung was not there.

Mr. WILEY. It was the representative of Communist China. He made it very clear that he had been taken aback. He had intended to take over the conference; instead, the other nations took it over and presented the ideas of free men, men of courage, who were representing freedom in Asia.

I thank the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. POTTER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Georgia yield for a question?

Mr. GEORGE. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. POTTER. I note in the committee report that the 30-percent requirement for development assistance on a loan basis has been eliminated. Will the distinguished Senator comment on the reason for eliminating that provision?

Mr. GEORGE. I shall be very glad to do so. Some members of the committee thought it unwise to eliminate the provision; other members, the majority of them, believed it to be wise, in light of the fact that the committee was assured that of all the funds authorized and appropriated for the current fiscal year, more than 30 percent had been distributed on a loan basis, rather than as grants.

It was said by the administrators of the fund, by the responsible officials, that the amount of loans probably would run in the neighborhood of 40 percent. They would feel a little restrained if the 30-percent provision remained in the act, because they wished to go more and more to loans. They thought that other countries, which might make applications for various kinds of aid and assistance, would be constantly reminding them of the situation. In effect, the officials said that while they would be bound to expend only 30 percent by way of loans, they would feel free to go much beyond 30 percent, if they had leeway.

When the committee considered the special fund of the President, we provided that the President himself must expend on a loan basis at least 50 percent of the entire $200 million; but the 30-percent requirement in regard to development assistance was eliminated because of the assurance given the committee by the administrators that not only had they exceeded 30 percent this year, but that they probably could and would be somewhat freer to go beyond 30 percent if no specific requirement were actually written into the law. Otherwise, they felt they would be bound by the 30-percent provision in the administration of the 1956 appropriation.

Mr. POTTER. Was it the judgment of the committee that if the 30 percent provision were left in the bill, it would serve more as a maximum rather than as a minimum requirement?

Mr. GEORGE. Exactly. The Senator from Michigan has precisely stated the fact. That was the view taken, not by all the committee, I may say, but, finally, by a majority. We felt justified in our action in view of the showing made to us.

Mr. POTTER. The Senator from Georgia has had vast experience in this particular field. Is it his opinion that there has been a tendency, through the granting of direct aid, for certain recipient countries to feel that the United States assumes a more or less paternalistic attitude, rather than a partnership relationship which would exist if the grants were made as loans rather than as gifts?

Mr. GEORGE. I think the Senator from Michigan has stated the situation better than I could. I read from the report of the committee, page 22:

> The committee's objective in rejecting the 30-percent loan requirement is to facilitate the use of an even greater percentage of the funds available in the form of loans. The committee attaches great importance to the maximum possible use of loans, and strongly urges the executive branch to move in this direction as rapidly as practicable.

That, I think, was the unanimous judgment of the committee.

Mr. POTTER. Did the Senator's committee receive any testimony as to the amount of funds which have been designated for development and assistance purposes which cannot be granted on a loan basis? I am thinking now about the funds which would be used in Berlin. Is it likely that it might not be desirable to grant such funds on a loan basis?

Mr. GEORGE. That is quite true. Those funds could not be granted on a loan basis.

Mr. POTTER. I am wondering if the Senator from Georgia can give examples similar to the Berlin situation, in which it would not be practicable to allocate funds on a loan basis, but where it would be desirable to give them on a grant basis.

Mr. GEORGE. I am unable to give the Senator specific illustrations; but again and again it was emphasized to the committee that in order to sustain the economy of the countries with whom we were seeking close relations, and with whom we desired a friendly relationship, it was often necessary to assist somewhat on the economic side in the doing of those things which tend to strengthen the general economy of those countries, so as to make them more capable of resisting aggression and of cooperating with the United States in the event of an aggressive action in which we should become involved.

Mr. POTTER. Is it not true that the Soviet Union, when it takes any so-called steps for economic development in other countries, does so on a loan basis rather than on a grant basis?

Mr. GEORGE. So far as I know, that is true.

Mr. POTTER. Has the Committee on Foreign Relations given thought to the possibility of allowing the administrator or the President to negotiate loans, or even of allowing the administrator to waive for a number of years the repayment of interest, whether it be repayment in cash, foreign currency, or goods, but, nevertheless, to negotiate a loan

contract rather than to make an outright grant?

Mr. GEORGE. That has been constantly the mind of the members of the committee. The committee as a whole wishes to move in that direction. We would be happy, indeed, if we could say that all aid and assistance should be given on a loan basis rather than as a grant.

But there is some reason for leaving the question somewhat open, or at least leaving it to the discretion of the administrator or the President himself, to whom the appropriation is made, rather than to adopt a rigid program of strictly all loans.

Mr. POTTER. I recognize that each country's situation would differ in that respect. The question in my mind has been the psychological effect upon the recipient countries. I think that many times the United States has not received the full effect of the money which has been given to the recipient countries, because of the fact that there has been a "rich uncle" philosophy on the basis of a money handout, rather than on a partnership basis, in which an agreement is entered into, even though payment is not expected by us for some time. Nevertheless they will feel they are partners in the relationship rather than dependents in a paternalistic program. That is a question with which I have been much concerned.

Mr. GEORGE. I am sure the Senator's concern has been shared by members of the Committee on Foreign Relations. Nothing is more deplorable than the "rich uncle" or "big brother" attitude. It is an attitude wholly unbecoming the United States of America, and ought to be discarded and completely thrown aside in our dealings with other peoples of the world.

I may say to the Senator that attention was called to a situation in which a country would be wholly unable to negotiate a loan adequate to meet its actual necessities, such as making arrangements to defend itself, or putting itself in a defensive posture, or arming itself. In such a situation putting the aid on a loan basis would prove to be inadequate. In circumstances of that kind it was the opinion of the administrators and the President that there should be some flexibility to enable those in charge of the program to make a grant rather than insist on a completely outright loan.

Mr. POTTER. Mr. President, if the distinguished Senator will yield for one further question, I should like to say that I note that $50 million will go to India for economic development. I well recall when this Government supplied India with wheat. I believe India asked for the wheat on a loan basis, but we gave them the wheat. I know that the Soviet Union has granted some money for the development of India, although very little, but it has been granted on a loan basis. India has great resources. It is true that at this time they are undeveloped to a great extent. But, with the vast resources India has, I am wondering if it would not be better, in improving our relationship with that great country, to put the $50 million to be spent on economic development on a loan basis, rather than on a grant basis.

Mr. GEORGE. I may say to the Senator from Michigan that, for the most part, India wants any aid extended to be placed on a loan basis.

Mr. POTTER. I would assume it would.

Mr. GEORGE. I think the total which would go to India under the bill would be about $85 million. I am not speaking exactly, but, in round numbers, I am in the neighborhood of the accurate figure. Some of that money would be for purely technical assistance. That is aside from some money to be used which could not be placed on a loan basis. However, the economic aid that will go to India, out of the total of $85 million, is contemplated as largely a loan rather than as a gift.

Mr. POTTER. I am reassured to hear that statement from the Senator.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Georgia yield?

Mr. GEORGE. I yield to the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. BARKLEY. I wish merely to comment on the colloquy between the Senator from Michigan and the Senator from Georgia in regard to the nature of our cooperation with other nations.

The bill is based upon mutuality; it is not based on charity. We do not thereby establish the United States or the Congress as an eleemosynary institution. We have recognized—and I think the change in the name symbolizes the change in attitude—that the program is mutual. We are seeking by this aid, whether it be by loan or grant, to create such a situation that the nations which are the beneficiaries of mutual assistance, whether by grant or loan, will protect our interest, while we are helping them to protect themselves, so long as they are free and are in the family of free nations.

The committee recognized that there might be some countries as to which we might be prone to furnish military aid. If we did not furnish economic aid also, we might find ourselves in a situation where there would be opposite currents. We would be helping a certain nation in a military way, and yet its economic system might collapse, and we would find that our military aid would have been of no real help for the reason that, because of its economic situation, the country might have become a victim of Communist aggression, whether by military or economic means.

Therefore, while we have sought in the bill to bring about both military and economic aid for those countries which need both, we have recognized that one is almost dependent on the other, because it would be foolish for us to send military aid to a country whose economy might collapse and which would become a victim of the Communists. We would find we would be working in a vacuum.

I ask the Senator from Georgia if that is not a fair statement of the committee's feeling about the problem.

Mr. GEORGE. I think so. I thank the Senator for his statement.

Mr. BARKLEY. While we have emphasized the necessity and desirability of loans, we have recognized also that there are situations in some countries which make loans impractical. If we allocate the funds altogether on a loan basis, the arrangement might deprive itself of that mutuality which we recognize is in our interest as well as that of the other nations.

Mr. GEORGE. I think the Senator is correct. I, myself, have tried to say the same thing, Mr. President, but I have done so not so well as has the distinguished Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. BARKLEY. The Senator from Georgia is overly modest, I am afraid.

Mr. GEORGE. I may say to the Senator from Michigan that of the $85 million for India, about $30 million will be for food. Our surplus agricultural commodities will be utilized. India's attitude is to pay us for the food as well as for any other assistance, except strictly technical assistance or point 4 aid. I think India should certainly pay for the greater part of the development assistance which will be received by her under the bill, if she desires aid.

Mr. POTTER. If the distinguished Senator from Georgia will yield further, I should like to state to the distinguished Senator from Kentucky that it was not the position of the Senator from Michigan to question the necessity for economic assistance. My question was related to the best value we could receive for the funds we send to other nations, whether they are on a loan or a grant basis. I believe that there would be a much greater psychological effect of partnership if the granting of money, whether it be between countries or individuals, is on a contractual loan basis, even though it might not be a good business loan. We might allow the administrator to be very flexible, to waive interest payments, if interest is provided for, or waive repayment, whether it be in cash, in foreign currency, or in kind, so that there would be a contractual relationship between parties, rather than, as I call it, a paternalistic influence of the wealthy giving something to the poor, needy neighbor. That was the very question to which I addressed myself. I wish to thank the distinguished chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee for his valuable advice in this field.

Mr. GEORGE. I thank the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. President, I have almost finished my statement on the bill, and I should like to finish it now.

Proposals to cut the authorization: Finally, Mr. President, proposals were made in the committee by some distinguished members to reduce the amount requested by the President for the program this year. The committee gave most careful attention to these proposals and rejected them.

This is no time for us to begin to trim a little here and a little there. I have seldom appeared on the floor of the Senate to oppose reductions in Federal expenditures on psychological grounds. But if I may say to my colleagues that if even a few dollars could be squeezed out of this bill here and there, I would oppose those cuts because of the impact such action would have on our foreign policy position at this critical time.

The foreign-aid programs of this Government which began soon after World War II were based on the proposition that results could not be expected overnight. The free world could be strengthened only gradually. And once strengthened, the military and economic strength would be recognized and respected by the Soviet Union only over a period of time.

I would not be so optimistic as to say that the future is bright. But it is true that within the past few weeks we have seen what might be construed as some lightening of the shadow that communism has cast over the free world. I am not ready to ascribe definitive reasons for the relaxation of tensions that has been felt in recent weeks.

We have known for a long time that if tension in the world was to be reduced, it could be done only at its source. The source of tension has been the constant post-war threat of communism to move either openly or underground to curtail the liberties of free men.

There may be some ulterior motive now in Soviet action. But it is also possible, and even likely, that our aid programs to the free world are now beginning to show positive results—not only in the free world, but behind the Iron Curtain, as well.

So long as there is a possibility that this program is beginning to pay off, we cannot risk the consequences of complacency. That would be the one sure way to invite the Communists to revert to the technique of on-again-off-again aggression.

We are now committed to explore Soviet intentions at the highest levels. Exploration is at best a dangerous operation. While I am optimistic, and in no sense am a defeatist, yet I realize that we may meet with discouraging results. In any event, I do not want the President of the United States to go into that meeting weakened by hasty and perhaps ill-advised action which we might take on this floor. It is of vital importance to the future of this Nation that he be unimpeded by any indication that the American people and their representatives in Congress do not back one hundred percent the substantial tokens of freedom represented by this bill.

In the history of every nation, there are occasions when it is as important to be united in peace as it is to be united in war. In this mid-century year of 1955, unity in support of the President—not because of his party affiliations—as he enters upon these crucial negotiations is highly essential. I hope very much the Senate will approve the recommendations of the Foreign Relations Committee.

Mr. President, in closing, I may say in that connection, that the high peak of the foreign-aid requests of Congress was in the Presidential message of 1951, for the fiscal year 1952. The total then requested was $8,500,000,000, which consisted of $6,300,000,000 for MDA and $2,200,000,000 for economic assistance. The total appropriations, based upon that request—as the appropriations were recommended by the Appropriations Committees—were $7,300,000,000.

Mr. President, we have traveled slowly; but we have come a long way, because the request as we make it today is for an authorization of less than half the amount actually appropriated for the fiscal year 1952.

I wish it were possible for us to make no more appropriations for foreign aid. However, I do not see how that is possible at this time. For my own part, I would rather take the chances of going along the road which our party, as represented by the Members on this side of the aisle, and the other party, as represented by the Members on the other side of the aisle, have followed. We have followed in the face of considerable criticism; but we have followed it with a good deal of faith and courage. And, Mr. President, courage, according to my interpretation of it, is nothing but faith in action.

So I hope the Senate will approve the recommendations we here make for these appropriation authorizations, and not to exceed the several amounts specified, leaving it in the hands of the Appropriations Committee to determine what shall be the precise amounts within that limitation.

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

Mr. GEORGE. I am glad to yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. First I wish to congratulate the Senator from Georgia, in his individual capacity, and as chairman of this great committee, for the very constructive way in which he has guided this proposed legislation and the broad-minded and realistic comments which he has made upon the pending bill.

I believe that one of the crucial tests of the American people in the years to come will be whether or not they have the fortitude and patience to ride out the storm until, ultimately, world peace will be brought about, on the basis of mutual recognition of the rights of all peoples in their respective countries. We all know that there is not a foot of land or any right to which any other nation or any other people is entitled that we wish to take away from them. All we have sought to do in the past 10 years, and all we seek to do now, is to preserve our own interests, our own rights, our own freedoms, and our way of life, and to help those who join with us in such preservation in preserving their own way of life, so that ultimately the free world, by its example and precepts, may convince the slave world, if there is such, and we feel that there is, of the superiority of our way of life and our institutions, and may stimulate other peoples to emulate our example.

We know that it has been the boast of those who are now and have been for 10 years seeking to destroy liberty that they have patience, that time means nothing to them, and that if they move in one place and fail, they will move out, and move in somewhere else.

The Senator has eloquently stated that there now seems to be a break in the clouds. However, we never can tell when the clouds may again be consolidated for the downpour which the world has been fearing ever since the end of World War II.

Therefore, while there has been more than a 50-percent reduction in the past 10 years in the amount of foreign aid, is it not wise for our own people to steel themselves against the possibility of a long siege? They should not become weak, overconfident, or overoptimistic, until there is a solidification, to some extent, of world recognition of the right of every country and every people to live its own life, and not have its life and its way, its methods, destroyed by outside aggression, either through military or psychological means. There seems to be a slight break in the clouds. It may be altogether temporary. If we weaken our forces and yield to the temptation to let our guard down, we may find ourselves in a predicament which will be infinitely worse, more expensive, and more burdensome than the appropriation of every dollar recommended in the pending bill. It seems to me that we cannot afford to let our guard down until the time comes when we can feel more certain than we now do of the ultimate results of our cooperative efforts.

Mr. GEORGE. I think the Senator is unquestionably correct. I have never thought otherwise. Although there may be some hopeful portents and promises, there are no present circumstances in the world which would justify any degree of complacency upon our part, or any relaxation of our efforts to reach the goal which may be dimly in sight.

Mr. BARKLEY. Therefore it is the duty of those of us who here temporarily represent the people and speak for them to be realistic with them and with ourselves, and not delude the people into the false hope that because of some temporary situation we can permanently let our guard down and be unaware of the possibilities of danger around the corner.

Mr. GEORGE. I think the Senator is entirely correct.

Let me make one observation, which applies to everything I have ever stood for in public life. I have always been conscious of the fact that my people, those who look directly to me, do not expect me to be free from error. They do not expect a perfect man. They do not expect perfect judgment or perfect decisions. However, they do expect me to be honest. The American people expect the American Senate now, in this midcentury of time, to be honest; and, if Senators are honest, they can give no assurance except that, for the time being, we must keep our hands to the plow.

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

Mr. GEORGE. I yield.

Mr. WILEY. I have listened with profit, as I always do, to the remarks of the distinguished Senator from Georgia. I wish to join in complimenting him for his statesmanship, and for seeing what I think are the facts of life in the world today.

I have just returned from my own State. I am frank to say that there is much to be said in favor of giving the people the world facts which they should know. I should like to ask the Senator from Georgia several questions of a general nature.

We have been talking about giving away money or lending money. As a matter of fact, is it not true that every dollar contemplated by the pending bill represents an impact upon the economy

of this country, so that the production of the goods which we sell will bring about the creation of new jobs?

Mr. GEORGE. I estimate that at least 75 percent of every dollar we appropriate never leaves our shores. It stays here. The other 25 percent comes back within the course of a very few months.

Mr. WILEY. It comes back in the process of buying what we produce here.

Mr. GEORGE. Beyond any doubt.

By this bill we are increasing the $350 million earmarked for surplus agricultural products last year to $600 million for 2 years, which will be paid for out of the dollars appropriated in the pending bill.

Mr. WILEY. The Senator has anticipated my next question, which is whether or not the effect of providing this credit is an easing of the pressure created by built-up surpluses of goods of which we have an overproduction. I refer to agricultural products, as well as others.

Mr. GEORGE. I have tried to say precisely that I do not agree that we have an overproduction. I think we simply have a lack of wide distribution of the products and bounties of nature which a kindly Providence has given us.

Mr. WILEY. I agree with that analysis. We use the expression rather loosely. We have built up surpluses. In that connection, I observe that there are 400 million children in the world who need the milk we produce. It is a question of distribution, and how to solve that problem. It is not a problem of lessening production, but a problem of distribution.

Mr. President, I expect to speak on this subject tomorrow.

FAMILY COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Order No. 387, S. 1289. The distinguished senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] is on the floor and I should like to have him give a brief explanation of the bill.

Mr. POTTER. Mr. President, I assume that the bill has been cleared with the minority members of the committee and with the minority leader. Am I correct?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I assure the Senator that that has been done.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will state the bill by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 1289) to establish a family court in and for the District of Columbia.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Texas?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on the District of Columbia with an amendment, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That there is hereby created in the Municipal Court for the District of Columbia a Domestic Relations Branch.

SEC. 2. Definitions: As used in this act—

(a) "Branch" and "Domestic Relations Branch" mean the Domestic Relations Branch of the Municipal Court for the District of Columbia created by this act;

(b) "Court" means the Municipal Court for the District of Columbia and the several judges thereof.

SEC. 3. (a) Additional judges: The first section of the act entitled "An act to authorize the appointment of three additional judges of the municipal court for the District of Columbia and to prescribe the qualifications of appointees to the municipal court and the municipal court of appeals, and for other purposes," approved October 25, 1949 (63 Stat. 887), is hereby amended by striking therefrom "thirteen" and inserting in lieu thereof "fifteen."

(b) One or more judges of the municipal court shall serve in said branch for such periods and in such order of rotation as the judges of the court may determine.

SEC. 4. The court shall have authority to appoint a commissioner or commissioners to assist the judges sitting in the branch. In accordance with rules adopted by the court, such commissioner or commissioners may investigate facts and file for the consideration of the judges in the branch a report setting forth the information obtained by such investigation: *Provided*, That the right to examine, and file exceptions to any such report, shall be reserved to each interested party or his attorney.

SEC. 5. Jurisdiction of domestic relations branch: The Domestic Relations Branch and each judge sitting therein shall have exclusive jurisdiction over all actions for divorce from the bond of marriage and legal separation from bed and board, including proceedings incidental to such actions for alimony, pendente lite and permanent, and for support and custody of minor children; applications for revocation of divorce from bed and board; civil actions to enforce support of minor children; civil actions to enforce support of wife; actions seeking custody of minor children; actions to declare marriages void; actions to declare marriages valid; actions for annulments of marriage; and proceedings in adoption.

SEC. 6. (a) Domestic Relations Branch vested with power to effectuate purposes of act: The Domestic Relations Branch is hereby vested with so much of the power as is now vested in the United States District Court for the District of Columbia, whether in law or in equity, as is necessary to effectuate the purposes of this act, including but not limited to, the power to issue restraining orders, injunctions, writs of habeas corpus, and ne exeat, and all other writs, orders, and decrees.

(b) The Domestic Relations Branch shall have the same power to enforce and execute judgments, orders, and decrees entered by it as is now vested in the United States District Court for the District of Columbia. Judgments of the branch shall have the same legal status as liens upon real estate as judgments of the United States District Court for the District of Columbia.

SEC. 7. (a) Amendments of statutes: Section 963 of the act approved March 3, 1901 (31 Stat. 1345, ch. 845), as amended by the act approved June 21, 1949 (63 Stat. 215, ch. 233; sec. 16–416, D. C. Code, 1951 edition), is amended by striking therefrom "United States District Court for the District of Columbia", and inserting in lieu thereof "Domestic Relations Branch of the Municipal Court for the District of Columbia."

(b) Subsection (a) of section 3, and section 113 of the act entitled "An act to prescribe and regulate the procedure for adoption in the District of Columbia", approved June 8, 1954 (68 Stat. 241), is amended by striking therefrom "United States District" and inserting in lieu thereof "Domestic Relations Branch of the Municipal."

(c) Section 6 of the act entitled "An act to regulate the placing of children in family homes, and for other purposes", approved April 22, 1944 (58 Stat. 194, as amended, is amended (1) by striking "Office of the Clerk of the District Court of the United States for the District of Columbia" and by striking "Office of the Clerk of the United States District Court for the District of Columbia", and by inserting in lieu of each such phrase "Office of the Clerk of the Municipal Court for the District of Columbia", and (2) by striking "justice of said court" and inserting in lieu thereof "judge sitting in the domestic relations branch of said court."

SEC. 8. Docket: A separate docket shall be maintained for the Domestic Relations Branch. There shall be recorded in such docket the actions taken at each stage of each action and proceeding instituted or conducted in the branch.

SEC. 9. Process: Service of process for the Domestic Relations Branch shall be made by the United States marshal for the District of Columbia or by any of his authorized assistants or in such other manner as the court may by rule prescribe. Service of process for the Domestic Relations Branch may also be had by publication in the same manner as service of process is had by publication for the United States District Court for the District of Columbia.

SEC. 10. (a) Pending cases and files transferred to domestic relations branch: All cases which, on the effective date of this section, are pending in the United States District Court for the District of Columbia and are within the jurisdiction of the Domestic Relations Branch, together with all files, papers, documents, and records in the custody of the United States District Court for the District of Columbia relating to such pending cases shall be transferred to the Domestic Relations Branch.

(b) The United States District Court for the District of Columbia shall, on and after the effective date of this section and upon request of any judge sitting in the Domestic Relations Branch, transfer to such branch the files, papers, documents, and records relating to any case in which final judgment has been entered in respect to divorce from the bond of marriage; legal separation from bed and board; revocation of divorce from bed and board; enforcement of support of minor children or wife; actions for custody of minor children; voiding or validating of marriages; annulment of marriage; or adoption, whether or not any such case has been reopened prior to the effective date of this section.

(c) All judgments, orders, processes, directions, and proceedings entered in any pending or reopened case transferred to the Domestic Relations Branch pursuant to this act shall be continued and proceeded with, and may be modified, enforced, and executed with the same force and effect as if proceeded with in the United States District Court for the District of Columbia; and no such action or proceeding shall abate or be in anywise affected by the enactment of this act.

SEC. 11. Rules: The court shall by rules prescribe the fees, charges, and costs and the forms of process, writs, pleadings, and motions, and the practice and procedure in actions and proceedings in the Domestic Relations Branch. Such rules shall neither abridge, enlarge, nor modify the substantive rights of any litigant. Except as otherwise specifically provided by such rules, the applicable Federal Rules of Civil Procedure shall govern in the branch.

SEC. 12. Appeals: Any party aggrieved by any final or interlocutory order or judgment entered in the Domestic Relations Branch shall have the same right of appeal available in respect to any final or interlocutory order or judgment entered in the civil branch of the court.

SEC. 13. Sessions: The Domestic Relations Branch, with at least one judge in attend-

ance, shall be open for the transaction of business every day of the year except Saturday afternoons, Sundays, and legal holidays, and, if deemed necessary, may also hold night sessions.

SEC. 14. Jurisdiction of juvenile court not affected: Nothing contained in this act shall be construed so as to affect or diminish the jurisdiction of the Juvenile Court of the District of Columbia, or any judge presiding therein.

SEC. 15. Appropriations authorized: Appropriations for expenses necessary for the operation of the Domestic Relations Branch, including personal services are hereby authorized.

SEC. 16. Effective dates: This act, except sections 5, 6, 7, and 10, shall take effect upon its approval. Sections 5, 6, 7, and 10 shall take effect 30 days after the appointment and qualification of the two additional judges authorized by this act to be appointed to the court.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, this bill comes to the floor with the unanimous report of the Committee on the District of Columbia.

The purpose of the bill, as amended, is to establish a domestic relations branch in the municipal court for the District of Columbia. Jurisdiction over all actions for divorce from the bond of marriage and legal separation from bed and board, including proceedings incidental to such actions, for alimony, pendente lite and permanent, and for support and custody of minor children; applications for revocation of divorce from bed and board; civil actions to enforce support of minor children; civil actions to enforce support of wife; actions seeking custody of minor children; actions to declare marriages void; actions to declare marriages valid; actions for annulments of marriage; and proceedings in adoption, would be transferred from the United States District Court for the District of Columbia, to the municipal court.

The bill also authorizes the appointment of two additional judges to the municipal court. These judges would rotate in the domestic relations branch along with the other judges of the court.

The court is given authority to appoint commissioners to assist the judges sitting in the new branch for the purpose of investigating facts and reporting thereon, with a proviso that the right to examine and file exceptions to such commissioner's reports shall be reserved to each interested party or his attorney.

The domestic relations branch shall maintain a separate docket, and service of process shall be made by the United States marshal, or in such other manner as the court shall by rule prescribe.

The bill further provides for the transfer of pending cases and files pertaining to domestic relations matters, to the Domestic Relations Branch.

Provision is made for the same right of appeal as is presently available in the civil branch of the court, and specifically states that the jurisdiction of the Juvenile Court will not be affected or diminished by the provisions of the bill.

It is estimated that the cost of the proposed branch, including the appointment of two additional judges, would amount to $121,580 annually.

I may say at this time that it is the view of the committee that we should try this procedure for a time and then consider anew other recommendations—which the committee rejected—which sought to establish a so-called family relations court as such. It was the opinion of the committee that this bill would accomplish the maximum good that was sought by the various organizations which wanted to take away from the United States District Court jurisdiction over domestic relations matters. The committee is of the unanimous opinion that such jurisdiction should be taken away from the District Court; and we are satisfied that putting it in the municipal court will establish a system which will meet the domestic relations needs of the District of Columbia.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended, so as to read: "A bill to establish a Domestic Relations Branch in the Municipal Court for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes."

THE AMERICAN NATIONAL RED CROSS

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I rise to pay a tribute to the American Red Cross. When disaster strikes our Nation, we are fortunate to have an agency which is not only immediately available, but is prepared to act.

Last week communities in Kansas and Oklahoma suffered tragic losses of both life and property from a devastating tornado which struck Blackwell, in Kay County, Okla., about 10 p. m. on May 25, where at least 19 persons were killed and over 200 injured. More than 100 were seriously injured and hospitalized.

The storm proceeded into Kansas and struck Udall, a small town with a population of 600, in Cowley County, Kans. Here the storm was most devastating, and every house and business building in the city was either destroyed or sustained major damage. Seventy-six persons lost their lives, 275 were injured, with 200 being hospitalized.

The Red Cross chapters in the devastated areas were quickly mobilized, and it was only a matter of hours until teams of doctors, nurses, and many volunteers were sent to meet the emergency needs of the disaster victims.

The Red Cross is now carrying on a program of caring for the homeless and making preparations for the rehabilitation of the people and the reconstruction of the devastated communities.

I take this opportunity to pay a tribute to the Red Cross for organizing the relief and rehabilitation work in these communities. I also want to mention the splendid work done by the volunteer organizations and citizens generally in the surrounding territory in assisting those who suffered so seriously in the storm.

This disaster has again given citizens of our State, and especially of the surrounding territory, an opportunity to demonstrate their neighborliness and their interest in those who must endure suffering and loss.

I ask unanimous consent that the report that I have received from Mr. R. T. Schaeffer, national director of the disaster services of the American National Red Cross, be printed in the RECORD as a part of these remarks.

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

MAY 26, 1955.

Subject: Oklahoma, Kansas tornadoes DR 786.

To: Mr. John C. Wilson.

From: R. T. Schaeffer.

Beginning late in the evening Wednesday, May 25, a series of tornadoes struck glancing blows at four counties in the Oklahoma Panhandle. Damage was relatively light in Leedey, Dewey County, the rural areas in Woodward, and Ellis Counties. Heavier damage, however, was sustained in the community of Cheyenne in Roger Mills County where 2 persons were killed, 1 injured and hospitalized, 18 houses destroyed, and 12 damaged. All of the tornado-conscious chapters went into immediate action, but fortunately the emergency needs of the families were very minor. One Red Cross field representative has been assigned to assist the chapters in the estimated rehabilitation for the five families.

As the storm moved in a northeasterly direction it gained in intensity and at approximately 10 p. m., tornadic winds lashed Blackwell in Kay County, Okla. The midwestern area office in St. Louis reports that at least 19 persons were killed in Blackwell, and over 200 injured with 100 of the more seriously injured being hospitalized. Latest reports from survey teams on property damage show that the twister flattened the homes in a 24-square block area and damaged others in a fringe area of approximately 50 square blocks. With the count incomplete it is estimated that 100 houses were destroyed and at least 200 damaged.

The next victim of this vicious storm was Udall, Cowley County, Kans., with a population of 600. Reports from that community show that every house and business building were either destroyed or sustained major damage. At 4 p. m. today there were 76 known dead, 275 injured with 200 of the victims hospitalized in five different hospitals within the area. It is estimated that at least 170 houses have been destroyed, with the survey still incomplete.

Red Cross chapters in the devastated areas quickly mobilized first aid teams, doctors, nurses, and many volunteeers to meet emergency needs of the disaster victims. First-aid stations were set up in churches, the armory and other buildings in Blackwell, Okla., where many of the injured were given first-aid treatment.

Two shelters and feeding centers have also been established. A mobile canteen manned by volunteers from the Oklahoma City Chapter arrived in Blackwell at dawn this morning to provide canteen service to victims and rescue workers.

Winfield, Kans., nearby headquarters for the community of Udall became the center of relief activities. A shelter and feeding center was established in the armory for the survivors of the tornadic winds. Doctors and nurses from Wichita and other nearby communities rushed to Winfield and Arkansas City where many of the injured were taken.

The Sedgwick County Red Cross Chapter at Wichita dispatched a mobile canteen into Udall along with a disaster rescue unit. The McConnell Aircraft Co. gave invaluable assistance by sending in 2 teams of doctors with 2 ambulances, 2 first-aid teams and a supply of cots and blankets.

The Wichita, Kans., blood center exhausted its supply of blood for victims during the night, and an early morning public appeal brought a block long line of donors to replenish the supply for growing needs. The Red Cross Blood Center at St. Louis sent an emergency shipment of 90 units of blood by police escort to the airport where civilian air patrol planes transported the blood to Wichita to cover immediate needs.

Members of the field staff of the national organization were rushed to the devastated areas to assist local Red Cross chapters.

Dr. Raymond Burnes, Medical Director, and Tom Desmond, Director of Disaster Services for the Midwestern Area, left St. Louis early this morning to assume direction of Red Cross disaster relief activities. In addition to Dr. Barnes and Mr. Desmond, 48 staff members of the national organization including 16 nurses are now either in the affected area or en route.

General headquarters for the two State area is being established at Arkansas City, Kans. with Mr. Desmond in charge. Subarea offices have been established in Udall, Kans. with Mr. Cecil Davis, Director of Disaster Services, Pacific Area in charge and in Blackwell, Okla. with Mr. Ed Brandhorst, Assistant Director, Disaster Services, Midwestern Area heading up relief operations in Kay County.

Reports from the field indicate that there has been excellent coordination and cooperation between the Red Cross, many private agencies and State and local governmental authorities. Civil Defense rescue teams performed valiant service in assisting in the rescue of victims buried in the debris.

R. T. SCHAEFFER,
National Director, Disaster Services.

BERNARD M. BARUCH

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, it is always heartwarming to have due recognition accorded to a great man who has served his country well.

It was with a deep feeling of pleasure that I read an editorial printed in the Atlanta Journal on an address recently delivered by Bernard M. Baruch. The address itself was printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of last Wednesday and is available for all to read.

In this address, Mr. Baruch—one of the most penetrating thinkers of our times—outlined his own philosophy through a discussion of the works of Woodrow Wilson. It was one of the most revealing statements of the past few years.

Mr. Baruch stands forth as a major force in preserving our free democratic institutions. His vision is broad and his idealism pure, and he couples his idealism and his vision with an effectiveness that is matched by few.

I ask unanimous consent that the Atlanta Journal editorial be printed in the RECORD as evidence of the esteem and respect in which so many Americans hold Bernard M. Baruch.

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

BARUCH'S CLASSIC ON WILSON

Occasionally some writer accomplishes perfection of thought and expression in a piece that is recognized, even if it is read for the first time, as a classic. It has the qualities that will make it endure.

Such an accomplishment is the address by Bernard M. Baruch delivered at a meeting to announce plans for the Woodrow Wilson Centennial Anniversary during 1956.

Mr. Baruch made Woodrow Wilson's magnificent wisdom his own. He, too, sees with that perception that enabled Wilson to comprehend nations and, at the same time, to understand the human heart.

It is speech filled with statements and phrases almost startling in their succinct penetration. It is a summary of the possible—which lesser men called impossible—that Wilson conceived and Baruch understands.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

INCREASE IN PAY OF POSTAL EMPLOYEES—UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, there is at the desk an unanimous-consent request which has been approved by the distinguished minority leader, the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, and the distinguished ranking minority member of that committee. On behalf of the minority leader and myself I offer the request and ask that it be read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The unanimous-consent request will be read.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

Ordered, That effective on Wednesday, June 1, 1955, after the conclusion of routine morning business, the Senate shall proceed to the consideration of S. 2061, a bill to increase the rates of basic compensation of officers and employees in the field service of the Post Office Department, and that debate on any amendment, motion, or appeal, except a motion to lay on the table, shall be limited to 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the proposer of any such motion or amendment and the majority leader: *Provided,* That in the event the majority leader is in favor of any such amendment or motion, the time in opposition thereto shall be controlled by the minority leader or some Senator designated by him: *Provided further,* That no amendment that is not germane to the provisions of the bill shall be received.

Ordered further, That on the question of the final passage of the bill debate shall be limited to 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled, respectively, by the majority and minority leaders.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the unanimous consent request? The Chair hears none, and the request is agreed to.

MUTUAL SECURITY ACT OF 1955

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 2090) to amend the Mutual Security Act of 1954, and for other purposes.

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a proposed unanimous-consent agreement, which is offered on behalf of myself and the distinguished minority leader, be read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will read the proposed unanimous-consent agreement.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

Ordered, That effective on Thursday, June 2, 1955, after the conclusion of routine morning business, during the further consideration of S. 2090, a bill to amend the Mutual Security Act of 1954, debate on any amendment, motion, or appeal, except a motion to lay on the table, shall be limited to 2 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the proposer of any such motion or amendment and the majority leader: *Provided,* That in the event the majority leader is in favor of any such amendment or motion, the time in opposition thereto shall be controlled by the minority leader or some Senator designated by him: *Provided further,* That no amendment that is not germane to the provisions of the bill shall be received.

Ordered further, That on the question of the final passage of the bill debate shall be limited to 2 hours, to be equally divided and controlled, respectivey, by the majority and minority leaders.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Is there objection to the unanimous-consent agreement proposed by the Senator from Texas? The Chair hears none, and the agreement is entered into.

THE SALK POLIO VACCINE

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I wish to make a few remarks on the statement by the President released by the White House today on the polio vaccine situation, as he calls it.

The President states:

The last week has been both eventful and encouraging.

Let me say, Mr. President, that all the events in the polio vaccine matter since April 12 have been eventful, but many of them most discouraging.

I wish to read one paragraph of the President's statement and make a brief comment on it. He says:

There has been delay in the vaccination program. But remember—we are dealing in this field with the lives of our children and our grandchildren. Because of scientific work that was done during that delay science has learned new things about the way viruses behave in large-scale manufacture and about the way we should make vaccine. Scientists have been able to design testing techniques of greater sensitivity and production techniques which build in a greater factor of safety and additional checks on the final product. So from that delay science has gained new knowledge, new safeguards.

I say most respectfully that the scientists knew of that problem before the vaccine was released. I say that the scientists have not learned any new techniques about this vaccine. They knew those techniques from the beginning. The difficulty is that those representing the Government in an administrative position decided, back in April, against exercising the most precautionary test-

ing techniques for this vaccine. That is what the President ought to have told the American people about the vaccine today. He did not tell them that, because if he had told them that he would not have tried to cover up the mistakes the administration has made on the whole vaccine program.

It is a very interesting cover-up message the President has sent to Congress, but let us keep the record straight, Mr. President. The record is that prior to April 12, 1955, there was a great division in the thinking of the scientists in regard to this matter. There were differences of opinion as to whether or not, for example, our pure food and drug officials and our Department of Health, Education, and Welfare should allow the vaccine to go out to the American public and have it injected into the arms of American boys and girls without the batches of vaccine made by the various companies tested under the stringent techniques that were known then, and which are now being required by our public health officials.

I am very glad that at long last our public officials are now requiring the maximum precautions in testing the vaccine. But my answer to the President of the United States is that eminent authorities abound that all these techniques were known prior to April 12. The fact is that our Government did not require the testing precautions which should have been required. Had they been required, we would not have had the confusion, to which the President refers, that has developed in this matter.

The President says further in his message:

> During the months immediately ahead we must be patient while our limited supply of vaccine is used first to help protect those who need it most.

Administration officials knew that away before April 12, Mr. President. They knew before April 12 how limited the supply was going to be, and they knew before April 12 that if the vaccine was going to be injected into the arms of children in the age bracket of 5 to 9, the Government was going to have to see to it that there would be set up a fair distribution of the vaccine. It was not set up. Thus we have gone through these weeks of confusion and vacillation and stop and go orders in regard to the vaccine problem.

Mr. President, when we go over to page 2 of the message, we read some more very interesting alibiing. The President of the United States says:

> Briefly the voluntary control plan for distribution will work as follows:
>
> 1. Priorities: The vaccine must be used first for those most susceptible to polio.

The President is right when he says it must be used first for those most susceptible to polio. Yet, in my judgment, and I speak most respectfully, the President ought to be insisting upon a legislative program which will guarantee that the "must" order to which he himself refers in his message will be carried out.

I want to say that if we are going to insist that the vaccine must be used first for those most susceptible to polio, then we have to have "must" legislation on the books; and we do not have "must" legislation on the books at the present time.

I think it most unfortunate that, confronted with the great mistake the administration has made in regard to the vaccine program, the President is not, even at this late hour, coming forth with a legislative program which will guarantee to the boys and girls in the 5-to-9 age bracket that they are going to get the vaccine.

Until that is done, as far as the senior Senator from Oregon is concerned, I am going to continue to say that this administration is failing the boys and girls in this country by not putting on the books a law, mandatory in nature, which will require that the limited supply of vaccine be used, and used in the first instance, for the benefit of the boys and girls in the 5-to-9-age brackets, and then that there be distribution of the vaccine in accordance with susceptibility to polio to other age brackets until there is available an adequate supply for all the children and adults of this country.

I only repeat the argument I made before; namely, we are dealing here with a national concern. We are dealing here with a national health problem. We are dealing here with a problem in which we find reputable medical authorities in dispute as to the danger which exists if we take one group of boys and girls and vaccinate them with the Salk vaccine, and let them play with another group of boys and girls who are not vaccinated.

There is even dispute among the medical authorities, Mr. President, as to whether or not the group which was not vaccinated would be more susceptible to polio because of contact with vaccinated boys and girls, than would be the case if neither group had been vaccinated in the first place.

As long as there exists that kind of conflict among medical authorities of this country, then it is clear that we need legislation that will protect the public and assure a fair distribution of the vaccine. As I said the other day, I did not comment here on the floor of the Senate in regard to this problem until I had first been briefed by medical authority on the matter. Irrespective of what the President tries to say now in the way of an alibi for the serious and inexcusable mistakes of his administration in regard to this vaccine problem, it is our clear duty as a Congress to proceed to pass legislation that will place the vaccine under governmental control and distribution until such time as there is an adequate supply for all our population. Mr. President, if there ever was brought to the Congress a public health program that carried with it congressional responsibility, this is it.

In view of the bungling that the Eisenhower administration has been guilty of, through the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, which bungling has really been approved by the President of the United States, in his attempt to sustain the incompetency of the Secretary of that Department, the Congress has the duty to pass the kind of legislation that some of us proposed on April 14.

Again I ask the President of the United States to look to the country to the north of us. Canada did not bungle it. There has been no confusion about this matter in Canada. From the very beginning Canada used the precautionary techniques in the manufacture of the vaccine in Canada that ought to have been used in the United States from the very beginning, and the responsibility for their not being used rests squarely upon the shoulders of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

So I wish to say that the President's alibiing message of today leaves me cold, because the President still is evading his responsibility to the American people. He is not stepping in with a recommendation for the enactment of legislation which will guarantee that the vaccine will be fairly distributed, so that all American boys and girls will receive it, in order to protect our population as a whole.

I quite disagree with the President's proposal to permit the States to determine what children will receive the vaccine free of charge and what children will not receive it free of charge. In this case we are dealing with a matter of such great concern to the national health that every American boy or girl, regardless of the ability of his parents to pay, should receive free vaccination of this vaccine. We should not permit anyone to have the discretion to determine whether, because of any economic reason, children will or will not receive the vaccine free of charge.

The Federal Government should make it clear that the vaccine will be made available free of cost to American boys and girls, because by vaccinating them we shall best protect not only their health, but also the health of the rest of the American people, insofar as the danger of contracting polio is concerned.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield for a question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McNAMARA in the chair). Does the Senator from Oregon yield to the Senator from Illinois?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is the Senator from Oregon aware of the fact that the Democratic members of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare have drafted a bill which provides that the Federal Government shall provide free vaccine to all States and that the States shall not impose on anyone a means test?

Mr. MORSE. I am all in favor of that proposal. As I said when I introduced my proposal on April 14, I am not wedded to it. Any proposal which will accomplish the same end will meet with my approval. The Senator from Illinois has just outlined a proposal which will accomplish that end, and I certainly hope the bill comes to the floor of the Senate.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, is the Senator from Oregon aware that the Democratic-sponsored bill in the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare

provides that free vaccine shall be given to all children, and will give the States the discretionary power of determining what is a child, and will permit the States to make such arrangements as they wish for the payment or nonpayment for the services of doctors in the giving of the vaccine?

Mr. MORSE. So long as the bill will result in having the vaccine placed in the bloodstreams of the boys and girls, and will have that done on a free basis, I will go along with that modification of my first proposal.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The Senator from Oregon would not be surprised, would he, to know that this proposal was adopted at the suggestion of the distinguished and eminent junior Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN]?

Mr. MORSE. No; I would not be surprised to learn that it was adopted either at his suggestion or at the suggestion of the distinguished Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS].

Mr. DOUGLAS. Would the Senator from Oregon be disconcerted by the fact that although the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare has been meeting or trying to meet on four separate occasions to consider this bill, thus far it has not been able to obtain a quorum to consider the bill?

Mr. MORSE. Not only am I interested in that fact, but I think the American people will also be interested in it.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Does not the Senator from Oregon feel that the committee members who have absented themselves from the committee meetings have—whether intentionally or unintentionally—done a disservice to the American people as regards taking adequate steps to check the disease of polio?

Mr. MORSE. I think the matter is so serious that a meeting of the committee should be scheduled for 2 a. m., either tomorrow morning or the following morning, for certainly no member of the committee would be able to say he had another engagement at that time. If the committee members are too busy to meet during the normal hours, then I suggest that a committee meeting be called for 2 a. m.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Would the Senator from Oregon be interested in knowing that the committee met at 10 o'clock today, and waited until 11 o'clock, but could not obtain a quorum; that this afternoon the committee met at 3:30 p. m., and waited until 4 p. m., and that only one Republican member was present at the morning meeting and no Republican member was present at the afternoon meeting and a quorum could not be obtained?

Mr. MORSE. I think that is most unfortunate.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I concur in the remarks of the Senator from Oregon and the Senator from Illinois.

I regret the statement which was made today by the President. Apparently he wishes to have the vaccine distributed on a purely voluntary basis, without control, without any provision whatsoever to make certain that the vaccine will be distributed to all children, regardless of any means test.

The bill to which the Senator from Illinois has referred, which now is in the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and which I have had a considerable part in drafting, provides for just two things: First, that in all the States of the Union, every child shall be able to obtain the vaccine free of charge, without discrimination, without discretion, if the child wishes to be vaccinated; second, that standby controls—not mandatory controls—shall be given to the President.

Mr. President, the President's statement does not address itself to the curing of the two difficulties to which I have referred briefly. Let me say parenthetically that not one step was taken by either the President of the United States or by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, until 2 days after the announcement was made. No attempt was made by them to provide adequate distribution machinery. No attempt was made to confer with drug manufacturers and with scientists, to work out the proper tests. Certainly the experience of the past few weeks has demonstrated that the tests which were adopted at that time were not adequate.

At this time I wish to read several excerpts from the President's statement. The President says:

> 4. State responsibility: The States will advise the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare as to their general plans for distribution of the vaccine and, specifically, their shipping instructions for manufacturers. This information then will be transmitted to the manufacturers.

Mr. President, let me say no power existing today will enable the Federal Government to insure fair distribution in the States or even the adoption of a fair plan of distribution. Under the law, as it exists today, there is no such power.

I read further from the President's statement:

> 5. Vaccination programs: To assure that no child is denied vaccination by reason of its cost, some States and localities may operate—

And in that connection I emphasize the word "may"—

> mass free public vaccination programs for all children.

Certainly there is no provision which would require that kind of public vaccination, free of charge.

I read further from the President's statement:

> Other States may provide free vaccination only for children whose parents are unable to pay, through clinics, schools, and preschool programs, or by furnishing free vaccine to private physicians.

Mr. President, that means there will be no uniformity whatever as between the States. For instance, the State of Connecticut could decide to distribute vaccine in one way, under a plan over which the Federal Government would have no control whatever under existing statutes. The State of Connecticut might decide to turn over most of the vaccine to druggists and others, for distribution through normal commercial channels, and might decide to charge for every vaccination given to children, whereas different systems might be in force in New York, Massachusetts, or New Jersey. Certainly that is bound to lead to confusion.

In my opinion, perhaps the most ill-advised statement in connection with the free distribution of vaccine as against vaccine to be paid for, is that found in another paragraph where the President says:

> Other States may provide free vaccination only for children whose parents are unable to pay, through clinics, schools, and preschool programs, or by furnishing free vaccine to private physicians.

Does that mean that we are to require a means test in every school, every kindergarten, every station for mass distribution? How are we going to do it? Why should we want to do it? In the first place, such a system would be completely unworkable, and in the second place, I do not know of anything that would be socially worse, socially more dangerous, socially more destructive of equality and understanding among groups of children than to say to one child, "You are going to get this vaccine free," and to another child, "You will get it only if you pay for it." What effect will the fact that one child pays for it have on the children who get it free? We do not follow that plan in the other free distributions made by the Government. I cannot conceive of anything worse than that; yet that is what the President of the United States now proposes to do.

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

Mr. LEHMAN. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Under this alleged system, will it not be almost inevitable that in many cases children will be able to get free vaccination and free vaccine only if they or their parents say that they are unable to pay for it?

Mr. LEHMAN. That is perfectly correct. There will be a means test.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Will not that involve a stigma which the parents and children dread, and which will humiliate them beyond words?

Mr. LEHMAN. There is no question about it. The Senator is correct. I do not think there could be anything more destructive of democracy in the schools, more certain to set up barriers, than the means test which is proposed.

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

Mr. LEHMAN. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. Is the Senator aware of the fact that we do not even require a means test of cattlemen in order to provide free vaccine in an endeavor to stamp out Bang's disease in the cattle herds of our country?

Mr. LEHMAN. The Senator is eminently correct. I went all through that when I was Governor of my State. In the late 1920's or the early 1930's we initiated an extensive program for the eradication of bovine tuberculosis, which at that time was prevalent in our State. We never required a means test. We took care of the situation in relation to every farmer in the State, and within 10 or 15 years we completely eradicated bovine tuberculosis.

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

Mr. LEHMAN. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is it not true that it would not be as humiliating in the case of cows to apply a means test as in the case of children, and that therefore the case for abolishing the means test is stronger in the case of polio than in the case of Bangs' disease?

Mr. LEHMAN. The theory of giving greater preference to animals than to human beings applies in many activities of the Government, unfortunately. Take the field of immigration. A man who is refused admission into this country because of the whim of a consular agent has no recourse whatsoever. He has no appeal whatsoever. His case cannot be considered by anyone. Yet if an importer is refused the right to import a bag of potatoes into this country, he can carry his case to the Supreme Court.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further question?

Mr. LEHMAN. I am glad to yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Does the Senator remember back some 30 years ago, when the question of health care for mothers and infants arose, that some State legislatures were reluctant to provide free health care for mothers and infants, but did provide free cholera care for hogs?

Mr. LEHMAN. There is no doubt about that. I recall it very well indeed.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Does the Senator remember the argument which was made by an Iowa mother to the Iowa Legislature, that even if they were not interested in the health care of children, but were interested in the health care of hogs, children who were sick could not take care of hogs very well, and that therefore, in order to protect hogs, it was necessary to have healthy children?

Mr. LEHMAN. That is perfectly true.

Mr. DOUGLAS. While we certainly do not accuse those who believe in the voluntary system of caring for polio with being unconcerned about the health of children—because that certainly would not be true—nevertheless, is it not true that if people were hard-hearted enough not to be moved by the desire to protect children for their own sake, they might wish to protect children so that they might take care of the cows and prevent them from succumbing to Bangs' disease?

Mr. LEHMAN. Of course the Senator is eminently correct. He has described the situation very accurately.

Mr. DOUGLAS. It is understood, of course, that I am not ascribing any callousness to those who defend the voluntary system.

Mr. LEHMAN. Anyone who knew the Senator would not ascribe callousness to him in connection with any subject.

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

Mr. LEHMAN. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. Does the Senator recall that a few years ago the Federal Government spent a great many millions of dollars south of the border, in Mexico, in an endeavor to stamp out an epidemic of hoof-and-mouth disease which, if it had spread across the border, would have been very costly to the cattle industry of this country?

Mr. LEHMAN. Yes; I recall that very well, indeed.

Mr. MORSE. Does the Senator agree with me that, when we look at the millions we were willing to spend—and rightly so—to protect the livestock industry, the American people, through the Congress, have a clear moral duty to proceed to provide free vaccination to all American boys and girls whose parents will give their consent to such vaccinations, in order to help greatly to reduce the threat of the scourge of polio?

Mr. LEHMAN. The Senator from Oregon is absolutely correct. Let me say to him that I am grateful to him for having brought up this subject. The proposal made today provides for free vaccine only to children in the first and second grades, and a few children in the third grade who may have received the first inoculations during a previous period. Although it is by no means certain that sufficient supplies will be on hand, it is hoped that the supplies on hand will be adequate to take care of children within the 5 to 9 year age group. There is no question that a child of 10, 12, or 15, or 17 is also very susceptible to this disease—perhaps not quite so susceptible as a child in the 5–9 year age group, but certainly very susceptible.

Our bill provides that every child in the country up to the age of 19 shall be entitled to vaccine free of charge. That does not mean that the doctors may not give the shots to others, but, so far as the vaccine itself is concerned, every child should be on a complete equal basis and be entitled to receive the vaccine. I am grateful to the Senator from Oregon for having raised that point.

Mr. MORSE. Will the Senator yield for a brief comment?

Mr. LEHMAN. I am glad to yield.

Mr. MORSE. We are grateful to the Senator from New York for making the fight he is making in the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, along with the Senator from Illinois and the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] and other senators, in trying to carry out what I think is a moral obligation of the American people to our children.

I try to put into practice, as a religious man, the moral principles that constitute the spiritual values I have been taught throughout my life. I try to put into practice in affairs of government the moral principles that I am refreshed on Sunday after Sunday as I sit in my pew. I happen to believe that as representatives of a free people that is our obligation and duty as Senators.

If ever there was a moral issue before the American people, and if ever there was an issue that called for putting into practice our religious faiths and teachings, this is the time to put into practice our Biblical teachings as to what we owe our children, and how children stand in the sight of God.

I am at a loss to understand why there is even any debate over meeting this moral obligation. It is a sad reflection on a government that has dilly-dallied as long as we have delayed action in providing the boys and girls of this country with free vaccine to help reduce the threat of the scourge of polio. Here is a terrible threat not only to children in the age group from 5 to 9, but also a serious threat in the age group between 1 and 5, and also to a serious extent from age 9 up through adulthood. Here we have an opportunity for the leaders of this Government to practice some religious principles.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I should like to say to the Senator that, although we go to different churches—and he worships on Sunday and I worship on Saturday—the principle he has enunciated, which is engraven so deeply on his heart, is also preached and practiced in my church. There is no difference between different religious beliefs in their determination, and in their tradition, which goes back through the centuries, to care for and safeguard the children of our Nation, and of every nation. There is no difference, and there is nothing more sacred than that. Yet we are neglecting the children and we are not making it possible for some children to get the vaccine without humiliating other children and embarrassing them.

It is all wrong. I have fought against it from the very first day the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare held hearings on the matter when I asked Mrs. Hobby, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, "Why did you wait so long before your plan of distribution was worked out? Why did you wait so long before adequate tests were made?"

Her answer was: "How could anyone forsee the great demand that would come for this vaccine?"

I wish to add a few more remarks with regard to the concluding paragraph of the President's message. He states:

> This plan for distribution of the vaccine can go into effect as soon as the free vaccination program of the National Foundation for Infantile Paralysis is completed.

Mr. President, the program of the National Foundation for Infantile Paralysis provides for only 18 million cubic centimeters of vaccine. It has been testified by experts that to inoculate all the children who are entitled to the vaccine it would take in excess of 175 million cc's. Such a program would include pregnant women, of course.

Then the President goes on to say:

> Under it—

The plan—

> the Federal Government will assume responsibility for the equitable allocation of the vaccine among the States, and the States will assume responsibility for the direction of distribution within their borders.

Mr. President, that statement of the President is completely unrealistic. He does not know how limited are the powers possessed today by the Federal Government, and he certainly does not know how limited are the powers possessed by the States in connection with some of the details of distribution.

Surely if he had sufficient powers to enforce such a program, my associates and I would not be fighting so hard to give the President standyby powers. We know that he does not have such powers, and that he is lacking in many of such powers. I speak not as a Member of the Senate alone but also as a former governor of the greatest State in the Union,

from a population standpoint, when I say that even the governors do not have all the powers they need to provide effective distribution and control of this highly prized vaccine, which I believe will be a great boon to all the people of our country. They do not have all the powers they need, and the President does not have such powers. We are trying to give the President standby powers. We are not trying to thrust anything down his throat. We are not saying to him, "You have got to do it this way."

We are simply saying to the President, "All right. We believe you are going to try to control the distribution of this vaccine equitably and fairly and effectively, but if you do not have the powers, and we do not believe they exist today, we will give you these stand-by powers so that you can make distribution fairly and equitably and effectively."

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

Mr. LEHMAN. I yield.

Mr. PURTELL. Does the Senator know whether there has been any denial of this vaccine to any child because a method of distribution which may meet the wishes of the Senator from New York and other Senators is lacking? Is it not a fact that the vaccine has not been produced in sufficient quantities; that the first 18 million cc.'s of vaccine will go to the National Foundation for Infantile Paralysis, and that the order for that quantity of vaccine has not been completed?

Mr. LEHMAN. I can answer the Senator a little more fully by not confining the answer merely within the scope of his question. Of course I know that there is not a sufficient quantity of vaccine on hand today. I am not blaming anyone particularly for that state of affairs, although I am deeply disappointed, and I feel the American people also are astonished and disappointed, because when the announcement was made—and the announcement was never denied or qualified by any responsible official of Government, the public which listened breathlessly felt that all they had to do was to step up the next morning and there would be sufficient vaccine to take care of their children on an equitable basis. Of course we know that of the 170 million cubic centimeters which will be required to vaccinate all the children of this country, only about 7½ million are available today. Of course, we know that. That is one of the tragedies of the situation. There are many others.

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

Mr. LEHMAN. I am glad to yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is it not true that if adequate methods of testing had been worked out in advance a larger quantity of vaccine could have been produced both before and after April 12, with the result that there would have been a larger quantity available?

Mr. LEHMAN. I know this scientific matter is so complicated that I am loath to blame anyone; and I still have great confidence in the ultimate effectiveness of the vaccine. I believe Dr. Scheele is an honest and intelligent man. But, certainly, Mr. President, if greater care had been taken, a far greater quantity of the vaccine could have been produced.

Mr. PURTELL. Mr. President, will the Senator from New York yield?

Mr. LEHMAN. I yield.

Mr. PURTELL. Is it not the Senator's understanding, when he refers to the testing, that Dr. Salk and the other scientists agreed at the time that they were using the best methods of testing? They were learning as they went along, and the method was considered to be adequate, safe, and correct. In fact, it is today still considered a safe method, is it not?

Mr. LEHMAN. I wish to point out that I said in my remarks that I was reluctant to blame anyone with regard to a discovery which is so useful to the health of the Nation as is this vaccine. But day after day, several times a week, methods of testing have been changed, and delays have occurred because of that fact. Certainly, many of these could have been prevented if proper action had been taken earlier in the period in which the inadequate, and in some cases, defective distribution was stopped completely.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator from New York yield further?

Mr. LEHMAN. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is it not true that last year when the final run of tests was being made under the auspices of the National Foundation for Infantile Paralysis, each batch of vaccine was tested three times, first, by the commercial producer, second, by Dr. Salk and his laboratory, and, third, by the appropriate agency of the Public Health Service, I believe, the National Institutes of Health?

Mr. LEHMAN. I believe that is the case.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is it not true that after April 12 only one set of tests was imposed, namely, by the manufacturer, with testing by the National Institutes of Health only as to rare batches, and that in general the public health authorities depended upon the printed or written statements of the private pharmaceutical houses?

Mr. LEHMAN. That is true. I assume the Senator from Illinois is now referring to the so-called protocols which were not reported to independent bodies at all, but were reports of the manufacturers themselves.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator from New York yield?

Mr. LEHMAN. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Has the Senator gathered that if the great line of argument were applied to the national defense forces, the air power, the naval power, and the Army, that is applied to the care and preparation by this administration in terms of polio, it would look a little ridiculous? We hear from our friends on the other side of the aisle that there is no problem of distribution. Why become so excited about distribution? There is very little vaccine to distribute. In other words, because the program broke down, there was really no need to prepare for a program that might work. That would be the same kind of an argument as to say, Do not worry about not having enough airplanes, which the administration does not have; do not worry about adequate defense forces, which the administration does not have; because, after all, perhaps we will not get into a jam. On that basis we would justify maladministration or justify inadequate administration of Government.

The only argument possessed by the friends who support what the administration is doing is that because the program did not work, a distribution program was not needed.

I say the President's message is a poor apology for an explanation. With all the fanfare attending the release of the vaccine and of a policy on the part of the Government properly to test the vaccine, it would be assumed that there should be something to distribute.

I challenge anyone to prove that there was any program of distribution until a sufficient amount of pressure or criticism was brought to bear upon the administration to cause it to come up with this halfhearted proposal for a testing program. The new tests to which the President refers in his message came about after we discovered some very glaring discrepancies in the testing program. The fact is that the National Institutes of Health had to start new testing. They had to have new means of detecting live virus. Once the program of the National Foundation for Infantile Paralysis has run its course, there is no program of distribution, except to say that the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare will notify all States that there is so much vaccine available. But all that does is to increase the pressure in the local areas for whatever vaccine may be available.

With all due respect, and with a note of commendation for belated action, the best we can say of the message is that it testifies to the failure of the administration in the two fields of distribution and adequate precaution. That is all it can be interpreted to mean.

I am glad we have found out something to satisfy the public desire for adequate testing. No one in the Government can defend the inadequacy of the tests used in the manufacture of the vaccine. No one in the administration can defend the failure of a distribution program simply by saying there was nothing to distribute. What a foolish argument that would be. It is most regrettable that we have had to indulge in all this talk. I think it would be much better if we could deal with this subject in the field of science and health.

But someone had to speak up in the Congress to ask that things be done that needed to be done. And I may say, Mr. President, that some of us have been very charitable. Had some of us wanted to open up in terms of the inadequacy of tests, in terms of pressures exerted, in terms of the designing that was promoted in the television spectacular, the public might have been advised earlier. I had in my possession for days and weeks important information about the testing. Dr. Scheele would be the last man to say that I have not had this information, because I brought it to his attention.

Dr. Scheele has worked his heart out to try to make the program work, but I do not think he has had the kind of backing which he should have had. I think he is a competent professional man. I said to him, "Doctor, your professional standing is now literally on the line, and the integrity of the Government of the United States is on the line. The American people are depending upon the Government of the United States to do its duty in terms of the health, welfare, safety, and security of our country." Because of the realization of that fact on the part of Dr. Scheele and others, the testing program has been implemented. There are new tests today, and I know the manufacturers are willing to comply with the testing program.

I think it is wrong to blame the manufacturers, because they were called upon to produce in large quantities, in mass production, although the tests of last year were of small quantities of test-tube production. Any scientist knows that the same controls cannot be exercised over large batches or quantities of vaccine in large containers as can be exercised in a laboratory over what is called test-tube production.

There can be arguments all day long as to whether we needed the distribution program. We needed one, if the program was to work.

Mr. LEHMAN. I thank the Senator from Minnesota for his contribution to the debate, but I emphasize the fact that although I deeply deplore the mistakes, the omissions, and failures which have occurred in the past 6 weeks, they are in the past. We unfortunately cannot undo them. What I am now interested in is making the program work in the future; in having a program which really can be enforced through powers which exist somewhere; and, in the second place, to have a plan and a program for the effective distribution of Salk vaccine to children of all ages, without charge—in other words, free.

It was perfectly evident from the hearings held by the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare that witness after witness agreed that he was not sure that under existing law there were sufficient powers in the Public Health Service, the State governments, or the President of the United States. Certainly it is necessary to have, somewhere, somehow, within the Government, the authority to enforce a plan, even the best kind of plan. These matters are not self-enforcing. I have had enough experience with the operations of the governments of the different States to know the difference of thinking which exists among the chief executives and the health officers, and to understand that there must be some power to make certain that a plan, no matter how good it may be, will be operative effectively. So far as I can see, the only place in which that power can be lodged is in the President of the United States.

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

Mr. LEHMAN. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. I think the people of the country are greately indebted to the Senator from New York, the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], and the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] for the record they have made this afternoon.

Mr. LEHMAN. And also to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. I think the Senator from Illinois put his finger on one very important fact which needs to be emphasized, because it is not true that the authorities in this field were of one mind as to how the vaccine should be tested and what precautions should be taken.

As the Senator from Minnesota knows, I received the same professional briefing from persons on the inside of the program as he received some weeks ago. Warnings were issued at that very time that the same precautions by way of pre-test procedure to which the Salk vaccine had been subjected, should be applied to the vaccine before it went on the market. The persons who issued those warnings have been proved right.

The Senator from Minnesota is correct when he says that Dr. Scheele now has come to and is following the point of view which some of those persons have insisted upon from the very beginning.

The warning flags were up, but the feeling was that the precautions which were being used through the so-called protocol approach were safe, and that the testing which was done in the drug houses would result in only pure vaccine getting onto the market. But that feeling was wrong, and there has been a tremendous setback to the program.

I say in behalf of the courageous persons who have been urging from the very beginning that more precautions should be used that they have been proved right in the matter. That is why some of us have voiced objections to the administration's mistakes from time to time in the Senate.

I have been critical of Dr. Scheele. There was a time when, in my judgment, the criticism of him was justified, because I thought he should have insisted upon the maximum precautions before the vaccine went on the market. I commend him now for having come to the point of view of insisting that the greatest of precautions must be used. It has already been demonstrated what damage will develop when the greatest of precautions are not used. I think the authorities are now on the right road, so far as safety is concerned. My point is that they had been forewarned before they proceeded with the so-called bulk manufacture as to what the maximum precautions should have been. They should have followed the same precautions as were used in the so-called smaller batches.

But what has happened is understandable. Mistakes are bound to happen. The desire to make speed in the matter is understandable; but when one is dealing with something as close to the safety of the American people as this matter is, then the people have the right to expect the Government to take the maximum precautions.

Now that the maximum precautions are being taken, we turn to the main point which the Senator from New York makes this afternoon. Let me emphasize again that I think it has been clear from the beginning that the medical authorities are right in their belief that this is a safe vaccine when it has been safely tested. It is a great preventive vaccine. I think it is a great medical miracle. I would not detract one iota from the great scientists, headed by Dr. Salk, who have produced this great discovery.

But when we come to the problem of precautionary safety measures in testing, and when we reach the field of distribution, we are then within the province of the legislative processes of the Government. The Government then has a duty, and we have a duty, to make certain that, legislatively, precautions are followed. Second, we have a duty, legislatively, to see to it that there is a fair distribution. The Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN] very effectively has addressed himself this afternoon to that subject primarily.

If the bill which he is recommending will do the job—and he is very persuasive in his belief that it will do the job—that is the bill with which we should go forward. I should have preferred from the beginning the bill I introduced on April 14. But let us get ahead with a bill which will place the Federal Government in the driver's seat, so to speak; a bill which will place the Federal Government in a position where it will assume its public health responsibility to the American people for fair distribution.

The argument that nobody is being denied vaccine now because of his means evades the problem before us. The supply now is short; but even as that short supply is distributed within the age bracket of 5 to 9, I agree with the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] in his argument that there should be no means test within that age bracket.

Even with the 18 million shorts of the vaccine, if it is to be used in the 5 to 9 age bracket, it should be used with no economic requirement at all. The children should get it free.

We should not say that the supply will be divided among the States, and let the States decide for themselves whether they will impose a means test. I say the children of America as a whole should be supplied with the vaccine free, as fast as it can be manufactured. The inoculation of the precious children of America is a public trust and duty.

That is my thesis. It has been my thesis throughout the debate, as it has continued during recent weeks. There is nothing in the President's message today which successfully, in my judgment, rebuts the soundness of that main thesis.

Mr. LEHMAN. I thank the Senator from Oregon for the splendid contribution he has made to the debate.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I happen to have a particular interest in the subject of Salk vaccine, not solely as a Member of Congress, but as a father. As was the case among all the other parents of the land, there was much prayerful thanksgiving in our family when we read that a medical scientist apparently had finally perfected an antitoxin which would prevent a terrible scourge among young children.

I have sat here this afternoon listening to some of my brethren on the other

side of the aisle denounce, pillory, and castigate the President of the United States. It has not been the first time I have sat here and listened to that kind of abuse.

Mr. President, on one occasion you and I listened to a Member of the Senate denounce the President of the United States for going to church.

I think I have a right to take a few moments of the session this afternoon to suggest that I share what the Senator from Oregon calls his moral principles, and to say to my brethren here, and to the people of California whom I in part represent, that if it is necessary to enact legislation in the Congress to provide for a just means of distribution of the Salk vaccine, then let the appropriate committee of the United States Senate bring to the floor such proposed legislation, and let us debate it.

I respect the recommendations of the President of the United States, who has said today, though I have not had an opportunity to study his message, that in his judgment no legislation is needed. It may well be that none is needed; but as a Member of the Senate, I shall be glad to participate by listening to, and perhaps making some comment on, whatever proposal the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare may wish to bring to this floor.

Speaking for myself, I should be very glad, Mr. President, to pay anything to have the daughter of Mrs. Kuchel and myself given the assurance that medical science has been able to give her immunity in her lifetime from a tragic scourge.

Far more important than that, as a United States Senator I agree that every child in this Nation ought to be inoculated when such inoculation, in the opinion of scientists, and not of legislators, is as free as is possible from the risk of itself causing polio. But unless Congress decides that some kind of compulsory legislation is necessary, I take it that the old American fashion of having the people and the States participate in the distribution should at least be considered. The President has considered it. He believes that legislation is not needed.

As I say, I shall be very glad to listen to any proposal that comes from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

However, my reason for rising for this brief moment is that earlier it was suggested, in some of the colloquy on the floor, that the minority members of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare were responsible for nothing having been done on this subject. That is a very serious charge, and so I arranged, through one of the pages, to have a distinguished member of that committee, the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. PURTELL] contacted, and I asked that he come to the floor.

When the charge was made, Mr. President, there went through my mind the fleeting thought that minorities do not control the committees; the majorities do, and each committee has a majority of members of the majority side who, were they to meet on call of the chairman, themselves could provide a quorum.

I have been told that two members on the minority side of the committee were absent this morning, but I am going to ask my friend from Connecticut [Mr. PURTELL], when I take my seat, to make his own comment with respect to the situation, so that the RECORD may disclose the fact and the truth as to the reason why the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare did not meet this morning and did not meet this afternoon. I have been told that under the rule the committee could not meet this afternoon. If that is so, that is sufficient reason for the American people to understand why the committee did not meet this afternoon. But, Mr. President, I did want the RECORD to contain a clear statement by the Senator from Connecticut, who was present this morning, with respect to the meeting on call of the Senator——

Mr. PURTELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. KUCHEL. I yield.

Mr. PURTELL. The Senator, as a father, has expressed his feeling, and the feeling of all the mothers and fathers of this country about their desire to have the vaccine given to their children.

I am sure the Senator read a recent news account that only 62 percent of the children eligible to receive vaccine responded. In other words, 38 percent failed to respond. Why? Because of the fear which has been engendered in the hearts of parents about the value of the Salk vaccine. From whence comes that fear? It arises because of constant attacks by men in public life, not only on the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, but upon the work of the Department. Is that not true?

Mr. KUCHEL. I agree with the Senator.

Mr. PURTELL. That has been done, instead of fostering faith in the institutions which we support, as we should do, and faith in the vaccine, the efficacy of which cannot be questioned.

Does the Senator feel that the scientists of this country would have permitted the production of a vaccine as to which there was any hazard of death to children, and permit such vaccine to be distributed and used? Does the Senator think that would have happened?

Mr. KUCHEL. Of course not.

Mr. PURTELL. Does the Senator think the scientists of our country think so little of the lives of our children as to permit that to have happened?

Mr. KUCHEL. Of course not, and the Senator is likewise correct about some of the statements which have been made by people in responsible positions in this country. Such statements have undermined the confidence of parents with respect to the vaccine.

Mr. PURTELL. Was a claim ever made at any time, at any place, that this vaccine would work 100 percent in every single case?

Mr. KUCHEL. No.

Mr. PURTELL. Does the Senator know of any other drug that will work 100 percent?

Mr. KUCHEL. I do not. The Senator is correct in his implication.

Mr. PURTELL. Mr. President, I came to the floor really to present for the RECORD a communication I received this noontime, but I should like to say that the Senator from Connecticut was at the meeting which was called for this morning. I was not present this afternoon, Mr. President, for the very good reason that there was no meeting which could have been called under the Senate rules. No permission was asked of the Senate for the committee to meet this afternoon. Therefore, no permission was granted to have a meeting this afternoon——

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PURTELL. Yes; I shall be very happy to yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. No request was made for the committee to meet this afternoon for the very simple and good reason that the minority leader informed the majority leader that consent for a meeting would not be given, and the majority leader has attempted to demonstrate that he is not interested in simply going through a lot of motions like a windmill. The minority leader assured me earlier that he had not been able to clear the consent, which the majority leader was prepared and willing to ask for when the Senate assembled at 12 o'clock.

Mr. PURTELL. Is the Senator from Connecticut incorrect in stating that no meeting could have been held for the reason, first, that permission had not been requested, and, second, if permission had been requested, it would not have been granted? In fact, the committee had no permission to meet.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. The Senator is not correct. He would have been correct if he had stated that no meeting could have been held because the minority leader did not give consent to permission being granted. I point to the written request. It does not bear the initials of the minority leader. I have been waiting for the minority leader's permission.

Mr. PURTELL. If the Senator from Texas says that is so, I know it is so.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. The Senator can be sure it is so.

Mr. PURTELL. No committee meeting could be held this afternoon, according to Senate rules, without permission. Is that correct?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Committee meetings frequently are held without permission, but if a committee proposes to report a bill or to transact any other business requiring a vote, it would be in violation of the rule providing that no committee shall sit during a Senate session without the permission of the Senate; and in this case the minority leader refused to give permission.

Mr. PURTELL. Regardless of the reason, is it not true, I ask the distinguished Senator, that no such permission was obtained?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I have stated that the minority leader refused to give permission.

Mr. PURTELL. That is the reason; but the fact remains that no permission was obtained for the committee to meet, and therefore the committee could not have met this afternoon, according to the Senate rules, and transacted any business, such as passing on the bill which was supposd to be before it.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. The Senator from Connecticut is correct when he says no permission was granted for the committee to meet this afternoon; and the Senator from Connecticut would more clearly and more frankly state the real situation which existed if he took my assurance that the minority leader did not clear the request which was made of me when the Senate assembled at 12 o'clock.

Mr. PURTELL. Let me assure the Senator from Texas that I do wish to be frank and I do accept what he said as being the fact.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I thank the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. PURTELL. But I wish to point out that that was the reason why a meeting of the committee was not held; and therefore there was no boycott or anything else by the chairman of a meeting of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I do not wish to ask the Senator from Connecticut to indulge me further. I know nothing of any reasons the minority leader may have had for not approving the request which was submitted. I assume he had his reasons, and I am sure he is prepared to give them to anyone who is interested. He simply told the majority leader that he was not prepared to accede to the request. And the majority leader is not in the habit of making requests merely for the purpose of having the RECORD show they were made.

Mr. PURTELL. I thank the majority leader for giving us facts of which I had no knowledge. But I did have knowledge of the fact that no request for a committee meeting was made, and therefore no meeting of the committee could be held. The reason for that situation has been stated by the majority leader.

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Connecticut yield to me?

Mr. PURTELL. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Indiana.

Mr. JENNER. I came into the Chamber too late to hear all the discussion, although I have heard a part of it. I wish to ask the Senator from Connecticut whether any hearings have been held on the bill to which he has referred.

Mr. PURTELL. No hearings have been held, to the best of my knowledge; and I am a member of the committee.

Mr. JENNER. Has anyone requested hearings on the bill?

Mr. PURTELL. I understand there have been requests for hearings. In that connection, let me say that I hold in my hand a telegram, dated today, which indicates that such a request has come from a very important segment of our populace, one having to do with the use of the vaccine. I desire to read the telegram to the Senate. It is addressed to me, is dated this morning, and reads as follows:

> Technical problems related to the safe manufacture of polio vaccine have been worked out. Dr. Walter B. Martin, the president of the American Medical Association, has stated:
>
> "In behalf of myself and the Board of Trustees, I have assured President Eisenhower that the Nation's physicians will cooperate in limiting polio vaccinations to children from 5 through 9 until the vaccine is available in larger supply. Children in this age group who do not receive the vaccine during the current program of the National Foundation for Infantile Paralysis for first- and second-graders will be vaccinated after its completion.

That ends the quotation from the president of the American Medical Association.

The telegram continues, as follows:

> The medical profession feels that the vaccination of all school children above the 5 to 9 age group can be carried out in orderly fashion and later the young adults on a voluntary basis and that legislation is not necessary to meet the needs or to complete this entire vaccination program.

Mr. President, the concluding sentence of the telegram is most important, and I desire to stress it:

> The American Medical Association would like permission to be heard before your committee on this important medical problem.

The telegram is signed by Dwight H. Murray, M.D., chairman of the board of trustees of the American Medical Association. I have read the entire telegram to the Senate.

Mr. President, I know of no Member of this body who is a scientist. The Members of this body can stand here all day, as legislators, talking about what should be done or what should not be done in connection with this matter. But none of us professes—certainly I do not—to have the knowledge which is had by the members of the medical profession.

In the committee it is proposed to recommend legislation about the use of this vaccine. Mr. President, what is wrong with asking those who do know about this matter for their views? Why not request their advice, and hold public hearings? We wish to have the children protected and adequately safeguarded; but we wish it to be done by those who understand what they are doing, those who have knowledge in this field, and, I may say, have greater knowledge than, in my opinion, does any Member of this legislative body.

I suggest that the American Medical Association and other interested groups of scientists who have knowledge in this field be requested to appear before our committee, so that it may hold full and complete hearings, after which the committee will be in a better position to make further suggestions, if such are necessary, regarding what type of legislation, if any, should be placed upon the statute books.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I wish to reply very briefly to several of the arguments the Senator from Connecticut has made.

Mr. President, I am accustomed to hearing arguments similar to the one we have heard this afternoon. In other words, I have realized that the few of us who have dared stand on the floor of the Senate and point out two great weaknesses in the administration's polio program—first, the weakness in distribution; second, the weakness of failing to take the necessary precautions to guarantee to the American people that pure vaccine will be released to the people—would be subject to the kind of argument the Senator from Connecticut has made here this afternoon. He charges that we are undermining public faith in the vaccine program.

Of course, the difficulty with such arguments is that those who make them do not take the time to read the speeches we have made here on the floor of the Senate. Mr. President, without exception, every one of us who has criticized the administration's handling of the polio-vaccine program has made clear that there is nothing wrong with pure Salk vaccine. On many occasions I have said, in a variety of ways, that it is a medical miracle. Our criticisms have been based upon medical advice which we have received.

Mr. President, the Members of this body have some legislative responsibilities. When we are called into conferences—as the Senator from Minnesota was and as I was—and are told about the dangers confronting the American people because adequate precautionary steps were not taken to guarantee pure vaccine, it becomes our duty to stand on the floor of the Senate and make the criticisms we have made. As Senators, it was our duty to point out the errors and lack of competence in this administration in its handling of the problem, both from the standpoint of distribution and from the standpoint of adequate testing. Mr. President, that duty on our part cannot be transferred by us to the medical profession.

Let me say that I am also aware of the frequently repeated argument that any matter which has anything to do with health should be handled by the medical profession, and that in that connection Congress should abdicate its jurisdiction and its duties, and should look to the medical profession for the handling of such problems. Mr. President, no one has greater respect than do I for the medical profession, and no one believes more than do I that the medical profession deserves greater trust and greater confidence from the American people. But that has absolutely nothing to do with having the Government, as a government, make clear to the medical profession, legislatively speaking, how public-health programs are to be administered. That is a legislative duty and function, not a medical duty and function. Of course, we should have representatives of the medical associations come before us and give us their advice. But when we come to deal with the question of whether the distribution shall be under Federal jurisdiction, through the doctors, or whether it shall be by State jurisdiction, through the doctors, that happens to be a legislative responsibility of the Congress. It happens to be a question for the Congress, not the American Medical Association, to determine.

All of us are aware of what happens to the American Medical Association when it enters the field of social science and politics. It seems to forget its training in the scientific method and the laboratory techniques involved in reasoning from cause to effect. Many pressure groups under the medical group succumb to their own selfish economic

interests. Unfortunately, in the field of legislation that has too commonly been the record of the American Medical Association in recent years. I happen to be one who does not quake at my knees when the doctors of my State, through the American Medical Association, try to make political war on me.

I will not quake at my political knees because the American Medical Association sends a wire in opposition to pending legislation. I refuse to believe that most doctors believe that the Congress of the United States should not protect the people of the country by a fair distribution of the vaccine through Federal jurisdiction. Until the doctors can prove to me that such a system would not afford the greatest guarantee to the boys and girls of this country of a fair inoculation program, I shall continue to urge Federal legislation. We need such legislation, no matter how many of the medical politicians of this country in trying to protect the fee dollar would like to prevent the Federal Government from enacting legislation to guarantee a fair distribution of this vaccine. That is my answer to that kind of telegram. It is typical of the kind of political pressure telegram which we have come to expect from the American Medical Association.

Let me say to the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL] that I know his feelings as a parent. As I have stated once before in this argument, I happen to be a parent whose family was struck by polio. Therefore, Mr. President, I know the anxiety of the Senator from California and every other parent. But the fact remains that our anxieties and our emotions have nothing to do with the real problem which confronts us as Senators. We should proceed with a vaccine program which will guarantee fair and equitable distribution, without cost, to the boys and girls of the country. Secondly, now that we apparently have an agreement as to testing, at long last, between the drug companies and our Federal authorities, we should follow a course of action which will guarantee pure vaccine.

Let me say to the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. PURTELL] that, in my judgment, what has undermined the confidence of the American people in this matter has been the failure of the administration, prior to the release of the vaccine on April 12, to adopt the very precautionary methods it is now adopting. The necessary techniques were known then. They have not been discovered since April 12. The testing techniques are well known. There has been a mistake, but an understandable mistake, and too long a time has been spent in correcting the mistake. Officials of the administration thought they could get more vaccine out faster if all the techniques for checking and precaution were not followed. That is what undermined the confidence of some people in this program. It needs to be said over and over again to the American people, as I have said in every speech I have made on this subject, and as my colleagues who have supported me in this matter have likewise said, that it is a sound vaccine. It is a safe vaccine, when the precautionary checks and tests are complied with.

Let me say to the Senator from California that no one has suggested any compulsory program. No one has said that every child must be vaccinated. No Member of this body would be more opposed to that kind of compulsion than the Senator from Oregon. However, I am satisfied that when we take the facts to the parents of the country—and the medical facts seem to be that the vaccine is between 60 and 85 percent preventive—it will be found that most parents will want their children vaccinated. We made that discovery when they thought it was a safe vaccine, and when they thought there was an adequate supply of it. There was a tremendous demand across the country for vaccinations.

What we need to do, by every medium of information in this country, is to make clear to the parents of America that this is a safe vaccine. I am satisfied that with the precautionary steps which are being taken by the public health authorities, the confidence of the American people will be restored.

I resent the implication that, because we spoke the truth about the fact that the precautionary methods were not being used, at a time when impure vaccine was a real danger to thousands of American boys and girls, we undermined faith in the vaccine. I resent that implication because there is no basis in fact for it. What undermined faith was that the Cutter Co. came out with impure vaccine. We have the statements of medical authorities to the effect that, because the vaccine was impure, it was causitive of polio. That is what undermined faith, and not speeches on the floor of the Senate urging quick application of the tests which we knew competent medical authorities within the health organization itself had been urging from the beginning to have applied to the vaccine. That is the whole case in a nutshell.

I am delighted that Dr. Scheele has done such a magnificent job in obtaining acceptance of the precautionary techniques and tests. I regret that he did not do it in the beginning. He should have done so. That is why I criticized him in the beginning. But I am just as strong in my commendation and praise of him now as I was in my criticism of him before. However, that does not wipe out the mistake.

So, having solved the problem of testing, we should go forward with legislation which will solve the problem of distribution. I agree with the Senator from Connecticut. Let us bring in the witnesses, but let us have some committee meetings. Let us bring in the witnesses and report a bill to the Senate at a very early date.

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

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. In his speech a few minutes ago the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL] raised the question as to why the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare had neither reported the bill which had been drafted, nor recommended procedures to be followed in its consideration. I think it is appropriate that that question should be answered.

There are 13 members of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. Seven are Democrats and six are Republicans. In order that a committee may act, there must be a quorum present consisting of 7 members. Upon four occasions the committee has attempted to hold a meeting to deal with this subject. One was on Thursday last at 2 o'clock p. m.; 1 on Friday at 10 o'clock a. m.; 1 this morning at 10 o'clock a. m.; and 1 this afternoon at 3:30 o'clock p. m.

The attendance at the first meeting, on last Thursday, was 3 Democrats and 1 Republican. On Friday, at 10 o'clock a. m., 4 Democrats were present. No more than one Republican was present in the committee room at any one time. I believe the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. PURTELL], for whom I have a real personal esteem, was present at the early part of the meeting, but had to leave. Later the junior Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT] came.

Mr. PURTELL. Mr. President, may I be permitted to ask a question? Did I not remain approximately 40 minutes? The Senator stated that I was present at the early part of the meeting.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is the Senator speaking of the meeting this morning, or the meeting last Friday?

Mr. PURTELL. I am speaking of the meeting this morning.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I have not yet come to the meeting this morning.

This morning there were 5 Democrats present and 1 Republican, namely, the Senator from Connecticut. He remained for 40 minutes. The rest of us waited for an hour for a quorum to appear. No other Republican appeared.

This afternoon the committee convened at 3:30. Five Democrats were present. No Republican was present.

Mr. PURTELL. Mr. President, may I ask one further question? Was there any official meeting this afternoon? The Senator refers to a meeting this afternoon. I understood, from the earlier colloquy, that there was no official meeting this afternoon. Some Democrats elected to get together, but there was no official meeting of the committee this afternoon.

Mr. DOUGLAS. All members of the committee who were in the city were notified, I believe, and certain members on the Republican side had stated, at an earlier time, that they intended to attend. Later they did not attend.

Mr. PURTELL. One member of the Republican side, the Senator from Connecticut, stated that he would be present. No time was set, at the time I left, for calling the meeting. I understood that, of course, the usual procedure would be followed, and that a unanimous-consent request would be made to authorize the committee to hold a meeting during the session of the Senate.

Since none was made, there was no official meeting that could be held; therefore, no one was absent from a meeting this afternoon.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The Committee on Labor and Public Welfare has frequently considered in an tentative fashion some measures even though consent to meet

during a session of the Senate had not been granted. I think it is obvious that the minority leader of the Senate prevented a formal and official meeting from being held, because he withheld his consent to the request of the majority leader.

If we make a total of the number of Democratic Senators who have attended the 4 meetings we get 17; and of the Republicans who were present throughout, 3. If we include the attendance of the Senator from Connecticut last Friday, we get a total of 4 for the Republicans.

Mr. PURTELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. PURTELL. Is it not true that there are seven Democratic Senators on the committee?

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is correct.

Mr. PURTELL. Is it not true that 7 members constitute a quorum of the committee?

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is correct.

Mr. PURTELL. Is it not true, also, that if 7 Democrats were present the committee would have had a quorum of its members present?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am glad to deal with that question. The two Democrats who were not present today are the senior Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] and the junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY]. The junior Senator from Massachusetts, as we all know, has been ill for months with a severe crippling sickness which kept him from the floor of the Senate from last August until a day last week. The junior Senator from Massachusetts has been compelled to go to a hospital in New York for further examinations to determine whether he is completely cured. Therefore he was prevented from attending the Senate session by doctor's orders. That I think one can consider a force majeure.

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

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. PURTELL. Is it not true that a Senator from the Republican side of the aisle was present at most of the meetings? I know I was. Therefore with that one Republican and 6 Democrats the committee would still have had a quorum had all the Democratic members been in attendance.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] is an official delegate to the meeting of the International Labor Organization at Geneva, and he not only has the consent of the Senate, but he has the approval of the Senate to attend those meetings. The Senator from Montana has been on the high seas for some days, and it was impossible for him to be here.

I think the evidence is therefore clear that the batting average of Democrats, out of a possible attendance of 20, is 17, or .850, which is a pretty good record in any league. The batting average of the Republicans is 3, or at the most 4, out of a possible attendance of 24. Therefore, their batting average is .166. I believe that indicates which side is really trying to have the committee meet.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr JOHNSON of Texas. Does the Senator from Illinois think it is passing strange that the minority should desire, much less advocate, that any committee of this great body should report a bill in the absence of minority representation?

Mr. DOUGLAS. We have tried to give to the minority their opportunity to be heard, both on the procedure to be adopted and on the substantive nature of the bill. We regret that not more Republicans have taken advantage of it. I should like to say that on the whole the Senator from Connecticut has the best record of the Republican members of the committee. His batting average is .500.

Mr. PURTELL. I thank the Senator from Illinois for his observation.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I realize that every Senator has more committee commitments than he can possibly take care of. Sometimes the committee meetings are held at the same time in conflict with each other. I have no information with respect to the reason of any Senator for not being in attendance at committee meetings. I suppose the majority leader is one of the worst offenders when it comes to attending committee meetings.

The only comment I wish to make is that I hope we have not reached the point in the Senate when either the majority or the minority can be indicted because a committee is not made up entirely of Senators belonging to one political party. In other words, it seems to me it is passing strange that the minority should advocate a committee taking action when none of its members is in attendance. It seems to me that the Senator from Illinois is being put in the position of being told: "You had only 5 or 6 majority members present. If you had all seven present, it would not be necessary for the minority to be represented at all."

I should think that that would be the last argument a minority would make. I have been in the minority at times, and I would certainly never make that kind of argument. People who live in glass houses should not throw stones.

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

Mr. DOUGLAS. First, I should like to comment on the point raised by the Senator from Texas. I notice that our Republican friends commonly demand a standard of perfection from Democrats to which they themselves seldom if ever conform. There is one modification I wish to make in my statement, because I desire to be completely just in this matter. I have spoken of the fact that this morning there was only one Republican in attendance, and this afternoon no Republican was in attendance. I am advised that the senior Senator from New York [Mr. IVES] is under a dentist's care today and therefore it was impossible for him to be present.

I am also informed that the senior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] is receiving an honorary degree from Columbia University today, and that that may well account for his absence.

But all the other Republican members, namely, 4, were in town this morning, and yet in the 2 sessions today only 1 appeared.

Therefore, their batting average today was 0.125. Of the 5 Democrats in town, all 5 appeared in the morning, and all 5 appeared in the afternoon. Their batting average, therefore, is 1.000. This, I think, represents the comparative attendance and earnestness of the 2 political parties on this subject, namely, a ratio of 1,000 to 125 or 8 to 1.

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

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. PURTELL. When was the Senator notified of the meeting this afternoon?

Mr. DOUGLAS. We arranged it at 10:55 this morning, and all other members of the committee were notified during the noon hour by the clerical staff, and were telephoned again for a second time between 3.20 and 3.30 in the afternoon.

Mr. PURTELL. I should like to inform the Senator from Illinois that I received my notification of the proposed afternoon meeting, which could not be held because it violated the rules of the Senate, at a quarter to 2 o'clock. Does the Senator from Illinois agree with me that Senators cannot, because of the volume of work before them, sit back and wait in the hope that perhaps they will get notice of a meeting which might be held or might not be held? Does the Senator realize that I have complained in committee about the fact that I have received notice of a meeting less than 24 hours before the meeting was held? Senators have other committee commitments, and many times the committee hearing dates are in conflict. When we receive notice of a meeting less than 24 hours before the meeting is held, it is entirely possible that we may have already made commitments for attendance at other meetings.

Mr. DOUGLAS. We felt we had assurances from the Republican side that a sufficient number would attend, so that there would be a quorum present this afternoon. We were very grievously disappointed.

Mr. PURTELL. Will the Senator from Illinois permit we to make an observation?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Certainly.

Mr. PURTELL. I am not grieved to find that the Republicans refused to violate a rule of the Senate by attending a meeting for which unanimous consent had not been granted.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I take it that the Senator is making the tacit admission that the Republican members of the committee who were present in Washington refused to come because they took advantage of the technicality that the minority leader had refused to give permission for the committee to meet.

Mr. PURTELL. Mr. President, will the Senator permit me to make another observation?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Certainly.

Mr. PURTELL. I have served with the distinguished Senator from Illinois

for 3 years and have learned a great deal about the Senate rules from him and from some of his colleagues. One of the things impressed upon me when we were in the majority was that a committee could not meet during sessions of the Senate unless there was unanimous consent of the Senate. We attempted to hold meetings on important legislation, but were informed that it could not be done. So I bow to my distinguished colleague and thank him for the information he gave me with reference to following Senate rules.

Mr. DOUGLAS. If a wrong was committed, I would say that two wrongs do not make a right. The Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare has never considered a more important bill than the one which we are now discussing.

Mr. PURTELL. I do not believe a wrong was done last year, and I am sure a wrong was not done today in not attending the meeting.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am grateful that the Senator now exonerates the Democratic Members in the past for not attending certain meetings. I am delighted.

Mr. PURTELL. I advised the Senator that I was indebted to him for much that I have learned about the Senate rules, particularly of committee meetings when certain pieces of important legislation might come up. I learned that several years ago, and I am grateful for it.

ORDER FOR RECESS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield for a unanimous-consent request?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate concludes its business today it stand in recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

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

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I am hopeful that following the vote on the postal-pay bill tomorrow, we can have a yea-and-nay vote on the treaty which is now on the Executive Calendar.

I invite the attention of the Senator from Minnesota to this announcement.

THE SALK VACCINE

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, there is one statement which the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL] made informally to our committee in reply to a similar telegram to that which the Senator from Connecticut received from the American Medical Association, that the bill which we are attempting to have considered does not provide for any mandatory system of control. It merely gives to the President the power to invoke such controls as in his judgment should be invoked. This is a point which should be considered. It gives to the President the power to prescribe such priority as he believes may be necessary and desirable.

Mr. President, in order that the public may know what the shooting is about, I ask unanimous consent that the confidential committee print prepared on this subject, which we have not yet been able to have considered by the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare because of our inability to get a quorum, be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

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

Be it enacted, etc.—

TITLE I—DISTRIBUTION AND USE OF POLIOMYELITIS VACCINE

SEC. 101. The Congress finds and declares that lessening or eliminating the threat of poliomyelitis through the use of poliomyelitis vaccine is a matter of great national concern affecting the public health and general welfare. The Congress further finds and declares that, while such vaccine is in short supply, the Federal Government has an obligation to assure that there is an orderly and equitable flow of such vaccine throughout the several States, and to assure that such vaccine is used with maximum effectiveness to reduce the incidence of the disease and thus lessen the spread of poliomyelitis between the several States. It is the policy of the Congress that during the shortage of such vaccine the available supply thereof should be fairly and equitably distributed to those having the greatest need for immunization, and that the powers conferred in this title should be used, insofar as may be necessary, to achieve that objective.

SEC. 102. Whenever the President shall determine that poliomyelitis vaccine is not being distributed fairly and equitably to persons or groups having the greatest need for immunization against poliomyelitis (by reason of susceptibility to the disease or other public health considerations), and that the exercise of some or all of the powers contained in this title is necessary to insure the fair and equitable distribution of such vaccine according to such need, and is otherwise in the public interest, he shall by proclamation make an appropriate finding and declaration. After the making of any such finding and declaration any or all of the powers hereinafter conferred in this title may be exercised.

SEC. 103. The President may provide for the allocation of poliomyelitis vaccine within the United States, its Territories, and possessions, upon such conditions and to such extent as he may deem necessary to insure the maximum availability and most equitable and effective distribution and use thereof. In the exercise of the powers conferred by this title, the President may establish priorities as to the use and distribution of such vaccine, including priorities by age group, physical condition, and geographical area.

SEC. 104. (a) The President may provide for the acquisition by purchase or otherwise of such supplies of poliomyelitis vaccine as he may deem necessary to insure the maximum availability and most equitable and effective distribution and use thereof, and to make such supplies available with or without charge therefor for immunization purposes to the extent to which he deems it to be in the public interest.

(b) The President may requisition supplies of poliomyelitis vaccine for the purposes of this section upon the payment of just compensation, to be determined as provided in this subsection, whenever he determines that acquisition of such supplies of poliomyelitis vaccine is necessary to accomplish the purposes of this section and that such supplies cannot be purchased by him upon fair and reasonable terms without undue delay. The President shall promptly determine the amount of the compensation to be paid for any supplies so requisitioned, and each such determination shall be made, as of the time of requisitioning, in accordance with the provision for just compensation in the fifth amendment to the Constitution of the United States. If the person entitled to receive the amount so determined by the President as just compensation is unwilling to accept the same as full and complete compensation for such supplies, he shall be paid promptly 75 percent of such amount out of any appropriations made for the purposes of this title (which are hereby declared available for such payment), and shall be entitled to recover from the United States, in an action brought in the Court of Claims or, without regard to whether the amount involved exceeds $10,000, in any district court of the United States, within 3 years after the date of the Secretary's award, an additional amount which, when added to the amount so paid to him, shall be just compensation.

SEC. 105. Upon the making of the finding and declaration provided in section 102 of this title, the President may delegate any power or authority conferred upon him by this title to any officer or agency of the Government, including any new agency or agencies (and the President is hereby authorized to create such new agencies as he deems necessary), and he may authorize such redelegations by that officer or agency as the President may deem appropriate.

SEC. 106. The President may make such rules, regulations, and orders as he deems necessary or appropriate to carry out the provisions of this title. Any such rule, regulation, or order may be established in such form and manner, may contain such classifications and differentiations, and may provide for such adjustments and reasonable exceptions as in the judgment of the President are necessary or proper to effectuate the purposes of this title, or to prevent circumvention or evasion, or to facilitate enforcement of this title, or any rule, regulation, or order issued thereunder.

SEC. 107. The President may require such reports and the keeping of such records by persons producing, dealing in, dispensing, or otherwise using poliomyelitis vaccine, and may make such inspections of any such records, as may be necessary and appropriate to the enforcement or the administration of this title and the regulations or orders issued thereunder. Any information obtained under this section which the President deems confidential or with reference to which a request for confidential treatment is made by the person furnishing such information shall not be published or disclosed unless the President determines that the withholding thereof is contrary to the public interest.

SEC. 108. (a) The President may perform the functions provided for in this title by contract or other arrangement, through any State or local public agency, or other public or nonprofit agency or organization. Any such contract or other arrangement may provide that payment (if any) to cover the cost thereof shall be made either in advance or by way of reimbursement, as may be provided therein.

(b) In carrying out the provisions of this title, the President may, notwithstanding any other provision of law providing for payment for services, accept and utilize voluntary and uncompensated services of individuals, or of public or nonprofit agencies, institutions, or organizations.

SEC. 109. No person shall be held liable for damages or penalties for any act or failure to act resulting directly or indirectly from compliance with a rule, regulation, or order issued pursuant to this title notwithstanding that any such rule, regulation, or order shall thereafter be declared by judicial or other competent authority to be invalid.

SEC. 110. (a) The President is authorized to consult with representatives of industry, business, professional groups, and other interested parties, with a view to encouraging the making by such persons with the approval by the President of voluntary agreements and programs to further the objectives of this title.

(b) No act or omission to act pursuant to this title which occurs while this title is in effect, if requested by the President pursuant to a voluntary agreement or program approved under subsection (a) and found by the President to be in the public interest, shall be construed to be within the prohibition of the Federal Trade Commission Act, or of the antitrust laws, as defined in such act. A copy of each such request intended to be within the coverage of this section, and any modification or withdrawal thereof, shall be furnished to the Attorney General and the Chairman of the Federal Trade Commission when made, and it shall be published in the Federal Register.

SEC. 111. (a) The district courts of the United States and the United States courts of the Territories shall have jurisdiction, for cause shown, and, subject to the provisions of rule 65 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, to restrain violations of any provision of this title or of any rule, regulation, or order issued thereunder, and to enforce compliance with any such provision.

(b) Any criminal proceeding on account of any violation of any provision of this title or of any rule, regulation, or order issued thereunder may be brought in any district in which any act, failure to act, or transaction constituting the violation occurred. Any proceeding for an injunction under this title may be brought in any such district or in the district in which the defendant resides or transacts business. Process in such cases may be served in any district wherein the defendant resides or transacts business or wherever the defendant may be found, and subpenas for witnesses who are required to attend a court in any district in any such case may run into any other district. The termination of this title, or of any rule, regulation, or order issued thereunder, shall not operate to defeat any action, or prosecution, whether theretofore or thereafter commenced, with respect to any right, liability, or offense incurred or committed prior to the termination date of such title, rule, regulation, or order.

SEC. 112. The functions exercised under this title shall be excluded from the operation of the Administrative Procedure Act, except as to the requirements of section 3 thereof.

SEC. 113. Any person who willfully performs any act prohibited, or willfully fails to perform any act required by any rule, regulation, or order promulgated under the authority of this title shall, upon conviction, be fined not to exceed $10,000 or imprisoned for not more than 1 year, or both.

SEC. 114. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this title.

SEC. 115. The President shall submit a report to the Congress 1 month after the effective date of this title and each 60 days thereafter covering the extent to which he has exercised the authority conferred by this title and including information setting forth the extent to which (whether or not such authority has been exercised) the available supply of poliomyelitis vaccine is being fairly and equitably distributed for the immunization of persons or groups having the greatest need therefor.

SEC. 116. If any provision of this act or the application of such provision to any person or circumstances shall be held invalid, the remainder of the act, and the application of such provision to persons or circumstances other than those as to which it is held invalid shall not be affected thereby.

SEC. 117. This title and all authority conferred thereunder shall terminate on December 31, 1956.

TITLE II—GRANTS TO STATES FOR VACCINATION PROGRAMS

AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS

SEC. 201. (a) For the purpose of assisting States, during the current shortage of poliomyelitis vaccine, to provide all children an equal opportunity for vaccination against poliomyelitis, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare shall pay to each State, which has submitted and has had approved by the Secretary an application under section 202 of this title, amounts equal to the cost of all poliomyelitis vaccine used in carrying out a vaccination program or programs set forth in such approved application, including vaccine made available without charge to physicians and used by them for the vaccination of children in the age group and area covered by such program.

(b) There is hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to make the payments provided for in this title, such sums to remain available until December 31, 1956.

STATE APPLICATION FOR FUNDS

SEC. 202. The Secretary shall approve the application of any State for payments under this title if such application—

(a) sets forth a program or programs for the use of the poliomyelitis vaccine purchased with funds paid to the State under this title which provide reasonable assurance that all children in an age group or groups determined by the State, or all children in an age group or groups in one or more areas determined by the State, shall be afforded an opportunity within a reasonable period for vaccination against poliomyelitis without charge: *Provided*, That the Secretary may, in the administration of this title, specify certain categories of children to be accorded priority in receiving immunization from poliomyelitis, and during any period in which any priority group has been so established and is in effect all vaccine provided under any such program shall be made available only to children within any such group;

(b) provides for administration or supervision of administration of any program included in the application by a single State agency;

(c) provides that the State agency will make such reports, in such form and containing such information, as the Secretary may from time to time reasonably require to carry out his functions under this title, and will comply with such provisions as the Secretary may from time to time find necessary to assure the correctness and verification of such reports; and

(d) provides such accounting, budgeting, and other fiscal methods and procedures as are necessary for the proper and efficient administration of the program.

PAYMENTS TO STATES

SEC. 203. The Secretary shall from time to time estimate the amount to be paid to each State under the provisions of this title for any period, and shall pay such amount to such State reduced or increased, as the case may be, by any sum (not previously adjusted under this section) by which he finds that his estimate of the amount to be paid to the State for any prior period under this title was greater or less than the amount which should have been paid to the State for such prior period under this title. Such payments shall be made in such installments as the Secretary may determine.

USE OF FUNDS TO STATES

SEC. 204. Funds paid to a State under this title may be used solely for the purchase, prior to December 31, 1956, of poliomyelitis vaccine for use in carrying out a program set forth in the application of such State approved pursuant to section 202.

FURNISHING OF VACCINE BY SECRETARY

SEC. 205. At the request of any State the Secretary may use all or any portion of any payment authorized to be made to such State under this title for the purchase of poliomyelitis vaccine to be furnished to the State in lieu of such payment (or such portion thereof). Vaccine so furnished shall be subject to the same requirements as to use as vaccine purchased from payments to States pursuant to this title.

PRIORITIES AND ADVISORY COMMITTEE

SEC. 206. Priorities established by the Secretary pursuant to section 202 (a) shall be based on the relative susceptibility of various age groups of children to poliomyelitis. The Secretary is authorized to establish an advisory committee on distribution of poliomyelitis vaccine to advise and assist him in the establishment of such priorities. Appointed members of such committee who are not otherwise in the employ of the United States, while attending conferences or meetings of the committee or otherwise serving at the request of the Secretary, shall be entitled to receive compensation at a rate to be fixed by the Secretary, but not exceeding $50 per diem, including travel time, and while away from their homes or regular places of business they may be allowed travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, as authorized by law (5 U. S. C. 73b-2).

DIVERSION OF FEDERAL FUNDS

SEC. 207. Whenever the Secretary, after reasonable notice and opportunity for hearing to the State agency administering or supervising the administration of the program included in the application of such State approved under section 202, finds that—

(a) such State agency is not complying substantially with the provisions of this title or the terms and conditions of its approved application; or

(b) any funds paid to such State or supplies of vaccine furnished to it under this title have been diverted from the purposes for which paid or furnished;

the Secretary shall notify such State agency that no further payments will be made (or no further supplies of vaccine will be furnished) to the State under this title until he is satisfied that there is no longer any failure to comply or the diversion has been corrected or, if compliance or correction is impossible, until such State agency repays or arranges for the repayment of Federal funds which have been diverted or improperly expended (or for repayment of the cost of the vaccine which has been diverted).

DEFINITIONS

SEC. 208. For purposes of this title—

(a) The term "Secretary" means the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare;

(b) The term "child" means any individual who has not attained the age of 20 years;

(c) The term "State" includes Alaska, Hawaii, Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, Guam, American Samoa, the Canal Zone, and the District of Columbia;

(d) The cost of poliomyelitis vaccine shall be determined by the Secretary on the basis of information available to him; and such cost may be determined from time to time or as of a specified date, and may be determined to be a single figure for all States or varied in accordance with actual cost.

Mr. PURTELL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield for another question?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. PURTELL. Did I correctly understand the Senator to say that the proposed legislation which we have been discussing has to do with the giving of standby controls to the President?

Mr. DOUGLAS. It also includes the free disposition of vaccine.

Mr. PURTELL. Is it not true that the reason why standby controls are needed is that the President may have them when the Congress is not in session?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I think that is one of the reasons, certainly.

Mr. PURTELL. Is it the Senator's thought that perhaps the Senate will not be in session tomorrow or the next day, so that the President might have to exercise such controls? Is it not reasonable to assume that we shall be here for a few more weeks and that, therefore we should explore the whole area and hold hearings so that anyone interested in the proposed legislation may have a chance to be heard before the committee? Is there any particular rush to empower the President with standby controls when it is likely that we shall be here for from 45 to 60 days?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am not at the moment debating the idea as to whether the bill is a wise one. What I am lamenting is the inability to obtain a quorum of Members to consider it. I think the record of attendance indicates on whose shoulders the responsibility of the failure to obtain a quorum rests.

Mr. PURTELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD following my remarks an excerpt from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 100, part 3, pages 3587 and 3588, from which I should like to read briefly. Referring to the question of holding committee meetings when the Senate is in session, the then minority leader said:

> I realize how important it is to get early action on the tax bill which is now in committee, and for that reason we on this side of the aisle wish to cooperate in every way we can. However, we desire to serve notice that unless we are confronted with an emergency and unless it is very imperative that committees meet in the afternoon, I shall not look with favor on granting unanimous consent, as a matter of regular policy, for committees to meet during the afternoon in the weeks ahead.

I should like to quote what the majority leader said at that time:

> There is a good reason for the rule prohibiting meetings of committees during sessions of the Senate, and I do not believe we should ignore it, except under very unusual circumstances.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the complete excerpt be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

COMMITTEE MEETING DURING SENATE SESSION

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Finance be permitted to meet this afternoon during the session of the Senate.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, permission is granted.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas subsequently said: Mr. President, if I may have the attention of the majority leader for a moment, when the request was made for permission to the Committee on Finance to meet this afternoon during the session of the Senate the minority leader made no objection. He had previously assured the majority leader that he would not object when the request was made. However, I wish to make this observation: For the past several days we have had a very small attendance on the floor of the Senate. Yesterday, while a very important proposal was being discussed, fewer than a half dozen Senators were on the floor.

I realize how important it is to get early action on the tax bill which is now in committee, and for that reason we on this side of the aisle wish to cooperate in every way we can. However we desire to serve notice that unless we are confronted with an emergency and unless it is very imperative that committees meet in the afternoon, I shall not look with favor on granting unanimous consent, as a matter of regular policy, for committees to meet during the afternoon in the weeks ahead.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, of course I recognize the fact that committees of the Senate cannot meet except by unanimous consent, in the normal procedure in the Senate. However, I should like to point out to my distinguished colleague and friend from Texas, the minority leader, that we could completely tie up the operations of the Senate if we do not permit committees to meet. We have a very heavy legislative program. It is difficult for many of the committees to finish their work in morning sessions.

It is possible that committees would be faced with the contingency which confronts the Senate, namely, if they are not allowed to meet during the sessions of the Senate, the committees might have to meet in the evening, which I believe would be just as burdensome on Senators as evening sessions of the Senate, which a great many Senators hope we will be able to avoid.

While I do not believe in a general development of afternoon committee meetings unless they are necessary, it is a fact that the Committee on Appropriations historically has always had to meet during the sessions of the Senate, and, of course, it has always been given permission to do so.

The Committee on Finance has before it an important piece of tax legislation. Other committees occasionally must meet also during the afternoon. Yesterday, for example, the Committee on Armed Services, of which the distinguished Senator from Texas is a member, held some very important hearings. It would have been very inconvenient to Cabinet officials and department heads and the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff if the committee had not been able to meet during the session of the Senate yesterday afternoon.

I myself deplore the fact that there is not at times a better attendance on the floor of the Senate; but, based on my almost 9 years of service here, it is not a new situation. It is caused by conditions to which I have made reference and also by the fact that Senators have other business to conduct.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Of course, I made no reference to the Committee on Appropriations. We have always given consent to that committee to meet during Senate sessions, and it has been the historic policy of the Committee on Appropriations to meet during sessions of the Senate. We understand the problems which confront that committee.

I waived objection to the meeting of the Committee on Finance, because I realize what the committee and the Senate are confronted with by way of proposed tax legislation. At the same time I believe we do not make any progress in the consideration of important measures, such as the one now pending, if only 3 or 4 Senators are on the floor during their discussion. The Senators who are presenting their views on the proposal which is now before the Senate will insist on presenting them again, unless they can get some more Senators to listen to them.

We must be reasonable about it. We must exercise good judgment. However, unless there is an emergency situation and unless some very excellent reasons can be given for a committee to meet during a session of the Senate, I shall be constrained to object. There is a good reason for the rule prohibiting meetings of committees during sessions of the Senate, and I do not believe we should ignore it, except under very unusual circumstances.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I have no intention at this time of making such a suggestion, but I will certainly want to discuss with the minority leader during this afternoon and tomorrow the possibility of holding some evening sessions of the Senate, because from my experience in the Senate, I have noted that there is a better attendance on the floor during evening sessions than during the afternoon, and there does not arise the problem of a conflict with committee meetings. If it is desirable, as I think it is—and I believe the minority leader has made a good point—that more Members of the Senate should be on the floor during the debate on the pending bill, perhaps we should hold some evening sessions in order to expedite the business of the Senate, or make some other arrangements for committee meetings.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I wish to make only one comment, and then I shall be ready to go into conference with the majority leader. Unless the majority leader has in mind more important legislation than appears on the calendar now, he will not be very persuasive with me so far as having evening sessions are concerned.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I was out of the Chamber and did not hear the request of the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. PURTELL. I simply asked that an excerpt from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of March 19, 1954, be printed in the RECORD. It has to do with committee meetings during Senate sessions.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I have no objection, but I have not expressed approval or disapproval of committee meetings. If the Senator is defending the Senate rules he can remain at his own desk. I have not expressed the opinion that the committee should meet or should not meet on this specific day.

The majority leader, in scheduling the program of the Senate each day, presents to the minority leader requests which have been made by the various chairmen. Today the majority leader had a request for the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare to meet. I presented the request to the minority leader, who said, as I recall, that before approving the request he would like to check with the minority members of the committee.

I renewed the request, I think, at least twice. The minority leader told me each time that he was not in a position to clear it. It was immaterial to me whether the committee met; and if the minority leader wished to object, he was perfectly within his rights to do so. He exercised those rights. For those reasons, the request was not made of the Senate.

I have never taken the position that the committee should meet this afternoon, tonight, or at any other time. If the chairman and the members of the committee wish to meet, I will present their request to the Senate. If such a meeting would interfere with any part of the program for which the majority leader is responsible, and I do not think the committee should meet, I shall have no hesitancy in objecting.

Mr. PURTELL. If the distinguished Senator from Texas will overlook my transgression of stepping across the aisle

to his desk for a moment, I shall be happy to present to him what I have just placed in the RECORD.

Mr. President, I came here today chiefly for the purpose of presenting a telegram from the American Medical Association. This is a very serious matter. It goes far beyond whether one gets good newspaper coverage of his remarks, or the appeal one's remarks might have to any particular segment of the people.

We are talking about the health of our children. We are talking about the happiness of those who love those children. It appears to me to be nothing but plain common sense to permit the American Medical Association, or any other interested group, to come before the committee which is presently considering proposed legislation having to do with the distribution and manufacture of Salk vaccine. Let us get all the information obtainable. We are not, to the best of my knowledge, anyway, the best-informed body in the world as to the medical profession.

I plead with my fellow Senators to make certain that we hear from all interested bodies—the American Medical Association and others—which might be opposed to or in favor of the plan, so that we, in our desire to do what is right—and I believe we all have that desire—may have the value of their experience and knowledge.

I cannot help believing that we are mature enough not to be unduly influenced by any organization. We are looking for the facts. I believe we can best get them by having representatives of all the interested organizations appear.

I hope that in reading the RECORD tomorrow my colleagues will pay particular attention to the plea of the American Medical Association. I do not ask them to do as I say, but to listen to what qualified experts may say about this matter, and then to do as they feel, in their wisdom and judgment, should be done.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. May I inquire of the Senator from Connecticut if he included in his request the complete colloquy between the Senator from Texas and the Senator from California?

Mr. PURTELL. I tried to be fair, so I quoted from the remarks of both the Senator from California and the Senator from Texas. I thought my remarks—and we can have the Official Reporter read them, if the Senator wishes—indicated that the Senator from Texas expressed a like attitude in this matter.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. If the Senator has no objection, and since he desires it to appear, I should like to have the complete colloquy extended at that point in the RECORD.

Mr. PURTELL. I should be most agreeable and most happy to concur in the request of the Senator from Texas.

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. The colloquy indicated that while there might be serious doubt at times, depending upon the circumstances, the Senator from Texas did not object to the Committee on Finance meeting.

Mr. PURTELL. He did not; that is correct. I was trying to point out that the attitude of the Senator from Connecticut was not unusual, but was in accord with the practice of the Senate, and with the view expressed by leaders in the Senate.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I have been interested in the colloquy which has taken place over the proposals which have been advanced both by the administration and by certain Senators for the distribution of the so-called Salk vaccine. I have one additional comment to make with reference to this matter, namely, that the administration belatedly, long after the fact, has now recognized that there is a need for some sort of program. Regrettably, the administration has difficulty in accommodating itself to the responsibilities of governing and of exercising authority when it pertains to matters concerning the general welfare of the great American public. However, the administration does not have such difficulty in exerting administrative action when it comes to some other projects which have less genuine, general interest for the American people.

I repeat what I said earlier today, that the need for a program of distribution has now been acknowledged by the administration in the President's statement. It has been acknowledged belatedly, long after the facts were revealed as to its urgent necessity.

Secondly, the administration now acknowledges that additional tests were required, even though the matter had been brought to the attention of competent authorities long ago.

Mr. President, I should like to speak for a few minutes on another subject of general interest.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota has the floor.

THE REFUGEE RELIEF ACT OF 1953

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, again the Eisenhower administration has recognized that possibly all is not well with the administration of the Refugee Relief Act of 1953. Under date of May 27, 1955, the President sent to Congress a message asking for 10 amendments to that act.

The Refugee Relief Act has been in force almost 2 years. There are Members of the Senate—and I am proud to be one of them—who have repeatedly pointed out that glaring weaknesses, inequities, limitations, and restrictions exist in the law which make it very difficult to administer.

Secondly, we have pointed out real problems confronting those who administer the law. Within recent months there has been adequate testimony as to that fact.

It has taken the Corsi incident—the dismissal of Mr. Corsi, a New York Republican and an expert in the field of immigration—and it has taken statement after statement in the Senate to bring finally to the President's attention the weaknesses, limitations, and restrictions in the Refugee Relief Act.

In reading the proposed 10 amendments to the act I was interested to note that over the weekend the press carried the message that a number of Republican Senators favored the President's proposal, as if that were news. It should be at least reasonably expected that a number of Republican Senators would be for the President's proposal. As I understand, the President is the leader of his party as well as the President of the United States.

But I think it would have been a little better had the message pointed out that a number of proposals had been suggested in the Senate. The junior Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN] is the main sponsor of a bill to amend the Refugee Relief Act. The senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] is a cosponsor. I am privileged to be a cosponsor, along with other Senators. That proposal was introduced in the Senate a considerable period of time ago. I know that the committees of the Senate are giving it serious consideration.

What is more, from time to time last year, following 1 year's experience under the Refugee Relief Act, weaknesses in the law were pointed out, and the administration was called upon to do something about them.

I point out that there has been statement after statement from the White House, the Secretary of State, and the State Department, and also from the President's own press secretary, to the effect that there was nothing basically wrong with the Refugee Relief Act, and that it was working well.

When it was stated on the floor of the Senate that after the act had been in operation more than a year, less than 100 refugees had been admitted, we heard only that the difficulties were being taken care of, that administrative inflexibilities were being ironed out, and that everything was going to work well. The truth is that we were purposely deluded by the administration for more than 2 years.

I say with all charity that it is good now to have the 10 suggestions of the President for amendment of the act. I further suggest that the President might look into the administration of the act. No law is any better than the support it receives from those who administer it. Congress can write the best possible laws, but if there is not the will to administer them within the spirit of the acts, there will be no positive results. I have watched this administration in the case of other laws change their whole intent and purpose by changes made in regulatory agencies.

We are going to be shortly debating a gas bill, for example. While we are getting ready to debate it, and before we have even debated it, the Federal Power Commission changes all the rules and regulations.

We have seen this happen in terms of the Federal Trade Commission. We have seen it happen in terms of one regulatory agency after another. Without ever changing the law, by changing those who administer the law, and by putting in administrative positions persons who are not sympathetic to the law, they, for all practical purposes, stop the impact of the law or change its intent and its design.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. SPARKMAN. The Senator is familiar with the report made recently by the Attorney General's so-called committee on antitrust laws; is he not?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I am, indeed.

Mr. SPARKMAN. The Senator has well pointed out how things can be done by changing the administration of the law. I have not counted them, but I have been told that of some 84 recommendations made by the Attorney General's committee with reference to the antitrust laws, 73 of them relate to changes in the administration of the laws, giving suggestions as to how the antitrust laws can be gotten around by change in administration.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator has put his finger on the particular analysis I should like to point out, namely, that even though the basic structure of the law is changed, it can be even more fundamentally changed by the persons who administer the law, and by the regulations and rules they adopt.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I wonder if the Senator will yield for one other point.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. SPARKMAN. A few moments earlier the Senator used the word "deluded."

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes, I did, after considered judgment.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I wish to emphasize that expression, because in the particular case to which I have called attention the committee was appointed, according to all reports and all appearances, for the purpose of making a study as to how we could strengthen our antitrust laws, our laws against monopoly, and our laws to protect free competition, and yet nearly every one of the recommendations was a method of getting around in some way and weakening the antitrust laws.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator is simply telling what is the fact regarding the recommendations to which he has referred, because, as we know, the Senator from Alabama has been holding hearings on these very recommendations. When the matter was gone into, it was ascertained that the proposals, rather than strengthening the antitrust laws and the antimonopoly laws, would actually weaken them.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Weaken and undermine them.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes; and undermine them.

I want to assure the President of the United States, the Secretary of State, and the Administrator of the Refugee Relief Act, Mr. McCleod, that a number of us in the Senate will do everything we can to finally redesign the legislation so that it will do what it was purportedly intended to do.

I find a certain amount of comfort in knowing that at long last the administration knows that the act which was so heralded, and which for so long, was apologized for, has proved to be relatively inoperative. It is reassuring and refreshing to have this confession of weakness and limitation. But I would be less than candid if I did not say that it would have been much more encouraging had the President, in many of his press conferences, indicated support of the basic provisions of the Lehman bill, which was introduced in the Senate some time ago. After all, there is not anything particularly wrong in having a bill sponsored by a Democratic Senator, particularly when there is a majority of Democrats in the Senate.

While I realize that it is very good to have Republican Members of the Senate—at least a number of them—support the proposal which has been placed before us today, it would be even more reassuring to know that they would support the broad provisions or the general principles of the proposal presented by the Senator from New York. Now that the President has given his support to revision of the Refugee Relief Act, I hope we can expedite action on it, make it truly bipartisan, and that we can also call to the attention of the State Department its responsibility to make any law which it enacted an effective instrumentality for carrying out the purposes of the legislation.

Mr. PURTELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. PURTELL. Is the Senator referring to the 10 suggested changes in the immigration law?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes.

Mr. PURTELL. The Senator has stated that, after all, occasionally a Democratic Senator may introduce a good bill. I suggested to him that it was a Democrat who introduced the bill. If I am not mistaken, he is referring to the McCarran-Walter bill.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I wish to say to the Senator from Connecticut that, while he desires to be right, in this instance he is definitely wrong. I say this most respectfully, because I have a warm friendship for the Senator from Connecticut. I think it is true that the bill was introduced by the Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS]. It was passed in the 83d Congress. I think it is equally true that the act was heralded as a great victory and one which was going to lead to a new day. It was a part of the dynamic, progressive, conservative program.

Mr. PURTELL. The bill which was introduced by the Senator from Utah had to do with the refugee relief problem; had it not?

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is what I am talking about.

Mr. PURTELL. Which would affect 209,000 persons; but, basically, it is all a part of the law on immigration.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Let me say to the Senator from Connecticut that the junior Senator from Minnesota fought vigorously against the McCarran-Walter Act, and is prepared to fight even more vigorously against it now, and the President of the United States has suggested many changes in it, which suggestions he has submitted to the Congress. What we are really talking about now is the Refugee Relief Act, which was sponsored by the 83d Congress, under a Republican majority. I wish to commend the Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS], for trying to do the right thing. I primarily charge the administration with failing to have the act properly administered.

Mr. PURTELL. Was not the bill proposed by the Senator from Utah because there were certain defects in the McCarran-Walter bill, and did that bill not have to do with refugees?

Mr. HUMPHREY. The law having to do with refugees was entirely different from the law covering the overall immigration problem, because a refugee was without a country. He was either a refugee, an escapee, or an expellee, who was no longer a citizen of any government, or who came from a government behind the Iron Curtain. Many of them were without means to obtain a regular visa. Therefore, legislation for relief of such persons was enacted.

If the Senator from Connecticut wants to join with the junior Senator from Minnesota in progressively and constructively attempting to amend the Walter-McCarran Act, I shall welcome his support. What I wish him to do now is to join with the rest of us in the amendment of the Refugee Relief Act. Then I want him to admit frankly that for 2 years the administration did not make the act work, for 2 years it tried to make us believe the act did work, and for 2 years it did not work.

Mr. PURTELL. Mr. President, I appreciate the vest knowledge now pouring forth from the Senator from Minnesota, but the Senator from Connecticut has already expressed his opinion regarding the 10 proposed amendments to the so-called Watkins bill. Is it not true that it is all a part of the immigration problem? Because we could not get the refugees to come to this country, that legislation was proposed.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Since the Senator has referred to the immigration law, I should like to say that the immigration law relates to nationals who live in their own countries, and that law does not refer to those extraordinary cases known as expellees, escapees, and refugees. I am rather surprised the Senator from Connecticut did not have this information at his fingertips, because since the war we have always had some kind of emergency program for displaced persons and war orphans, for whom we have enacted legislation.

Mr. PURTELL. I am quite cognizant of that fact, and I simply state that it is all a part of the question as to whom we shall permit to come into this country. It is all part of the immigration problem.

Mr. HUMPHREY. In that respect the Senator is correct.

Mr. PURTELL. And the law covering that subject is the McCarran-Walter Act.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I may remind the Senator that the Democrats led the fight against that legislation. If we had had one more Republican vote, we would have sustained the Presidential veto, but we did not have that vote. We have had a lot of loud talk about the Refugee Relief Act, and very little action. I say it is to the credit of the administration that it is willing to recognize the need for 10 amendments. I may assure the administration officials that they will get real bipartisan support for those amendments. I regret, however, that the administration did not have the good will or the good sense to support proposals

which already have been introduced, but instead, has condemned and criticized the law.

Instead of condemning and criticizing the law, the administration should have joined with us in saying, "Let us proceed forthwith to improve it." However, at long last—after the embarrassment of the Corsi incident; and believe me, Mr. President, it was embarrassing and shocking—the administration, in order to make the record a little more palatable to the American people, has come forward with 10 proposed amendments. I pledge my wholehearted support to those amendments. In fact, I think we should make more amendments, in order to improve the law. But those 10 amendments in themselves would make the law a much more efficient and much more effective piece of legislation. Then, Mr. President, if we can imbue into the administrator of the law the spirit of the Refugee Relief Act, if we can imbue into him "dynamic conservatism"—and I place quotation marks around that phrase—we shall obtain better administration of the act.

Mr. PURTELL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield for a question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SPARKMAN in the chair). Does the Senator from Minnesota yield to the Senator from Connecticut?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. PURTELL. The Senator from Minnesota has referred to good judgment and good sense. Of course, what constitutes good judgment and good sense may be a matter of discretion.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Oh, yes.

Mr. PURTELL. I assure the Senator from Minnesota that there is good judgment and good sense in these amendments. Am I to understand that he is suggesting that these proposed changes in the law be made?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, the Senator from Minnesota is of good heart and warm spirit. He is always ready to commend those who do good deeds, even if their good deeds are late.

Let me say that my only complaint—and I hope the Senator from Connecticut will not take exception to this—is that for 2 years we were led to believe that all was well, and that the administrative complexities of the law were being ironed out. But now, after the administration's very humiliating experience, one which the administration would like to forget—I refer to the appointment by the administration of a Republican to come to Washington to help administer the Refugee Relief Act, and then to find in the rules a technicality for dismissing him, namely, a provision that such persons could be hired for only 90 days, with the result that Mr. Corsi was sent back to New York—all at once, just to make the record a little more palatable to the American people, these 10 amendments are brought forth.

Let me say that I welcome the 10 amendments, and I believe they should be adopted; and as a cosponsor of the Lehman bill I wish to say that we shall be more than happy to join with our friends on the opposite side of the aisle in having these amendments adopted. We extend to them the warm hand of bipartisan fellowship, and ask them to join with us in the course of the sponsorship of this proposed legislation.

I desire to thank my friend, the Senator from Connecticut, because I know he is a strong supporter of these proposals.

Mr. PURTELL. I am; and long before I heard the Senator from Minnesota's discourse I was a strong supporter of the 10 proposed amendments.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I understand the Senator from Connecticut was, and I wish more or less to firm up his support, so that those convictions will last beyond this session of Congress, and into the next session.

Mr. PURTELL. I assure the Senator from Minnesota that while I appreciate his kindness and confidence in me, frankly, my convictions on this subject were firmed up long before I heard his remarks.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I hope I have done nothing to weaken the position of the Senator from Connecticut, and I hope he will stand fast.

Mr. PURTELL. I assure the Senator from Minnesota that I will.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I join in hoping that the Senator from Connecticut will.

THE SUPREME COURT'S DECREE FOR AN IMMEDIATE END TO SEGREGATION IN SCHOOLS

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD a statement prepared by me.

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

STATEMENT BY SENATOR EASTLAND

The Supreme Court's decree today calls for an immediate start to mixing the races in the schools. In my judgment the order means that the Court intends within 3 to 5 years to have a large racial mixture in southern schools.

To resist them is the only answer. We must resist them in the courts, in our legislative halls, and by the ballots of the people. I know that southern people will not surrender their dual school system and their racial heritage at the command of this crowd of racial politicians in judicial robes. This decision will be unanimously resisted in the Southern States. Southern people will not be violating the Constitution or the law when they defy this monstrous proposition. They will be defying those who would destroy our system of government. In fact, our people of the South will be upholding their finest traditions and love of their country and its institutions.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, if no other Senators desire to obtain the floor at this time, I am prepared to move that the Senate take a recess.

I desire to announce that following the vote tomorrow on the postal pay bill, and following the vote on the treaty which is on the executive calendar, debate on the mutual security bill will be continued. It will carry on as late in the evening as any Senator may desire to discuss the bill to insure full and free discussion of that measure. If it appears desirable, I shall consult with the minority leader late tomorrow, and perhaps the Senate could convene at an early hour on Thursday, in order to permit further discussion, before amendments are considered.

Mr. President, it is hoped by the distinguished chairman of the committee and by the ranking minority member of the committee, who have held long and tedious hearings on this measure, that it may be possible late on Thursday for the Senate to take a final vote.

As Senators know, at this time of the year it is rather difficult to arrange matters in the Senate in such a manner as to have a maximum number of Senators present on Fridays. Commencement exercises are being held, and in that connection many arrangements have been made months in advance. If it is at all possible for the leadership—and I speak for the leadership on both sides—to accommodate the chairman of the committee, and ranking minority member of the committee, and as many other Senators as possible, we wish to do so. But if we are unable to reach a vote on Thursday, the leadership will be prepared to ask Senators to come here on Friday, and, if necessary, on Saturday, because next week we have two very important appropriation bills and a very important housing bill, and we have in the committee stage several extremely important measures which will be reported and must be considered.

I shall try to accommodate every Senator, and I hope to please every Senator, although that is rather a difficult thing to do.

Today we could have voted on the treaty. But when I came to the office this morning, I was informed that at least 11 Senators could not conveniently vote today on the treaty. So, although we had given advance notice, and although every Senator was on notice, the minority leader and myself agreed to accommodate those Senators and postpone the vote on the treaty until tomorrow.

I hope all Senators who read the RECORD, if they are not able to be present in the Chamber—as I know many of them are not, because of the critical stage in various committee deliberations—will bear in mind that we are now about to enter the month of June; that under the Reorganization Act we are to conclude our session by July 31; that a national emergency no longer confronts the country; and that we have only 2 more months in which to conclude our action on approximately 10 appropriation bills, the Reserve bill, the housing bill, the wage bill, possibly an education bill, and numerous extensions of acts which otherwise will expire.

It is very easy for a Senator to say: "I hope there will not be a rollcall vote" on a certain day, and to ask the other 95 Senators to wait on him. But it is very difficult for the leadership to work out a program which will please all Senators, when we are in the month of

June. So I hope Senators will be as understanding as possible.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President——

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield to the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. ELLENDER. Of course I realize the difficulties under which the leadership is now working.

When I came here this morning, I stated to my good friend, the Senator from Texas, that I understood that the mutual security bill would be considered on Thursday. From the radio and the newspapers I receive the impression that consideration of the bill would begin on Thursday.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. The Senator from Louisiana means last Thursday, I assume.

Mr. ELLENDER. No; I mean the coming Thursday. The report was available to some of us last Saturday, and the hearings were made available this morning.

This is a very important bill. I was quite surprised, as I told the majority leader a while ago, when I learned that the Senate had agreed to start voting on the bill next Thursday. The amount involved is quite large. For the past 3 months I have been trying to obtain facts about the unexpended balances, also about the kind of projects in foreign lands which were being considered, in order to compare them with projects in our own country which are being denied funds.

Up to this time I have been unable to obtain such evidence. In response to a letter I wrote him more than 3 months ago, Governor Stassen came to my office several weeks ago and stated that it would be rather difficult for him to obtain the data I had requested; whereupon he volunteered to furnish me what he had. That was 3 weeks ago, and up until now I have not heard from him.

I have made an earnest effort to obtain a great deal of data which I believe would be of interest to the Senate. I fear that the program on which we are embarking might develop into one similar to the Marshall aid program for Europe. Once we start spreading the program to Asia, there is no telling the extent to which it may be increased. It strikes me that, before we undertake a program of such magnitude, trying to cover an area many times greater than that of Europe, and involving many more people, and different kinds of people than those with whom we have dealt in Europe, facts in connection with the program should be presented to the Senate, and ample opportunity should be given to make such presentation. That is all I ask.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. If the Senator will permit an interruption at that point, I do not wish to interrupt his train of thought, but I think he has made a very good point. I understand it, and I am in sympathy with it. I think no Member of the Senate is more competent to present that viewpoint than is the distinguished Senator from Louisiana. No one has cooperated better with the majority leader in helping to bring legislation to the floor and to see that it is thoroughly discussed and considered. I am sure that is the object both of us have in mind in our deliberations.

It may be that I did not make myself clear. I make many mistakes. No one is more conscious of the mistakes he makes than is the Senator from Texas.

On practically every day last week, at some time during the deliberations of the Senate, I invited the attention of Senators to our problem. The Senator from Louisiana will remember that last March we were having yea-and-nay votes, and that an effort was being made to compel the Senate to remain in session at night, during the first 3 months of the session. The Senator from Texas resisted such night sessions that early in the session of Congress, although he is agreeable, when the month of June has arrived, to meeting at night. Later in the year, when we lost 1 or 2 of our colleagues, the Senator from Texas was very thankful that there had not been prolonged night sessions in the Senate which might have contributed toward bringing about a bad physical condition on their part.

Let me read a portion of the statement of the majority leader at the last meeting of the Senate:

> Our program for next week, beginning on Tuesday—

This was on Friday of last week—

> will be somewhat heavy. The report of the Committee on Appropriations on the State, Justice, and Judiciary appropriation bill has been placed on the desks of Senators. It is our plan on Tuesday, following the morning hour, to begin the discussion of the appropriation bill.

Then I spoke about a treaty. According to our practice, a yea-and-nay vote is had on all treaties, even though some of them may be noncontroversial. I showed the Senator the request of 11 Senators today to postpone such a vote. That matter had to go over until today.

The Senator from Texas continued:

> If, following the measures referred to, time remains on Tuesday, as I think may be the case, the Senate may hear some discussion on the mutual security bill, but there will be no votes on that bill that day.

The statement referred to Tuesday.

> I hope that on Wednesday the Senate may be able to proceed with the debate on the mutual security bill in an effort to secure a vote on it as soon as possible.

Further, the Senator from Texas said:

> Mr. President, I ask all Senators to be on notice of the program contemplated for next week. The Senate has transacted a great deal of business this week, and it has been largely the result of cooperation on the part of every Member. Therefore we are able to recess from today until next Tuesday.

The Senate will be in session all day tomorrow. This afternoon we have had the problem of finding enough speakers to occupy the time. I have personally talked with every Democratic member of the committee, and many Republican members, and have asked them to spcak on the bill. Some Senators have asked why the Senate could not proceed to a vote today on the bill.

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. Let me say to my good friend from Texas that if all I had to do was to come here and study the mutual security bill, I would not complain.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I understand that. The Senator is not complaining.

Mr. ELLENDER. As the Senator knows, I happen to be chairman of the Subcommittee on Public Works of the Committee on Appropriations. I was busy from early morning until late at night all of last week, and this morning I was attending hearings on the Armed Services bill, which involves about 68 percent of the budget this year.

Furthermore, as chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, I gave notice 2 weeks ago that, beginning tomorrow morning at 10 o'clock, there would be extended hearings on the price support program. That has required a great deal of my time and attention.

I spent a good deal of yesterday and the day before in trying to plan the hearings so as to allow opportunity to all those who desired to be heard.

All those things require a great deal of time. As I stated, I got the impression that the Senate would not begin debate on the mutual security bill until Thursday. I thought I would have until that time to do a little night work in getting my facts and figures together. When I came to the Chamber today and learned that there is to be a limitation of debate on next Thursday, my good friend from Texas indicated to me that I could have all the time I required in order to present my views. It will require a great deal of time to collect all the information I have, particularly the information which I have been trying to obtain from FOA. I obtained quite a bit of information on my visits abroad, but not in the detail in which I should like to present it to the Senate.

This is an important program. It involves obligating ourselves, in addition to what is in the pipeline, to another $3½ billion. That is a large sum.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I am eager to accommodate every Senator, and to arrange the schedule of the Senate in such a way as to permit each Senator to say everything he desires on every subject.

It is rather difficult to have all the Senators in attendance on Friday and on Saturday, although in the month of June all Senators should be prepared to be here. If we are unable to conclude consideration of the bill after discussing it on Tuesday and on Wednesday and on Thursday, the majority leader will be prepared to have the Senate stay in session on Friday and on Saturday.

I know the great burden the Senator from Louisiana carries. All of us do not have as many committee meetings to attend as he does. Not many of us must act as chairman of as many committees as he does. Sometimes even a junior member of a committee finds it impossible to attend as many sessions of committees as he should, as is the case with the Senator from Texas.

The President sent his message on this subject to Congress on April 20. The Committee on Foreign Relations began its public hearings very shortly thereafter, early in the month of May, so that the committee could take all the time it needed to hear all the witnesses that wanted to appear before it to present evidence and offer amendments. I understand amendments were offered in committee, and that some of them were adopted and others rejected. I believe the committee has given rather thorough attention to the bill.

The Senator from Georgia is anxious to have the Senate consider it as thoroughly as possible. However, the House is awaiting Senate action on this bill to start its consideration of the House appropriation bill. If the House Committee on Appropriations takes as much time in reporting the appropriation bill as the Senate committee took in reporting the authorization bill, it will mean that——

Mr. ELLENDER. The House has not acted on the authorization bill, as I understand.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. That is correct.

Mr. ELLENDER. I understand the House refuses to take action on the authorization bill until the Senate has passed its authorization bill.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. The Senator from Texas said the House is awaiting Senate action on the authorization bill to begin its hearings in the Committee on Appropriations on the appropriation bill. If that committee takes as much time on this legislation as the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations has taken on the authorization bill, it may well be that we will not get the appropriation bill for Senate consideration before the middle of July.

As the Senator from Louisiana knows, we are no longer operating in a national emergency. Under the law which Congress in its wisdom passed some years ago, this session of Congress is scheduled to come to an end on July 31.

Mr. ELLENDER. No one will be happier than I if that can be done.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. The Senator from Texas may not be happier, but he will be equally happy, I assure the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. ELLENDER. Although limitation on debate has been agreed to, I hope to be in a position to state my views on the bill.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. The Senator from Texas will do everything within his power to assist the Senator from Louisiana in that regard. If the Senator from Louisiana wishes to have the Senate meet earlier on Thursday, that can be arranged, too. If he wishes it to sit later on Thursday evening or sit later on Wednesday evening, that can be arranged. We have had difficulty in getting Senators to speak on this bill today.

Mr. ELLENDER. The trouble is the Senator from Louisiana worked all yesterday, all day Sunday and all day Saturday on other matters. He has worked even at night. If I am to be prepared to make a presentation of my views on the bill by Thursday, it will mean a great deal of night work for me tonight, and a great deal of night work tomorrow night, because all day tomorrow I will be busy on other matters. The only salutary thing about the whole matter is that we will have a second shot at it. If we miss this time, we will get another shot when the bill comes before the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I have no doubt that the Senator's committee will give careful consideration to the appropriation bill on mutual aid. Whatever authorization——

Mr. ELLENDER. Whatever authorization is made, the Appropriations Committee can still cut the amount in half or do as it pleases with it. That is one salutary thing about it. Whether I am in a position to offer my views in full remains to be seen, but I will do my best along that line, in order to assist the majority leader to carry on.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I appreciate the Senator's graciousness and generosity. I assure him that under the unanimous-consent agreement to limit debate there will be ample latitude to permit him to offer amendments. I know if he decides in his wisdom to offer amendments, he will have adequate time under the unanimous-consent agreement to discuss his amendments. If he does not have sufficient time, the Senator from Texas will be perfectly willing to submit another unanimous-consent agreement to provide the Senator from Louisiana with additional time.

All that the Senator from Texas wants to do is to have the Democratic Party meet its responsibility as a responsible party and to pass responsible legislation. I believe we are doing that. Although the weeks and months ahead are going to be more trying than in the past, if we can get the cooperation of all the Members of the Senate in the same way in which we have obtained their cooperation this evening, I believe we will be able to adjourn by the deadline.

I hope the staff of the Committee on Foreign Relations will supply the information the distinguished Senator from Louisiana has requested. I can assure the Senator that the viewpoint he has expressed is not only his viewpoint. Other Senators have expressed the same views that he has expressed. I believe if the staff will get that information for the Senator from Louisiana and he can submit it to the Senate, the Senate can decide what it will do about it.

Mr. ELLENDER. If I can obtain the information from the committee, or even from Mr. Stassen, I will be ready by Thursday.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I thank the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. ELLENDER. But unless I get the information in full, as I desire it, the chances are I will not be able to make the case I intend to make.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. The distinguished chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations stated earlier in the day that this is merely an authorization bill, and he realizes that the Committee on Appropriations must carefully consider it. I know that if the Senator from Louisiana does not have all the time to say everything he wants to say on the authorization bill, he will take time to say everything he wants to say when the request is made for money to implement the authorization bill.

Mr. ELLENDER. I am a member of the Committee on Appropriations, and I have served on it diligently for some time. In order that the proponents may get the money, they will have to justify every penny they ask for.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I hope the Senator will see that that is done, but I ask him also to not delay the defense bill and the public works bill, both of which we are very anxious to have reported to the Senate at the earliest possible date.

Mr. ELLENDER. Very well.

RECESS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, 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 38 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess, the recess being, under the order previously entered, until tomorrow, Wednesday, June 1, 1955, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate May 31 (legislative day of May 2), 1955:

RENEGOTIATION BOARD

Donald Ross, of New Jersey, to be a member of the Renegotiation Board, vice John Hubbard Joss, deceased.

IN THE NAVY

Rear Adm. Charles Wellborn, Jr., United States Navy, to have the grade, rank, pay, and allowances of a vice admiral while serving under a designation in accordance with section 413 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947.

POSTMASTERS

The following-named persons to be postmasters:

ALABAMA

Dorothy B. Andrews, Fulton, Ala., in place of A. K. Gilmer, retired.

ARIZONA

Clarence Mortimer Palmer, Jr., Tombstone, Ariz., in place of M. V. Van Deren, removed.

CALIFORNIA

Leonard A. Mannee, Colusa, Calif., in place of R. G. Power, deceased.

Alda D. Thornton, Lake Arrowhead, Calif., in place of E. M. Inskeep, retired.

Owen J. Underwood, Placentia, Calif., in place of M. E. Geeting, retired.

James T. Walter, St. Helena, Calif., in place of F. B. Rossi, resigned.

Ray F. Hawkins, Vallejo, Calif., in place of J. J. Madigan, deceased.

Walter Lewin, Westminster, Calif., in place of L. N. Strawbridge, removed.

COLORADO

Hazel L. Weston, Bristol, Colo., in place of B. E. Osborn, resigned.

Hannah Esther Fairchild, Peetz, Colo., in place of E. A. Kennedy, retired.

FLORIDA

Ellen B. Turberville, Century, Fla., in place of E. R. Vaughn, retired.

James M. Solano, Elkton, Fla., in place of R. M. Floyd, retired.

Arthur O. Jefferis, Eustis, Fla., in place of W. J. Calvin, Jr., removed.

Andrew Bartlett O'Hara, Rockledge, Fla., in place of B. M. Stefurak, removed.

GEORGIA

William B. Haskins, Dudley, Ga., in place of J. W. Duggan, deceased.

IDAHO

Thomas M. Vaughn, Richfield, Idaho, in place of C. O. McKay, retired.

ILLINOIS

James S. Rutter, Addison, Ill., in place of R. M. Laux, resigned.

William S. Totten, Alexis, Ill., in place of G. A. Porter, removed.

Neal E. Muma, Brownstown, Ill., in place of C. E. Eyestone, transferred.

Annabelle C. Lorenz, Carbon Cliff, Ill., in place of Catharine Hampson, retired.

Ray D. Robison, Ferris, Ill., in place of D. I. Siegfried, retired.

Ralph C. Jacob, Mendota, Ill., in place of Etta Lutz, retired.

J. S. Marsh, Saunemin, Ill., in place of C. R. Callaby, transferred.

INDIANA

Ralph E. Watson, Tipton, Ind., in place of William Rollings, resigned.

Gene M. Wilson, Versailles, Ind., in place of F. C. Winsor, retired.

Roger J. Rhodes, Walton, Ind., in place of O. R. Small, retired.

IOWA

George R. Helble, Bettendorf, Iowa, in place of C. L. Hamilton, deceased.

Thursa L. Hinchliff, Minburn, Iowa, in place of L. E. Wicks, retired.

Ila O. Benge, Pleasantville, Iowa, in place of T. L. Smith, retired.

Eugene M. Clark, Stockport, Iowa, in place of H. E. Smith, transferred.

KANSAS

David W. Fowler, Admire, Kans., in place of C. W. Romer, resigned.

Wayne E. Rinne, Gardner, Kans., in place of E. E. Moore, transferred.

Everett J. Fritts, Gorham, Kans., in place of P. P. Mudd, transferred.

Jean D. Fretz, Liberal, Kans., in place of E. R. Jones, deceased.

Fern E. Warnock, Partridge, Kans., in place of Agnes Lennen, resigned.

KENTUCKY

David Combs, Bulan, Ky., in place of Estill Hurt, retired.

Robert H. Eckler, Dry Ridge, Ky., in place of F. E. Thomas, resigned.

Kendall L. Alexander, Crofton, Ky., in place of D. S. Mitchell, resigned.

Margaret S. McCoy, Ekron, Ky., in place of L. G. Palmer, retired.

James Wayne Hargan, Fort Knox, Ky., in place of S. H. Jones, deceased.

Mervyn E. Allen, Vine Grove, Ky., in place of J. A. Gross, retired.

LOUISIANA

Melvin J. Hester, Basile, La., in place of Frank Reed, deceased.

Henry P. Ponstein, Chalmette, La., in place of Carmen Colomb, deceased.

Mastin A. Robison, Oil City, La., in place of J. F. George, resigned.

MAINE

Allan Joseph Wentworth, Kittery, Maine, in place of N. R. Hubbard, retired.

Edward A. Ludwig, Washington, Maine, in place of F. L. Ludwig, retired.

MASSACHUSETTS

Roger H. Hinds, Canton, Mass., in place of A. H. Gibson, deceased.

William R. Pleshaw, Framingham, Mass., in place of C. R. Halloran, transferred.

Roy W. Jacques, North Oxford, Mass., in place of William Bacon, deceased.

Candido A. Torcoletti, Southboro, Mass., in place of R. H. Howes, retired.

David F. Studley, West Hanover, Mass., in place of P. J. Hanbery, deceased.

MICHIGAN

Ralph I. Burns, Alpena, Mich., in place of S. J. Davison, retired.

Francis C. Fuller, Avoca, Mich, in place of E. B. Knisley, retired.

Alton C. Britton, Battle Creek, Mich., in place of J. O. Curry, retired.

Doris E. Farley, Breedsville, Mich, in place of W. B. Cassada, resigned.

Andrew R. Farnsworth, Holt, Mich., in place of M. P. Hancock, resigned.

Lavon J. Fare, Stanton, Mich., in place of R. A. Cutler, retired.

Gordon H. Buckner, St. Clair, Mich., in place of J. C. Chamberlin, retired.

MINNESOTA

Clarence J. Verthein, Hokah, Minn., in place of P. R. Reilly, retired.

Alvord J. Dammann, Sanborn, Minn., in place of H. E. Kent, retired.

Archie C. Twett, South St. Paul, Minn., in place of Andrew Reid, deceased.

MISSISSIPPI

Lealon P. Yarber, Belmont, Miss., in place of L. C. Davis, retired.

Euree J. Grantham, Mendenhall, Miss., in place of H. W. Mangum, removed.

MISSOURI

John H. Jones, Ethel, Mo., in place of J. A. Byler, retired.

Carl W. McKinney, Houston, Mo., in place of Charles Gentry, deceased.

Margaret H. Mackie, Mexico, Mo., in place of M. H. Stewart, retired.

Eldon R. Woods, Orrick, Mo., in place of Ruth Vandiver, retired.

MONTANA

Lewis R. Knox, Helena, Mont., in place of J. R. Wine, deceased.

NEBRASKA

Norris P. Sensel, Culbertson, Nebr., in place of L. H. Metzer, retired.

James L. Vrba, Howells, Nebr., in place of B. E. Busch, retired.

NEW HAMPSHIRE

Raymond H. Chase, Dover, N. H., in place of Edward Reilly, retired.

NEW JERSEY

Helen A. Grod, Hackensack, N. J., in place of Charles Orth, retired.

Geoffrey A. Parmee, Ringwood, N. J., in place of W. D. Carleton, retired.

NEW MEXICO

John R. Goddard, El Rito, N. Mex., in place of D. M. Chavez, retired.

NEW YORK

Arthur T. Guyer, Celoron, N. Y., in place of O. H. Hanson, deceased.

Peter C. Curtin, Chateaugay, N. Y., in place of T. B. Ryan, deceased.

Elbert H. Wild, Copiague, N. Y., in place of Ellen Longpre, retired.

Abbott L. Dibblee, Garden City, N. Y., in place of G. A. Wagner, removed.

Edwin H. Baker, Hancock, N. Y., in place of L. L. Lakin, retired.

Leslie G. Clark, Lakemont, N. Y., in place of C. R. Hinson, resigned.

Marjorie D. Tabor, Meridian, N. Y., in place of N. H. Davis, retired.

NORTH CAROLINA

William Oliver Keller, Lake Lure, N. C., in place of E. S. Holliman, resigned.

NORTH DAKOTA

Michael Martin, Jr., Forbes, N. Dak., in place of Otto Bollinger, removed.

OHIO

Richard J. Phillips, Bowling Green, Ohio, in place of H. B. Davis, transferred.

OKLAHOMA

Edward E. Easton, Muskogee, Okla., in place of Harold Cartwright, resigned.

George E. Snethen, Sulphur, Okla., in place of B. M. Williams, resigned.

OREGON

Francis L. Norton, Blachly, Oreg., in place of G. J. Pritchard, resigned.

PENNSYLVANIA

William H. Strauch, Cressona, Pa., in place of H. C. Beck, retired.

Charles R. Root, Gillett, Pa., in place of O. M. Harkness, deceased.

Julia K. Hammond, Lima, Pa., in place of L. J. Wood, deceased.

SOUTH CAROLINA

James M. Ritter, Cope, S. C., in place of D. J. Laffitte, retired.

Charles C. Withington, Greenville, S. C., in place of D. D. Davis, resigned.

William F. Lanier, La France, S. C., in place of M. H. Moore, deceased.

William R. Shealy, Little Mountain, S. C., in place of A. E. Boland, retired.

Harry E. Moose, Newberry, S. C., in place of G. K. Dominick, resigned.

John J. Wise, Rock Hill, S. C., in place of T. S. Gettys, resigned.

TENNESSEE

Norris Y. Brown, Bullsgap, Tenn., in place of V. C. Pendleton, retired.

Robert I. Taylor, Jr., Dyersburg, Tenn., in place of R. R. Jones, transferred.

Filbert G. McIllwain, Holladay, Tenn., in place of H. D. Eaves, transferred.

Sarah L. Graves, Louisville, Tenn., in place of G. L. Cox, resigned.

Fred Gentry, McEwen, Tenn., in place of O. C. Doyle, Jr., transferred.

Jesse F. Branson, Washburn, Tenn., in place of N. B. Rucker, retired.

Robert H. Eddings, Westmoreland, Tenn., in place of J. E. Law, transferred.

Gettis H. Hudson, Whitwell, Tenn., in place of H. E. Hudson, retired.

TEXAS

Johnnie E. Brown, Alba, Tex., in place of Arlie Farrington, transferred.

Warren R. Howery, Aransas Pass, Tex., in place of R. P. Park, resigned.

Travis A. Barnes, Jr., Chester, Tex., in place of J. L. Howard, resigned.

Spencer H. Mayes, Graham, Tex., in place of W. E. Simpson, removed.

William H. Watson, Naples, Tex., in place of O. A. Walls, deceased.

Lloyd C. Miller, Panhandle, Tex., in place of L. B. Gramer, resigned.

Allie Cayard, Port Neches, Tex., in place of B. C. Howell, deceased.

VIRGINIA

Harry G. Penley, Gate City, Va., in place of H. B. Quillen, Jr., resigned.

Leo W. Arthur, Hurt, Va., in place of J. B. Robertson, resigned.

Dorothy M. Cliborne, McKenney, Va., in place of M. H. Hardy, retired.

WASHINGTON

Mabel P. Rayback, Des Moines, Wash., in place of E. L. Baker, retired.

George J. Morry, Seattle, Wash., in place of G. E. Starr, retired.

WEST VIRGINIA

Richard L. McDowell, Burlington, W. Va., in place of L. E. Humphrey, retired.

Ralph C. May, St. Albans, W. Va., in place of H. E. Riddleberger, resigned.

Raymond Stanley, Sylvester, W. Va., in place of W. R. Martin, resigned.

WISCONSIN

Robert R. Smith, Caroline, Wis., in place of O. R. Erdmann, retired.

Robert J. Antes, Evansville, Wis., in place of R. E. Reckord, retired.

Matilda J. Loden, Granville, Wis., in place of H. M. Pfeil, resigned.

Anthony Janoch, Herbster, Wis., in place of C. A. Nelson, retired.

Richard J. LeJeune, Solon Springs, Wis., in place of V. A. Patterson, retired.

Terence P. Arseneau, Washburn, Wis., in place of J. T. O'Sullivan, retired.

Leonard J. Giebink, Waupun, Wis., in place of J. C. O'Connell, transferred.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate May 31 (legislative day of May 2), 1955:

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

Selden Chapin, of the District of Columbia, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Iran.

Richard Lee Jones, of Illinois, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Liberia.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, MAY 31, 1955

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Most merciful and gracious God, grant that in these perilous days with their ever-shifting human scenes, we may find our peace and security in Thee and those laws and principles which we know are authentic and abiding.

May we give ourselves gladly and unreservedly to the guidance of Thy spirit, knowing that Thy ways are the ways of pleasantness and peace.

Inspire us with courage to believe that the forces of evil, however gigantic and terrible, are not too great for Thy divine power to defeat and destroy.

Grant that we may place all our confidence in the Christ, that friend who will never fail or forsake us, but who is the friend sticking closer than a brother.

Hear us in His name, who is ever the same, yesterday, today, and forever. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Friday, May 27, 1955, was read and approved.

RESEARCH IN DEVELOPMENT AND UTILIZATION OF SALINE WATERS

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 2126) to amend the act of July 3, 1952, relating to research in the development and utilization of saline waters, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments, and ask for a conference with the Senate.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. ENGLE, ASPINALL, O'BRIEN of New York, MILLER of Nebraska, and SAYLOR.

CONSTRUCTION OF DISTRIBUTION SYSTEMS ON AUTHORIZED FEDERAL RECLAMATION PROJECTS BY IRRIGATION DISTRICTS

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 103) to provide for the construction of distribution systems on authorized Federal reclamation projects by irrigation districts and other public agencies, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments, and ask for a conference with the Senate.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. ENGLE, ASPINALL, O'BRIEN of New York, MILLER of Nebraska, and SAYLOR.

LIBERALIZING SOCIAL-SECURITY LAW

Mr. KARSTEN. 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 Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. KARSTEN. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced legislation which is designed to liberalize our social-security law in two areas in which present law is totally inadequate in protecting our American workers and their families. The amendments which would be accomplished by the enactment of my bill are necessary and long-overdue improvements in our social-security law. By acting favorably on my bill, Congress will have passed legislation to make the social-security law more equitable and to eliminate many hardship situations that exist in present law.

One of the amendments proposed in my bill would for the first time make disability benefits available to a covered worker and his dependents at any time that the worker sustains a total extended disability. Under present law, a worker who becomes disabled prior to attaining age 65 is required to wait for his benefits until he reaches retirement age. This inequity in the old-age and survivors insurance program has resulted in the loss of self-respect and financial security by workers who suffer the misfortune of becoming seriously injured. This condition creates not only a hardship for the worker but also imposes intolerable economic and social consequences on the worker's family.

We have made tremendous strides in the last two decades in developing facilities for the rehabilitation of our disabled citizens. I am confident that the enactment of my bill to provide old-age and survivors insurance benefits to disabled workers will contribute materially to further progress in worker rehabilitation. It is my view that by making disability benefits available under the old-age and survivors insurance program, we will succeed in shortening the period of disability rather than prolonging it. I base this opinion on the fact that through disability benefits we will have provided the disabled worker with a minimum floor of protection against poverty and want. We will have kept him from becoming a public charge and will have enabled him to provide for his family. It cannot be disputed that a worker who becomes totally injured is as much in need of social-security benefits as is a person who is unable to work for reasons of age.

It is estimated that approximately 2 million American citizens will benefit from the enactment of the provision of my bill which would make disability benefits available. These people would receive in benefits approximately $1.5 billion per year.

The second long-overdue improvement in our social-security law which my bill would accomplish is to make old-age and survivors insurance benefits available to women at age 62, instead of requiring them to wait until they have become 65 years of age. This amendment would make a woman who is 2 or 3 years younger than her husband eligible for benefits at the same time that he becomes eligible for old-age and survivors insurance benefits upon attaining age 65. It also would mean that widows will be able to draw benefits at a younger age than is permitted at the present time. It is estimated that in the first full year of operation this amendment will provide $400 million in benefits to approximately 700,000 women. Eventually, the amendment will aid over 1 million women annually with annual benefit payments equaling approximately $1 billion.

As a member of the Committee on Ways and Means, I have introduced this important legislation with a view to asking for immediate study of the proposals by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. It is also my purpose to ask the earliest possible consideration of these amendments to the social-security law by the Congress of the United States. The costs of liberalizing the old-age and survivors insurance program as provided in my bill would be far outweighed by the benefit that will be derived by the American public.

UPPER COLORADO RIVER STORAGE PROJECT NEEDS FACTS, NOT EMOTION

Mr. HOSMER. 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 California?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, the discussion of the proposed upper Colorado River storage project which has so far occurred from the forum has, in general, created much more heat than light on this very important subject.

It is a vital subject, both from the standpoint of the tremendous proposed expenditures of Federal taxpayers' funds and its consequences with respect to the national debt, and from the standpoint