are from the pens of three of Bill's close associates, and are eloquent testimony of his noble character summed up in the words of Byron:

He had kept the whiteness of his soul, and thus,
Men over him wept.

BILL ROSS PASSES

(By Harold T. Gray)

The office force of the Courier-Express will miss the almost daily visit which Bill Ross made to his desk in the editorial office every nice afternoon, when he hadn't been confined to the hospital, for the past few years. Before that, one could have found him in the office at odd hours, both on weekdays and Sundays, for his desk was almost his home, and it was there that he used to sit for hours, looking over local exchanges, and making notes for his next issue. Bill, during the past few years, seldom took a vacation, and then for only a day or two, seemingly always glad to get back to his desk. We suggested 2 years ago that he go with one of the James Wick tours to Europe and the Near East, with the idea that it would broaden his experience, and give him greater perspective in his daily editorials. But he was more content at home, rotating for his meals between the Hotel DuBois, the Elks Club in winter, and the country club during the summer months, with an occasional visit to one of the other hotels or restaurants of town. We had urged Bill also to spend the winter months in Florida, where he would have the advantage of enjoying the warmer climate, and an opportunity of visiting with many contemporaries in the winter spas. But, again, he expressed himself as being more content at home, and here he spent the twilight years, visiting with his business associates and friends, until Father Time wrote "30" to a long and uneventful life. Perhaps Bill missed a great deal of life, for he reached neither the heights of exultation nor the nadir of human despair—he was happy and content, and who shall say that he should have lived otherwise than as he did. So on his last journey to the bourne from which no traveler e'er returns, we wish Bill Godspeed, with the hope that he may find the same peace and contentment in his life eternal.

WILLIAM B. ROSS

(By Jason S. Gray)

We can't help but say a few words about our old friend and coworker, Bill Ross, who passed away recently, and with whom we had been associated for many years. Bill, in his younger and later in his mature years, was regarded as a very capable newspaperman, particularly in the period before the present-day news-gathering methods developed, which proved of great assistance in channeling many items across an editor's desk. Bill worked his shift on the Courier for many, many years as night editor—not a very pleasant duty at many times, and undoubtedly monotonous as the years moved along, missing much of the sunshine and many of the daily contacts that usually follow a more normal routine. He did this without complaint however, and for years, with his limited staff, turned out a daily paper that was both newsy and respected in the community, and compared favorably with other small-town dailies in the State. All this in addition to other duties that included taking extended news reports by telephone from a press agency that then required editing and "heading up" before their final use in the paper. We worked with Bill in those days for a short time in picking up our first knowledge of newspaper work and initiation as a cub reporter and came to respect both his knowledge and ability, and it was with regret that we saw him pass into his retirement in recent years and later his illness that led to his eventual death. Bill was a good scout, a sincere friend, and a good newspaperman, and we shall always remember him when he was in the full prime of his life when he could well hold his own with the best editors in the State. He will be missed by the writer and by all of his coworkers at the Courier-Express.

TO BILL ROSS

(By Marv Bloom)

Around the news sanctums the quiet, mild-mannered Bill Ross was known as Willie by some, the Veep by others, and as plain Bill by others.

The little fellow with the same-tempered personality is gone but not forgotten, and the news folks with whom he was associated can recall many an incident in which the late editor was a principal participant.

Of Willie, as he would prefer us to refer to him, the CE organization, directors and employees alike, will always say, "There was a man who lived his own life in his own inimitable desire, a man believing the other fellow should also live with his own desire."

Bill Ross never bothered anybody, never complained, nor protested. He maintained his individuality as he wished, his decisions as he deemed fit, yet never would he make a decision to harm his fellow man or associate.

Willie, as we knew him, adhered to the news school which believed in the laissez faire policy—meaning hands off.

We frequently disagreed, arguing our own points, yet always the late editor would listen to our arguments, voice his own, and that was that. Afterward no so-called hard feeling nor ill feeling existed. That's as disagreement should terminate.

And the following day all would be serene with Willie, until another argument broke into the open.

But always, W. B. Ross, as sternly as he ensued his own policies, would respect his fellow man for his answer or the other opinion.

For Bill believed in freedom of speech, freedom of the press, and, above all, the right for a man to think for himself. Yet in his own news policy, he maintained a neutral course, flaying public discussion. That, Willie felt, was his prerogative as the editor.

Bill is now reading his proofs and following the Bucs (Pittsburgh Pirates) from the editor's chair in the Great Beyond, and you can always be sure the little fellow with the quiet-mannered, individualistic personality will always be saying, "Let man think for himself, keep his public ideas to himself, not try to persuade others, and the fellows on earth will get along a lot better." For that was the Bill Ross way.

The following account of the death of the late William B. Ross appeared in the May 12, 1955, issue of the DuBois Courier-Express:

WILLIAM B. ROSS, EDITOR, SUCCUMBS—HAD BEEN ASSOCIATED WITH LOCAL NEWSPAPER SINCE 1892

William Burchfield Ross, 77, editor emeritus of the Courier-Express since his retirement in November 1953, and vice president since 1914, died in his apartment in the Maple Avenue Hospital yesterday afternoon at 5:15. His last hours were spent quietly in his room with his radio and newspaper, and he had received some visitors during the afternoon hours. At 5 o'clock he was given a light supper, but in a few moments he lapsed into unconsciousness and died in a matter of moments before either relatives or associates could reach his bedside.

William Ross had for many years made his home in the Hotel DuBois. He had never married, but had devoted himself to his profession, which had encompassed three score years, since he first entered the newspaper field as an apprentice in 1892. He carried on actively in his profession until ill health forced his retirement from his editorial position with the Courier in 1953. Since that time he has spent much of his time in the hospital, and about a month ago he took a small suite of rooms at the Maple Avenue where he passed his final day listening to the Pirate games and reading his favorite newspapers and books.

During the final days of his life, as he sank in weakness, he escaped the colored coils of mortality. At the penultimate moment, as he was loosed from the burning obedience to life, he was content to lie listening while the robins sang, and the world went softly violet before the nightingale began. With such a sigh, after a long and useful life, he put on the soft silk robe of absolute sleep and forgetfulness.

William Burchfield Ross was born in Du Bois on November 17, 1877, the son of William T. and Susan Angus Ross. He was the grandson of Rev. John Wray, the first pastor of the Beechwoods Presbyterian Church. He bore the name of William Burchfield, first pastor of the Presbyterian Church here.

He attended the public schools here and later numbered among the early graduates from DuBois High School.

He first became associated with the Courier in 1892 as an apprentice, while still attending school. Following his graduation from high school he enrolled at Lake Forest College, where he completed his higher education. Returning to DuBois in 1904 he again became associated with the Courier in the editorial department, remaining with the Courier for only 1 year before moving to the Daily Express, where he assumed the position of editor of that daily paper. In 1914 he again became associated with the Courier as managing editor and associate publisher, remaining in that position until 2 years ago at the time of his retirement, when he became editor emeritus of the paper. He is also director and vice president of the Gray Printing Co., Tri-County Broadcasting Co., and Courier Building Co.

At the time he returned to the Courier he became associated with the late E. W. Gray, the late L. C. Sheffler, and L. F. Mohney in the ownership and operation of the paper and has remained in an active capacity in the editorial department and management of the paper until the time of his retirement.

Only one brother, J. Wray Ross, of West Scribner Avenue, survives of a family of 9 children, those preceding him in death being Mrs. Nellie Bell, Mrs. George Wert, Bruce, Scott, Richard, Charles, and Dr. Samuel. Two nephews, Scott M. Ross, of Philadelphia, and William B. Wert, of Munhall, also survive.

He was a member of the BPOE, and a past exalted ruler of that lodge. He was an organizing member of the DuBois Country Club, and its past president. For many years he had been a member of the Rotary Club, having been also one of the organizing members of that club. He was a member of the Troop Committee of the Courier-Express Troop 25, Bucktail Council Boy Scouts of America. Throughout his long career he had been associated with many organizations and committees active in the building of DuBois.

Friends will be received at the N. R. Moore Son Funeral Home until the time of the funeral, Saturday afternoon at 2:30 o'clock to be conducted by Rev. Ross M. Haverfield, pastor of the First Presbyterian Church, of which the deceased was a member for many years. Interment will be made in the family plot in Morningside Cemetery.

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

SENATE

WEDNESDAY, JUNE 1, 1955

(Legislative day of Monday, May 2, 1955)

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

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

O God our Father, Thou searcher of men's hearts, from whom no secrets are hid, help us in this opening moment of a new day's council to draw near to Thee, in tranquillity, in humility, in sincerity. With Thy benediction, may we face the toil of this day with honest dealing and clear thinking, with hatred of all hypocrisy, deceit, and sham, and in the knowledge that all great and noble service in this world is based on gentleness and patience and truth. Across the debris of ancient wrong may our glad eyes see the coming of the glory of the Lord, as selfish exploitation makes way for brotherhood and for man. In the Redeemer's name we ask it. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday, May 31, 1955, was dispensed with.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

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

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the Subcommittee on Antitrust and Monopoly of the Committee on the Judiciary was authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the Internal Security Subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary was authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the Subcommittee on Investigations of the Committee on Government Operations, under the chairmanship of Mr. MCCLELLAN, was authorized to meet today during the session of the Senate.

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, a subcommittee of the Committee on Banking and Currency was authorized to meet today during the session of the Senate.

ORDER FOR TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

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

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

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

REPORT ON WORKING CAPITAL FUNDS

A letter from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the financial condition of working capital funds of the Department of Defense, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1954 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Armed Services.

AUDIT REPORT ON BUREAU OF MINES AND DEFENSE MINERALS EXPLORATION ADMINISTRATION

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, an audit report on the Bureau of Mines and Defense Minerals Exploration Administration, Department of the Interior, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1954 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

AMENDMENT OF FEDERAL PROPERTY AND ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES ACT OF 1949

A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, Washington, D. C., transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Government Operations.

REPORT OF MARITIME ADMINISTRATION

A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the Maritime Administration of the Department of Commerce on its activities under the Merchant Ship Sales Act of 1946, for the period January 1, 1955, through March 31, 1955 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

RELIEF OF CERTAIN RURAL CARRIERS

A letter from the Acting Postmaster General, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation for the relief of certain rural carriers (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a list of papers and documents on the files of several departments and agencies of the Government which are not needed in the conduct of business and have no permanent value or historical interest, and requesting action looking to their disposition (with accompanying papers); to a Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Papers in the Executive Departments.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore appointed Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina and Mr. CARLSON members of the committee on the part of the Senate.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

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

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

"Senate Concurrent Resolution 31

"Concurrent resolution requesting the Congress of the United States to enact legislation authorizing the issuance of highway revenue bonds in a sum not to exceed $50 million

"Whereas it is essential to the safety and welfare of the people of the Territory of Hawaii that the Territorial Highway System be improved by many costly projects of new highway construction and reconstruction; and

"Whereas there is great economic advantage if, and it is important that, such projects be completed as soon as possible; and

"Whereas the Territory of Hawaii proposes to finance such projects by the issuance of bonds payable from the proceeds of highway vehicle fuel taxes; and

"Whereas in view of the existing limitations on the bonded debt of the Territory, the authority of the Territory to issue such highway revenue bonds should be confirmed by act of Congress: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate of the 28th Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Congress of the United States is hereby respectfully requested to enact a bill in substantially the following form:

"'Be it enacted, etc.—

"'SECTION 1. The Territory of Hawaii, any provision of the Hawaiian Organic Act or any other act of Congress to the contrary notwithstanding, is authorized and empowered to issue highway revenue bonds in a sum not to exceed $50 million payable from funds derived from highway vehicle fuel taxes, for the purpose of providing for the construction and maintenance of highways in the Territory. The issuance of such revenue bonds shall not constitute the incurrence of an indebtedness within the meaning of the Hawaiian Organic Act, and shall not require the approval of the President of the United States.

"'SEC. 2. All bonds issued under authority of section 1 shall be issued pursuant to legislation enacted by the Legislature of the Territory which shall provide (1) that, so long as any of the bonds are outstanding, highway vehicle fuel taxes shall be levied and collected in amounts at least sufficient to provide for the payment of the principal of the bonds and the interest thereon, as such principal and interest become due (except that interest due upon any such bonds during the first year after their date of issuance may be paid from the proceeds of sale of the bonds), and that Federal aid funds may also be used for payments of the principal of the bonds and interest thereon; (2) that the superintendent of public works of the Territory, or any officer or agency succeeding to his powers and duties in respect to highways, shall have the power to issue and sell the bonds and to expend the proceeds and provide for the repayment thereof, in accordance with standards and pursuant to provisions which shall be set forth in such legislation; and (3) that the office of the superintendent of public works, or an office or agency succeeding to the powers and duties of that office in respect of highways, shall be continued in existence and shall retain the powers and duties set forth in such legislation, so long as any of the bonds are outstanding.

"'SEC. 3. As used in this act, the term "highway vehicle fuel taxes" means taxes in

respect of the fuel used on, or to be used on the highways, but in the event the legislation providing for such tax levies the same in respect of other fuel and does not provide for the segregation of the taxes in respect of the fuel used on, or to be used on the highways, then the term "highway vehicle fuel taxes" includes as well all such taxes in respect of fuel as are commingled with the taxes in respect of the fuel used, or to be used on the highways"; be it further

"*Resolved*, That certified copies of this concurrent resolution shall be transmitted to the President of the Senate and to the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States of America, to the Secretary of the Interior, and to the Delegate to Congress from Hawaii."

A resolution adopted by the 13th Ward Women's Republican Club, Minneapolis, Minn., protesting against United States participation in any conference with Red China; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

RESOLUTION OF HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES OF MASSACHUSETTS

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, and my colleague, the junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], I present, for appropriate reference, and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a memorial of the House of Representatives of the General Court of Massachusetts protesting against any 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.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

(See resolution printed in full when laid before the Senate by the Vice President on May 31, 1955, p. 7223, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

JOINT RESOLUTION OF VERMONT LEGISLATURE

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, I present, for appropriate reference, and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, Joint Resolution R-47 of the acts and resolves of 1955 of the Legislature of the State of Vermont entitled "Joint resolution requesting Congress to extend the benefits of the old-age and survivors insurance and old-age assistance programs."

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

The joint resolution was referred to the Committee on Finance, as follows:

Joint resolution requesting Congress to extend the benefits of the old-age and survivors insurance and old-age assistance programs

Whereas a person under 72 years of age who is otherwise entitled to receive monthly benefits under the Federal old-age and survivors insurance program is not entitled to receive the maximum benefits otherwise allowable if he earns more than $1,200 in a year; and

Whereas such provision tends to encourage idleness of persons, to lower the level of subsistence and to discriminate against persons within that group who do not have income from sources other than earnings; and

Whereas many of the persons 65 years of age and older whose property and income are so limited as to entitle them to benefits under the old-age assistance program do not receive sufficient payments thereunder to subsist at a healthful level, and some are destitute: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the senate and house of representatives, That the Congress of the United States be respectfully urged to extend the old-age and survivors insurance benefits to allow beneficiaries thereunder to earn up to $2,400 a year without curtailment of payments, and to extend the benefits of the old-age assistance program to allow recipients to earn reasonable amounts regularly to supplement the payments received and to enable maintaining themselves at a healthful level; and that the secretary of State be directed to transmit duly attested copies of this resolution to the President of the United States, the President of the United States Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, the chairman of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, the chairman of the House Committee on Education and Labor, the chairman of the Senate and House Committees on Appropriations, and to our congressional delegation.

Approved May 19, 1955.

INCREASED FEDERAL TAX ON GASOLINE—RESOLUTION OF VERMONT TOURIST ASSOCIATION

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, I present, for appropriate reference, a resolution adopted by the Vermont Tourist Association with regard to the increase in the Federal tax on gasoline. I ask unanimous consent to have the resolution printed in the RECORD.

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

Whereas the Congress of the United States is presently considering raising the 2 cents per gallon Federal gasoline tax to finance a vast network of interstate highways; and

Whereas the overriding purpose of this greatly expanded Federal interest in highways is related to national and civil defense and should be paid for from general revenues of the broadest applications; and

Whereas linking the Federal gasoline tax to highways would destroy the time-tested principle that Federal highways aid is a general responsibility of the Government; and

Whereas the present Federal gasoline tax duplicates the State gasoline tax and any further addition to the Federal levy would be confiscatory and unfair; and

Whereas the proposed increase in the Federal gasoline tax would serve as a lever to promote further increased taxes at the State level, thus compelling the taxpayer to buy back his own Federal tax payments by heavier State levies: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Vermont Tourist Association go on record opposing any increase in the Federal tax on gasoline; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be forwarded to the Representatives and Senators in Congress from this State, with instructions to present this resolution to the proper committees in Congress.

STRENGTH OF UNITED STATES MARINE CORPS—LETTER

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I was very pleased to receive from my home area a message urging retention of the full strength of the United States Marine Corps.

I endorse this message which was sent me by William Leinenkugel, commandant of the Chippewa Valley Detachment of the Marine Corps League.

In my judgment, there is no single body of men in the United States Armed Forces who have more deservedly won the admiration and respect of the people of our country for their fighting courage, their instant readiness, their magnificent tradition, than the men who have fought "from the Halls of Montezuma to the shores of Tripoli."

I ask unanimous consent that Commandant Leinenkugel's letter be printed at this point in the RECORD, and be thereafter appropriately referred for due consideration by the Senate Armed Services Committee.

There being no objection, the letter was referred to the Committee on Armed Services, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CHIPPEWA VALLEY DETACHMENT,
MARINE CORPS LEAGUE,
Chippewa Falls, Wis., May 27, 1955.

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

DEAR SIR: It has come to our attention that Congress is contemplating a cut in strength of the United States Marine Corps. It would seem to us, as members of the Marine Corps League, Chippewa Valley Detachment (Eau Claire and Chippewa Falls) that a cut in strength would be unwise as the United States Marine Corps is still on a voluntary enlistment basis and the Army is still drafting men. As far as an economy move is concerned it would also seem that the reenlistment rate of the Marine Corps should be taken into consideration as it is the highest of all our Armed Forces.

I would like to go on record, representing 38 members in good standing in our detachment, for this area requesting that after careful study no cut in strength be proposed for the United States Marine Corps.

Very truly yours,
WILLIAM LEINENKUGEL,
Commandant.

NINETY-PERCENT PARITY SUPPORTS ON BASIC AGRICULTURAL COMMODITIES—RESOLUTION

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, and appropriately referred, a resolution adopted by the Stockholm Farmers Union Local at their meeting on May 10, 1955, in Cokato, Minn., urging the Senate to restore 90-percent parity supports on basic agricultural commodities, including dairy products.

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

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

MY DEAR SENATOR: Whereas agriculture is one of the main segments of our economy; and

Whereas agriculture is one of the largest buyers of manufactured consumer goods; and

Whereas the income of the farmer is steadily dropping, and cost of operation high and going higher, which will ruin our family-size farmer, small home owner, and

small business on which a real and free democracy will thrive: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Stockholm Farmers Union Local, meeting May 10, 1955, goes on record urging our United States Senators to work and vote for the repeal of the sliding scale support law, and restore 90-percent parity supports on basic commodities, including dairy products; be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent by the secretary to our United States Senators, Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, Senator EDWARD J. THYE, of Minnesota, and also to Senator ELLENDER, of Louisiana, chairman of the Senate Agriculture Committee.

The above resolution was adopted May 10, 1955.

ARNOLD W. LARSON,
President.
BERT E. JOHNSON,
Secretary.

COKATO, MINN.

UNIVERSAL MILITARY TRAINING AND COMPULSORY RESERVE SYSTEM—RESOLUTIONS

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, and appropriately referred, resolutions adopted by the Minnesota Conference of the Evangelical United Brethren Church at their annual session held in Grace Church, Minneapolis, Minn., reaffirming their stand against the principle of universal military training and a compulsory Reserve system as a permanent policy.

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

REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE OF CHRISTIAN SOCIAL ACTION, MINNESOTA CONFERENCE, EVANGELICAL UNITED BRETHREN CHURCH

UNIVERSAL MILITARY TRAINING

Whereas the universal military training bill, H. R. 2967, with a companion bill in the Senate, was introduced in Congress, January 25, 1955, which would extend the Selective Service Act when it expires July 1, for a period of 4 years; and

Whereas the national Reserve plan, H. R. 5297, which embodies the essentials of UMT if enacted into law will obligate every man to an 8-year period of military training, service, or Reserve duty. Even men who enlist for 4 years will have to serve a 4-year period of compulsory Reserve; and

Whereas the national Reserve plan if passed will mean that:

1. Between 100,000 and 250,000—17- and 18-year-olds may volunteer for the 6 months training, after which they must serve 7½ years in the Active Ready Reserve.

2. Men may still enlist in the regular Armed Forces, National Guard, or the Reserves with specified requirements as at present. All of these men, after serving their active service, will be compelled to serve 1, 2, or 3 years in the Active Ready Reserves and 3 more years in the Standby Reserves.

3. Men who do not volunteer for the above programs are subject to the draft, which the House has already passed (and on which the Senate will undoubtedly concur). All of these men after serving their 2-year period, will be compelled to serve 3 years in the Active Reserve and 3 years in the Standby Reserve.

4. The bill provides "teeth" in the Reserve requirements. Ready reservists will have to take 48 weekly periods of satisfactory training, plus 17 days of active training or may be ordered back into active service for 2 more years; and

Whereas the report of the Committee of Christian Social Action of the General Conference in 1954 says, "the church believes that war and bloodshed are contrary to the Gospel of Jesus Christ; we declare it to be the duty of every Christian to promote peace and good will; moreover, we proclaim our continued opposition to universal military training"; and

Whereas the Department of Christian Social Relations of the Minnesota Council of Churches, in harmony with the National Council of Churches, and the vast majority of religious bodies of our country, has previously expressed its opposition to the adoption of military training and service as a permanent measure; and

Whereas the National Council of Churches in its own action has declared "we believe that it is one thing to acknowledge the necessity of drafting men for a limited period to meet a specific international emergency; it is another and quite a different thing for the churches to support conscription of each succeeding generation of the Nation's youth for a program of universal military training"; and

Whereas President Dwight D. Eisenhower being interested in bilateral disarmament has appointed the Honorable Harold E. Stassen as Disarmament Assistant to the President with Cabinet status: Therefore be it

Resolved, That we reaffirm our stand against the principle of universal military training and a compulsory Reserve system as a permanent policy (and against the above measures to effect such a program) as being contrary to the basic principles of Christian democracy and freedom, a deterrent to our present peace effort and a step toward the militarization of the mind of youth; and be it further

Resolved, That we regard the adoption of a system of universal military training and a compulsory Reserve as particularly unwise at this moment, inasmuch as it is certain to be regarded by some other nations as an evidence of insincerity on our part in our declared purpose to work for universal disarmament; be it further

Resolved, That we ask our secretary of Christian Social Action to send a copy of these resolutions to both of our State Senators and the Armed Services Committee of both the House and the Senate and request that members of the conference, write at once to their Senators and Representatives.

YOUTH IN SERVICE

Whereas there is a continued need to bring the moral and spiritual ministry of the church to bear upon the evils of our day; and

Whereas there is a continued need to recognize that our youth in all branches of the services are constantly subjected to unwholesome influence in our camps: Therefore be it

Resolved, That we commend those churches who follow with interest and prayer their boys in the service; and be it further

Resolved, That we encourage our church members and pastors to keep in touch with their youth in all branches of the armed services by personal letters, parish papers, weekly bulletins, etc., and tracts which are available from the general office of Christian Social Action at Dayton, Ohio; and be it further

Resolved, That we commend our pastors who through giving themselves to the chaplaincy are seeking to give helpful guidance to the moral and spiritual needs of our youth in the armed services; and, be it further

Resolved, That we ask our Congress to place greater safeguards about our service camps to protect our youth against the temptations of alcoholic beverages, gambling, and other vices; and

Whereas alcoholic beverages without cost are often provided to our youth in the armed services: Therefore be it

Resolved, That we voice our disapproval of this practice, and that if this practice continues, we request that soft drinks also be made available.

W. W. ZAHL, *Chairman.*
B. C. STEWARD, *Secretary.*

EXTENSION OF SUSPENSION OF CERTAIN IMPORT TAXES ON COPPER—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, from the Committee on Finance, I report favorably, without amendment, the bill (H. R. 5695) to continue until the close of June 30, 1958, the suspension of certain import taxes on copper, and I submit a report (No. 403) thereon. I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE] may file minority views.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I should like to ask the Senator from Virginia when the minority views are to be filed?

Mr. BYRD. I understand the views will be forthcoming tomorrow morning.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I ask that the Senator have until——

Mr. BYRD. Midnight tonight.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. If the Senator will include that understanding in his request, I shall not object.

Mr. BYRD. My request is that the minority views be filed by midnight tonight.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The report will be received and the bill will be placed on the calendar; and, without objection, the request of the Senator from Virginia is agreed to.

HOUSING AMENDMENTS OF 1955—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, from the Committee on Banking and Currency, I report favorably, an original bill to extend and clarify laws relating to the provision and improvement of housing, the elimination and prevention of slums, the conservation and development of urban communities, the financing of vitally needed public works, and for other purposes, and I submit a report (No. 404) thereon, together with the individual views of the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BUSH].

The VICE PRESIDENT. The report will be received and printed, and the bill will be placed on the calendar.

The bill (S. 2126) to extend and clarify laws relating to the provision and improvement of housing, the elimination and prevention of slums, the conservation and development of urban communities, the financing of vitally needed public works, and for other purposes, reported by Mr. SPARKMAN, from the Committee on Banking and Currency, was read twice by its title and placed on the calendar.

AMENDMENT OF SMALL BUSINESS ACT OF 1953—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, from the Committee on Banking and Currency, I report favorably, an original bill, to amend the Small Business Act of 1953, and I submit a report (No. 405) thereon.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The report will be received, and the bill will be placed on the calendar.

The bill (S. 2127) to amend the Small Business Act of 1953, reported by Mr. MORSE, from the Committee on Banking and Currency, was read twice by its title and placed on the calendar.

BILLS INTRODUCED

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

By Mr. WILEY:

S. 2119. A bill to amend title X of the Social Security Act to increase the amount of income which an individual may earn while receiving aid to the blind thereunder, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

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

By Mr. MAGNUSON (for himself and Mr. JACKSON):

S. 2120. A bill restoring to tribal ownership certain lands upon the Colville Indian Reservation, Wash., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. HUMPHREY:

S. 2121. A bill to enlarge and extend the special school milk program; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

S. 2122. A bill to declare that the United States holds certain lands in trust for the Minnesota Chippewa Tribe; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

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

By Mr. EASTLAND:

S. 2123. A bill to amend the marketing quota and price support provisions applicable to upland cotton; and

S. 2124. A bill to amend the price support provisions applicable to agricultural commodities; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. ELLENDER (for himself, Mr. YOUNG, and Mr. SCHOEPPEL):

S. 2125. A bill to permit the Secretary of Agriculture to make more accurate adjustments in support prices for cotton and wheat to the end that the price support program will not encourage the production of cotton of undesirable staple lengths and wheat of undesirable varieties; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. SPARKMAN:

S. 2126. A bill to extend and clarify laws relating to the provision and improvement of housing, the elimination and prevention of slums, the conservation and development of urban communities, the financing of vitally needed public works, and for other purposes; placed on the calendar.

(See the remarks of Mr. SPARKMAN when he reported the above bill, from the Committee on Banking and Currency, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MORSE:

S. 2127. A bill to amend the Small Business Act of 1953; placed on the calendar.

(See the remarks of Mr. MORSE when he reported the above bill, from the Committee on Banking and Currency, which appear under a separate heading.)

ENCOURAGEMENT OF BLIND WORKERS

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend title 10 of the Social Security Act so as to encourage blind workers in our country to earn their own way to the greatest possible extent.

I believe that the example shown by blind workers is by and large an inspiration to all Americans. They do not want pity; they do not want idle sympathy; they do not want handouts; they do want the opportunity to earn their own way to the greatest possible extent, and live normal lives to the extent that it is possible.

In the House of Representatives, the gentleman from Ohio, Representative JENKINS, has offered bill H. R. 5658 for the purpose of attaining this objective. I believe this is a sound bill, and one which is in complete conformity with the spirit of the old-age and survivors insurance law and the spirit of American self-help.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of a letter prepared at my request by Hulen C. Walker, legislative analyst for the American Foundation for the Blind, describing this bill be printed at this point in the RECORD, and be thereafter appropriately referred to the Finance Committee.

I may say that down through the years the American Foundation has done invaluable work on behalf of the blind, and has served as a vital clearinghouse. Only recently its fine efforts in connection with the Blinded Veterans' Association were called to my attention, and I was pleased indeed to note those efforts.

Blindness, whether it be from congenital reasons, cataracts, fireworks, accidents, home mishaps, traffic causes, or military combat, is a heavy affliction. But it is not insuperable as great people like Helen Keller—soon to reach her 75th milestone—and as unknown courageous folks have proven.

I ask unanimous consent that the bill and letter be printed in the RECORD, as part of my remarks.

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

The bill (S. 2119) to amend title X of the Social Security Act to increase the amount of income which an individual may earn while receiving aid to the blind thereunder, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. WILEY, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Finance, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That (a) effective July 1, 1957, clause (8) of subsection (a) of section 1002 of the Social Security Act is amended to read as follows: "(8) provide that the State agency shall, in determining need, take into consideration any other income and resources of the individual claiming aid to the blind; except that, in making such determination, the State agency shall disregard the first $50 per month of earned income and one-half of any amount of earned income in excess of $50 per month;".

(b) During the period beginning July 1, 1955, and ending June 30, 1957, any State agency established or designated as required by clause (3) of section 1002 (a) of the Social Security Act may, in determining an individual's need under the provision of the State plan required by clause (8) of such section, disregard both the first $50 per month of such individual's earned income and also one-half of his earned income in excess of $50 per month.

SEC. 2. (a) Effective July 1, 1957, subsection (a) of section 1002 of the Social Security Act is amended by striking out "and" immediately before clause (12), and by striking out the period at the end of the subsection and inserting in lieu thereof a semicolon and the following: "and (13) provide that if an individual who has received aid to the blind becomes ineligible for such aid because of an increase in the amount of his earned income, and such individual again becomes eligible for aid to the blind (by reason of a decrease in or termination of such income) within a period of 6 calendar months after the last previous month for which he received such aid, he shall be furnished such aid without further application, effective (subject to verification of such decrease or termination by the State agency) as of the date on which he files written notification of such decrease or termination with such agency."

(b) During the period beginning July 1, 1955, and ending June 30, 1957, any State agency established or designated as required by clause (3) of section 1002 (a) of the Social Security Act may furnish aid to the blind to an individual who had been eligible for aid to the blind but became ineligible for such aid because of an increase in his earned income, if such individual shall have again become eligible for such aid (by reason of a decrease in or termination of such income) within a period of 6 calendar months after the last previous month for which he received such aid, without further application and effective (subject to verification of such decrease or termination by the State agency) as of the date on which he files written notification of such decrease or termination with such agency.

The letter presented by Mr. WILEY is as follows:

[Hon. Dwight D. Eisenhower, honorary president; M. C. Migel, chairman, board of trustees; William Ziegler, Jr., president; George F. Meyer,[1] vice president; Eustace Seligman, secretary; Jansen Noyes, Jr., treasurer; M. Robert Barnett,[1] executive director; Helen A. Keller,[1] L. H. D., LL. D., counselor, Bureau of National and International Relations]

AMERICAN FOUNDATION FOR THE BLIND, INC.,
New York, N. Y., May 27, 1955.

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

DEAR SENATOR WILEY: May I take this opportunity to thank you and your staff for the many courtesies shown me during my visits to your office.

You will recall that on my last visit to your office, I discussed provisions of H. R. 5658, introduced into the House of Representatives on April 19 by Representative JENKINS of Ohio. I will consider it a personal favor, as well as a great service to the blind of the Nation, if you can find it possible to introduce a companion measure in the Senate.

As you will note, H. R. 5658 amends Title X of the Social Security Act to provide that 50 percent of all earned income above $50 earned in one month by a recipient of aid to the blind shall be disregarded in determining his eligibility to receive assistance. Several years ago, the law was amended to permit the disregarding of the first $50 per

[1] Blind.

month of earned income each month. Workers for the blind have found that this works fine up to a point; the need however goes further, to create an incentive to cause the individual to develop his maximum earning power. This bill would reduce the aid to the blind grant received by the individual 50 cents for each dollar he earns in excess of the already exempt $50 per month. It would eventually aid the individual to develop his earning power without losing his security to the point that he would be earning sufficient funds to be taken off the aid to the blind grant, thereby becoming a taxpayer rather than a tax recipient.

The bill further would protect the individual's security by providing that the recipient will be automatically reinstated on the aid to the blind rolls if his earning ability decreases during the first 6 months after he works himself off the aid to the blind rolls.

Workers for the blind are convinced that the number of recipients of aid to the blind would be materially reduced after passage of this measure. By reducing the number of recipients, certainly the cost of aid to the blind would also be reduced, making the measure both beneficial to the blind and a material saving to the taxpayer.

This measure has been studied by workers for the blind and is endorsed by the American Foundation for the Blind, a natianal private agency; and the American Association of Workers for the Blind, a national association composed of both blind and sighted workers with the blind.

We will greatly appreciate your sponsorship of this measure in the United States Senate.

Sincerely yours,

HULEN C. WALKER,
Legislative Analyst.

EXPANSION OF SCHOOL MILK PROGRAM

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to enlarge and extend the special school milk program.

Few programs have proven more successful than our effort in the past year to increase milk consumption through our schools. Because of its success, several proposals have been advanced for increasing the amount of money authorized for this purpose. However, I feel we must do more than just increase the amount of money allocated to this program, by opening up the eligibility to other groups that are eager to cooperate in improving the diet of preschool students, as well as school-age youngsters. After all, if we are concerned enough about children's health to see to it that they get milk during the school term, we should be just as interested in seeing that they get an opportunity to have milk during the summer months at settlement houses and summer camps.

For that reason my bill proposes doubling the amount of authorization, and extending the coverage to nonprofit nursery schools, child care centers, settlement houses, summer camps, and similar nonprofit institutions devoted to the care and training of children, as well as to all nonprofit schools.

Last year, one of our Minneapolis settlement houses wanted to participate in this program and found it was ineligible under existing law. After my negotiations with the Department of Agriculture at that time, I was determined to make them eligible. The only question the Department of Agriculture has raised about the expanded coverage I propose is whether or not State departments of education administering the school lunch program would be willing to handle the milk program among other child centers. I am convinced, however, the fact that most of our States handle distribution of other surplus commodities to these nonprofit institutions is evidence enough that they could and would handle the milk program as well.

In fact, I have direct word to that effect from Minnesota. Andrew R. Taylor, director of the school lunch section of our State department of education, has stated that during the past 2 years he has distributed other surplus foods to 126 nonprofit camps and child care centers in Minnesota, and that if fluid milk is made available for this purpose, as it is under the school lunch program, his office could be making milk available to these groups within 3 to 5 days after receiving such authorization.

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

The bill (S. 2121) to enlarge and extend the special school milk program, introduced by Mr. HUMPHREY, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

HOLDING CERTAIN LANDS IN TRUST FOR MINNESOTA CHIPPEWA TRIBE

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to declare that the United States holds certain lands in trust for the Minnesota Chippewa Tribe. I ask unanimous consent to have a resolution adopted by the tribal executive committee of the Minnesota Chippewa Tribe on March 19, 1955, which provides the basis for this bill, printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

The bill (S. 2122) to declare that the United States holds certain lands in trust for the Minnesota Chippewa Tribe, introduced by Mr. HUMPHREY, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

The resolution presented by Mr. HUMPHREY is as follows:

"Resolution 12

"Whereas a bill H. R. 1551 was introduced in the House of Representatives of the 83d Congress of the United States, to declare title to approximately 28,554 acres of land purchased by the United States for the benefit of the Minnesota Chippewa Tribe; and

"Whereas although this land was acquired for the benefit of the tribe and has been so administered, the title to the land has never been legally declared by the Federal Government to be held in trust for the Indians: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved,* That the Minnesota Chippewa Tribal Council requests that our Representatives and Senators now assembled in this 84th Congress of the United States again introduce this bill H. R. 1551 of 1953 which provides that the United States hold certain lands in trust for the Minnesota Chippewa Tribe; and that any rents previously collected for the use of said land be declared held in trust by the United States of America for the use and benefit of said tribe; and be it further

"*Resolved,* That a copy of this resolution be mailed to each of our Senators and Representatives of the present 84th session of Congress, and that they do all they can toward the enactment of this legislation, if and when a new bill is introduced in Congress."

The Minnesota Chippewa Tribal Council requests the reintroduction and possible enactment of this legislation so that the Indians may get the maximum benefit from the land. The tribe intends to develop the lands through reforestation, but hesitates to expend tribal funds on such a project until the title is specifically vested in the Indians. The Indians have, in past years, spent thousands of dollars of their tribal funds on forest-planting projects alone to bring into producing status lands similar to those covered by this bill.

ED. M. WILSON,
President, Tribal Executive Committee, the Minnesota Chippewa Tribe.

I hereby certify that the foregoing resolution was duly presented, approved, and enacted at a regular meeting of the tribal executive committee of the Minnesota Chippewa Tribe, held at Bemidji, Minn., on March 19, 1955, and a vote was cast as follows: For, 11; against, 0.

WM. J. HEISLER,
Secretary, Tribal Executive Committee, the Minnesota Chippewa Tribe.

MUTUAL SECURITY ACT OF 1955—AMENDMENTS

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I submit amendments to (S. 2090) the mutual security bill which is now before the Senate in the hope of providing for our American marine insurance companies the right to compete on equal basis with foreign insurance companies for the business of insuring foreign-aid shipments.

Under the law as it is now interpreted by the officials of our mutual aid organization, dollars are not allocated for payment of marine insurance on foreign-aid shipments unless they are requested by the recipient country. American insurance agencies have tried unsuccessfully to get a fair share of this business, but, because of discrimination against them by the recipient countries in favor of their own companies, they have failed in their efforts.

This has deprived the American marine insurance market of the opportunity to compete for some of this business and the mutual security organization has refused their request to change the regulations so that dollars will be available to pay the insurance premiums to Americans.

There seems to be no other recourse left except to include in the mutual security bill a provision that dollars shall be made available for marine insurance on commodities shipped where the insurance is placed on a competitive basis in accordance with normal practices prevailing before World War II.

I am, therefore, submitting the amendments which also provide that where a participating country by statute, decree, rule, or regulation discriminates against any marine insurance company licensed

to do business in the United States the commodities purchased with funds advanced under the program shall be insured in the United States against marine risks with a company authorized to do business in the United States.

Mr. President, it seems only fair that our marine insurance companies be given the same right to bid on the insurance on foreign-aid shipments as companies from other countries of the world enjoy.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendments will be received, printed, and lie on the table.

Mr. POTTER submitted amendments, intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 2090) to amend the Mutual Security Act of 1954, and for other purposes, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

Mr. LONG submitted amendments, intended to be proposed by him to Senate bill 2090, supra, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

Mr. KNOWLAND submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by him, to Senate bill 2090, supra, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

HOUSING ACT OF 1955—AMENDMENTS

Mr. CAPEHART submitted amendments, intended to be proposed by him, to the bill (S. 2126) to extend and clarify laws relating to the provision and improvement of housing, the elimination and prevention of slums, the conservation and development of urban communities, the financing of vitally needed public works, and for other purposes, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

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 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, as follows:

By Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania:

Commencement address delivered by him at the Eastern Baptist College, at St. Davids, Pa., on May 28, 1955.

By Mr. WILEY:

Address on the program of Congress for 1955 delivered by him over station WGN, Chicago, on May 28, 1955.

NOTICE OF HEARING ON NOMINATION OF WILLIAM B. HERLANDS TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE, SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, I desire to give notice that a public hearing has been scheduled for Friday, June 10, 1955, at 10 a. m., in room 424, Senate Office Building, upon the nomination of William B. Herlands, of New York, to be United States district judge, Southern District of New York, vice Edward A. Conger, retired. At the indicated time and place all persons interested in the nomination may make such representations as may be pertinent. The subcommittee consists of myself, chairman, the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], and the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN].

REPLY OF GENERAL ROMULO TO PRIME MINISTER NEHRU AT BANDUNG

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, in the long-range view of history what happened in the Asian-African Conference in Bandung a month ago we cannot now assess. But we know what it meant to the free world when we read the newspaper dispatches, because all of us were uplifted by the developments in the conference, and we realized that the leaders of the free Asians and Africans were on the offensive, and that communism was openly and courageously assailed by them.

But it is not merely the fact that communism was placed on the defensive in that conference that was hailed by the free world. It was the spirit of the democratic alinement in that region that aroused enthusiasm among all freedom loving peoples. They spoke with courage and vigor; they did not mince words; they called a spade a spade, and they used the strongest terms in condemning what they believe to be the greatest danger to the peace of the world today. For the first time in that area communism was driven to the wall.

As I read the newspaper dispatches sent from Bandung, however, one incident attracted my attention, because I believe it was really the highlight of that conference. That was the debate in the political committee between the Prime Minister of India, Mr. Nehru, and the chief delegate of the Philippines, General Carlos P. Romulo. Mr. Nehru advocated coexistence and his five principles, and attacked regional pacts. He specifically mentioned the SEATO Treaty, and said that it was humiliating for any nation to join a regional pact. It is said that it was an impressive speech. The delegates listened to him intently.

Immediately after Nehru's blistering attack on the SEATO, General Romulo asked for the floor. The newspaper reports said that the Philippine delegate was at his best. Speaking extemporaneously he answered Mr. Nehru point for point. His rebuttal was so devastating and so effective, according to press dispatches of that day, that the Prime Minister of India had to apologize after General Romulo had concluded his rejoinder, saying, "I apologize to the distinguished delegate of the Philippines for my remarks, which were not intended to be harsh."

Mr. President, because I believe the Romulo rebuttal is a faithful expression of the free world's views on the questions brought up by Mr. Nehru, because I believe the Philippine delegate in speaking as he did was really the spokesman of democracy and freedom, and because I know his address will go down in history as a great state document, I ask for unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD. It is the transcript of General Romulo's rebuttal as taken from the official proceedings of the conference.

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

THE ASIAN-AFRICAN CONFERENCE

(From the official record of the proceedings. Verbatim report of the reply of Gen. Carlos P. Romulo, member of the cabinet, to Prime Minister Nehru of India, before the Committee of Chief Delegates, April 28, 1955)

Mr. Chairman, I did not intend to speak on this subject to preserve the concord and harmony in this conference that has so far prevailed until the Prime Minister of India spoke, as he always speaks, with great impact on all those who are privileged to hear him. We just had fresh evidence, if evidence were needed, why he is regarded not only in India but throughout the world as a man of peace. Though he referred often to his own nation, I do not doubt that his concern is extended to all peoples everywhere. Underlying everything that he said is a sensitivity to the human situation. He is eminent as an Indian, distinguished as an Asian and as a member of the human family. For this I salute him. However, I would have wished he spoke with the same serenity that he spoke in New Delhi in 1947, and I would have much preferred to have heard him here with less heat, less passion, and less dogma.

I speak, sir, for a small country, like many other countries around this table, that cannot boast of the size of India. I cannot say, as did the Prime Minister of India, conscious of his country's power, that "even if the whole world went to war, India would stand alone and refuse to fight." I cannot defy the whole world, sir, conscious of my country's limitations. How few, indeed, are the nations here who can be like India.

Mr. Nehru spoke about the danger of coalitions. I do not quarrel with his concern. But I hope I can make him see today the side of small nations so that he may realize that it is not fair for him to say that "it is humiliating for them to join regional organizations." Why has my country joined a regional grouping. The answer is exactly the same as the answer each one of you would give me if I asked you, Why are you putting so much of your wealth and your energies into preparing for war? Let us be realistic and not be starryeyed visionaries dreaming utopian dreams. If I asked my good friends in India and Pakistan why almost half their national budgets are going into military preparations, both would say that this is being done not because the governments or the peoples of each nation are spoiling for a fight, but because there is a situation in the Kashmir which might be even more difficult to settle fairly if only one side were armed. So far, there has been no effective instrument by which a decision in the Kashmir acceptable to both sides can be reached. Each country expends vast energies and output not for the purpose of aggressing against the other but for the purpose of protecting itself if some incident quite outside the calculations of the parties involved should touch off a general explosion leading to a military show-down. Even Mahatma Gandhi, that great Indian leader to whose memory I ask you to join me in turning our reverential thoughts today, in the early days of partition, didn't hesitate a moment in supporting the Prime Minister's decision to send troops to the Kashmir not for the purpose of waging a war—he was a saintly man—but for the purpose of preventing one by making the presence of these troops as vivid as possible.

A moment ago I praised Mr. Nehru as a man of peace. I believe that Mr. Ali is no less a great statesman, no less devoted to peace—peace between India and Pakistan, peace in our continent, and peace in the world. Here we have two men of good will yet that good will has so far not been enough by itself to cause either of their countries

to lay down their arms. For the building of the peace only begins with good will and good intentions. In order that peace should be real, it requires a design—a specific design concerned with all the multiple parts that are involved in any workable mechanism of peace. Such a mechanism, I hasten to make clear, does not eliminte the need for good will and understanding. But it does provide a basis both for security and justice, and that is all that any nation wants in its dealings with other nations.

We have started to discuss coexistence and we have heard many views on the subject. Prime Minister Nehru has just discoursed on it at length. May I in reply tell him that to us coexistence as a concept is nothing new to the free world. We have long enjoyed and continue to enjoy the benefits of coexistence. Within the free world community there are a great number and diversity of economic political and social systems. Yet it is possible for these diverse systems to exist in peace and to practice cooperation without resort to force as an instrument of policy.

The question then arises: Why cannot the Communist nations participate in this area of peaceful coexistence, or more specifically, why is it that only the Communists are unable to participate?

For the answer we must go back to our fundamental problem: Aggressive expansionism as basic policy doctrine in Communist conduct of its foreign affairs, and dependence upon force as an instrument of policy.

It must be recognized and understood that the fundamental source of existing world tensions and the problems arising out of those tensions is the aggressive expansionist nature of international communism. This is not a charge made by non-Communist countries—it is the explicit declaration of international communism. It may be read in the literature produced by Communist publishers, governments, circulated in Communist educational institutions, and at no time denied or repudiated by any responsible Communist official.

This doctrine, which the Communists proclaim as the very wellspring of its overall program, is based upon the premise that Communist states cannot exist indefinitely alongside non-Communist states. That there must be ultimate decision culminating in world revolution and worldwide communism. While provision is made for temporary diversionary tactics, such as professions of willingness to live in peace with neighbors, it is clearly and explicitly stated that such diversionary tactics are intended solely to strengthen the Communist position in its drive toward the ultimate objective.

This is the candid and continuing definition of Communist foreign policy as we derive it from their own words and from sources bearing their official imprimatur. Nor is this doctrine maintained at a high philosophical plane. It is equally easy to examine the manuals of organization and procedure issued to ranking Communist Party members throughout the world. For these manuals get down to the very specifics of subversion, infiltration, sabotage—all with the ultimate view of overthrowing the host government by violence.

Thus the non-Communist world faces the indisputable fact that a Communist neighbor is an active and continuing aggressor. This, as I have said, is not a charge brought against communism by the free world—it is a Communist declaration of purpose. Nor can we take comfort from the fact that in some parts of the world communism has suffered defeat in free elections. Communists do not consider elections seriously except as vehicles to further their propaganda aims. Communism's very existence is based upon the rejection of the electoral process as being a means of changing society.

Its schism with socialism is based upon the fact that Communists see violence as the sole means of achieving social reform.

These are the basic facts that must necessarily influence all the free-world thinking at this time.

Let not Asia repeat Europe's tragic error in refusing to believe the brazen program of conquest openly revealed by Hitler in his book Mein Kampf.

His Excellency Prime Minister Nehru gave us a scholarly disquisition on his five principles, and I must pay him tribute for his masterly use of the English language and his deep knowledge of history.

What are the principles embodied in the five principles? They are "mutual respect for each other's territorial integrity and sovereignty, mutual nonaggression, mutual noninterference in each other's internal affairs, equality and mutual benefit, and peaceful coexistence."

We agree—wholeheartedly. These are excellent principles. Those peaceable peoples who have wished only to develop their own material and spiritual resources in their own way inside their own borders have always prayed that such principles might govern the conduct of all the nations. It was to establish such principles and ensure their application that the League of Nations and the United Nations were formed.

Are we entirely sure in our minds what is intended by those who declare adherence to these principles? Are we assured that there will be no further cases of aggression such as that of which the Republic of Korea was the victim? This seems to us to be the all-important question. Who is willing to give this assurance? Is it too much to ask that some restitution be made for the invasion and present occupation of North Korea by bringing home invading forces and letting the Korean people choose their own government under United Nations observation, free at last of interference in their internal affairs? These, it seems to us, are important tests of the five principles intentions.

If it is persisted that the attack launched without warning and without provocation upon the Republic of Korea and its subsequent invasion were consistent with the principle of non-aggression, then what does the principle mean? If the principle of non-aggression will sanction the aggression against Korea, then will it not sanction aggression against any other country?

Let us recollect that the five-power United Nations commission stationed in Korea at the time hostilities began found unanimously that the attack was launched from the north, not from the south—as would certainly be indicated by the fact that the attack immediately carried deep into the Republic of Korea on the strength of the surprise achieved. Let us also recollect that 50 nations subsequently judged who is guilty of aggression in Korea. If the invaders nevertheless continue to take the position they have in the past, that they were guiltless in Korea, that it was the Republic of Korea that initiated the war and that those defending the Republic were the aggressors, then we are forced to conclude that in such lexicon "non-aggression" means calculated assault upon a free nation by aggressive military forces while "aggression" describes the action of those coming to the assistance of the victim. We shall then have a clearer idea of what to expect under the five principles.

Another of these principles calls for "mutual non-interference in each other's internal affairs." If we may turn for a moment to the Soviet Union, we may recall that in World War II, when the Western powers and the Soviet Union were pitted against a common foe, Nazi Germany, Stalin agreed to dissolve the Soviet Union's instrument of interference in the internal affairs of other nations—the Communist International, or Comintern. Subsequently, as we all know, the Comintern was recreated under a slightly different name, the Cominform. The Cominform has the primary task of insuring that Communist parties in other countries will be advised of, and will faithfully follow, the line that happens to serve Soviet Russian interests at a given time. We may remember the rebellion of the Yugoslavian Government at the intervention of the Cominform in its domestic affairs. It is interesting to note that for years the Peiping regime refused to accept relationships with Yugoslavia, for in the Communist world, the resistance of a small state to intervention in its internal affairs cannot be tolerated, if it is the Soviet Union or Communist China that is doing the intervening.

In Asia, the prime agency for directing the local Communist Parties is the liaison bureau of the WFTU. This organization, with its fictitious interest in labor, has as its objective the liberation of the non-Communist countries of Asia, which means bringing those countries under Communist control. Those who oppose that kind of liberation—and that would include all but two of the delegations at this conference—are to be regarded as enemies. This strategy by which Communist elements—called democratic trade unions or the working masses in conventional Communist lingo—are to be assisted in taking power were made fairly clear at the so-called Asian Trade Union Conference held in Peiping in November 1949, under the auspices of the WFTU. Louis Saillant, secretary of the WFTU, was surprisingly outspoken about the Soviet Union's hopes and fears with respect to Asia at that meeting. It is interesting to remember what he said about some of the countries represented here today:

"In India, in Burma, in Ceylon, in Pakistan, in Iran, and in Japan, the democratic trade unions may well have to face a worse situation even than now; their leaders and active members may have to suffer from an intensification of the terrorist measures taken against them. They should find in their very development of their fight for the workers' claims efficient means enabling them to maintain their links with the working masses."

This is purely an incitement to Asian Communists to join forces in a revolt against the representative governments of Asian states, governments which are to be considered terrorists because they resist intervention by the Communist International masquerading as WFTU. What such governments could expect at the hands of international communism was spelled out at the Peiping Conference of November 1949, by Mr. Liu Shao-chi, the leading theoretician of Communist China. He stated: "Armed struggle can, and must, be the main form in the people's liberation struggles in many colonial and semicolonial countries."

The Communists refer to all underdeveloped countries not under their control as colonial and semicolonial. It was about us, about most of us here, that Liu Shao-chi was talking. And when he spoke of liberation struggles he meant struggles not against European colonial regimes, but nationalist Asian governments. For Liu Shao-chi spoke only 2 months after the Indonesian Communists under the direction of the Soviet-trained agent, Muso, violently and treacherously attacked the Republic of Indonesia which was then, with resources already unequal to the task, standing up to the forces of Dutch imperialism. When Liu Shao-chi spoke of the liberation struggle, it was little more than a year after the Communists in Hyderabad rose against the Government of India and the national leadership that had won the country its independence.

Liu Shao-chi was, in fact, taking note that under the cover and through the agency of local Communist forces, the Soviet Union

and Communist China, were waging war against free Asia. Many of my fellow countrymen have fallen in that war, shot to death by raiding Communist gangs, ambushed in the wooded hills. Thousands of true nationals of Indonesia, India, Burma, and Malaya have also died. They well merit our sorrowful remembrance. But we should also not withhold our sympathy from those who killed them, for their misled brothers who had been persuaded to believe that the way to peace is through bloodshed; that the way to justice is through murder; that the way to freedom is through tyranny; that the way to plenty for the people is through the confiscation of all they own by the state, and we should not forget the tragedy of those in Indochina who have suffered a fate only too characteristic of Asia in our times, those patriots who found themselves caught between European colonial intervention on one side and the intervention of the Communist bloc on the other.

What we should like to know is whether the Peiping government, in foreswearing interference in the internal affairs of other nations, is promising to cease abetting, inciting, and supplying the forces of armed conspiracy against the integrity of the free Asian states. It is not enough to be told that "revolution cannot be exported," as Mr. Chou En-lai declared in connection with the five principles. The question is, Can so-called revolutionary bands be directed and provisioned from the outside under the principle of noninterference in the internal affairs of other nations? It is not enough to be told that the Communist conspiracies directed against the representative Asian governments are all purely indigenous movements with no outside connections.

References have also been made here a while ago by the Prime Minister of India against the Manila Pact. In fact it was stated here—and I repeat it—that it was humiliating for any nation to join regional groups. Let me take your time to tell you what the Manila Pact really is, not how it is presented to you by those who are prejudiced against it.

The actual terms of the treaty and the Pacific Charter best indicate the positive character of those documents. The preamble of the treaty reaffirms faith in the purposes and principles of the Charter of the United Nations. Among the principles heavily underscored are those referring to equal rights and self-determination of peoples, individual liberty, and the rule of law, the promotion of economic well-being, collective defense for the preservation of peace and security, and united action against aggression.

The purely defensive and strictly nonaggressive character of the treaty is written into article I, under which the parties undertake to settle any international disputes in which they may be involved by peaceful means * * * and to refrain in their international relations from the threat or use of force in any manner inconsistent with the purposes of the United Nations. Article II refers to methods of developing their capacity to resist armed attack. In order to make doubly certain that the treaty is in absolute harmony with the Charter of the United Nations, article VI provides that that treaty does not affect and shall not be interpreted as affecting the rights and obligations of any of the parties under the Charter of the United Nations or the responsibility of the United Nations for the maintenance of international peace and security.

All the eight signatories to the Manila Pact are members of the United Nations. They have therefore an equal and inescapable duty to make absolutely certain that they are assuming no obligations under the Manila Pact which are contrary to or inconsistent with their prior obligations under the Charter of the United Nations. Since the principal objective of the United Nations is to maintain international peace and security through, among other means, collective action to repeal aggression, it follows that the Manila Treaty can be valid only to the extent that it will assist, through a regional arrangement, in the achievement of that objective. The Manila Pact would be void if it went beyond this objective, and it would be useless if it fell short of it.

Article IV is the crucial provision of the treaty. This article has three paragraphs. The first paragraph provides that each party would act in accordance with its constitutional processes to meet aggression committed by means of an armed attack against any of the parties or against any designated state in the treaty area. This is clearly a provision against actual aggression. It provides assurance that the military clauses of the treaty are inoperative except in the event of such aggression. Under no circumstances can the treaty be invoked to promote joint action among the parties in support of an aggressive action by any one or any number of them.

The second paragraph of article IV covers cases of subversion. Experience has shown that this has become the favorite method of Communist imperialism. Communists well realize the grave danger that is inherent in the method of conquest by overt aggression, and therefore they may be expected henceforth to employ techniques of domination which are less likely to lead to outright war. The treaty accordingly provides that in the event of such danger arising in the treaty area, the parties shall consult immediately in order to agree on the measures which should be taken for the common defense.

This is probably the first treaty of its kind to refer specifically to the danger posed by subversion. But it is an innovation which has been directly called for by the new techniques which Communist imperialism has increasingly employed in many parts of the world.

Article III refers to economic cooperation among the parties as a useful adjunct to any program designed to meet by long-range measures the menace of Communist subversion and aggression. Article V sets up a council for the implementation of the treaty, particularly as regards any military and other planning which may be required.

By implication the treaty has been attacked here by the Prime Minister of India on the grounds that:

1. The treaty has made more difficult the relaxation of international tension; and

2. It is a plan for perpetuating colonialism and suppressing the national liberation movement in Southeast Asia.

The Manila Pact is aimed at the exact opposite of all these things.

It was intended to halt the buildup of tension in Southeast Asia resulting from the Communist moves in the Indo-Chinese states. The Communist military success in the area, feeding upon itself, was certain to heighten the atmosphere of danger in the area, and might well have driven the Communists to further heedless adventures and compelled the free world into taking desperate remedial or retaliatory action. The Manila Pact has reduced this hazard. It leaves the Communists in no doubt whatever that if they undertake further military adventures in Southeast Asia, immediate and effective countermeasures shall be taken against them by the members of the Alliance.

The Manila Pact and the Pacific Charter also constitute a clear and dramatic disavowal of the methods and purposes of colonial imperialism in the region. These two documents can give no comfort to those who believe that this archaic system can be maintained in the modern world. At the same time, by upholding the principle of self-determination and the right of peoples to self-government and independence, both the Manila Pact and the Pacific Charter rule out the doctrine that the dying colonial imperialism in Asia would be replaced by the newer and even more dangerous species of Communist imperialism.

The Manila Pact has also been criticized by Premier Nehru on the grounds that:

1. It diminished the "climate of peace" that was generated by the Geneva settlement on Indochina;

2. It is contrary to the spirit of the agreements and understanding on nonagression and noninterference which had been reached between India, China, and Burma; and

3. That it is contrary to the Charter of the United Nations.

Let me answer the Prime Minister of India point for point.

Far from destroying the so-called climate of peace following the Indochina settlement, the Manila Pact makes it doubly certain that the signatories shall not countenance any fresh outbreaks or renewal of Communist aggression in the region. In effect, under the Manila Pact, the Communists can neither renew their aggression against free Vietnam, Laos, and Cambodia, nor start aggression in any other part of Southeast Asia without risking counter measures. One would think that this will serve to reinforce rather than weaken the climate of peace which is said was the direct outcome of the Geneva conference.

As far as the so-called nonagression or noninterference agreements or understandings between India, China, and Burma, are concerned, I fail to see in what way the Manila Pact can be said to be inconsistent with such agreements or understandings. If India and China have an agreement not to interfere in each other's affairs, and not to make war upon each other, such an agreement, it is hoped, would not inhibit India from defending itself in the event China nevertheless commits aggression against India. Yet this is the only situation in which India, if it had been a member of the Alliance, could expect assistance under the Manila Pact. India could expect no help under the alliance if it purposes to attack China or Pakistan or, indeed any other state anywhere else in the world. Where the supposed inconsistency is therefore not clear at all.

The attempt to prove that the Southeast Asia Collective Defense Alliance is not covered by articles 51 or 52 of the Charter of the United Nations is more ingenious than clear. By a somewhat involved series of arguments, it is said that the Manila Pact provides for a defensive system which is neither collective nor regional. Therefore, it is said, it is not covered by article 51 which recognizes the validity of a collective self-defense, nor by article 52 which recognizes the validity of regional organizations.

I believe that a more rational approach is through the text of the Manila Pact itself. Bearing in mind article 103 of the charter which provides that the obligations assumed by a member state under the Charter of the United Nations supersede those assumed by it under any other international instrument, we should next examine the text of article VI of the Manila Pact. This provides that the Manila Treaty "does not affect and shall not be interpreted as affecting the rights and obligations of any of the parties under the Charter of the United Nations or the responsibility of the United Nations for the maintenance of internationl peace and security."

To sum up: The Manila Pact is a treaty of collective defense. No aggressive purpose is written into it.

As for the Pacific Charter, we consider this to be a document worthy of the best traditions of any civilized state in the world today, whether Asian or non-Asian. This is the moral basis and justification of the Manila Pact, and we stand on its principles, proud and unflinching, in the sight of our friends and neighbors in free Asia.

To all free Asians we say: "This is a treaty on which we all can stand together, without vanity or invidiousness, but united in the de-

termination to preserve the peace and freedom of Asia."

To any potential aggressor or any power that intends aggression we say through this treaty: "We desire to live in peace with you, but if you attack us we shall fight back with all our strength."

Let me say to Premier Nehru in conclusion:

The empires of yesterday on which it used to be said the sun never set, are departing one by one from Asia. What we fear now are the new empires on which we know the sun never rises. May his India not be caught by the encircling gloom!

GREAT LAKES FISHERIES CONVENTION

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I am pleased that the Senate will shortly be in a position to vote upon the Great Lakes Fisheries Convention.

The particular urgency of this convention arises, of course, from the critical problem of the dreaded sea lampreys—vampire eels which have destroyed a great deal of lake fishing.

It is the purpose of the new Great Lakes Fisheries Commission, to be composed of 3 representatives of the United States and 3 of Canada, to carry out a lamprey control program so as to increase stocks of commercial fish in the Great Lakes.

It is estimated that the annual cost to the United States for the first 3 years under the convention will be approximately $750,000. By comparison, the lamprey damage is now estimated at $5 million a year.

But there is a longer range problem, and it concerns the coordinating of basic research of lakes fisheries as a whole.

There has been an unfortunate tendency over the years for more valuable species of fish to be replaced by less valuable species.

An earlier convention with Canada, signed in 1946, was never ratified by the Senate, and was withdrawn by the President. It would have given the Commission certain regulatory powers, and for that reason was opposed in many quarters.

The present convention is, however, strongly supported by a large number of conservation groups in our land, including the Izaak Walton League, and many others. In my own State, the Wisconsin Federation of Conservation Clubs has gone all-out in support of it, as has the State conservation commission at Madison.

I send to the desk a sample expression which I have received from one of many conservation clubs in my State supporting the convention. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed at this point in the body of the RECORD. I trust that the Senate will promptly agree to this sound convention in the public interest.

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

NORTHWEST ASSEMBLY
OF CONSERVATION CLUBS,
Superior, Wis., May 25, 1955.

Senator ALEXANDER WILEY,
United States Senate Chambers,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR WILEY: Inasmuch as the eradication or control of the sea lamprey has become a most vital problem, and the lamprey has already invaded our small lakes by means of rivers leading from Lake Superior (one was found attached to a bluegill caught in Lake St. Croix last Saturday), the more than 2,000 members of the St. Croix, Amnicon-Dowling, Head-O-Lakes Conservation Clubs, and the Douglas County Fish and Game League, all of Douglas County, Wis., sincerely urge that the proposed plan of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee to set up a Great Lakes Fisheries Commission to fight the lamprey and increase the trout in the Great Lakes be ratified and put into action as soon as possible.

We believe that the proposed fund of $750,000 per year is entirely justified, and it is our hope that with the aid of the Canadian Government the threat of the lamprey can be eliminated.

Sincerely,

ED. SCHMIDT, *President.*

RESTORATION OF FUNDS FOR UNITED STATES INFORMATION AGENCY

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I was pleased to note in yesterday's CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on pages 7245–7246, a statement by my colleague, the distinguished senior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE]. He commended the Senate Appropriations subcommittee which handled the appropriations bill for the United States Information Agency, H. R. 5502.

I should like to join in the sentiments expressed by my colleague. I want to express my own felicitations to the chairman of that subcommittee and to his associates for their thorough and sympathetic study of the USIA's budget request.

I am, of course, particularly gratified at the Senate's restoration of the funds requested by this Agency.

PRESIDENT SUPPORTS USIA

I am also profoundly delighted that no less a personage than the President of the United States has personally reiterated time and again his keen awareness that we are in a war for men's minds throughout the world. President Eisenhower has stressed time and again that instead of weakening our effort to pierce the Iron Curtain, we must strengthen that effort.

MY SPEECHES COMMENDED USIA

I have just returned from an extensive tour of my State. I found the people of Wisconsin deeply interested in the work being done to get across America's message to the peoples of the world. In a great many speeches which I made, I urged full support of the United States Information Agency.

I am very pleased that one of my speeches, delivered in Detroit, was reproduced in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by Representative FRANK THOMPSON, of New Jersey.

SOVIET PROPAGANDA CONTINUES ALL-OUT

As ranking member of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, I am keenly aware that Communist propaganda throughout the world has not diminished in the slightest in its effort to vilify the United States. Yes, in spite of the Soviet cold war peace offensive, the Red propaganda mill is continuing to grind full blast. Under these circumstances, we have no alternative but to restore the USIA's funds. It would be absurd if the Congress were to grant considerable funds for Armed Forces, yet at the same time weaken funds which are similarly vitally necessary in America's self-interest.

SENATE SHOULD INSIST ON ITS AMOUNT

The Senate-House conference committees on the State-Justice Department appropriations bill will shortly meet.

I trust that the conferees of the Senate will decline to accept any substantial reduction in the funds which the Senate has recommended for the USIA. By so doing, we will protect and preserve the best interests of the United States, and we will better assure the prevention of war.

THE LATE JUDGE HAROLD M. STEPHENS

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, the passing of Judge Harold M. Stephens last Saturday will be mourned by all who were fortunate enough to know him.

Thousands more who never had the opportunity to know him personally were aware of his brilliant career as a young Assistant Attorney General, and later as a member and chief judge of the United States Court of Appeals, District of Columbia Circuit. They also will note his demise with profound regret.

Mr. President, I am one of those fortunate persons who knew Judge Stephens during the period when he was a student of law at Harvard University. Later I was associated with him in the county attorney's office, where we were both assistant prosecutors, in our native State of Utah.

During this close association, and through my contacts with him during the nearly two decades of his service in the Federal judiciary, I have been impressed that the career of Judge Stephens is another good example that this country has been fortunate in its selection of Federal judges.

Judge Stephens' entire career on the bench was characterized by outstanding devotion to duty, a display of the highest of ethical standards, and a passion for fairness and justice for all who came before him. With him, these ideals of judicial conduct were not mere precepts of theory, but were the everyday practice of a sincere and dedicated jurist.

In all the depth of meaning of the term, he was a just man; and this was recognized by all those associated with him and by all who came before him for the administration of justice.

Judge Stephens was also a deeply religious man. He not only had a deep and stabilizing personal religious conviction, but he also had a pervading sense of appreciation for human dignity and a high degree of tolerance for the religious views of others.

Intensely loyal, Judge Stephens was a vigorous and persistent advocate for causes and organizations in which he believed and participated. He demonstrated this in his advocacy for a stronger and sounder Federal judiciary, and his position was in the front ranks of many movements for improvement in the judiciary. His interest and ability were recognized by his associates, who nominated him to the judicial council as their

advocate and champion. He appeared in this capacity on numerous occasions before hearings of the Senate Judiciary Committee in which I participated; and I can testify that his appearances, without exception, evoked respect for him as an individual and as a jurist.

Details of some of his achievements in improving the Federal judiciary are chronicled in an article which appeared in the Washington Post and Times-Herald of May 29, and I now request unanimous consent to have the article printed at this point in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks.

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

CHIEF JUDGE STEPHENS IS DEAD—ON COURT OF APPEALS 20 YEARS

Chief Judge Harold Montelle Stephens of the United States court of appeals here, who died last night, was a man who lived and loved the law as few men have. He was 69 on March 6.

The victim of a hopeless cancer that spread through his abdomen, Judge Stephens would have completed 20 years on the Federal appellate bench in October.

Although he had not occupied the bench since last winter, the jurist did not learn the nature of the disorder that caused death until an exploratory operation was performed at the Mayo Clinic early in May.

Judge Stephens first went to the Rochester, Minn., institution in February. Tests failed to disclose any abnormality, but Mayo physicians told the intense, hard-working jurist to take a long rest in Florida. It was while he was there, attempting to rest and toss aside the innumerable worries of a court that is second only to the Supreme Court in importance, that Judge Stephens suffered another attack.

HOPED FOR RECOVERY

He returned to Mayo Clinic and the investigative surgery. After his condition was diagnosed, Judge Stephens came home to his apartment at the Sheraton-Park Hotel to wait out the inevitable. Until the end he had hopes of recovery sufficiently to resume his place at the head of the appellate tribunal.

He is survived by his wife, the former Virginia Adelle Bush, whom he married in 1912, and a brother, E. W. Stephens, of California.

The jurist was a Congregationalist until 1928, when he entered the Roman Catholic Church.

Generally considered a legal conservative whose all-consuming passion in life was the law, Judge Stephens made his mark in his chosen field early in life. He was a judge in the Third Judicial District Court in Utah at the age of 31.

A friendly, approachable man with a long, narrow face, he was distinguished for his profound scholarship and the exacting research he put into his work.

After leaving the Utah bench in 1921, Judge Stephens went into private practice for a dozen years until 1933, when this concededly brilliant man from the West came East to begin a Federal Government career that lasted until his death.

HEADED ANTITRUST UNIT

In 1933 Judge Stephens took office as an Assistant Attorney General under the then Attorney General Homer S. Cummings. The man from Utah was placed in charge of the Justice Department's Antitrust Division in the early, hectic days of the New Deal.

Judge Stephens on several occasions sat in on Cabinet meetings with President Roosevelt as the Justice Department's representative and got to know FDR personally. The mid-1930's were the years when such legislation as the National Recovery Act (NRA) with its blue eagle and the Agricultural Adjustment Act occupied the public attention.

From his key Justice Department post, Judge Stephens played a major role in the administration of the laws depended upon by FDR to save the Nation.

He was active in another field, too—in the courts. He went before the Supreme Court numerous times to argue on behalf of the Government. Among those cases in which he represented the United States were the "hot oil" cases, which prohibited the transportation of Government restricted oil in interstate commerce, Federal Trade Commission and Interstate Commerce Commission cases and still others dealing with the Sherman Antitrust Act.

Together with several others, Judge Stephens was instrumental in the creation of the Federal Register, so relied upon today as a readily available source of Government Executive orders, departmental decisions, agency regulations and other important official documents.

NAMED TO BENCH IN 1935

In 1935, after being considered a strong contender for the Supreme Court opening caused by the death of Justice Benjamin Cardozo, Judge Stephens was chosen by President Roosevelt to fill the Court of Appeals vacancy created by the death of Judge William Hitz.

Less than 5 months after he was sworn in, Judge Stephens attracted wide attention by writing the opinion in the famed broken-tooth case, a landmark decision. The ruling opened a new era in the protection of the public in Washington.

The case began when a drugstore luncheonette customer chewed into a roll and broke his tooth on a pebble. He sued. In his opinion of February 24, 1936, Judge Stephens wrote:

"We [the court] conclude that upon the service of food for a consideration and for immediate consumption upon the premises of the seller, but which food was not prepared by the seller but purchased elsewhere and the defect in which was not discoverable except by destroying the marketability of the article, there is an implied warranty that the food is wholesome, for breach of which an action lies for the recovery of consequential damages."

MEMORIZED BY STUDENTS

The lawyers know the case as *Cushing* v. *Rodman*, and nearly a generation of law students has memorized its basic tenet.

Judge Stephens also became known as a jurist exceptionally learned in patent law. When he first went on the bench, his knowledge of this highly specialized field was not too great.

By applying the same probing, analytical, tenacious mind to the study of patent law that he later turned to good use in urging Congress to strengthen the judiciary by various legislative means, Judge Stephens soon mastered its scientific intricacies. He subsequently wrote the opinions in dozens of important patent disputes.

Judge Stephens also was an expert in medical law. He authored an article entitled "The Legal Responsibility of Hospitals" for the Bulletin of the American College of Surgeons and was made a member of the organization.

NOTED FOR GYPSUM CASE

His energy was perhaps best exhibited in the massive 114-page opinion he wrote in the antitrust case involving the United States Gypsum Co. and other gypsum-manufacturing firms.

The decision was handed down on June 15, 1946, denying the Government an injunction against the companies.

To this midwestern descendant of *Mayflower* and Revolutionary War ancestors, the law was the thing. And he didn't hesitate to set forth his views in dissenting opinions when outvoted by fellow jurists.

Judge Stephens took the same meticulous professional care in writing a dissenting opinion as he did when he spoke for the majority. One of the most striking examples was his dissent in the first appeal of the controversial Owen Lattimore perjury case.

Though outvoted 8 to 1 by his colleagues on the celebrated Communist-sympathizer charge, Judge Stephens contended that the accusation thrown out in the trial court should have been reinstated. One reason the charge was valid, he asserted, was because it stated all the elements of the crime of perjury as set forth in the law.

FOUGHT FOR JUDICIARY

The public and the bar knew Judge Stephens primarily as the fine appellate jurist he was. But there was another facet to his work that became tremendously important after he was named chief judge in 1948.

Judge Stephens often represented the judiciary in its dealings with the Congress. He fought for more judges to help carry the burden of administering justice, for higher salaries to attract and retain capable jurists, and for the statute creating the administrative office which enabled the judiciary to become more independent of the executive branch of Government.

When he spoke Congress listened, for they knew him to be a man who spoke only after an exhaustive investigation of the facts.

Together with Chief Judge Bolitha J. Laws, of district court here, he proved the need of a new courthouse for Washington so clearly and dramatically that the economy-minded 80th Congress appropriated more than $18 million to erect the great white building which now stands at the foot of Capitol Hill on Constitution Avenue.

As recently as last February he appeared before a Senate Judiciary subcommittee conducting a hearing on a resolution to establish the tradition of a Chief Justice of the United States periodically addressing the Congress in joint session.

The idea for such a speech by the Chief Justice appeared novel when it was mentioned some months ago. Actually, it originated with Judge Stephens and Chief Judge John Biggs, Jr., of the United States Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit in Wilmington, Del., 4 years ago—another effort by Judge Stephens to improve and strengthen the judiciary.

GIVEN MEDAL FOR MERIT

Awards and honors came to Judge Stephens during his career, including membership in Phi Beta Kappa for his scholarship and an honorary doctor of laws degree from Georgetown University in 1939. But the award he most cherished was the Medal for Merit, the highest award given a civilian for wartime service.

President Truman conferred the honor on Judge Stephens for his service as American Chairman of the Joint Committee on Interchange of Patent Rights and Information with Great Britain, for mutual aid during World War II. He did the job while continuing to carry out the duties of his judgeship.

A native of Crete, Nebr., whose family moved to Salt Lake City when he was 2 years old, Judge Stephens attended public schools in the Utah city. Then came 2 years at the University of Utah, followed by 2 more years at Cornell University and a bachelor of arts degree in 1909.

Judge Stephens moved on to the Harvard Law School, where he received his degree in 1913. Two years in private practice in Salt Lake City followed and then he served as assistant prosecuting attorney for Salt Lake County from 1915 until he went on the State bench in 1917.

In 1930 to 1931 he did graduate work at the University of California. He returned to

Harvard and in 1933 earned the coveted degree of doctor of juridical science.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, the passing of Judge Stephens is a great loss to the Nation, and a heavy personal loss to me. He was one of my closest and best friends here in Washington. His timely advice and encouragement were a great help to me on numerous occasions.

Mr. President, numerous eulogies of Judge Stephens have been published. One appeared in an editorial in the Washington Post and Times Herald of May 30. Another appeared in an editorial in the Washington Star of yesterday, May 31. I ask unanimous consent that the editorials be printed at this point in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks.

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

[From the Washington Post and Times Herald of May 30, 1955]

HAROLD M. STEPHENS

As chief judge of the United States Court of Appeals, Harold M. Stephens made a profound impression upon the American bench and bar. He presided over the court with dignity tempered by an innate humility with diligence that amounted to a passion, and with an acute sense of judicial responsibility. In the literal meaning of the words, he was a judge's judge.

In recognition of his brilliance as a student of the law and as a prosecutor and practicing attorney, he was made a judge of the third judicial court in Salt Lake City at the age of 31. At the end of his 4-year term he went back to practice, took graduate courses at the University of California and Harvard Law School, and came to Washington as Assistant Attorney General in 1933. Even as a Government lawyer arguing cases in the Supreme Court in the turbulent days of the New Deal, his judicial temperament and his unswerving loyalty to the concept of a fair trial were much in evidence. While trying to save the Petroleum Code in the "hot oil" cases, he candidly admitted that that the code had been enforced for a year without a penal section.

Judge Stephens' frank acknowledgment that men were being indicted and sent to jail for violating Executive orders that were difficult to find in print led to the creation of the Federal Register, in which all official regulations are now published. Both on and off the bench he was a stickler for orderly and proper procedures. An expert on judicial rules, he devoted an enormous part of his time as chief judge to administrative and procedural problems. Last year he personally handled 1,776 of the 2,500 motions and petitions filed in the court of appeals and presided over 745 3-judge hearings on motions. His colleagues give him credit for establishing a motions-calendar system that has eliminated the previous chaos in this sphere and brought the hearing of motions up to date.

As a member of the United States Judicial Conference, Judge Stephens exerted a powerful influence toward improvement of the whole judicial system. He worked for the establishment of the administrative office of the United States courts and was the sparkplug behind two salary increases for judges. The District's new courthouse will long stand as a monument to the persistence and drive of Judge Stephens, former Chief Judge D. Lawrence Groner, Chief Judge Laws of the District court, and a few others.

In the decision of cases Judge Stephens was a perfectionist. He didn't like to make up his mind until he had read and pondered everything bearing on a case. It was not unusual for him to cite 25 cases pertinent to a point at issue. When his laborious homework had been done, he brought to the court a rare quality of legal judgment. While this newspaper sometimes challenged his conclusions, as in the Thompson's Restaurant case, we always maintained great respect for his objectivity and his independent pursuit of the facts and the law. His talent for handling legal technicalities gave him a special expertise in patent law, and he wrote many opinions in this field.

Always alert to injustice, he had a passion for hearing everyone who knocked at the door of the court. Sometimes his leniency in favoring reargument of cases troubled his colleagues, but they respected his purpose of giving every man his day in court. In personal relations the "Judge," as he was so often called, seemed to have the good will and affection of everyone. His passing leaves a gaping hole in the court of appeals but adds another chapter of great achievement to the history of the American judiciary.

[From the Washington Evening Star of May 31, 1955]

CHIEF JUDGE STEPHENS

If one were to mention but a single characteristic of Harold M. Stephens, it might well be his scrupulous regard for the dividing line between the functions of the judicial and legislative branches of the Government. For the chief judge of the United States Court of Appeals for the District was not addicted to what is popularly termed judicial lawmaking. He firmly believed that it was the business of Congress to make the laws and that it was not the function of the courts to rewrite them through any process of interpretation. To this philosophy, honored too often in the breach these days, he was faithful throughout his entire career on the bench.

Judge Stephens' service on the court of appeals extended over a span of 20 years. He was appointed chief judge in 1948, and from that time forward, in the public eye at least, he was prominently identified with administrative reforms with the effort to obtain suitable quarters for the court and with the successful endeavor to persuade Congress to provide more adequate compensation for the judges.

This does not mean, however, that Judge Stephens lacked stature in his primary role.

As a judge, he was highly regarded. Perhaps he took longer to do a job than some others might. His capacity for detail was notable, and his opinions often were correspondingly lengthy. But he was a judge with the courage of his convictions, a judge who applied the law as he saw it, and without regard to any other consideration.

As one of his colleagues has put it, opinions can and often do vary as to what constitutes a fine judge. But if those with varying views could agree on a common denominator, that would be Harold Stephens. Certainly his passing is a severe loss to the court of appeals and to this community, which he had adopted as his own.

ROY H. GLOVER

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, another Montanan, Roy H. Glover, has been elected chairman of the board of the Anaconda Co. Roy Glover has earned this promotion through hard work, understanding, and a keen awareness of the facts of life. A man of broad knowledge, he has figured prominently in bringing order out of chaos in the copper industry in Chile, and in expanding into the fields of uranium and aluminum in this country.

His great talents and abilities have been recognized in Montana, throughout the United States, and overseas where, just recently, he was personally decorated by President Carlos Ibanez, of Chile, with the Order of Merit, one of the highest honors bestowed by Chile, and one which has been awarded to very few foreigners.

It is gratifying to me that this outstanding American has been given this signal honor. It is heartening that in Roy Glover we have a man who is fully aware of his responsibilities and the opportunities for service they represent. He is a great credit and a real asset to Montana and the United States. I join with thousands of other Montanans in wishing him Godspeed and good luck in the difficult years ahead.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks, sundry articles and editorials from Montana newspapers, as well as from the Christian Science Monitor, relative to Roy Glover.

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

[From the Butte (Mont.) Daily Post of May 27, 1955]

ROY H. GLOVER ELECTED CHAIRMAN OF BOARD OF ANACONDA CO.—ANOTHER MONTANAN IS AT THE HELM OF HUGE METALS FIRM

NEW YORK.—Roy H. Glover, 64-year-old vice president and general counsel of Anaconda Copper Mining Co., was elected chairman of the board of that huge metals firm Thursday.

He takes the place of Cornelius F. Kelley, who announced his retirement last week after 54 years with Anaconda.

Mr. Glover, a tall westerner, joined Anaconda at Butte, Mont., in 1943 as counsel. He became vice president and general counsel in 1951 and has held the same positions with Chile Copper Co. and Chile Exploration Co., Anaconda subsidiaries. He is a director of Anaconda and of these subsidiaries.

Mr. Glover takes over as head of a company which is one of the world's largest producers of copper, with mines in the United States and in Chile, where it is the biggest producer. It operates huge copper-fabricating plants, is a major factor in zinc production, and the largest manganese producer in the United States.

It will begin to produce aluminum in July at a new plant in Columbia Falls, Mont. In New Mexico it is developing the largest uranium deposit in this country.

Because of the widening scope of operations, the company's name will be changed next month from the Anaconda Copper Mining Co. to the Anaconda Co.

Anaconda has assets of $673 million. Gross income last year was nearly $465 million.

As Roy H. Glover becomes chairman of the board of directors of the Anaconda Co., another Montanan takes the helm of the vast, far-flung corporation, which has steadily increased its importance in the Nation's industrial picture. He follows two illustrious chairmen of the board, the first the late John D. Ryan and the second, Cornelius F. Kelley, who announced his retirement to the stockholders of Anaconda at their annual meeting in Anaconda on May 18. Thus since directors have named chairmen of the Anaconda board each one has been a Montanan who previously served in executive capacities at Montana headquarters of the company in Butte.

Following a distinguished career in the law with his Great Falls firm, Mr. Glover

joined the Anaconda Co.'s legal staff in Butte in 1943 and in 1945 he was appointed western general counsel of the company, succeeding his old Great Falls law associate, the late W. H. Hoover, who became general counsel of the company and later president.

On October 12, 1951, Mr. Glover was named vice president and general counsel and also a director of the Anaconda Co. Since then he has made his headquarters in New York City. Much of his time was occupied in the past few years on affairs connected with Anaconda's large operations in Chile, his remarkable ability and talents in those matters bringing him wide recognition both in this country and from the Chilean Government.

On April 6 of this year President Carlos Ibanez, of Chile, personally decorated Mr. Glover with his Government's Order of Merit, one of the highest honors bestowed by the South American Republic and one which has been awarded to but few foreigners.

The award ceremony took place in the Presidential Hall of Ceremonies with many distinguished persons being present.

The Order of Merit is awarded for valuable services to Chile, and President Ibanez spoke glowingly of Mr. Glover's qualifications. He has contributed greatly to the economy of the country in connection with Chile's copper industry, it was pointed out.

Mr. Glover was born at Goldendale, Wash., where he received his early education. He later attended school at Portland and earned his law degree at the University of Oregon. Upon graduation there in 1916 he practiced until his enlistment in the Army. He had overseas service in World War I and returning to the States he located at Great Falls in May, 1919, after having been admitted to the Montana bar late in 1918.

Beginning as a law clerk in June, 1919, he became in the ensuing years one of Montana's leading attorneys. He either tried law suits or handled legal business in every Montana county during his years of practice. He first became a member of the firm of Weir, Clift, Glover and Bennett, with offices in Great Falls and Helena, the firm being counsel for the Great Northern Railway in Montana. Later in Great Falls, he was a member of the law firm of Cooper, Stephenson and Glover from 1936 to 1943, when he entered the Anaconda Co.'s legal department in Butte. His Great Falls firm handled Anaconda Co. legal business in northern Montana while he was a member. In 1945 Mr. Glover was named general counsel for the Montana Power Co.

Mr. and Mrs. Glover maintain a home in Butte at 915 West Galena. They have hundreds of friends in the mining city and in many other Montana communities.

In Butte during his years as western general counsel Mr. Glover took an active part in civic affairs, his leadership being sought on numerous occasions for worthwhile community movements. He always gave an eager hand to the various enterprises in this city and in Great Falls, where he was an eminent citizen for so many years.

For many years Mr. Glover was interested in stockraising. He has maintained a summer home in the Sun River country for some time and his favorite relaxation from a busy career has been trout fishing in that rugged area.

Mr. Glover is a director of a number of corporations which include the First Bank Stock Corp. of Minneapolis, the Montana Power Co., the First National City Bank of New York, the Metals Bank and Trust Co. of Butte, the First National Bank of Great Falls, and the Heisey Co. of Great Falls. He is also on the board of directors of a large number of smaller business organizations.

The new board chairman of Anaconda is a member of the American Bar Association, the Federal Bar Association and the Montana State Bar Association.

[From the Montana Standard of May 27, 1955]

GLOVER CHOSEN CHAIRMAN ANACONDA COMPANY BOARD—ANOTHER MONTANAN TAKES HELM OF VAST CORPORATION

NEW YORK.—Roy H. Glover, 64-year-old vice president and general counsel of Anaconda Copper Mining Co., was elected chairman of the board of that huge metals firm Thursday.

He takes the place of Cornelius F. Kelley, who announced his retirement last week after 54 years with Anaconda.

Mr. Glover, a tall westerner, joined Anaconda at Butte, Mont., in 1943 as counsel. He became vice president and general counsel in 1951, and has held the same positions with Chile Copper Co. and Chile Exploration Co., Anaconda subsidiaries. He is a director of Anaconda and of these subsidiaries.

Mr. Glover takes over as head of a company which is one of the world's largest producers of copper, with mines in the United States and in Chile, where it is the biggest producer. It operates huge copper fabricating plants, is a major factor in zinc production, and the largest manganese producer in the United States.

It will begin to produce aluminum in July at a new plant in Columbia Falls, Mont. In New Mexico it is developing the largest uranium deposit in this country.

Because of the widening scope of operations, the company's name will be changed next month from the Anaconda Copper Mining Co. to the Anaconda Co.

Anaconda has assets of $673 million. Gross income last year was nearly $465 million.

As Roy H. Glover becomes chairman of the board of directors of the Anaconda Co. another Montanan takes the helm of the vast far-flung corporation, which has steadily increased its importance in the Nation's industrial picture. He follows two illustrious chairmen of the board, the first the late John D. Ryan, and the second, Cornelius F. Kelley, who announced his retirement to the stockholders of Anaconda at their annual meeting in Anaconda on May 18. Thus since directors have named chairmen of the Anaconda board each one has been a Montanan who previously served in executive capacities at Montana headquarters of the company in Butte.

Following a distinguished career in the law with his Great Falls firm, Mr. Glover joined the Anaconda Co's legal staff in Butte in 1943 and in 1945 he was appointed western general counsel of the company, succeeding his old Great Falls law associate, the late W. H. Hoover, who became general counsel of the company and later president.

On October 12, 1951, Mr. Glover was named vice president and general counsel and also a director of the Anaconda Co. Since then he has made his headquarters in New York City. Much of his time was occupied in the past few years on affairs connected with Anaconda's large operations in Chile, his remarkable ability and talents in those matters bringing him wide recognition both in this country and from the Chilean Government.

On April 6 of this year President Carlos Ibanez of Chile personally decorated Mr. Glover with his Government's Order of Merit, one of the highest honors bestowed by the South American Republic and one which has been awarded to but few foreigners.

The award ceremony took place in the Presidential Hall of Ceremonies with many distinguished persons being present.

The Order of Merit is awarded for valuable services to Chile and President Ibanez spoke glowingly of Mr. Glover's qualifications. He has contributed greatly to the economy of the country in connection with Chile's copper industry, it was pointed out.

Mr. Glover was born at Goldendale, Wash., where he received his early education. He later attended school at Portland and earned his law degree at the University of Oregon. Upon graduation there in 1916 he practiced until his enlistment in the Army. He had overseas service in World War I and returning to the States he located at Great Falls in May 1919 after having been admitted to the Montana bar late in 1918.

Beginning as a law clerk in June 1919 he became in the ensuing years one of Montana's leading attorneys. He either tried law suits or handled legal business in every Montana county during his years of practice. He first became a member of the firm of Weir, Clift, Glover & Bennett, with offices in Great Falls and Helena, the firm being counsel for the Great Northern Railway in Montana. Later in Great Falls, he was a member of the law firm of Cooper, Stephenson & Glover from 1936 to 1943, when he entered the Anaconda Co.'s legal department in Butte. His Great Falls firm handled Anaconda Co. legal business in northern Montana while he was a member. In 1945 Mr. Glover was named general counsel for the Montana Power Co.

Mr. and Mrs. Glover maintain a home in Butte at 915 West Galena. They have hundreds of friends in the mining city and in many other Montana communities.

In Butte during his years as western general counsel Mr. Glover took an active part in civic affairs, his leadership being sought on numerous occasions for worthwhile community movements. He always gave an eager hand to the various enterprises in this city and in Great Falls, where he was an eminent citizen for so many years.

For many years Mr. Glover was interested in stockraising. He has maintained a summer home in the Sun River country for some time and his favorite relaxation from a busy career has been trout fishing in that rugged area.

Mr. Glover is a director of a number of corporations which include the First Bank Stock Corp., of Minneapolis; the Montana Power Co.; the First National City Bank of New York; the Metals Bank & Trust Co., of Butte; the First National Bank of Great Falls; and the Heisey Co., of Great Falls. He is also on the board of directors of a large number of smaller business organizations.

The new board chairman of Anaconda is a member of the American Bar Association, the Federal Bar Association, and the Montana State Bar Association.

[From the Montana Standard of May 27, 1955]

MR. GLOVER FORESEES NO CHANGES IN POLICIES OF COMPANY

NEW YORK.—Roy H. Glover, newly elected chairman of Anaconda Copper Mining Co., said Thursday he foresees no changes in the company's present policies, no expansion in the near future, and no reason for changes in Anaconda's earnings trend.

"Anaconda is looking to the utilization of nuclear energy not for war but for the benefit of mankind," Mr. Glover told a press conference. He said the firm will advance in the uranium field considering "the beneficial aspects of nuclear power."

Mr. Glover paid tribute to the philosophy of former Chairman Cornelius F. Kelley, who retired a week ago. Mr. Kelley determined that Anaconda would get into the uranium field of operations, he noted, and Mr. Glover intends to follow his lead.

"Under Mr. Kelley every one had the opportunity to put forward his ideas," he said. "That has been the reason for the progress of Anaconda in its various fields. I don't know how you could improve on that type of policy."

The new chairman said Anaconda has arrived at a "fine understanding with the Chilean Government and shares with it an appreciation of mutual difficulties." He said

he has just finished his sixth trip to Chile in 3 years.

Asked about Anaconda's diversifying into other fields, Mr. Glover said the company is "always ready to go into any appropriate field where it can be of service. That's why the name is being changed from Anaconda Copper Mining Co. to the Anaconda Co."

Speaking of copper demand in 1955, Mr. Glover said he saw no reason why it shouldn't be heavy and added there is certainly "no surplus."

The copper industry is "an integral part of the United States economy and of the world, based on communication and transportation, and copper is indispensable in those fields as well as related fields," he said.

The new chairman sees no change in Anaconda's earnings trend "unless unforeseen things occur." Asked about the firm's aluminum reduction plant expansion, he said Anaconda has not even got a new plant into operation yet.

Mr. Glover's hobbies include hunting—both big and small game—golf and fishing. "What do you expect from a man from Montana?" he asked reporters.

[From the Montana Standard of May 28, 1955]

ROY H. GLOVER BECOMES NEW ANACONDA CHAIRMAN

When the directors of the Anaconda Co. elected Roy H. Glover chairman of the board to succeed Cornelius F. Kelley they made certain that the heart of the farflung organization would remain in Montana. This is as it should be. The Anaconda Co. had its origin here in the "richest hill on earth." Its operations centered in Butte, Anaconda, and Great Falls for many years while building the foundation upon which it later based its expansion from a $30 million corporation in 1895 to a $673 million organization today.

The direction—the fate of the company—always has resided in the hands of Montanans. The others were the late John D. Ryan, a longtime Montanan, and Mr. Kelley, who was president and chairman of the board for a total of 37 years—both of whom became famous leaders of industry.

Mr. Glover in assuming the board chairmanship of the Anaconda Co. brings a wealth of experience and ability to the post as well as a dominant love for Montana and Montanans. He is a typical westerner with a typical western philosophy of life. And if there is one characteristic which dominates all his activities it is a genius for getting along with people—just plain people.

Mr. Glover has demonstrated this ability time and again in his capacity as company attorney, western counsel, general counsel, and vice president and in his official capacity in Chile where he successfully undertook difficult negotiations with the government there in connection with hte copper industry.

His outstanding accomplishments for the betterment of Chile's economy won for him the Chilean Order of Merit which President Ibanez bestowed in person.

Mr. Glover's diplomatic ability is therefore appreciated both in corporate and governmental circles.

As chairman of the board of the Anaconda Co., Mr. Glover heads an organization which operates in 19 States of the Union and several foreign countries. But while the organization's headquarters are in New York City, the financial center where many other similar organizations have their headquarters, Mr. Glover maintains his home in a modest dwelling at 915 West Galena Street, where he and Mrs. Glover welcome their neighbors and friends on their visits to the mining city. Mr. and Mrs. Glover feel equally at home in Great Falls where they lived a number of years and took part in civic and other local affairs as they have done in Butte. Indeed, Mr. Glover is known throughout the State of Montana where he traveled extensively as an attorney before joining the Anaconda Co. in 1943.

His elevation to this position which carries such heavy responsibilities, as well as great honor, will come as pleasing news to all Montana citizens, even those in the most remote parts of the Nation's third largest State. His determination to carry on with the policies of Mr. Kelley which have proved so successful will also come as welcome news to Montanans, as well as to friends of Anaconda everywhere.

[From the Glendive (Mont.) Daily Ranger of May 26, 1955]

ANACONDA HAS NEW CHAIRMAN

NEW YORK.—The Anaconda Copper Mining Co. today announced the election of Roy H. Glover as chairman of the Board of directors to succeed Cornelius F. Kelley, who retired a week ago.

The election of Glover, who will be 65 on July 15, was announced following a meeting of Anaconda directors here.

Glover, who joined Anaconda in 1943 at Butte, Mont., is a vice president, general counsel, and director of the parent company and its foreign subsidiaries, Chile Copper Co. and Chile Exploration Co.

The newly elected Anaconda chairman was born at Goldendale, Wash., July 15, 1890, the son of Mary and Waldo E. Glover. He was educated at the University of Oregon from which he was graduated with an L.L. B. degree in 1915. During World War I, he served as a sergeant in the United States Army in the overseas courier service. Glover and his wife, the former Helen A. Henderson, live in Butte.

The business career of the new chairman began in 1915 when he was admitted to the Oregon bar, after which he practiced law in Portland, Oreg., and was admitted to the Montana bar in 1918. His legal career was divided into two periods—from 1919 to 1936, he was a member of the Great Falls, Mont., law firm, Weir, Clift, Glover & Bennett; and from 1936 to 1943, he was a member of Cooper, Stephenson & Glover.

Glover joined Anaconda in 1943 as counsel and served in this capacity until 1945. He has been Anaconda's western general counsel since 1945 as well as general counsel for the Montana Power Co. In 1951, Glover became the firm's vice president and general counsel.

[From the Great Falls (Mont.) Tribune of May 27, 1955]

ROY H. GLOVER SUCCEEDS KELLEY—ANACONDA TO PRESS FOR PEACEFUL USE OF NUCLEAR POWER, NEW CHAIRMAN SAYS

NEW YORK.—Roy H. Glover, newly elected chairman of Anaconda Copper Mining Co., said Thursday the firm will advance in the uranium field with a view to "the beneficial aspects of nuclear power."

"Anaconda is looking to the utilization of nuclear energy not for war but for the benefit of mankind," Glover told a news conference.

Glover also said he foresees no changes in the company's present policies, no expansion in the near future, and no reason for changes in Anaconda's earnings trend.

Glover paid tribute to the philosophy of former chairman Cornelius F. Kelley, who retired a week ago. Kelley determined that Anaconda would get into the uranium field of operations, he noted, and Glover intends to follow his lead.

Glover's election as chairman of the board of directors was announced Thursday after a meeting of the board.

He joined the company in 1943 at Butte, Mont., and had served as vice president, general counsel, and director of the parent company and its foreign subsidiaries, Chile Copper Co., and Chile Exploration Co.

The new chairman was born at Goldendale, Wash., July 15, 1890. He was educated at the University of Oregon. Glover and his wife, the former Helen A. Henderson, live in Butte.

The busines career of Glover began in 1915 when he was admitted to the Oregon bar, after which he practiced law in Portland, Oreg. He was admitted to the Montana bar in 1918. His legal career was divided into two periods. From 1919 to 1936, he was a member of the Great Falls, Mont., law firm of Weir, Clift, Glover, and Bennett, and from 1936 to 1943, he was a member of Cooper, Stephenson, and Glover.

Glover joined Anaconda in 1943 as counsel and served in this capacity until 1945. He has been Anaconda's western general counsel since 1945 as well as general counsel for the Montana Power Co. In 1951, he became the firm's vice president and general counsel.

The new chairman also is president of the Fairmont Corp., the Standard Publishing Co., and the Heisey Co. He is a vice president of the Columbia Amusement Co., Interstate Lumber Co., and Post Publishing Co.

Glover is a director of Columbia Amusement Co., Fairmont Corp., Post Publishing Co., Standard Publishing Co., the Heisey Co., Metals Bank & Trust Co., First Bank Stock Corp., the First National Bank of Great Falls, the Montana Power Co., Great Falls Breweries, Inc., International Smelting & Refining Co., Interstate Lumber Co., and the First National City Bank of New York.

The announcement of Kelley's retirement as chairman of Anaconda was made at the firm's annual stockholders' meeting May 18, but Glover's election to the board chairmanship was held up until Thursday's directors' meeting.

Kelley, one of the great captains of industry in the 20th century, had been with Anaconda more than 50 years, including 15 years as chairman of the board and 22 years as president.

Anaconda which will mark its 60th anniversary next month, then will assume its new name, the Anaconda Co., which was approved by stockholders a week ago. The name has been abbreviated from the Anaconda Copper Mining Co., it was explained, on directors' approval, because of the widening scope of the firm's operations and products.

Asked about Anaconda's diversifying into other fields, Glover said the company is "always ready to go into any appropriate field where it can be of service. That's why the name was changed."

Speaking of copper demand in 1955, Glover said he saw no reason why it shouldn't be heavy and added there is certainly "no surplus."

The copper industry is "an integral part of the United States economy and of the world, based on communication and transportation, and copper is indispensable in those fields as well as related fields," he said.

The new chairman sees no change in Anaconda's earnings trend "unless unforeseen things occur."

[From the Billings (Mont.) Gazette of May 27, 1955]

ROY H. GLOVER NAMED ANACONDA CHAIRMAN AS KELLEY'S SUCCESSOR

NEW YORK.—Roy H. Glover, 64-year-old vice president and general counsel of Anaconda Copper Mining Co., was elected chairman of the board of that huge metals firm Wednesday.

He takes the place of Cornelius F. Kelley, who announced his retirement as chairman last week after 54 years with Anaconda.

Glover, a tall westerner, joined Anaconda at Butte, Mont., in 1943 as counsel. He became vice president and general counsel in 1951 and has held the same positions with

Chile Copper Co. and Chile Exploration Co., Anaconda subsidiaries. He is a director of Anaconda and of these subsidiaries.

Glover takes over as head of a company which is one of the world's largest producers of copper, with mines in the United States and in Chile, where it is the biggest producer. It operates huge copper fabricating plants, is a major factor in zinc production and the largest manganese producer in the United States.

It will begin to produce aluminum in July at a new plant in Columbia Falls, Mont. In New Mexico it is developing the largest uranium deposit in this country.

Because of the widening scope of operations, the company's name will be changed next month from the Anaconda Copper Mining Co. to the Anaconda Co.

Anaconda has assets of $673 million. Gross income last year was nearly $465 million.

Glover, whose election is effective immediately, told newsmen he planned no change in Anaconda policies.

"Under Mr. Kelley everyone had the opportunity to put forward his ideas," he said. "That has been the reason for the progress of Anaconda in its various fields. I don't know how you could improve on that type of policy."

Referring to Anaconda's activities in uranium, Glover said the company "is looking to the utilization of nuclear energy not in war but for the great benefit of mankind."

Asked if Anaconda would expand into new fields, Glover said:

"Anaconda is always ready to go into any appropriate field."

He forecast continued heavy demand for copper through the end of this year, assuming industrial activity continues high.

He said the recent agreement with Chile, which eases restrictions on American copper firms, represented "an appreciation of our mutual difficulties, problems, and aspirations."

THIRD MONTANAN IN POST

Roy H. Glover, who was elected chairman of the board of directors of the Anaconda Co. at a directors' meeting in New York Thursday, becomes the third Montanan to head the big industrial concern.

He succeeds Cornelius F. Kelley who announced his retirement at the annual stockholders' meeting in Anaconda May 18 after more than 50 years with the company including 15 as chairman and 22 as president. The first chairman was the late John D. Ryan.

All were Montanans who served in executive capacities at western headquarters of the company in Butte.

After a distinguished career in law with his Great Falls, Mont., firm, Glover joined Anaconda's legal staff in Butte in 1943.

In 1945 he was appointed western general counsel for the company, succeeding his former Great Falls law associate, the late W. H. Hoover who became general counsel and later president of the company.

On October 12, 1951, Glover was named vice president and general counsel and also a director of the Anaconda Co. His headquarters were moved at that time to New York City.

Much of his time has been occupied in the past few years on affairs connected with Anaconda's large operations in Chile. His work there brought him wide recognition in this country and in Chile.

On April 6 of this year President Carlos Ibanez Del Campo, of Chile, decorated him with the Chilean Government's Order of Merit. This is one of the highest honors bestowed by the South American republic and one which has been awarded to but few foreigners.

The new board chairman was born at Goldendale, Wash., July 15, 1890. He attended school at Portland and received his law degree from the University of Oregon in 1916.

Glover practiced law until his enlistment in the Army. He had overseas service as a sergeant in World War I. After returning to the States he located at Great Falls in May 1919.

He started as a law clerk and became one of Montana's leading attorneys. He either tried law suits or handled legal business in every Montana county during his years of practice.

Glover first became a member of the firm of Weir, Clift, Glover, and Bennett with offices in Great Falls and Helena. The firm was counsel for the Great Northern Railway in Monta.

Later in Great Falls, he was a member of the firm of Cooper, Stephenson, and Glover from 1936 until 1943 when he entered Anaconda's legal department in Butte.

His Great Falls firm handled Anaconda's legal business in northern Montana while he was a member.

For many years he was interested in stockraising. He has a summer home in the Sun River country west of Great Falls. He and Mrs. Glover also maintain a home in Butte.

Glover is a director of a large number of corporations. These include the First Bank Stock Corp. of Minneapolis, Montana Power Co., First National City Bank of New York, Metals Bank & Trust Co. of Butte, First National Bank of Great Falls, Heisey Co. of Great Falls, and several others.

He is a member of the American Bar Association, Federal Power Bar Association, and Montana Bar Association.

[From the Great Falls (Mont.) Tribune of May 28, 1955]

ANACONDA'S NEW CHAIRMAN

Rated among the top-bracket giants of industry on both the domestic and international scene, the Anaconda Co. has always found its Montana operations a favored proving ground for the recruiting of its top directive personnel.

Election of Roy Glover, former Great Falls attorney, successively western and then general counsel and vice president of the company, to chairmanship of Anaconda's board follows this pattern in signal manner. Roy has a warm place in the hearts of this community, who remember him as one of the stalwarts who unselfishly contributed much to the growth and welfare of Great Falls.

It is of considerable comfort to all Montanans to know that the top echelon of Anaconda includes so many who had their business roots in the Treasure State, who have a clear and sympathetic understanding of its problems, and on whose friendly consideration we can depend as the years go on.

[From the Christian Science Monitor of May 27, 1955]

GLOVER NAMED NEW CHAIRMAN OF ANACONDA

Roy H. Glover who joined Anaconda Copper Mining Co. 12 years ago as counsel, has been elected chairman of the board and chief executive officer.

A soft-spoken westerner, Mr. Glover took over from Cornelius F. Kelley, one of the great figures of the industry who announced last week that he was resigning after 54 years with Anaconda. Mr. Kelley continues as a director.

Mr. Glover told newsmen after his election that he plans no change in Anaconda policies. As for possible expansion into other fields, Mr. Glover remarked that Anaconda "is always ready to go into any appropriate field."

DEVELOPING URANIUM DEPOSIT

Under Mr. Kelley, the firm branched out into copper fabricating and became a major producer of zinc and the top domestic miner of manganese. It will start operation of a new aluminum plant at Columbia Falls, Mont., in July, and is developing the Nation's biggest uranium deposit in New Mexico. Because of its increasing diversification, the firm's name will be changed June 18 to the Anaconda Co.

Mr. Glover commented that Anaconda "is looking into the utilization of nuclear energy not in war but for the great benefit of mankind."

The new chairman predicted that copper demand will continue strong for the rest of this year, barring a letup in industrial activity. Copper has been in extremely tight supply since last fall and the domestic price has gone up 6 cents a pound this year.

A native of Goldendale, Wash., Mr. Glover received a law degree from the University of Oregon in 1915 and practiced in Portland, Oreg., and Great Falls, Mont. He joined Anaconda at Butte in 1943.

CHILEAN INTERESTS

At the time of his election as chairman, Mr. Glover had risen to vice president and general counsel. He has taken a particular interest in the company's vast Chilean mining operations in recent years and this spring was made Knight Commander, Order of Merit of Bernado O'Higgins, by President Carlos Ibanez Del Campo, of Chile.

Mr. Glover is vice president, general counsel, and a director of Chile Copper Co. and Chile Exploration Co., Anaconda subsidiaries. He is general counsel and director of Montana Power Co., president and director of the Heisey Co. of Great Falls, and vice president and director of Columbia Amusement Co., Interstate Lumber Co., and Post Publishing Co., of Butte.

He is a director of Metals Bank & Trust Co., Butte; the First National City Bank of New York; First Bank Stock Corp., Minneapolis, and the First National Bank of Great Falls. He also is a director of a number of Anaconda subsidiaries.

LETTER FROM J. W. BROWN REGARDING LABOR DIFFICULTIES BETWEEN CERTAIN MIAMI BEACH HOTEL OPERATORS AND EMPLOYEES

Mr. NEELY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a letter, dated May 18, 1955, written to me by Mr. J. W. Brown, of Cincinnati, general counsel for the Hotel and Restaurant Employees' International Union, relative to labor trouble between certain Miami Beach hotel operators, on the one hand, and their striking employees, on the other.

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

CINCINNATI, OHIO, *May 18, 1955.*

Hon. MATTHEW M. NEELY,
Chairman, Senate Subcommittee on Labor and Public Welfare,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR NEELY: We respectfully call your attention to a situation in Miami Beach, Fla., wherein 3,000 hotel workers have been denied the right to bargain through representatives of their own choosing and find themselves in a no man's land beyond the protection of labor laws.

Beginning on April 13, 1955, 12 Miami Beach hotels have been on strike. These hotels are: Monte Carlo, Sorrento, Casa Blanca, Sea Isle, Roney Plaza, Sherry Frontenac, Lombardy, Saxony, Sans Souci, DiLido, Empress, and Algiers.

Approximately 95 percent of the employees involved left these major Miami Beach hotels and have refused to return to work. The issue is centered around the refusal of the

hotel owners to bargain with the Hotel and Restaurant Employees and Bartenders' International Union which represents the strikers.

Despite the fact that the hotels concerned are the biggest and most luxurious in Miami Beach and derive almost all of their business through tourists solicited in interstate commerce, the union finds itself in a position where the National Labor Relations Act cannot be utilized to require collective bargaining. Florida likewise does not have a Labor Relations Act which requires collective bargaining.

The hotel owners have combined in a tight association and have raised a large fund for the dual purposes of breaking the strike and enforcing discipline upon their own members. Hotel owner after owner has informed the union that he would like to settle his own individual strike and arrive at an agreement with the union but that he is unable to because of the threat directed to him by the association. These owners have indicated that they have been threatened with a boycott as to convention and other overflow business which the association distributes among them, should they sign any type of contract with the union.

Strike breakers have been imported from Puerto Rico and rural communities by the hotels and a tremendous amount of harassing litigation has been instigated by the hotels. In spite of these tactics, the ranks of the strikers have remained firm and the public opinion in greater Miami and Miami Beach has been solidly in support of the strikers.

We have here the anomaly of the highest room rates and the lowest paid hotel workers in the United States. Hotels which charge guests from $20 to $200 per day pay wage rates running as low as $2 for a 12-hour day. Employees work 7 days per week with no overtime provisions. The greater Miami public is well aware of these conditions and has observed the peaceful conduct of the strike. It has also expressed through public committees, including mayors of Miami and Miami Beach, and the Governor of the State, the generally felt opinion that the hotel owners should negotiate with the representatives of their employees. The public has felt that this request is not unreasonable, and there is a good deal of indignation in the community because there are no Federal or State laws available to remedy this situation.

It is the feeling of the Hotel, Restaurant, and Bartenders International Union that Congress is unaware that such a large industry—in the case of Florida the largest industry—has been excluded from the protection of labor legislation by administrative rulings of the National Labor Relations Board and limitation of existing laws.

Not only the welfare of 3,000 people on strike is involved, but the entire business community of Miami and Miami Beach has been affected by the greed and unreasonableness of the hotel owners.

We respectfully request that your committee investigate the hotel industry of Miami and Miami Beach and devise appropriate legislation for the protection of the workers and the welfare of the communities.

Very truly yours,

J. W. BROWN,
General Counsel, Hotel and Restaurant Employees and Bartenders International Union.

THE PRICE OF SILVER

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD at this point an article appearing in the Wall Street Journal of today, June 1, 1955, entitled "Silver Service." This article will, I believe, be of interest to the Members of the Congress, in view of pending legislation.

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

SILVER SERVICE

Silver a few days ago achieved a kind of parity with gold. Private buyers paid more for it than the 90.41 cents an ounce which the United States Treasury stands ready to shell out for it if it is mined in this country.

For the past 22 years this has not been the case. In 1933 American silver producers began receiving this special treatment, and it has amounted to a very substantial annual subsidy, since for almost the whole of those 22 years the market price has been far below the Treasury's buying price.

In contrast, gold, though much more widely regarded as a useful monetary standard, has sold most of the time at prices equal to or higher than the Treasury would pay for it. Silver, always jealous of gold, can now boast that it, too, stands on its own feet.

The silver-mining industry can boast another honor. It has the distinction of being probably the inventor, at least in the United States, of price-support and stockpiling schemes for its own benefit. There was a Treasury silver-purchase program as far back as the 1870's—long before the American farmer had thought of any such thing. Of course, since the present silver program was started in 1933, other interests have caught on. Elaborate and permanent schemes of the same general kind, covering major farm commodities, have been adopted, and the idea also has spread to additional metals, including lead, zinc, mercury, and others.

But silver has a special magic of its own, by which even the Treasury benefits. Even though it pays more for silver than it's worth, it manages to make a profit on it—a secret which would be invaluable in the commercial world. The moment Uncle Sam buys an ounce of silver at 90.41 cents he lists it as an asset worth $1.29. Then he issues silver certificates on the basis of that new value. This process is called seigniorage, in reverence for the lords and kings who used to steal from their subjects in a similar manner.

You've probably got some of these certificates in your pocket right now. If you turned them in for the silver (in accordance with the promise on their face) you would, of course, lose about 30 cents of each dollar so exchanged. Fortunately, however, Uncle Sam will accept such bills in full payment of taxes on the $1.29 an ounce basis of value. So Uncle Sam is rightly regarded in a better light than those old lords and kings.

Yet it is obvious that the Government could issue paper money of this kind without bothering to accumulate all that silver. It's got about 3 billion ounces of it, 15 times the world's annual production at the present rate. That's far in excess of any other stockpile in relation to output. Furthermore, this is one hoard that can't possibly have any real use in a war emergency.

Thus the silver stockpile is the first to have been started, relatively the biggest, and also the most useless. Quite a record for an industry about as big as the manufacture of gloves.

RECIPROCAL TRADE AGREEMENTS ACT — LETTER FROM JOHN S. COLEMAN

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask the permission of the Senate to have printed in the RECORD a copy of a letter from Mr. John S. Coleman, chairman, Committee for a National Trade Policy, and president of Burroughs Corp., Detroit, Mich., commenting on a statement presented to the Committee on Finance for inclusion in the record of the hearings on H. R. 1 by Mr. Robert M. Burr, president of the National Bureau of Economic Realism, Inc., of New York City.

The record of the hearings was printed prior to the receipt of Mr. Coleman's communication and, therefore, it was not possible to include his statement in regard to Mr. Burr's remarks on the National Trade Policy and the committee president, Mr. Charles P. Taft.

I submit Mr. Coleman's letter for the information of the Senate.

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

BURROUGHS CORP.,
Detroit, Mich., April 13, 1955.

The Honorable HARRY F. BYRD,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: My attention has been called to an attack on the Committee for a National Trade Policy and on Charles P. Taft, our president, by a gentleman named Burr, not otherwise identified, who sent in to the Senate Finance Committee, a long statement for inclusion in the record on H. R. 1. He has printed this in a 48-page pamphlet and apparently circulated it widely, including the press.

He refers to pages of the typewritten record on other than his own statement, which I had understood were not available to any outsider, and were certainly not similarly available to our committee.

I am writing to you, however, as the chairman of our committee, to protest against the reception of such an obviously incoherent and irrelevant document. It is primarily an attack upon the Buy American Act and the Presidential order of December 17, 1954, under that act, which has nothing to do with H. R. 1.

It is, incidentally, an attack upon a number of individuals and upon my committee and its president. The nub of the attack upon this committee is the implication that its operations have been inspired and financed "from abroad by our very friends whom we seek to help." This innuendo is absolutely false. We have not accepted or received any contribution from any foreign source.

The attack on Mr. Taft is on the ground at the time he helped to organize this committee he was registered with the Attorney General as a foreign agent. The gentleman is not even consistent, because on the prior page of the printed form of the statement appears, from the Attorney General's report, the notation that this employment terminated August 1, 1953. This committee was not organized until September 17, 1953.

Mr. Taft was employed only by the Venezuelan Chambers of Commerce, and not at any time by any of the other foreign agencies which employed Cleary, Gottlieb, Friendly, and Ball.

The gentleman also attacks Mr. Taft on the ground that he did not disclose this registration or employment by the Venezuelan Chambers of Commerce either to the Congressional committees or to his associates in the Committee for a National Trade Policy. Both charges are completely false. Mr. Taft registered with both the Clerk of the House and the Clerk of the Senate as a lobbyist for the Venezuelan Chambers of Commerce and reported his compensation in 1953, although under the later Supreme Court decision he had done nothing which strictly required such registration. This is completely omitted by Mr. Burr. Mr. Taft testified, not in the abbreviated form which the gentleman quotes, but in full, to each of the committees hearing testimony on H. R. 1, about the prior employment.

What Mr. Taft told his associates on the committee about his prior employment is

none of the gentleman's business, but in fact, Mr. Taft told us all there was to know.

Mr. George Ball will communicate with you direct, regarding the facts in this case. I would only add that none of the funds paid to Mr. Ball's firm or to Mr. Taft through it were in any way directly, or indirectly, contributions to our committee. On the contrary, the flow of funds was in the other direction; our committee paid Mr. Taft a salary from about September 1, 1953, and paid Mr. Ball's firm a substantial fee for legal services in the organization of the committee.

If Mr. Burr's statement is accepted over our protest, then we ask that this letter also be included.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN S. COLEMAN,
Chairman, Committee for a National Trade Policy.

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

POSTAL FIELD SERVICE COMPENSATION ACT OF 1955

The VICE PRESIDENT. Pursuant to the unanimous-consent agreement entered into on yesterday, the Chair lays before the Senate the postal pay bill.

The Senate proceeded to the consideration of the bill (S. 2061) to increase the rates of basic compensation of officers and employees in the field service of the Post Office Department, which had been reported from the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service with amendments.

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

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

IMPORTANCE OF ACCURATE INFORMATION TO THE PUBLIC ON PROGRESS IN THE INTERCONTINENTAL BALLISTIC MISSILE FIELD

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President——

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I yield 3 minutes to the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I thank the Senator from Texas for his courtesy.

Mr. President, several weeks ago there was a packaged-telecast program which included many prominent figures in separate telecast interviews. President Eisenhower was among them.

On that telecast, Dr. Wernher Von Braun, one of the heads of the Nazi missile center at Peenemunde—now in the hands of the Communists—stated he felt the United States was several years ahead of the Communists in the field of the intercontinental missile.

I thereupon asked Secretary of the Army Stevens if I could talk to Dr. Von Braun because his remarks would have impact.

We met in Secretary Stevens' office. I questioned Dr. Von Braun for about an hour and one-half in front of Secretary Stevens, General Ridgway, and others.

None of his replies supported the statement he made in the telecast in question to the effect this country was several years ahead of the Communists on ballistic missiles. In fact, the reverse was true. He could give no facts whatever to justify his position that this country is certainly several years ahead in the missile race. In fact, his detailed replies convinced me even more that we are behind.

It really all boiled down to the fact, as Dr. Von Braun later told me, that he felt his television address should be optimistic, so as to reassure the American people.

After Dr. Von Braun left, I asked Secretary Stevens why an employee of the Army who was not working on the intercontinental ballistic missile project should, nevertheless, be chosen as the one to give the facts on the project to the American people.

Secretary Stevens replied he had not been informed that Dr. Von Braun was going on the telecast.

Two days after the broadcast in question, at a press conference, the Secretary of Defense said:

> I was trying to think of a German scientist that is over here now working on the problem. I happened to read what he said.

A reporter asked: "Von Braun?"

Secretary Wilson replied:

> Yes; and I imagine his analysis of it would be as good as anyone's. He knows the business. As I remember it, he said he thought, to begin with, the Russians were ahead in the rocket business because they took everything that the Germans had and they kept right on working on it, but they didn't establish as broad a base, developing ideas, and with the same imagination that we had over here; and, in his opinion, at this time, we are well ahead—that is, if I accurately summed up what he said. That is my own feeling about it. Sometimes it is difficult to know the other side of the equation. We know what we are doing. We don't know for sure everything they are doing.

In other words, the Secretary of Defense backed up Von Braun's position, without reservation.

The script in question of the telecast with Von Braun was reviewed by the Department of Defense. Some of his answers were deleted by that Department.

This part about our being ahead was approved by the Defense Department without any consultation with the Air Force which has responsibility for the IBM; or even with the Army, for whom Von Braun worked.

No one can be sure whether or not the Soviet is ahead of the United States in the intercontinental ballistic missile field, or whether the United States is ahead of the Soviet. But contrary to the published opinion of Dr. Von Braun, who, as stated, was frank with us in stating he felt his remarks on that broadcast should be optimistic, any extrapolation based on the facts which can be obtained on this question would tend to show that the Communists were years ahead of us in this IBM field.

Once again, therefore, lulling unsupportable information is presented to the American people by the Department of Defense with respect to our relative position of strength as against that of the Communists.

In this case the matter in question could not be more important, as was well discussed in a recent editorial in the Kansas City Times. This editorial read in part:

> What we really need to be concerned about is whether the United States or Russia is ahead in the development of an intercontinental ballistics missile. Such a weapon probably would be the supreme factor, even decisive, in atomic-hydrogen war with the Communist powers. Our own safety depends mainly on keeping up our balance of convenional air might and investing without stint in the all-important missiles project. If we do this determinedly and without relaxation, the issue of which country's airpower is the greater becomes academic.

Once again the strength of a nation depends upon the will of its people. How can that will function properly if the people are misinformed?

Mr. President, I ask that at this point an editorial from the magazine Aviation Week of May 30 be inserted in the RECORD.

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

EVASIONS OF THE DEFENSE DEPARTMENT

(By Robert Hotz)

The Washington press corps and the American people to whom they report have been given another sorry demonstration of the careless, inaccurate, and evasive manner in which the Department of Defense publicly handles matters of life and death concern to every citizen.

The occasion of this latest demonstration was a press conference held by Defense Secretary Charles E. Wilson last week in the Pentagon during which he confirmed details of the types and numbers of Russian bombers and fighters exclusively reported by Aviation Week in its May 23 issue as having participated in the recent aerial display over Moscow.

Here are some examples of what we and other veteran Pentagon reporters consider to be evidence of this careless attitude toward vital facts by top-level Defense Department civilian officials.

On May 13 the Defense Department issued a brief, vague statement on the Moscow air display mentioning four types of Soviet planes. Aviation Week reported on May 23 that these types appeared in operational numbers and a new supersonic day fighter was seen in formation of 50 planes. Our story was widely reprinted on the front pages of daily newspapers and broadcast on radio and television on the same day. On May 24, the next day, Secretary Wilson issued a statement confirming the appearance of the 50 new supersonic fighters and confirmed the numbers of all-weather fighters, turboprop bombers, twin-jet bombers and four-jet bombers cited by Aviation Week as visible in the Moscow fly-by.

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

When asked by Aviation Week's military editor why these facts were not in the original Department of Defense statement, Mr. Wilson replied:

"The statement on May 13 was a very general one."

Mr. Wilson was asked by Aviation Week's Washington editor if he planned to release

publicly the pictures of these Russian planes flying over Moscow that are now available in the Pentagon. He replied:

"Hadn't thought about it."

When asked if he had changed his mind from a year ago when he stated the Russians were concentrating on building a purely defensive air force, Wilson said:

"Well, 10 airplanes isn't very many airplanes to fight a war with and there isn't any question that the first big development in Russia was on the MIG's the defensive airplane and they built a lot of them. They probably kept building them too long from our point of view. We would rather have spent the money on an improved and better one quicker. That is the technique over here."

Mr. Wilson knows or should know that the MIG-15 went out of production in Russia late in 1952 after 15,000 were produced. This was the year before Mr. Wilson made his defensive statement.

He also knows or should know that we are still building the F-86 Sabre series that was the MIG-15's contemporary.

He should know that we did not get into production on the F-100, successor to the Sabre, until late in 1953.

He also knows or should know that by July 1954, Lt. Gen. Earle Partridge, commander of the Far East Air Forces, reported that the MIG-17, the Soviet successor to the MIG-15, was already in squadron service with Red air force units opposite FEAF in Siberia. The first F-100 combat wing was equipped late in 1954; grounded for several months due to technical troubles, and became operational early in 1955.

MISQUOTES PRESIDENT

Mr. Wilson also misquoted President Eisenhower in his formal prepared statement. Mr. Wilson said the President said at his news conference last week "'it is just not true' that we no longer have air superiority." What the President actually said was: "* * * we may not have as many B-52s as we should like at this moment. I don't know the exact number, but to say that we have lost in a twinkling all of this great technical development and technical excellence as well as the number in our total aircraft is just not true."

Nobody has stated we have lost anything in a twinkling. What Aviation Week and other critics of the Defense Department attitude on Russian airpower have said is that the 1955 Moscow air display offered definite proof that during the past 3 years our once wide margin of technical superiority had been whittled to a very slim margin and that Russians are moving at faster rates of development and production now than are the United States Air Force and naval aviation. Neither Mr. Wilson nor anybody else in the Pentagon or White House has taken direct issue with that statement.

The May 13 Department of Defense statement noted that the Russian bomber display "observations establish a new basis of our estimate of Soviet airpower." In his May 24 statement, Mr. Wilson said on the same subject: "These are facts which are not new to the Department of Defense but which are currently causing public discussion about the relative air superiority of the United States."

Mr. Wilson is still apparently confused about how many twin jet Badgers flew which year. He said: "They displayed more than 40 new medium bombers known for the first time last year (1954) as a prototype." Actually, in the 1954 Moscow air display the Russians flew a formation of nine of these twin jet medium Badgers, indicating at that time that they were out of the prototype stage and into production.

Events of the last 3 years have proved that Mr. Wilson has been wrong on every major evaluation he has made on Russian airpower developments since he took office in 1953. His performance at the Pentagon press conference last week on this issue of vital importantce to every American did not inspire any new confidence in his accuracy or candor on the rapid rise of Russian jet airpower.

Nor did it inspire any confidence that Mr. Wilson's new requirement that all Defense Department public statements must make a constructive contribution will be administered either wisely or well.

The American people deserve more precise and accurate facts, more candor and a much deeper sense of public responsibility on the part of top-level Defense Department leaders before they should place much faith in official utterances on the Russian airpower controversy.

GRANTING OF STAYS OF EXECUTION BY FEDERAL JUDGES—AND FEDERAL WRITS OF HABEAS CORPUS

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BARKLEY in the chair). The time is under the control of the majority leader and the minority leader.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, may I have 1 or 2 minutes?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from Utah.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, many States are becoming concerned about the delays and miscarriages of justice that are resulting from our present laws relating to the granting of stays of execution by Federal judges, and to the laws relating to Federal writs of habeas corpus.

Corrective legislative proposals are now before the Congress, such as S. 877, which I introduced, and S. 1753, which was drafted by a committee of the judicial conference, with the aid and assistance of several chief justices of the State courts and representative attorneys general.

My own State is concerned about two glaring cases of the abuse of State judicial action by multiple appeals to Federal courts. Chronologies of these two cases were submitted to me by the Utah attorney general, E. R. Callister and I request unanimous consent to have them printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks, because of the public interest in this proposed legislation.

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

BRAASCH AND SULLIVAN

October 22, 1949: Service station attendant murdered in Beaver, Utah.

October 23, 1949: Braasch and Sullivan arrested in Las Vegas, Nev., and confessed murder.

October 25, 1949: Charged with first-degree murder.

December 20, 1949: Found guilty of first-degree murder. Sentenced to die on February 16, 1950.

February 3, 1950: Motion for new trial denied.

February 8, 1950: Notice of appeal filed with Utah Supreme Court. Stay of execution granted.

April 4, 1950: Appeal filed with Utah Supreme Court.

March 24, 1951: Conviction affirmed by Utah Supreme Court.

April 30, 1951: Petition for rehearing filed with Utah Supreme Court.

June 19, 1951: Petition for rehearing denied by Utah Supreme Court.

July 11, 1951: Sentenced to die on August 21, 1951.

August 2, 1951: Application for commutation of sentence filed with Utah Board of Pardons.

August 7, 1951: Governor signs reprieve until next meeting of the board of pardons on August 29.

August 29, 1951: State board of pardons refuses to commute death sentence.

September 7, 1951: Utah Supreme Court grants stay of execution pending application to United States Supreme Court for writ of certiorari.

January 7, 1952: United States Supreme Court denies petition for writ of certiorari.

January 14, 1952: Utah Supreme Court sets aside stay of execution.

January 22, 1952: Sentenced to die on February 26, 1952.

January 30, 1952: State board of pardons asked to rehear application for commutation of death sentence.

February 16, 1952: State board of pardons refuses to rehear application for commutation of sentence.

February 18, 1952: Application for writ of habeas corpus filed with Utah Supreme Court.

February 19, 1952: Supreme Court denies application for writ of habeas corpus.

February 23, 1952: United States district court for Utah grants 45 days' stay of execution pending action of application for writ of habeas corpus.

March 14, 1952: Amended petition for writ of habeas corpus filed in United States district court.

March 31, 1952: United States district court orders psychiatric study of defendants.

April 3, 1952: Defendants appear before United States district court on the petition for writ of habeas corpus and hearing held thereon.

April 4, 1952: United States district court grants another stay of execution pending further proceedings in that court. Retains jurisdiction until State remedies are exhausted.

December 23, 1952: Application filed with Utah Supreme Court for writ of habeas corpus.

February 6, 1953: Utah Supreme Court denies application for writ of habeas corpus.

February 25, 1953: Petition for rehearing filed with Utah Supreme Court.

February 26, 1953: Utah Supreme Court denies petition for rehearing. Application made to the United States Supreme Court for writ of certiorari.

October 19, 1953: United States Supreme Court denies certiorari.

November 30, 1954: United States district court grants writ of habeas corpus applied for in that court on February 20, 1952, but orders defendants to remain in custody pending appeal.

February 2, 1955: Findings of fact and order granting the writ filed in United States district court. Case now in process of appeal to Tenth Circuit Court of Appeals.

DON JESSE NEAL

May 23, 1951: Sergeant Owen T. Farley of the Salt Lake City Police was shot fatally in an automobile while he was driving Neal and a woman companion to police headquarters for questioning in a robbery.

October 2, 1951: Trial begun in Utah Third District Court.

October 4, 1951: Jury returned verdict of guilty of murder in the first degree.

October 16, 1951: Motion for new trial denied and Neal sentenced to die on December 13, 1951. Notice of appeal filed with Utah Supreme Court and stay granted pending appeal.

February 15, 1952: Appeal filed with the Utah Supreme Court.

October 6, 1952: Case argued before Utah Supreme Court.

March 28, 1953: Utah Supreme Court affirms conviction.

July 20, 1953: Petition for rehearing field with Utah Supreme Court.

October 29, 1953: Petition for rehearing denied.

November 5, 1953: Utah Supreme Court stays execution pending application to the United States Supreme Court for writ of certiorari.

May 4, 1954: United States Supreme Court denies petition for writ of certiorari.

May 15, 1954: Neal sentenced to die on June 19, 1954.

June 4, 1954: Petition for writ of habeas corpus filed in United States District Court for Utah.

June 11, 1954: United States District Court for Utah denied the application for writ of habeas corpus. Appeal made to United States court of appeals, 10th Circuit.

June 16, 1954: Stay of execution granted by United States court of appeals, 10th circuit.

June 22, 1954: United States court of appeals affirms district court's denial of the application for writ of habeas corpus.

June 23, 1954: Neal sentenced to die on August 3, 1954.

July 23, 1954: Utah State Board of Pardons denies appeal for commutation of sentence.

July 28, 1954: Petition for writ of habeas corpus filed with Utah Supreme Court. Denied on same date.

July 31, 1954: Stay of execution granted by United States Supreme Court Justice Tom Clark.

April 4, 1955: United States Supreme Court denied petitions for writ of certiorari of both the Utah Supreme Court's denial of the petition for writ of habeas corpus and of the circuit court of appeals' affirmance of the district court's denial of writ of habeas corpus.

April 8, 1955: Neal sentenced to die on May 9, 1955.

April 19, 1955: Petition for writ of habeas corpus filed in United States district court for Utah.

April 29, 1955: Petition for writ of habeas corpus and stay of execution denied by United States district court.

May 2, 1955: United States district court grants stay of execution.

May 7, 1955: Motion to vacate United States district court's stay of execution taken under advisement by 10th Circuit Court of Appeals and a stay granted by that court.

May 23, 1955: Petition for writ of habeas corpus argued before 10th Circuit Court of Appeals.

May 26, 1955: Petition for writ of habeas corpus denied by 10th Circuit Court of Appeals. Granted a stay of execution until June 15, 1955.

Mr. WATKINS. It will be noted from these chronologies that more than 4 years have elapsed since the commission of the crime in the Neal case. Neal has petitioned the United States Supreme Court 3 times for writ of certiorari, all of which were denied, but is now in the process of again appealing to the United States Supreme Court. More than 5½ years have elapsed since the commission of the crime in the Braasch and Sullivan case.

POSTAL FIELD SERVICE COMPENSATION ACT OF 1955

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 2061) to increase the rates of basic compensation of officers and employees in the field service of the Post Office Department.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I wonder if the majority leader will join with me in asking for the yeas and nays on final passage of the bill, in order that Senators may be on notice.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I join in the request.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON].

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, S. 2061 is the third version of postal pay legislation considered by the Senate this session. First, the Senate approved S. 1, a bill providing a 10 percent or $400 minimum increase. That was the bill we took to conference. Second, the Senate approved the conference agreement providing an average increase of 8.6 percent and sent it to the President. That compromise was vetoed. S. 2061—the third version—provides an average increase of approximately 8 percent. Under this bill, 6 percent is a direct pay increase to each and every postal employee retroactive to March 1. The additional 2 percent results from application of the administration's position classification to be put into effect within 180 days after enactment of the bill.

S. 2061 resolves the objections of the President to the conference agreement on S. 1 as follows:

First, special delivery messengers are raised to the same pay level as city clerks and carriers.

Second, the rural carrier schedule has been revised to maintain the traditional relationship between these employees and others in the department.

Third, the cost has been reduced.

Fourth, amendments have been adopted—in complete harmony with the Post Office Department—to make the bill completely workable without creating unduly difficult administrative problems.

In view of these changes there is every reason to believe S. 2061 is acceptable to the administration. Certainly, we have worked long and hard to produce a bill that will be enacted into law.

Mr. President, I am greatly disappointed that the bill does not provide a larger increase. I am not happy that we were compelled to accept the position classification plan of the administration. However, that is the price we had to pay for a much deserved and meritorious cost-of-living pay increase.

I wish to give a word of assurance to the rank and file postal worker, the distribution clerk, the carrier, the mail handler, the sorting clerk, and the others who expertly keep our letters moving day in and day out.

The committee has made every effort to adopt language which will protect the rights of individual employees, and prevent the assumption of unwarranted power by the Postmaster General. The committee intends to watch this matter very, very closely, and will take immediate action in behalf of our postal employees if it should become necessary, to protect their rights and privileges under the civil-service laws now on our statute books.

Mr. President, I ask for the passage of the bill.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, is the bill open to amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Not yet.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The committee amendments agreed to en bloc are as follows:

On page 4, line 11, after the word "than", to strike out "twenty" and insert "forty"; in line 12, after the numerals "17", to strike out "ten" and insert "twelve"; in line 13, after the numerals "18", to strike out "two" and insert "four"; on page 15, line 22, after the word "city", to insert "or special"; at the top of page 83, to strike out:

"POSTAL FIELD SERVICE SCHEDULE

"Level	Per annum rates and steps						
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
1	$2,880	$2,980	$3,080	$3,180	$3,280	$3,380	$3,480
2	3,085	3,190	3,295	3,400	3,505	3,610	3,715
3	3,330	3,445	3,560	3,675	3,790	3,905	4,020
4	3,660	3,785	3,910	4,035	4,160	4,285	4,410
5	3,880	4,005	4,130	4,255	4,380	4,505	4,630
6	4,190	4,330	4,470	4,610	4,750	4,890	5,030
7	4,530	4,685	4,840	4,995	5,150	5,305	5,460
8	4,890	5,060	5,230	5,400	5,570	5,740	5,910
9	5,280	5,465	5,650	5,835	6,020	6,205	6,390
10	5,800	6,000	6,200	6,400	6,600	6,800	7,000
11	6,380	6,600	6,820	7,040	7,260	7,480	7,700
12	7,020	7,260	7,500	7,740	7,980	8,220	8,460
13	7,730	7,990	8,250	8,510	8,770	9,030	9,290
14	8,500	8,780	9,060	9,340	9,620	9,900	10,180
15	9,350	9,650	9,950	10,250	10,550	10,850	11,150
16	10,300	10,600	10,900	11,200	11,500	11,800	12,100
17	11,400	11,700	12,000	12,300	12,600	12,900	13,200
18	12,500	12,800	13,100	13,400	13,700	14,000	14,300
19	13,600	13,900	14,200	14,500	------	------	------
20	14,800	------	------	------	------	------	------ "

And insert in lieu thereof:

"POSTAL FIELD SERVICE SCHEDULE

"Level	Per annum rates and steps						
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
1	$2,880	$2,980	$3,080	$3,180	$3,280	$3,380	$3,480
2	3,090	3,195	3,300	3,405	3,510	3,615	3,720
3	3,330	3,445	3,560	3,675	3,790	3,905	4,020
4	3,660	3,785	3,910	4,035	4,160	4,285	4,410
5	3,880	4,005	4,130	4,255	4,380	4,505	4,630
6	4,190	4,330	4,470	4,610	4,750	4,890	5,030
7	4,530	4,685	4,840	4,995	5,150	5,305	5,460
8	4,890	5,060	5,230	5,400	5,570	5,740	5,910
9	5,280	5,465	5,650	5,835	6,020	6,205	6,390
10	5,800	6,000	6,200	6,400	6,600	6,800	7,000
11	6,380	6,600	6,820	7,040	7,260	7,480	7,700
12	7,020	7,260	7,500	7,740	7,980	8,220	8,460
13	7,730	7,990	8,250	8,510	8,770	9,030	9,290
14	8,500	8,780	9,060	9,340	9,620	9,900	10,180
15	9,350	9,650	9,950	10,250	10,550	10,850	11,150
16	10,300	10,600	10,900	11,200	11,500	11,800	12,100
17	11,400	11,700	12,000	12,300	12,600	12,900	13,200
18	12,500	12,800	13,100	13,400	13,700	14,000	14,300
19	13,600	13,900	14,200	14,500	14,800	------	------
20	14,800	------	------	------	------	------	------ "

On page 84, after line 5, to strike out:

"RURAL CARRIER SCHEDULE

	"Per annum rates and steps						
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Carriers in rural delivery service:							
Fixed compensation per annum	$1,590.00	$1,630.00	$1,670.00	$1,710.00	$1,750.00	$1,790.00	$1,830.00
Compensation per mile per annum for each mile up to 30 miles of route	63.00	65.00	67.00	69.00	71.00	73.00	75.00
For each mile of route over 30 miles	21.50	21.50	21.50	21.50	21.50	21.50	21.50
Temporary carriers in rural delivery service on routes to which no regular carrier is assigned:							
Fixed compensation per annum	1,590.00						
Compensation per mile per annum for each mile up to 30 miles of route	63.00						
For each mile of route over 30 miles	21.50						
Temporary carriers in rural delivery service on routes having regular carriers absent without pay or on military leave	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)
Substitute carriers in rural delivery service on routes having carriers absent with pay	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)"

[1] Basic compensation authorized for the regular carrier.

And insert in lieu thereof:

"RURAL CARRIER SCHEDULE

	"Per annum rates and steps						
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Carriers in rural delivery service:							
Fixed compensation per annum	$1,566.00	$1,611.00	$1,656.00	$1,701.00	$1,746.00	$1,791.00	$1,836.00
Compensation per mile per annum for each mile up to 30 miles of route	65.00	67.00	69.00	71.00	73.00	75.00	77.00
For each mile of route over 30 miles	22.00	22.00	22.00	22.00	22.00	22.00	22.00
Temporary carriers in rural delivery service on routes to which no regular carrier is assigned:							
Fixed compensation per annum	1,566.00						
Compensation per mile per annum for each mile up to 30 miles of route	65.00						
For each mile of route over 30 miles	22.00						
Temporary carriers in rural delivery service on routes having regular carriers absent without pay or on military leave	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)
Substitute carriers in rural delivery service on routes having carriers absent with pay	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)"

[1] Basic compensation authorized for the regular carrier.

On page 86, line 15, after the word "schedule", to insert a comma and "and basic salary is paid, together with other forms of compensation provided by this act, shall replace all existing forms of compensation for such postmasters"; on page 87, line 22, after the word "shall", to strike out "remain in such" and insert "not be reduced in"; on page 91, after line 2, to strike out:

"RETROACTIVE BASIC SALARY INCREASES

"SEC. 306. (a) The basic salary in effect immediately prior to the effective date of this section, of each employee paid under the act of July 6, 1945, as amended (39 U. S. C., secs. 858, 859, 861a, 862, 863–866, 868, 869), or under the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, shall be increased by 6 percent effective March 1, 1955 (rounded to the nearest dollar in the case of per annum rates and to the nearest one-half cent in the case of hourly rates, a half-dollar or one-quarter of a cent being rounded to the next highest dollar or one-half cent, respectively). Such increase shall be applied (1) in the case of each rural carrier to his fixed compensation, his compensation per mile, and any additional compensation allowed him for serving a heavily patronized route, and (2) to the amounts specified in sections 3 (c), 3 (d), 12 (a), 12 (e), 15 (f), and 17 (d) of the act of July 6, 1945 (Public Law 134, 79th Congress), as amended.

"(b) Retroactive salary shall be paid under this act only in the case of an individual in the service of the United States (including service in the Armed Forces of the United States) or of the municipal government of the District of Columbia on the date of enactment of this act, except that such retroactive salary shall be paid a retired postmaster, officer, or employee for services rendered during the period beginning March 1, 1955, and ending with the date of his retirement, or in accordance with the provisions of the act of August 3, 1950, for services rendered by a deceased postmaster, officer, or employee during the period beginning on March 1, 1955, and ending with the date of his death."

On page 92, line 13, after the word "level", to strike out "PFS–6" and insert "PFS–5;" in line 16, after the word "level", to strike out "PFS–10" and insert "PFS–9;" on page 93, line 4, after the word "level", to strike out "PFS–11" and insert "PFS–10;" at the beginning of line 16, to strike out "PFS–6" and insert "PFS–5;" in line 19, after the word "shall", to insert "not;" in line 20, after the word "level", to strike out "PFS–6" and insert "PFS–5;" on page 94, after line 5, to strike out:

"SEC. 403. For the purpose of establishing eligibility for step increases under section 401, the Postmaster General is directed to preserve for employees presently in the automatic grades, other than the maximum automatic grades, their present anniversary dates: *Provided*, That no employee whose anniversary date occurs before the anniversary date of a senior employee shall be advanced ahead of such senior employee. The anniversary date of any employee whose present anniversary date cannot be preserved without advancing ahead of such senior employee shall be that date which results in the shortest additional waiting period for such employee. Each employee in a maximum automatic grade or a single salary grade shall begin the waiting period for his anniversary date on the effective date of his transfer into the appropriate schedule contained in section 301, 302, or 303 of this act."

And insert in lieu thereof:

"SEC. 403. In order to retain to the maximum possible extent promotion credits earned by employees under the act of July 6, 1945, as amended, and in order to prevent the advancement by step-increases of junior employees ahead of senior employees, employees whose basic salaries are adjusted on the effective date of the schedules in this act shall establish credit toward advancement by step increases under section 401 in the following manner:

"(1) Each employee in the automatic grades who had not reached the maximum grade for his position under the provisions of the act of July 6, 1945, as amended, shall retain the anniversary date established for his next automatic promotion under such Act unless the amount of increase in basic salary which he receives upon adjustment to the appropriate schedule is equal to or greater than the difference between the salary for his automatic grade and the next higher automatic grade for his position under such act.

"(2) Employees in the automatic grades who do not retain their anniversary dates under paragraph (1), above, employees who had reached the maximum grades for their positions, and employees who occupied positions for which single rates were established under the act of July 6, 1945, as amended, shall begin the waiting period for advancement to the next step for their positions on the date of adjustment to the schedules in this act."

On page 103, line 4, after the word "level", to strike out "PFS–8" and insert "PFS–7"; at the beginning of line 9, to strike out "PFS–8" and insert "PFS–7"; on page 104, line 9, after the word "level", to strike out "PFS–8" and insert "PFS–7"; in line 17, after the word "level", to strike out "PFS–9" and insert "PFS–8"; on page 105, line 24, after the word "employees", to insert "and to employees in post offices of the third class"; on page 110, after line 3, to insert:

"TITLE VII

"RETROACTIVE BASIC SALARY INCREASES

"SEC. 701. (a) The basic salary in effect immediately prior to the effective date of this section, of each employee paid under the act of July 6, 1945, as amended (39 U. S. C., secs. 858, 859, 861a, 862, 863–866, 868, 869) or under the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, shall be increased by 6 percent effective March 1, 1955 (rounded to the nearest dollar in the case of per annum rates and to the nearest one-half cent in the case of hourly rates, a half-dollar or one-quarter of a cent being rounded to the next highest dollar or one-half cent, respectively). Such increase shall be applied (1) in the case of each rural carrier to his fixed compensation, his compensation per mile, and any additional compensation allowed him for serving a heavily patronized route, and (2) to the amounts specified in sections 3 (c), 3 (d), 12 (a), 12 (e), 15 (f), and 17 (d) of the act of July 6, 1945 (Public Law 134, 79th Cong.), as amended.

"(b) Retroactive salary shall be paid under this act only in the case of an individual in the service of the United States (including service in the Armed Forces of the United States) or of the municipal government of the District of Columbia on the date of enactment of this act, except that such retroactive salary shall be paid a retired postmaster, officer, or employee for services rendered during the period beginning March 1, 1955, and ending with the date of his retirement, or in accordance with the provisions of the act of August 3, 1950, for services rendered by a deceased postmaster, officer, or employee during the period beginning on March 1, 1955, and ending with the date of his death."

On page 111, at the beginning of line 11, to strike out "Title VII" and insert "Title VIII"; at the beginning of line 13, to change the section number from "701" to "801," and in the same line, after the aforementioned amendment, to strike out "The" and insert "At the beginning of each fiscal year, the"; in line 16, after the word "receipt", to insert "for the preceding calendar year"; in line 23, after the figures "$1,500", to insert "except as provided in section 303 (g)"; on page 112, at the beginning of line 2, to change the section number from "702" to "802"; at the beginning of line 13, to change the section number from "703" to "803"; at the beginning of line 21, to change the section number from "704" to "804"; on page 113, at the beginning of line 3, to change the section number from "705" to "805"; at the beginning of line 14, to change the section number from "706" to "806"; at the beginning of line 18, to change the section number from "707" to "807"; at the beginning of line 23, to change the section number from "708" to "808"; on page 114, at the beginning of line 2, to change the section number from "709" to "809"; and after line 5, to strike out:

"SEC. 710. (a) This section shall take effect on the date of enactment of this act.

"(b) Section 601 of this act shall take effect on any Saturday following the date of enactment of this act designated by the Postmaster General but not later than the first Saturday of the first calendar month which begins more than 60 days after such date of enactment.

"(c) The remainder of this act shall take effect on the first day of the first pay period which begins after the date of enactment of this act.

"(d) (1) The adjustment of the basic salary of each employee to the basic salary established for the position he was occupying on the effective date of this act shall be completed within 180 days after the effective date of section 304 (b).

"(2) The applicable salary schedules, provisions, and limitations contained in the act of July 6, 1945 (Public Law 134, 79th Cong.), as amended, or the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, as the case may be, shall continue in effect with respect to each such employee until the date on which his basic salary is adjusted under such section 304 (b).

"(3) Such adjustment of basic salary of each such employee shall be made effective as of the effective date of section 304 (b) and payments of basic salary on the basis of such adjustment shall be decreased by the amounts of basic salary received by such employee during such period under the applicable provisions of such act of July 6, 1945, as amended, or the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, as the case may be."

And, in lieu thereof, to insert:

"SEC. 810. (a) This section shall take effect on the date of enactment of this act.

"(b) This act, except title VII and this section, shall take effect on the first Saturday of the calendar month which begins more than 180 days after the date of its enactment.

"(c) Title VII shall take effect on the first day of the first pay period which begins after the date of enactment of this act."

So as to make the bill read:

"*Be it enacted, etc.*, That this act may be cited as the 'Postal Field Service Compensation Act of 1955.'

"TITLE I—DEFINITIONS, COVERAGE, AND EXEMPTIONS

"DEFINITIONS

"SEC. 101. For the purposes of this act—

"(1) 'Department' means the Post Office Department established by section 388 of the Revised Statutes (5 U. S. C., sec. 361), and the postal field service of the Post Office Department;

"(2) 'postal field service' includes all operations and organization units of the Department, other than the departmental operations and organization units in the headquarters offices of the Post Office Department at the seat of the Government, and includes postal inspectors assigned to the headquarters offices of the Post Office Department at the seat of the Government;

"(3) 'employee', unless the context otherwise indicates, includes postmasters, officers, supervisors, and all other persons employed in the postal field service, regardless of title, other than persons who provide services for the Department on a fee, contract, job, or piecework basis;

"(4) 'position' means the duties and responsibilities assigned to an employee, other than duties performed on a fee, contract, job, or piecework basis;

"(5) 'key position' means an existing position, described in section 203 of this act;

"(6) 'salary level' means the numerical standing in the Postal Field Service Schedule assigned to a position in the postal field service;

"(7) 'basic salary' means the rate of annual or hourly compensation specified by law, exclusive of overtime, night differential, and longevity compensation;

"(8) 'basic compensation' means basic salary plus longevity compensation; and

"(9) 'persons' has the meaning prescribed for such word in section 1 of title 1 of the United States Code.

"COVERAGE

"SEC. 102. This act applies to all positions and employees in the postal field service.

"TITLE II—RANKING OF POSITIONS

"ADMINISTRATION

"SEC. 201. (a) The Postmaster General shall determine the personnel requirements of the postal field service, and fix the number of supervisors and other employees in such service, except that not more than one assistant postmaster may be employed at any post office. He shall define the various positions other than the key positions specified in section 203 of this act and the standard positions of postmaster in a fourth-class office and rural carrier. He shall assign each such position to its appropriate salary level in the Postal Field Service Schedule. He shall ascertain the appropriate salary level of a position (1) by comparing the duties, responsibilities, and work requirements of the position with the duties, responsibilities, and work requirements of key positions described in section 203 of this act, and (2) by ranking the position in relation to the key position most closely comparable in terms of the level of duties, responsibilities, and work requirements.

"(b) In ranking positions, the Postmaster General shall apply the principle of equal pay for substantially equal work and give effect to substantial differences in difficulty of the work to be performed, in the degree of responsibility to be exercised, in the scope and variety of tasks involved, and in the conditions of performance.

"(c) There shall not at any one time be more than 40 employees in positions assigned to salary level 17, 12 employees in positions assigned to salary level 18, 4 employees in positions assigned to salary level 19, or 15 employees in positions assigned to salary level 20.

"(d) The Postmaster General's determinations under this section shall be the basis for the payment of compensation and for personnel transactions.

"APPEALS

"SEC. 202. Any employee, either individually or together with one or more other employees with a similar grievance, may appeal at any time, in person or through the representative specifically designated for that purpose, to the United States Civil Service Commission to review (1) if such employee is in a position other than a key position described in section 203 of this act, any action taken by the Postmaster General under section 201 of this act, in order to determine whether his position has been placed in its appropriate salary level in accordance with such section, and (2) if such employee is in a key position described in section 203 of this act, any administrative action taken or determination made under this act, in connection with such employee, in order to determine whether such employee has been placed correctly in a key position on the basis of and in accordance with the descriptions of key positions and the assignments of such positions to salary levels specified in section 203 of this act. The Commission shall act upon such appeal at the earliest practicable time, and its decision on such appeal shall be certified forthwith to the Postmaster General who shall take action in accordance with such certificate.

"KEY POSITIONS

"SEC. 203. Key positions in the postal field service consisting of standard, related tasks commonly performed in that service are described and assigned to salary levels in the Postal Field Service Schedule, as follows:

"(1) Position: Janitor—Level 1.

"Basic function: Cleans, sweeps, and removes trash from work areas, lobbies, and washrooms.

"Duties and responsibilities:

"(A) Sweeps and scrubs floors and stairs, dusts furniture and fixtures, cleans washrooms and washes windows (except exterior glass in high buildings).

"(B) Moves furniture and helps erect equipment and fixtures within offices of the building.

"(C) In addition, may perform any of the following duties:

"(i) Cleans ice and snow from the sidewalks and driveways, and tends the lawn, shrubbery, and premises of the post office.

"(ii) Washes walls and ceilings.

"Organizational relationships: Reports to a foreman or other designated supervisor.

"(2) Position: Elevator operator—Level 2.

"Basic function: Operates a freight or passenger elevator.

"Duties and responsibilities:

"(A) Operates elevator.

"(B) Cleans cab of elevator and polishes metal fittings.

"(C) In addition, may perform any of the following duties:

"(i) Pushes handcarts of mail on and off elevator or assists in loading or unloading material carried on elevator.

"(ii) Tends the heating plant or performs cleaning duties in the vicinity of the elevator.

"Organizational relationships: Reports to an elevator starter or other designated supervisor.

"(3) Position: Order filler—Level 2.

"Basic function: Selects, assembles, and makes ready for shipment items requisitioned by postal field establishments.

"Duties and responsibilities:

"Is assigned any of the following duties:

"(A) Separates sheets of the requisition form, fastens copies to clipboards and places on appropriate conveyor line.

"(B) Clarifies writing on carbon copies of requisitions in order to minimize errors in filling requisitions.

"(C) Sets up and prepares shipping containers.

"(D) Places in cartons on convey lines the quantities of items requisitioned from an assigned station, indicating action taken opposite each item.

"(E) Fills and labels bulk shipping orders and moves bulk material to dispatch area.

"(F) Replenishes from stock items stored in individual stations and keeps stations neat and orderly to facilitate filling of requisitions.

"(G) Transports bulk and individual shipments on hand trucks.

"(H) Assembles materials for each requisition where conveyor lines converge.

"(I) Places cartons on assembly table for coordination and packaging.

"(J) Checks requisition copies and items to assure that proper action has been taken.

"(K) Directs items not requiring packing to dispatch area.

"(L) Combines shipments to reduce packing.

"(M) Transmits bulk slips and shipping labels to the appropriate person.

"(N) Labels bulk and individual packages with printed labels to avoid hand labeling.

"(O) Prepares labels by use of appropriate rubber stamps.

"(P) Seals cartons with stapling machine or tape.

"(Q) Packs supplies for shipment.

"(R) Stacks and trucks completed orders.

"Organizational relationships: Reports to a foreman or other designated supervisor.

"(4) Position: Clerk. Third-class post office—Level 2.

"Basic function: Sorts incoming and dispatches outgoing mail for a small number of points of separation and destination; provides a limited number of services at public windows.

"Duties and responsibilities:

"(A) Sorts incoming mail for general delivery, lock boxes, and one or more delivery routes.

"(B) Postmarks and prepares mail for dispatch by train or other mail route; closes, locks, and affixes labels to pouches and mail sacks.

"(C) Performs services at a public window, such as selling stamps, stamped envelopes, or other routine functions.

"(D) As the needs of the service require, may perform other related duties incidental to the operation of the post office.

"Organizational relationships: Reports to a postmaster.

"(5) Position: Guard—Level 3.

"Basic function: Makes rounds of the post office building, and punches clocks at designated stations.

"Duties and responsibilities:

"(A) Patrols builidngs, punching watchman's clock where furnished, checking door and window locks, noting and reporting fire hazards and other irregularities, such as running water and unclosed doors and windows.

"(B) Sounds fire alarm.

"(C) Preserves order in corridors and, when necessary, detains persons for interrogation by postoffice inspectors or local police.

"(D) In addition may perform any of the following duties:

"(i) Gives directions to the public in building lobby.

"(ii) Raises and lowers the flag.

"(iii) Retrieves lost and found articles and delivers them to the appropriate place.

"(iv) Obtains names of victims, doctors, police, and witnesses in the event of accident.

"(v) Guards property entrances and prevents damage to property by the public.

"(vi) Tends the heating plant of the building.

"(vii) Operates elevators on a relief basis.

"(viii) Does incidental cleaning and laboring work.

"Organizational relationships: Reports to a lieutenant of the guard, a building superintendent, or other designated supervisor.

"(6) Position: File clerk—Level 3.

"Basic function: Sets up and maintains files on one or more subject matters.

"Duties and responsibilities:

"(A) Prepares new file folders and maintains existing folders in correct order as prescribed in the established filing system.

"(B) Transmits folders or information contained therein to authorized personnel (for example, forwards personnel folders to requesting supervisors, or copies data from folders to satisfy requests).

"(C) Opens, sorts, and searches file material, and maintains files in up-to-date condition.

"(D) In addition, may perform any of the following duties:

"(i) Types from rough draft or plain copy.

"(ii) Answers telephones.

"(iii) Prepares requistions for supplies.

"(iv) Operates a mimeograph machine.

"Organizational relationships: Reports to a designated supervisor.

"(7) Position: Typist—Level 3.

"Basic function: Types material such as forms, correspondence, and stencils from rough draft or plain copy.

"Duties and responsibilities:

"(A) In accordance with instructions and information furnished by supervisor, types forms, standard reports, and documents such as invitations to bid, orders, contracts, invoices, personnel actions, and related materials.

"(B) Types correspondence and memoranda from rough drafts or general information.

"(C) Cuts stencils for instructions, circulars, and other general uses.

"(D) In addition, may perform any of the following duties:

"(i) Transcribes from a dictating machine.

"(ii) Operates a mimeograph machine.

"(iii) Files, checks requisitions, prepares vouchers, and answers the telephone.

"Organizational relationships: Reports to a designated supervisor.

"(8) Position: Mail handler—Level 3.

"Basic function: Loads, unloads, and moves bulk mail, and performs other duties incidental to the movement and processing of mail.

"Duties and responsibilities:

"(A) Unloads mail received by trucks. Separates all mail received by trucks and conveyors for subsequent dispatch to other conveying units, and separates and delivers working mails for delivery to distribution areas.

"(B) Places empty sacks or pouches on racks, labels them where labels are prearranged or racks are plainly marked, dumps mail from sacks, cuts ties, faces letter mail, carries mail to distributors for processing, places processed mail into sacks, removes filled sacks and pouches from racks, closes and locks same. Picks up sacks, pouches, and outside pieces, separates outgoing bulk mails for dispatch and loads mail onto trucks.

"(C) Handles and sacks empty equipment, inspects empty equipment for mail content, restrings sacks.

"(D) Cancels stamps on parcel post, operates canceling machines, carries mail from canceling machine to distribution cases.

"(E) Assists in supply and slip rooms and operates addressograph, mimeograph, and similar machines.

"(F) In addition, may perform any of the following duties:

"(i) Acts as armed guard for valuable registry shipments and as watchman and guard around post office building.

"(ii) Makes simple distribution of parcel post mail requiring no scheme knowledge.

"(iii) Operates electric fork-lift trucks.

"(iv) Rewraps soiled or broken parcels.

"(v) Performs other miscellaneous duties, such as stamping tickets, weighing incoming sacks, cleaning and sweeping in workrooms, offices, and trucks where such work is not performed by regular cleaners.

"Organizational relationships: Reports to a foreman or other designated supervisor.

"(9) Position: Garageman—Level 3.

"Basic function: Performs a variety of routine services incidental to the proper maintenance of motor vehicles.

"Duties and responsibilities:

"(A) Lubricates trucks in accordance with lubrication charts and type of truck.

"(B) Changes crankcase oil and filter cleaners and cleans case in conformance with instructions and vehicle mileage.

"(C) Changes tires and makes necessary repairs.

"(D) Washes and steam-cleans trucks.

"(E) Assists automotive mechanics.

"(F) Fuels and oils trucks.

"(G) Cleans garage, garage office, swing room, and washroom, as assigned.

"Organizational relationships: Reports to a foreman of mechanics or other designated supervisor.

"(10) Position: Motor vehicle operator—Level 4.

"Basic function: Operates a mail truck on a regularly scheduled route to pick up and transport mail in bulk.

"Duties and responsibilities:

"(A) Picks up and delivers bulk quantities of mail at stations, branch offices, and terminal points; as required, picks up mail from collection boxes and deposits mail in relay boxes.

"(B) Operates truck in conformity with time schedules and rules of safety, and in accordance with instructions regarding the route for which responsible.

"(C) Ascertains the condition of the truck prior to leaving and upon returning to the garage; reports all accidents, mechanical defects noted, and mechanical failures while on route.

"(D) In addition, may perform any of the following duties:

"(i) Drives a tractor and semitrailer on occasion, unloading bagged mail and packages at post offices and picking up mail for delivery to a central point.

"(ii) Prepares daily trip reports showing work performed.

"(iii) Makes minor mechanical repairs to truck in emergencies while on route.

"Organizational relationships: Reports to a superintendent of motor vehicles or other designated supervisor.

"(11) Position: City or special carrier—Level 4.

"Basic function: Is responsible for the prompt and efficient delivery and collection of mail on foot or by vehicle under varying conditions in a prescribed area within a city. As a representative of the postal service, maintains pleasant and effective public relations with route patrons and others, requiring a general familiarity with postal laws, regulations, and procedures commonly used, and with the geography of the city.

"Duties and responsibilities:

"(A) Routes or cases all classes of mail in sequence of delivery along an established route. Rearranges and relabels cases as required by route adjustments and changes in deliveries.

"(B) Withdraws mail from the distribution case and prepares it in sequence

for efficient delivery by himself or a substitute along an established route. Prepares and separates all classes of mail to be carried by truck to relay boxes along route for subsequent delivery.

"(C) Enters change of address orders in change of address book and on appropriate form. Readdresses mail to be forwarded and marks for appropriate handling other mail addressed to route patrons who have moved. Sorts such mail into throw-back case for convenient handling by clerks.

"(D) Delivers mail along a prescribed route, on a regular schedule, picking up additional mail from relay boxes. Collects mail from street letter boxes and accepts letters for mailing from patrons. Such sevice may be rendered on foot or by vehicle and in some instances may consist exclusively of parcel post delivery or collection of mail.

"(E) Delivers and collects charges on customs, postage-due, and c. o. d. mail matter. Delivers and obtains receipts for registered and certain insured mail. Receipts for such matter, except insured mail, at the post office before beginning route and accounts for it upon return by payments of the amounts collected and delivery of receipts taken.

"(F) Deposits mail collected in the post office upon return from route; faces such mail for stamp cancellation.

"(G) Checks, and corrects if necessary, mailing cards presented by advertisers bearing names and addresses of patrons or former patrons of the route.

"(H) Furnishes patrons with postal information when requested, and provides change of address cards and other postal forms as requested.

"(I) Reports to supervisor all unusual incidents or conditions relating to mail delivery, including condition of street letter boxes and timecards.

"(J) Regular city carriers assigned to foot delivery routes are required to become proficient in the casing of mail on at least one other foot delivery route.

"(K) Substitute city carriers may be assigned to perform clerical duties and may be required to pass examinations on schemes of city primary distribution.

"(L) Special-delivery carriers receive special-delivery mail for delivery and sign c. o. d. and registered items at post office before beginning route; deliver on foot and by vehicle special-delivery mail to patrons; obtain signatures when required; collect amounts and fees on c. o. d.'s; in case of absent patrons, exercise judgment in determining whether to leave mail or leave notice and return mail to post office; return receipts and moneys collected to authorized personnel at post office.

"(M) In addition, may perform any of the following duties:

"(i) Checks hotels and other such establishments to insure that mail for residents undeliverable as addressed is not improperly held.

"(ii) Delivers stamps or other paper supplies to contract or classified stations.

"(iii) Serves at carriers' delivery window.

"(iv) Receives and registers, where practical, all letters and packages of first-class matter properly offered for registration and gives receipt therefor.

"(v) Makes delivery on other routes as assigned.

"Organizational relationships: Reports to a postmaster or assistant postmaster, or other designated supervisor.

"(12) Position: Distribution clerk—Level 4.

Basic function: Separates mail in a post office, terminal, airmail field, or other postal facility in accordance with established schemes, including incoming or outgoing mail or both.

"Duties and responsibilities:

"(A) Makes primary and one or more secondary distributions of incoming mail by delivery point (for example, classified or contract station or branch or other delivery unit, general delivery, lockboxes, rural or star route, or city carrier route) based on a knowledge of the distribution scheme established for that office.

"(B) Makes primary and one or more secondary distributions of outgoing mail for dispatch (for example, by city, State, region, train, highway or railway post office, or airmail flight) based on a knowledge of the distribution scheme prescribed by the Postal Transportation Service.

"(C) In addition, may perform any of the following duties:

"(i) Maintains records of mails.

"(ii) Examines balances in advance deposit accounts.

"(iii) Faces and cancels mail.

"(iv) Ties mail and inserts facing slips.

"(v) Opens and dumps pouches and sacks.

"(vi) Operates canceling machines.

"(vii) Records and bills mail (for example, c. o. d., registered, and so forth) requiring special service.

"(viii) Renders service at public windows.

"Organizational relationships: Reports to a foreman or other designated supervisor.

"(13) Position: Window clerk—Level 4.

"Basic function: Performs a variety of services at a public window of a post office or post office branch or station. As a representative of the postal service, maintains pleasant and effective public relations with patrons and others requiring a general familiarity with postal laws, regulations, and procedures commonly used.

"Duties and responsibilities:

"(A) Sells postage stamps, stamped paper, cards, internal revenue stamps, migratory bird stamps, and postal savings stamps and certificates.

"(B) Accepts from and, after proper identification, delivers to patrons parcel post, insured, c. o. d., and registered mail; makes collection of required postage, issues necessary receipts, and issues general delivery mail to patrons.

"(C) Verifies second-, third-, and fourth-class mailings, computing and maintaining on a current basis mailers' credit balances.

"(D) Assigns special delivery and registered mail for delivery.

"(E) Checks and sets post office stamp-vending machines, postage meters, and large mailers' stamp permit meters.

"(F) Receives, follows up, and recommends action on patrons' claims and complaints.

"(G) Issues and cashes foreign and domestic money orders and postal savings certificates.

"(H) Rents post office boxes, receives rental payments, conducts reference checks, and completes related forms.

"(I) Provides information to the public concerning postal regulations, mailing restrictions, rates, and other matters involving postal transactions.

"(J) In addition, may perform any of the following duties:

"(i) Makes emergency carrier relays.

"(ii) Assists in alien registration and census matters.

"(iii) Separates and distributes mail.

"Organizational relationships: Reports to a postmaster, assistant postmaster, or other designated supervisor.

"(14) Position: Automotive mechanic—Level 5.

"Basic function: Repairs mail trucks, including the removal and installation of complete motors, clutches, transmissions, and other major component parts.

"Duties and responsibilities:

"(A) Diagnoses mechanical and operating difficulties of vehicles, repairing defects, replacing worn or broken parts.

"(B) Adjusts and tunes up engines, cleaning fuel pumps, carburetors, and radiators; regulates timing, and makes other necessary adjustments to maintain in proper operating condition trucks that are in service.

"(C) Repairs or replaces automotive electrical equipment such as generators, starters, ignition systems, distributors, and wiring; installs and sets new spark plugs.

"(D) Conducts road tests of vehicles after repairs, noting performance of engine, clutch, transmission, brakes, and other parts.

"(E) Operates standard types of modern garage testing equipment.

"(F) In addition, may perform any of the following duties:

"(i) Removes, disassembles, reassembles, and installs entire engines.

"(ii) Overhauls transmission, rear end assemblies, and braking systems.

"(iii) Straightens frames and axles, welding broken parts where required.

"(iv) Makes road calls to make emergency repairs.

"(v) Makes required truck inspections.

"Organizational relationships: Reports to a foreman of mechanics or other designated supervisor.

"(15) Position: Transfer clerk—Level 5.

"Basic function: Arranges for transfer of mail at junction points between trains and other mail units and observes the separation, loading and unloading of mail by railroad employees to make certain that this is done properly.

"Duties and responsibilities:

"(A) Provides for the most expeditious transfer of mail from observations of the operation of trains, star route, or mail messenger vehicles, Government-owned vehicles and platform vehicles.

"(B) Examines outgoing and incoming cars to determine maximum utilization of space and proper adherence to railroad safety requirements; reports findings, when necessary, to the district superintendent.

"(C) Decides whether outbound cars in full authorizations should be held beyond the first available dispatches in order to obtain fuller loading and maximum utilization of the space paid for, making certain that this will not unduly delay the arrival of the mail at destination.

"(D) Studies the routing and loading of mail dispatched from his station in storage cars in order to recommend changes which would bring about economies in line haul and terminal charges and effect earlier arrival. Gives similar attention to incoming mail to assure that dispatching divisions are using best routing and loading methods; reports facts to the district superintendent.

"(E) Maintains close liaison with foremen of appropriate incoming and outgoing trains and vehicles to assure prompt receipt and expeditious dispatch of mail.

"(F) Keeps informed on local holding orders for each outgoing dispatch and requests that departure of unit within these limitations be withheld when scheduled connections are delayed.

"(G) Prepares list of railroad cars (except railway post office cars) in which mail is loaded, and maintains record of mail loaded and unloaded in outgoing and incoming trains. Serves notice on railroad company to cancel operation and purchases lesser storage unit in its place when necessary. Prepares official diagram and appropriately labels outgoing cars to indicate destination or next relay point.

"(H) Inspects the loading and unloading of storage mail to secure individual piece count of lesser storage units (30 feet and less); estimates volume when more than 30 feet.

"(I) Observes and reports to designated supervisor any failure of the railroad company to afford protection for the mail.

"(J) Qualifies periodically through examination on knowledge of distributing schemes, postal regulations, space rules, and train connections.

"(K) In addition, may perform any of the following duties:

"(i) Receipts for, transfers, and delivers registered mail between trains or between train and post office.

"(ii) Distributes mail prescribed for distribution in transfer office.

"Organizational relationships: Reports to a foreman or other designated supervisor.

"(16) Position: Distribution Clerk, R. P. O. or H. P. O.—Level 5.

"Basic function: Distributes mail in railway or highway post office prior to departure and while en route.

"Duties and responsibilities:

"(A) Determines the fastest or most expeditious dispatch of mail from the standpoint of assignment. In emergencies, such as floods, storms, wrecks, strikes, and missed connections, redistributes the mail so as to reach destination by the most expeditious alternative means, for example, by other railway post office or highway post office, air mail route, or star route.

"(B) Distributes mail rapidly into letter case or pouches and sacks.

"(C) Hangs pouches and sacks in racks and places labels in holders provided; labels letter cases in accordance with official diagram.

"(D) Prepares mail for dispatch, involving labeling and tying of letter mail in packages for distribution in pouches, closing and locking sacks and pouches, and maintenance of proper separations for connections en route.

"(E) In addition, may perform any of the following duties:

"(i) Receives and dispatches mail en route.

"(ii) Unloads mail and equipment at terminal of run.

"(iii) Examines car to ascertain that no mail is left.

"(iv) Convoys registered mail to post office and connecting lines.

"(F) qualifies through examination periodically on knowledge of distributing schemes, postal regulations, space rules, and train schedules.

"Organizational relationships: Reports to a foreman in charge of the railway post office car or highway post office.

"(17) Position: Claims clerk, paying office—Level 5.

"Basic function: Examines claims for loss or damage of insured or c. o. d. mail matter and determines and approves for payment the amount found to be due under postal regulations.

"Duties and responsibilities:

"(A) Receives and reviews prescribed claim papers to ascertain whether:

"(i) All necessary items of the appropriate claim form have been properly completed.

"(ii) Proof of value has been properly determined.

"(iii) Appropriate check has been made of applicable records.

"(iv) Other necessary information has been supplied.

"(B) Determines whether amount of claim exceeds amount of loss and the proper amount payable is within the limits of the indemnity.

"(C) Conducts necessary correspondence in connection with the claim.

"(D) Approves amount to be paid, and directs disposition of damaged articles.

"(E) Maintains prescribed record of claims.

"Organizational relationships: Reports to an assistant postmaster or other designated supervisor.

"(18) Position: Postmaster, small third-class office—Level 5.

"Basic function: Is responsible for all operations of a small third-class post office, including actual performance of mail processing and window service, disbursement of funds and preparation of required reports. This office has no employees other than the postmaster and a replacement to serve during his leave; has annual receipts of approximately $1,700; has no rural delivery service within its jurisdiction.

"Duties and responsibilities:

"(A) Conducts the activities of the office in such manner as to provide prompt and efficient postal service to the patrons of the office.

"(B) Maintains direct contact with the public and gives personal attention to complaints.

"(C) Sorts incoming mail for boxholders and general delivery; faces, cancels, sorts by destination, ties and sacks outgoing mail.

"(D) At a window delivers general delivery mail, issues and cashes money orders, delivers c. o. d. and customs mail, accepts and delivers parcel post, registered and insured mail, sells stamps and stamped paper, and collects box rents.

"(E) Prepares and submits estimates of operating allowances as required.

"(F) Makes deposits of accountable funds; requisitions stamps and stamped paper; requisitions supplies; pays authorized bills.

"(G) Maintains required office records; prepares and submits necessary reports in accordance with instructions.

"(H) Maintains files for the office.

"Organizational relationships: Administratively responsible to a district manager.

"(19) Position: Claims clerk, common and contract carriers—Level 6.

"Basic function: Audits carriers' claims for the transportation of mail to insure their accuracy and correctness of form prior to certifying them for payment.

"Duties and responsibilities:

"(A) Checks original or draft of claims submitted by carriers using space procurement data, records of air carrier flights and weight allocations, reports of railroad space utilization, emergency space procured, and other pertinent reports and data submitted by the districts.

"(B) Corrects errors in drafts of claims and returns them to the carrier for resubmission in final corrected form.

"(C) Expedites the processing of claims by continuous coordination with the carriers to minimize the incidence of error on claims submitted.

"(D) Rechecks resubmitted claims prior to certifying them for payment.

"(E) Maintains records pertinent to carrier claims such as unscheduled air carrier flights, weight allocations for mail on flights of air carriers, and air line flight schedules.

"(F) Accumulates data and prepares periodic and special reports on subjects related to the purchase and use of railroad space, and air carrier weight allocation.

"Organizational relationships: Reports to the supervisor in charge of the fiscal section in a Postal Transportation Service division office or other designated supervisor.

"(20) Position: Postmaster, third-class office—Level 6.

"Basic function: Is responsible for all operations of a third-class post office, including actual performance of mail processing and window services, disbursement of funds and preparation of required reports. This office has one part-time clerical employee; has annual receipts of approximately $4,700; has no rural delivery service within its jurisdiction.

"Duties and responsibilities:

"(A) Supervises and conducts the activities of the office in order to provide prompt and efficient postal service to patrons.

"(B) Maintains direct contact with the public and gives personal attention to complaints.

"(C) Appoints personnel to serve in the post office within the limits prescribed by departmental and civil service regulations.

"(D) Sorts incoming mail for boxholders and general delivery; faces, cancels, sorts by destination, ties and sacks outgoing mail.

"(E) At a window delivers general delivery mail, issues and cashes money orders, delivers c. o. d. and customs mail, accepts and delivers parcel post, registered and insured mail, sells stamps and stamped paper, and collects box rents.

"(F) Makes required deposits of accountable funds; requisitions stamps and stamped paper; requisitions supplies; pays authorized bills and makes salary disbursements.

"(G) Prepares and submits annual estimates of manpower needs and operating allowances as required.

"(H) Maintains required office records; prepares and submits necessary reports in accordance with instructions.

"(I) Maintains files for the office.

"Organizational relationships: Administratively responsible to a district manager.

"(21) Position: Foreman, mails—Level 7

"Basic function: Supervises a group of employees engaged in carrying out assigned tasks connected with the processing of incoming or outgoing mail.

"Duties and responsibilities:

"(A) Lays out work for employees; insures attendance to duties and proper performance of assignments; shifts employees from one assignment to another to meet fluctuations in workload; answers questions respecting work progress.

"(B) Trains new employees and provides continuous on-the-job training for all employees under his supervision.

"(C) Reports unusual difficulties to a general foreman and suggests solutions. Personally resolves problems of a routine nature.

"(D) Keeps required records for such matters as time, mail on hand, and mail processed.

"(E) Recommends personnel actions respecting subordinates; maintains morale among the employees in the group; adjusts complaints; supplies leadership necessary to secure maximum interest and effort from men and promotes cooperation and harmony.

"Organizational relationships: Administratively responsible to a general foreman or other designated superior. Supervises approximately 20 or more employees.

"(22) Position: Postmaster, third-class office—Level 7

"Basic function: Is responsible for all operations of a third-class post office, including actual participation in processing of mail and window services, disbursement of funds and preparation of required reports. This office has two clerical employees and annual receipts of approximately $6,000, and rural delivery service within its jurisdiction.

"Duties and responsibilities:

"(A) Supervises the activities of the office in order to provide expeditious handling of the mails, and efficient and courteous postal service to patrons.

"(B) Maintains direct contact with the public and gives personal attention to complaints.

"(C) Appoints personnel to serve in the post office within the limits prescribed by Department and Civil Service Regulations; selects personnel and trains them in their respective positions.

"(D) Directs the activities of employees; arranges working schedules of employees and is responsible for the administration of the Efficiency Appraisal System.

"(E) Distributes incoming mail for carrier delivery, boxholders and general delivery; faces, cancels, distributes, ties and sacks outgoing mail; performs general delivery window services; issues and cashes money orders; delivers c. o. d. and customs mail; accepts and delivers parcel post, registered and insured mail; sells stamps, stamped paper, savings bonds, postal savings stamps and certificates, migratory and documentary stamps, and collects box rents.

"(F) Checks financial accountability of employees in accordance with existing instructions; makes daily deposits of accountable funds in local bank; obtains bids for proposed purchases; requisitions supplies; issues checks for employees' salaries and other official disbursements.

"(G) Prepares annual estimates of manpower needs and operating allowances for submission as required.

"(H) Prepares reports of a recurring nature, reflecting various transactions of the office, such as personnel salary summaries, retirement and withholding tax data, cost estimates, money order and bond summaries and schedules of disbursement.

"(I) Maintains all files for the office.

"Organizational relationships: Administratively responsible to a district manager.

"(23) General foreman: R. P. O.—Level 8.

"Basic function: Directs mail service operations in a railway post office train with two or more authorized cars. Supervises a crew of foremen and clerks whose primary function is the distribution and exchange of mails en route.

"Duties and responsibilities:

"(A) Provides for the proper distribution, exchange, and dispatch of mail regularly assigned for handling in the railway post office cars. Makes decisions concerning the most expeditious dispatch, rerouting and utilization of alternative connections involving irregularly received mail and also in emergency situations.

"(B) Directs mail service operations in the railway post office train including:

"(i) Rapid distribution of all classes of mail in accordance with official diagrams and via most advantageous routing.

"(ii) Handling, recording, and protection of registered mails.

"(iii) Makeup and exchange of mail at intermediate and terminal offices.

"(iv) Proper utilization of space in each railway post office car with relation to other storage space in train and, except as charged to transfer clerks, for proper handling of all storage mail in train.

"(v) Loading and unloading of railway post office cars to assure maximum use of available storage space without additional cost.

"(vi) Proper usage of mail equipment and supplies.

"(vii) Maintenance of distribution schemes and schedules of mail routes in corrected condition.

"(C) Supervises the activities of foremen and clerks in the cars and reassigns them to various duties as may be required to complete maximum distribution. Instructs clerks on proper practices and procedures and reports failures to meet operating standards to the district superintendent.

"(D) Inspects condition of railway post office cars and reports to the railroad company unsatisfactory situations.

"(E) Completes trip report form covering service operations, including particulars of train operation, roster of clerks on duty, mails received, worked, and dispatched, and mails not worked; prepares a list of all cars on train in which mail is carried, a record of the mail, and a report of any irregularities in service. Observes and reports to district superintendent any failure of the railroad company to afford protection to the mail.

"(F) May personally distribute letter mail for one or more States, and maintain record of pouches received and dispatched.

"Organizational relationships: Administratively responsible to a district superintendent or other designated superior. Directs, through one or more subordinate foremen, clerks assigned to the run.

"(24) Position: Assistant Postmaster, small first-class post office—Level 8.

"Basic function: Serves as the overall assistant to the postmaster, providing general direction and supervision over mails, finance, personnel, and other related activities. This office has approximately 16 employees, annual receipts of approximately $63,000, and 8 carrier routes within its jurisdiction.

"Duties and responsibilities:

"(A) Participates in the organization and management of the office to insure expeditious handling of the mails and to provide courteous and efficient service to patrons.

"(B) Reviews and evaluates recommendations referred to the postmaster by subordinates with respect to promotions and disciplining of post office personnel; generally oversees the training of all personnel for their respective positions.

"(C) Directs a continuous audit program concerning the accountability of responsible finance employees of the office.

"(D) Reviews estimates of manpower needs and operating allowances for action of the postmaster.

"(E) Analyzes and reports to the postmaster the daily manpower expenditures and is responsible through designated subordinates for maintaining proper apportionment of authorized allowances to operating units.

"(F) Gives assistance and direction to key subordinate employees in planning and executing the mail handling, finance, and administrative programs of the post office.

"(G) Reviews reports and recommendations of subordinates and attends to administrative matters essential to the management of the post office.

"(H) Represents the postmaster in relationships with the public in the area, including representation with employee organizations.

"(I) May personally handle window transactions and perform work elsewhere in the office as the workload requires.

"(J) Assumes complete responsibility and authority for the post office in the postmaster's absence and at other times as required.

"Organizational relationships: Administratively responsible to the postmaster.

"(25) Position: Postmaster, second-class office—Level 8.

"Basic function: Is responsible for all operations of a second-class post office, including actual participation in processing of mail and window services, disbursement of funds and preparation of required reports. This office has approximately six employees, annual receipts of approximately $16,000, and has rural delivery service within its jurisdiction.

"Duties and responsibilities:

"(A) Supervises and coordinates the activities of the office in order to provide expeditious handling of the mails, and efficient and courteous postal service to patrons.

"(B) Maintains direct contact with the public on administrative matters and gives personal attention to complaints.

"(C) Appoints personnel to serve in the post office within the limits prescribed by Departmental and Civil Service Regulations; selects personnel and trains them in their respective positions.

"(D) Directs the activities of employees: arranges working schedules of employees; recommends promotions of employees; is responsible for the administration of the Efficiency Appraisal System.

"(E) Distributes incoming mail for carrier delivery, boxholders and general delivery; faces, cancels, distributes, ties and sacks outgoing mail; performs general delivery window service; issues and cashes money orders; delivers c. o. d. and customs mails; accepts and delivers parcel post, registered and insured mail; sells stamps, stamped paper, savings bonds, postal savings stamps and certificates, migratory and documentary stamps, and collects box rents.

"(F) Checks financial accountability of employees in accordance with existing instructions; makes daily deposits of accountable funds in local bank; obtains bids for proposed purchases; requisitions supplies; issues checks for employees' salaries and other official disbursements.

"(G) Prepares annual estimates of manpower needs and operating allowances for submission as required.

"(H) Prepares reports of a recurring nature, reflecting various transactions of the office, such as personnel salary summaries, retirement and withholding tax data, cost estimates, money order and bond summaries, and schedules of disbursement.

"(I) Maintains all files for the office.

"Organizational relationships: Administratively responsible to a district manager.

"(26) Position: General foreman, mails—Level 9.

"Basic function: Directs foremen in the distribution of all or part of incoming mails, outgoing mails, or both, at a first-class post office.

"Duties and responsibilities:

"(A) Lays out work for foremen at the beginning of a tour and issues instructions.

"(B) Oversees work in progress to prevent accumulation of mail.

"(C) Insures that mail is distributed in accordance with established orders and instructions.

"(D) Shifts men from one foreman to another to keep mails moving.

"(E) Reports difficulties and suggests corrective measures to superior.

"(F) Maintains required records.

"(G) Assures that adequate on-the-job training is carried out to promote employee proficiency.

"(H) Reviews and forwards recommendations of foremen respecting discipline, promotions, or changes in assignments; approves time and leave requests; submits manpower estimates.

"Organizational relationships: Administratively responsible to a superintendent or assistant superintendent or other designated superior. Directs, through approximately four foremen, employees as assigned.

"(27) Position: Postmaster, small first-class office—Level 9.

"Basic function: Is responsible for all operations of a first-class post office, including direction and supervision of mails, finance, personnel, and other related activities. This office has approxmately 16 employees, annual receipts of approximately $63,000, and city delivery service consisting of 8 carrier routes within its jurisdiction.

"Duties and responsibilities:

"(A) Organizes the post office to insure expeditious handling of mails and to provide courteous and efficient service to the patrons.

"(B) Maintains direct contact with the public on administrative matters and gives personal attention to complaints.

"(C) Appoints personnel to serve in the post office within the limits prescribed by Departmental and Civil Service Regulations; determines that personnel are carefully selected and adequately trained for their respective positions.

"(D) Directs the activities of employees; arranges working schedules of employees; recommends promotions of employees and is responsible for the proper administration of the Efficiency Appraisal System.

"(E) Checks financial accountability of employees in accordance with existing instructions; makes daily deposits of accountable funds in local bank; obtains bids for proposed purchases; requisitions supplies.

"(F) Prepares annual estimates of manpower needs and operating allowances for submission as required.

"(G) Prepares reports of a recurring nature, reflecting various transactions of the post office; submits postmaster's accounts with supporting vouchers and documents in accordance with existing instructions.

"(H) Advertises for bids for various services, including contract stations, vehicular service, mail messenger service, and vehicular maintenance service, and submits bids, with recommendations, as required.

"(I) Directs the maintenance of files for the office.

"(J) May personally handle window transactions and perform work elsewhere in the office as the workload requires.

"Organizational relationships: Administratively responsible to a district manager.

"(28) Position: Building superintendent—Level 10.

"Basic function: Directs the janitorial, maintenance, and operating services of a large post-office building and branches and stations covering an aggregate area of approximately 700,000 square feet, including security, heating and ventilating, mechanical and electrical equipment, and elevator services.

"Duties and responsibilities:

"(A) Plans and prepares work schedules and supervises the custodial forces in cleaning, heating, guarding, operating, and repairing the post office building and equipment.

"(B) Makes frequent inspections to determine maintenance needs of the building and equipment, and to determine the efficiency of the janitorial and maintenance force.

"(C) Prepares and answers correspondence relating to custodial service.

"(D) Plans and supervises maintenance or alteration work under contract.

"(E) Supervises the office force in the preparation of vouchers, requisitions and reports incidental to custodial service, and in the maintenance of required accounts and records.

"(F) Recommends transfers, promotions, and disciplinary measures for custodial personnel.

"(G) Inspects mechanical equipment to determine repair needs and adherence to standards of preventive maintenance.

"Organizational relationships: Administratively responsible to the postmaster or other designated superior. Directs through a general foreman of laborers and a chief engineer, approximately 100 employees, including electricians and other skilled trades.

"(29) Position: Postmaster, first-class office—Level 10.

"Basic function: Is responsible for all operations of a first-class post office, including direction and supervision of mails, finance, personnel, and other related activities. This office has approximately 27 employees, annual receipts of $129,000, and 11 city delivery and rural carrier routes within its jurisdiction.

"Duties and responsibilities:

"(A) Organizes the post office to insure expeditious handling of mails and to provide courteous and efficient service to the patrons.

"(B) Maintains direct contact with the public on administrative matters and gives personal attention to complaints.

"(C) Appoints all personnel to serve in the post office within the limits prescribed by Departmental and Civil Service Regulations; determines that all personnel are carefully selected and adequately trained for their respective positions.

"(D) Directs the activities of all employees; supervises arrangement of working schedules of employees; recommends promotions of employees; and is responsible for the proper administration of the Efficiency Appraisal System.

"(E) Checks financial accountability of employees in accordance with existing instructions; makes daily deposits of accountable funds in local bank; obtains bids for proposed purchases; requisitions supplies.

"(F) Prepares annual estimates of manpower needs and operating allowances for submission as required.

"(G) Prepares reports of a recurring nature, reflecting various transactions of the post office; submits postmaster's accounts with supporting vouchers and documents in accordance with existing instructions.

"(H) Advertises for bids for various services, including contract stations, vehicular service, mail messenger service, and vehicular maintenance service, and submits bids, with recommendations, as required.

"(I) Directs the maintenance of files for the office.

"(J) May personally handle window transactions and perform work elsewhere in the office as the workload requires.

"Organizational relationships: Administratively responsible to a district manager.

"(30) Position: Tour superintendent, incoming or outgoing mails—Level 11.

"Basic function: Directs general foremen in the distribution of incoming mails or outgoing mails on a tour at a large first-class post office.

"Duties and responsibilities:

"(A) Provides for the prompt and complete operation of a tour activity, such as incoming mails, outgoing mails, or all first- and third-class outgoing mails.

"(B) Reassigns employees as necessary to meet peakload demands; provides direction to subordinate foremen, coordinating the portions of work assigned to them.

"(C) Answers questions of subordinate foremen regarding operating problems; refers policy questions to his superior with appropriate recommendations.

"(D) Reviews requests for personnel actions by subordinate foremen, recommending final action to superior.

"(E) Reviews estimates of manpower required, consolidating for recommendation to superior.

"Organizational relationships: Administratively responsible to an assistant superintendent of mails or other designated superior. Directs, through general foremen, employees assigned to the tour.

"(31) Position: Postmaster, first-class office—Level 11.

"Basic function: Is responsible for all operations of a first-class post office, including direction and supervision of mails, finance, personnel, and other related activities. This office has approximately 53 employees, annual receipts of $314,000, 6 Government-owned vehicle units, no classified stations, and 25 city and rural delivery routes within its jurisdiction.

"Duties and responsibilities:

"(A) Organizes the post office to insure expeditious handling of mails and to provide courteous and efficient service to the patrons.

"(B) Maintains direct contact with the public on administrative matters and gives personal attention to complaints.

"(C) Appoints personnel to serve in the post office within the limits prescribed by Departmental and Civil Service Regulations; determines that personnel are carefully selected and adequately trained for their respective positions.

"(D) Directs the activities of all employees; supervises arrangement of working schedules of employees; recommends promotions of employees and is responsible for the proper administration of the Efficiency Appraisal System.

"(E) Checks financial accountability of employees in accordance with existing instructions; makes daily deposits of accountable funds in local bank; obtains bids for proposed purchases; requisitions supplies.

"(F) Prepares annual estimates of manpower needs and operating allowances for submission as required.

"(G) Prepares numerous reports of a recurring nature, reflecting various transactions of the post office; submits postmaster's accounts with supporting vouchers and documents in accordance with existing instructions.

"(H) Advertises for bids for various services, including contract stations, vehicular service, mail messenger service, and vehicular maintenance service, and submits bids, with recommendations, as required.

"(I) Directs the maintenance of files for the office.

"(J) May personally handle window transactions and perform work elsewere in the office as the workload requires.

"Organizational relationships: Administratively responsible to a district manager.

"(32) Position: Postal inspector—Level 12.

"Basic function: Is responsible in an assigned territory, usually including all classes of post offices, for inspection and investigative programs covering all phases of the postal service. In heavily populated areas may be assigned a majority of the time to selected types of work as determined by the inspector-in-charge.

"Duties and responsibilities.—Assigned Territory:

"(A) Inspects post offices and related postal units to insure compliance with postal laws and regulations, protection and proper expenditure of postal revenues and appropriated funds, and evaluates and reports to administrative officials on operational efficiency.

"(B) Maintains close working relationship with regional officials and submits to them factual information and recommendations on conditions and needs of the postal service; acts as counselor to postmasters and other postal officials and employees in explaining instructions, regulations, applicable laws and decisions.

"(C) Investigates violations of postal laws, including, but not limited to, armed robbery, mailing of bombs, burglary, theft of mail, embezzlements, obscene literature and pictures, and mail fraud.

"(D) Determines the validity and seriousness of charges against postmasters and other officers and employees and makes pertinent recommendations.

"(E) Investigates local and area operating problems and recommends corrective action, and within his prescribed jurisdiction, initiates necessary corrective acton, including restoration of service immediately in disaster areas caused by hurricanes, tornadoes, floods, and other catastrophes.

"(F) Maintains liaison activities (i) with military installations to insure adequate postal service for the military forces; (ii) with Federal and State civil defense authorities at the area level; (iii) with branches of Federal and State law enforcement agencies.

"(G) Ascertains postal needs for post offices and stations, rural and city delivery, changes in schedules, quarters, equipment, manpower, and procedures and reports findings and recommendations to appropriate officials.

"Selected cases:

"(H) Investigates the loss, theft, destruction, and damage to mail matter through technical analyses of complaints and other specialized procedures.

"(I) Investigates money-order forgeries; investigates complaints of use of the mails to defraud and to operate lotteries.

"(J) Investigates personal injuries, motor-vehicle and other accidents; develops evidence for defense of suits under the so-called Federal Tort Claims Act; recommends out-of-court settlements.

"(K) In any criminal investigation, develops evidence, locates witnesses and suspects; apprehends and effects arrests of postal offenders, presents facts to United States attorney, and collaborates as required

with Federal and State prosecutors in presentation before United States commissioner, grand jury, and trial court.

"(L) Surveys postal service on an area basin to ascertain and recommend ways of improving service and effecting economies.

"(M) Makes investigations of a variety of other matters and performs related duties as assigned.

"Organizational relationships: Responsible to the inspector-in-charge or the assistant inspector-in-charge of the division. Supervises trainees and other inspectors as assigned.

"(33) Position: Postmaster, first-class office—Level 12.

"Basic function: Is responsible for all operations of a first-class post office, including direction and supervision of mails, finance, buildings, personnel, and related services. This office has approximately 72 employees, annual receipts of $797,000, 6 Government-owned vehicle units, no classified stations, and 17 carrier routes within its jurisdiction.

"Duties and responsibilities:

"(A) Organizes the post office to insure expeditious handling of the mails and to provide efficient and courteous postal service to patrons.

"(B) Represents the Post Office Department in its relationships with the public in the area.

"(C) Appoints personnel to serve in the post office within the limits prescribed by Departmental and Civil Service Regulations; determines that personnel are carefully selected and adequately trained in their respective positions.

"(D) Supervises the administration of the Efficiency Appraisal System and is responsible for maintaining satisfactory employee relations with representatives of employee organizations and individual employees.

"(E) Reviews estimates of manpower needs and operating allowances, submits requests and recommendations as required, and determines that operations are efficiently carried out and expenditures authorized in accordance with approved estimates.

"(F) Provides for the safeguarding of all moneys, the operation and maintenance of equipment and other facilities of the post office, and for the expenditure of funds in accordance with applicable laws and regulations.

"(G) Approves requisitions for supplies and equipment submitted by operating officials of the post office for submission to the Supply Center or the Department.

"Organizational relationships: Administratively responsible to a district manager.

"(34) Position: Station superintendent, large classified station—Level 13.

"Basic function: Directs the operations of a large classified station, including the distribution, delivery, and dispatch of mail and all required window services to the public.

"Duties and responsibilities:

"(A) Plans and supervses the distribution of incoming and outgoing mails, the delivery service, including special delivery, and the dispatch of outgoing mail.

"(B) Supervises services to the public at windows, including sales of stamps and stamped paper, money orders, postal savings stamps and certificates, migratory and documentary stamps, registry and issuance of mail; handling of c. o. d. items; general delivery and box mail.

"(C) Supervises city and rural carriers and determines that delivery schedules are maintained; consults in the adjustment and establishment of routes to reflect changes in volume, patronage, or population; and recommends establishment or changes in location of collection boxes.

"(D) Directs and maintains required records for personnel of station; verifies and approves timecards for payroll purposes; makes manpower estimates and reports; trains new supervisors and employees in various aspects of station operations.

"(E) Requisitions supplies and equipment, stamps, stamped paper, and accountable forms from main post office, reissuing to subordinates as required. Is responsible for entire fixed credit of station and for operation within the allowance granted.

"(F) Maintains effective relations with large mailers and the public; simplifies handling of mail, and takes appropriate action to meet complaints.

"(G) In addition, may perform any of the following duties:

"(i) Supervises the cleaning and custodial maintenance of the station building.

"(ii) Makes necessary arrangements for special services such as alien registrations, special census reports, or handling of special purpose mailing.

"Organizational relationships: Administratively responsible to a superintendent of mails or other designated superior. Directs, through subordinate supervisors, approximately 1,000 or more employees.

"(35) Position: Assistant postmaster, first-class office—Level 13.

"Basic function: Serves as the overall assistant to the postmaster, particularly on internal operations, and provides general direction over the mails, finance, administrative, and service functions of the post office. The office has approximately 450 employees, annual receipts of $2,700,000, 50 Government-owned vehicle units, 1 classified station or branch, and 130 carrier routes within its jurisdiction.

"Duties and responsibilities:

"(A) Participates in the organization and management of the office to insure expeditious handling of the mails and to provide courteous and efficient service to patrons.

"(B) Reviews and evaluates recommendations referred to the postmaster by subordinates with respect to promotions and disciplining of post-office personnel; generally oversees the training of all personnel for their respective positions.

"(C) Directs a continuous audit program concerning the accountability of responsible finance employees of the office.

"(D) Reviews estimates of manpower needs and operating allowances for action of the postmaster.

"(E) Analyzes and reports to the postmaster the daily manpower expenditures and is responsible through designated subordinates for maintaining proper apportionment of authorized allowances to operating units.

"(F) Gives assistance and direction to key subordinate officials in planning and executing the mail handling, finance, and administrative programs of the post office.

"(G) Reviews reports and recommendations of subordinates and attends to administrative matters essential to the management of the post office.

"(H) Represents the postmaster in relationships with the public in the area, including representation with employee organizations.

"(I) Carries out special assignments for and as directed by the postmaster.

"(J) Assumes complete responsibility and authority for the post office in the postmaster's absence and at other times as required.

"Organizational relationship: Administratively responsible to the postmaster.

"(36) Position: Postmaster, first-class office—Level 13.

"Basic function: Is responsible for all operations of a first-class post office, including the direction and supervision of mails, finance, buildings, personnel, and related services in the main post office, stations, and branches. This office has approximately 180 employees, annual receipts of $1 million, 21 Government-owned vehicle units, 3 classified stations, and 65 carrier routes within its jurisdiction.

"Duties and responsibilities:

"(A) Organize the post office to insure expeditious handling of the mails and to provide efficient and courteous postal service to patrons.

"(B) Represents the Post Office Department in its relationships with the public in the area.

"(C) Appoints personnel to serve in the post office within the limits prescribed by Departmental and Civil Service Regulations; determines that personnel are carefully selected and adequately trained for their respective positions.

"(D) Supervises the administration of the Efficiency Appraisal System and is responsible for maintaining satisfactory employee relations with representatives of employee organizations and individual employees.

"(E) Reviews estimates of manpower needs and operating allowances, submits requests and recommendations as required, and determines that operations are efficiently carried out and expenditures authorized in accordance with approved estimates.

"(F) Provides for the safeguarding of all moneys, the operation and maintenance of equipment and other facilities of the post office, and for the expenditure of funds in accordance with applicable laws and regulations.

"(G) Approves requisitions for supplies and equipment submitted by operating officials of the post office for submission to the Supply Center or the Department.

"Organizational relationships: Administratively responsible to a district manager.

"(37) Position: Assistant postmaster, first-class office—Level 14.

"Basic function: Serves as the overall assistant to the postmaster, particularly on internal operations, and provides general direction over the mails, finance, administrative, and service functions of the post office. This office has approximately 1,200 employees, annual receipts of $8,460,000, 117 Government-owned vehicle units, 16 classified stations and branches, and 290 carrier routes within its jurisdiction.

"Duties and responsibilities:

"(A) Participates in the organization and management of the office to insure expeditious handling of the mails and to provide courteous and efficient service to patrons.

"(B) Reviews and evaluates recommendations referred to the postmaster by subordinates with respect to promotions and disciplining of post office personnel; generally oversees the training of all personnel for their respective positions.

"(C) Directs a continuous audit program concerning the accountability of responsible finance employees of the office.

"(D) Reviews estimates of manpower needs and operating allowances for action of the postmaster.

"(E) Analyzes and reports to the postmaster the daily manpower expenditures and is responsible through designated subordinates for maintaining proper apportionment of authorized allowances to operating units.

"(F) Gives assistance and direction to key subordinate officials in planning and executing the mail handling, finance, and administrative programs of the post office.

"(G) Reviews reports and recommendations of subordinates and attends to administrative matters essential to the management of the post office.

"(H) Represents the postmaster in relationship with the public in the area, including representation with employee organizations.

"(I) Carries out special assignments for and as directed by the postmaster.

"(J) Assumes complete responsibility and authority for the post office in the postmaster's absence and at other times as required.

"Organizational relationships: Administratively responsible to the postmaster.

"(38) Position: Postmaster, first-class office—Level 14.

"Basic function: Is responsible for all operations of a first-class post office, including direction and supervision of mails, finance, buildings, personnel, and related services in the main post office, stations, and branches. This office has approximately 450 employees, annual receipts of $2,700,000, 50 Government-owned vehicle units, 1 classified station or branch, and 130 carrier routes within its jurisdiction.

"Duties and responsibilities:

"(A) Organizes the post office to insure expeditious handling of the mails and to provide courteous and efficient postal service to patrons.

"(B) Represents the Post Office Department in its relationships with the public in the area.

"(C) Appoints personnel to serve in the post office within the limits prescribed by departmental and civil-service regulations; determines that personnel are carefully selected and adequately trained in their respective positions.

"(D) Supervises the administration of the Efficiency Appraisal System and is responsible for maintaining satisfactory employee relations with representatives of employee organizations and individual employees.

"(E) Reviews estimates of manpower needs and operating allowances, submits requests and recommendations as required, and determines that operations are efficiently carried out and expenditures authorized in accordance with approved estimates.

"(F) Provides for the safeguarding of all moneys, the operation and maintenance of equipment and other facilities of the post office, and for the expenditure of funds in accordance with applicable laws and regulations.

"(G) Approves requisitions for supplies and equipment submitted by operating officials of the post office for submission to the supply center or the Department.

"Organizational relationships: Administratively responsible to a regional director or other designated superior.

"(39) Position: Assistant postmaster, first-class office—Level 15.

"Basic function: Serves as the overall assistant to the postmaster, particularly on internal operations, and provides general direction over the mails, finance, administrative and service functions of the post office. This office has approximately 3,200 employees, annual receipts of $16,900,000, 200 Government-owned vehicle units, 34 classified stations and branches, and 1,000 carrier routes within its jurisdiction.

"Duties and responsibilities:

"(A) Participates in the organization and management of the office to insure expeditious handling of the mails and to provide courteous and efficient service to patrons.

"(B) Reviews and evaluates recommendations referred to the postmaster by subordinates with respect to promotions and disciplining of post-office personnel; generally oversees the training of all personnel for their respective positions.

"(C) Directs a continuous audit program concerning the accountability of responsible finance employees of the office.

"(D) Reviews estimates of manpower needs and operating allowances for action of the postmaster.

"(E) Analyzes and reports to the postmaster the daily manpower expenditures and is responsible through designated subordinates for maintaining proper apportionment of authorized allowances to operating units.

"(F) Gives assistance and direction to key subordinate officials in planning and executing the mail handling, finance, and administrative programs of the post office.

"(G) Reviews reports and recommendations of subordinates and attends to administrative matters essential to the management of the post office.

"(H) Represents the postmaster in relationships with the public in the area, including representation with employee organizations.

"(I) Carries out special assignments for and as directed by the postmaster.

"(J) Assumes complete responsibility and authority for the post office in the postmaster's absence and at other times as required.

"Organizational relationships: Administratively responsible to the postmaster.

"(40) Position: Postmaster, first-class office—Level 15.

"Basic function: Is responsible for all operations of a first-class post office, including direction and supervision of mails, finance, buildings, personnel, and related services in the main post office, stations and branches. This office has approximately 700 employees, annual receipts of $4,470,000, 77 Government-owned vehicle units, 8 classified stations and branches, and 200 carrier routes within its jurisdiction.

"Duties and responsibilities:

"(A) Organizes the post office to insure expeditious handling of the mails and to provide courteous and efficient postal service to patrons.

"(B) Represents the Post Office Department in its relationships with the public in the area.

"(C) Appoints personnel to serve in the post office within the limits prescribed by departmental and civil-service regulations; determines that personnel are carefully selected and adequately trained in their respective positions.

"(D) Supervises the administration of the Efficiency Appraisal System and is responsible for maintaining satisfactory employee relations with representatives of employee organizations and individual employees.

"(E) Reviews estimates of manpower needs and operating allowances, submits requests and recommendations as required, and determines that operations are efficiently carried out and expenditures authorized in accordance with approved estimates.

"(F) Provides for the safeguarding of all moneys, the operation and maintenance of equipment and other facilities of the post office, and for the expenditure of funds in accordance with applicable laws and regulations.

"(G) Approves requisitions for supplies and equipment submitted by operating officials of the post office for submission to the supply center or the Department.

"Organizational relationships: Administratively responsible to a regional director or other designated superior.

"(41) Position: General Superintendent, PTS Division—Level 16.

Basic function: Directs all activities of a division of the Postal Transportation Service of average size and complexity in terms of numbers of employees and in expenditure of funds, or in terms of the importance of the mail gateways in the division, the volume and complexity of the mail-handling operations, and concentrations which create congestions. Is responsible for the transportation, transfer, distribution, and dispatch of mail in transit, and for the efficient and economical operation of the division.

"Duties and responsibilities:

"(A) Directs and coordinates the activities of subordinate district superintendents in planning and effectuating the transportation and processing of transit mail within, entering, or emanating from the division; confers with officials of commercial carriers regarding mail handling and transportation, schedules, security of mail in transit, and rates.

"(B) Provides, through his assistants, general supervision over the activities of the employees of the division. Establishes manpower controls, effective employee relations, and inspections of personnel activities, both informally and as required by regulations.

"(C) Exercises administrative control over the district superintendents and, through them, the constituent field units such as transfer offices, airmail fields, terminals, railway post-office lines, highway post-office lines, and contract carriers such as star routes and mail-messenger routes, and related operating units, maintains financial control of the division, reporting on expenditures and requirements as directed.

"(D) Maintains liaison with airlines, railroads, trucklines, and other contract carriers; contacts major publishers, mail-order houses, and other large-volume patrons with respect to mass-mailing problems.

"(E) Coordinates division activities with those of contiguous divisions and with other segments of the Post Office Department within the area.

"Organizational relationships: Administratively responsible to a regional director. Directs, through an assistant and district superintendents, up to 3,300 employees.

"(42) Position: Assistant postmaster, large first-class office—Level 16.

"Basic function: Serves as the overall assistant to the postmaster, particularly on internal operations, and provides general direction over the mails, finance, administrative, and service functions of the post office. This office has approximately 8,000 employees, annual receipts of $48 million, 400 Government-owned vehicle units, 50 classified stations and branches, and 1,400 carrier routes within its jurisdiction.

"Duties and responsibilities:

"(A) Participates in the organization and management of the office to insure expeditious handling of the mails and to provide courteous and efficient service to patrons.

"(B) Reviews and evaluates recommendations referred to the postmaster by subordinates with respect to promotions and disciplining of post-office personnel; generally oversees the training of all personnel for their respective positions.

"(C) Directs a continuous-audit program concerning the accountability of responsible finance employees of the office.

"(D) Reviews estimates of manpower needs and operating allowances for action of the postmaster.

"(E) Analyzes and reports to the postmaster the daily manpower expenditures and is responsible through designated subordinates for maintaining proper apportionment of authorized allowances to operating units.

"(F) Gives assistance and direction to key subordinate officials in planning and executing the mail handling, finance, and administrative programs of the post office.

"(G) Reviews reports and recommendations of subordinates and attends to administrative matters essential to the management of the post office.

"(H) Represents the postmaster in relationships with the public in the area, including representation with employee organizations.

"(I) Carries out special assignments for and as directed by the postmaster.

"(J) Assumes complete responsibility and authority for the post office in the postmaster's absence and at other times as required.

"Organizational relationships: Administratively responsible to the postmaster.

"(43) Position: Postmaster, first-class office—Level 16.

"Basic function: Is responsible for all operations of a first-class post office, including direction and supervision of mails, finance, buildings, personnel, and related services in the main post office, stations, and branches. This office has approximately 1,200 employees, annual receipts of $8,460,000, 117 Government-owned vehicle units, 16 classified

stations and branches, and 290 carrier routes within its jurisdiction.

"Duties and responsibilities:

"(A) Organizes the post office to insure expeditious handling of the mails and to provide courteous and efficient postal service to patrons.

"(B) Represents the Post Office Department in its relationships with the public in the area.

"(C) Appoints all personnel to serve in the post office within the limits prescribed by Departmental and Civil Service Regulations; determines that all personnel are carefully selected and adequately trained in their respective positions.

"(D) Supervises the administration of the Efficiency Appraisal System and is responsible for maintaining satisfactory employee relations with representatives of employee organizations and individual employees.

"(E) Reviews estimates of manpower needs and operating allowances, submits requests and recommendations as required, and determines that operations are efficiently carried out and expenditures authorized in accordance with approved estimates.

"(F) Provides for the safeguarding of all moneys, the operation and maintenance of equipment and other facilities of the post office, and for the expenditure of funds in accordance with applicable laws and regulations.

"(G) Approves requisitions for supplies and equipment submitted by operating officials of the post office for submission to the Supply Center or the Department.

"Organizational relationships: Administratively responsible to a regional director or other designated superior.

"(44) Position: General superintendent, largest PTS division—Level 17.

"Basic function: Directs all activities of the largest divisions of the Postal Transportation Service in terms of numbers of employees and in expenditure of funds, as well as in terms of the importance of the mail gateways in the division, the volume and complexity of the mail and mail-handling operations, and concentrations which create congestions. Is responsible for the transportation, transfer, distribution, and dispatch of mail in transit, and for the efficient and economical operation of the division.

"Duties and responsibilities:

"(A) Directs and coordinates the activities of subordinate district superintendents in planning and effectuating the transportation and processing of transit mail within, entering, or emanating from the division; confers with officials of commercial carriers regarding mail-handling and transportation schedules, security of mails in transit, and rates.

"(B) Provides, through his assistants, general supervision over the activities of the employees of the division. Establishes manpower controls, effective employee relations, and inspections of personnel activities, both informally and as required by regulations.

"(C) Exercises administrative control over the district superintendents and, through them, the constituent field units such as transfer offices, air mail fields, terminals, railway post office lines, highway post office lines, and contract carriers such as star routes and mail messenger routes, and related operating units; maintains financial control of the division, reporting on expenditures and requirements as directed.

"(D) Maintains liaison with airlines, railroads, trucklines, and other contract carriers; contacts major publishers, mail-order houses, and other large volume patrons with respect to mass mailing problems.

"(E) Coordinates division activities with those of contiguous divisions and with other segments of the Post Office Department within the area.

"Organizational relationships: Administratively responsible to a regional director. Directs, through an assistant and district superintendents, approximately 3,300 or more employees.

"(45) Position: Assistant postmaster, largest first-class office—Level 17.

"Basic function: Serves as the overall assistant to the postmaster, particularly on internal operations, and provides general direction over the mails, finance, administrative, and service functions of the post office. This office has approximately 20,000 employees, annual receipts of $140 million, 1,100 Government-owned motor-vehicle units, 66 classified stations and branches, and 3,200 carrier routes within its jurisdiction.

"Duties and responsibilities:

"(A) Participates in the organization and management of the office to insure expeditious handling of the mails and to provide courteous and efficient service to patrons.

"(B) Reviews and evaluates recommendations referred to the postmaster by subordinates with respect to promotions and disciplining of post-office personnel; generally oversees the training of all personnel for their respective positions.

"(C) Directs a continuous audit program concerning the accountability of responsible finance employees of the office.

"(D) Reviews estimates of manpower needs and operating allowances for action of the postmaster.

"(E) Analyzes and reports to the postmaster the daily manpower expenditures and is responsible through designated subordinates for maintaining proper apportionment of authorized allowances to operating units.

"(F) Gives assistance and direction to key subordinate officials in planning and executing the mail handling, finance, and administrative programs of the post office.

"(G) Reviews reports and recommendations of subordinates and attends to administrative matters essential to the management of the post office.

"(H) Represents the postmaster in relationships with the public in the area, including representation with employee organizations.

"(I) Carries out special assignments for and as directed by the postmaster.

"(J) Assumes complete responsibility and authority for the post office in the postmaster's absence and at other times as required.

"Organizational relationships: Administratively responsible to the postmaster.

"(46) Position: Postmaster, first-class office—Level 17.

"Basic function: Is responsible for all operations of a first-class post office, including direction and supervison of mails, finance, buildings, personnel, and related services in the main post office and stations and branches. This office has approximately 3,200 employees, annual receipts of $16,900,000, 200 Government-owned vehicle units, 34 classified stations and branches, and 1,000 carrier routes within its jurisdiction.

"Duties and responsibilities:

"(A) Organizes the post office to insure expeditious handling of the mails and to provide courteous and efficient postal service to patrons.

"(B) Represents the Post Office Department in its relationships with the public in the area.

"(C) Appoints personnel to serve in the post office within the limits prescribed by Departmental and Civil Service Regulations; determines that personnel are carefully selected and adequately trained for their respective positions.

"(D) Supervises the administration of the Efficiency Appraisal System and is responsible for maintaining satisfactory employee relations with representatives of employee organizations and individual employees.

"(E) Reviews estimates of manpower needs and operating allowances, submits requests and recommendations as required, and determines that operations are efficiently carried out and expenditures authorized in accordance with approved estimates.

"(F) Provides for the safeguarding of all moneys, the operation and maintenance of equipment and other facilities of the post office, and for the expenditure of funds in accordance with applicable laws and regulations.

"(G) Approves requisitions for supplies and equipment submitted by operating officials of the post office for submission to the supply center or the Department.

"Organizational relationships: Administratively responsible to a regional director or other designated superior.

"(47) Position: Postmaster, large first-class office—Level 18.

"Basic function: Is responsible for all operations of a large first-class post office, including direction and supervision of mails, finance, buildings, personnel, and related services in the main post office and stations and branches. This office has approximately 8,000 employees, annual receipts of $48 million, 400 Government-owned vehicle units, 50 classified stations and branches, and 1,400 carrier routes within its jurisdiction.

"Duties and responsibilities:

"(A) Organizes the post office to insure expeditious handling of the mails and to provide courteous and efficient postal service to patrons.

"(B) Represents the Post Office Department in its relationships with the public in the area.

"(C) Appoints personnel to serve in the post office within the limits prescribed by Departmental and Civil Service Regulations; determines that personnel are carefully selected and adequately trained for their respective positions.

"(D) Supervises the administration of the Efficiency Appraisal System and is responsible for maintaining satisfactory employee relations with representatives of employee organizations and individual employees.

"(E) Reviews estimates of manpower needs and operating allowances, submits requests and recommendations as required, and determines that operations are efficiently carried out and expenditures authorized in accordance with approved estimates.

"(F) Provides for the safeguarding of all moneys, the operation and maintenance of equipment and other facilities of the post office, and for the expenditure of funds in accordance with applicable laws and regulations.

"(G) Approves requisitions for supplies and equipment submitted by operating officials of the post office for submission to the supply center or the Department.

"Organizational relationships: Administratively responsible to a regional director or other designated superior.

"(48) Position: Postmaster, largest first-class office—Level 19.

"Basic function: Is responsible for all operations of one of the largest first-class offices, including direction and supervision of mails, finance, buildings, personnel, and related services in the main post office, stations and branches. This office has approximately 20,000 employees, annual receipts of $140 million, 1,100 Government-owned vehicle units, 66 classified stations and branches, and 3,200 carrier routes within its jurisdiction.

"Duties and responsibilities:

"(A) Organizes the post office to insure expeditious handling of the mails and to provide courteous and efficient postal service to patrons.

"(B) Represents the Post Office Department in its relationships with the public in the area.

"(C) Appoints personnel to serve in the post office within the limits prescribed by Departmental and Civil Service Regulations; determines that personnel are carefully selected and adequately trained in their respective positions.

"(D) Supervises the administration of the Efficiency Appraisal System and is responsible for maintaining satisfactory employee relations with representatives of employee organizations and individual employees.

"(E) Reviews estimates of manpower needs and operating allowances, submits requests and recommendations as required, and determines that operations are efficiently carried out and expenditures authorized in accordance with approved estimates.

"(F) Provides for the safeguarding of all moneys, the operation and maintenance of equipment and other facilities of the post office, and for the expenditure of funds in accordance with applicable laws and regulations.

"(G) Approves requisitions for supplies and equipment submitted by operating officials of the post office for submission to the supply center or the Department.

"Organizational Relationships.—Administratively responsible to a regional director.

"(49) Position: Regional director—Level 20.

"Basic function: Directs the management of all postal activities within the jurisdiction of an assigned region in accordance with basic departmental policies and with functional direction and guidance from Assistant Postmasters General.

"Duties and responsibilities:

"(A) Develops and formulates policies and practices for the region within basic policies and instructions of the Postmaster General.

"(B) Manages post office operations.

"(C) Administers routing, distribution, and transportation of mail within and in transit through the region.

"(D) Arranges for the provision of adequate facilities and equipment for all postal functions in the region.

"(E) Administers the personnel program of the region, including employment, placement, training, evaluation of positions, employee relations, and other personnel functions.

"(F) Authorizes and issues allowances for all expenditures and exercises budgetary controls.

"(G) Administers cost reduction programs and provides industrial engineering services to operating segments of the region.

"(H) Maintains effective public relations with the general public, large mail users, and with Federal, State, and municipal authorities.

"Organizational relationships: Administratively responsible to the Deputy Postmaster General. Directs, through subordinate officials, approximately 30,000 to 35,000 employees in some 3,000 offices within the region.

"DUAL EMPLOYMENT AND EXTRA DUTIES

"SEC. 204. (a) An employee may be appointed to more than one position and shall be paid compensation at the rate provided by law for each position, without regard to the provisions of sections 1763, 1764, and 1765 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (5 U. S. C., secs. 58, 69, and 70).

"(b) As the needs of the service require, an employee may be assigned from time to time to perform, without change in compensation, duties, and responsibilities other than the duties and responsibilities specifically set forth in his position description; however, if any employee is assigned for more than 30 days in any calendar year to duties and responsibilities of a salary level which is higher than the salary level to which his position is assigned, except to perform service in a relief capacity for a supervisor granted compensatory time pursuant to section 603, he shall be paid for the period of his assignment in excess of 30 days a basic salary computed in accordance with the provisions of section 502.

"REPORT OF THE POSTMASTER GENERAL

"SEC. 205. (a) The Postmaster General shall transmit to the Congress, on or before January 15, 1956, a comprehensive report of operations under this title. Such report shall include, among other matters, the following—

"(1) information, in summary and in detail, with respect to actions by the Postmaster General taken under section 201, with specific reference to the definitions of positions, the designations of the respective salary levels to which such positions are assigned, and the reasons for such actions;

"(2) a statement showing the number of employees determined to be in each key position under section 203, and the occupational titles of such employees immediately prior to the conversion of such employees under section 304 (b);

"(3) a statement with respect to the operation of the appeals system prescribed by section 202, including the number of such appeals by employees, a general discussion of the reasons for such appeals, the actions taken thereon and the reasons therefor; and

"(4) such other information and evidence as is necessary to enable the Committees on Post Office and Civil Service of the Senate and the House of Representatives to carry out the responsibility for supervision and review of the administration of this title, in accordance with section 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 (Public Law 601, 79th Cong.).

"(b) The report submitted by the Postmaster General under subsection (a) of this section shall be delivered to the President of the Senate and to the Speaker of the House of Representatives on the same day, and shall be referred to the Committees on Post Office and Civil Service of both Houses. The report shall be printed as a House document.

"TITLE III—BASIC SALARY SCHEDULES

"POSTAL FIELD SERVICE SCHEDULE

"SEC. 301. (a) There is established a basic salary schedule for positions in the postal field service which shall be known as the Postal Field Service Schedule, and for which the symbol shall be "PFS." Except as provided in sections 302 and 303 of this act, basic salary shall be paid to all employees in accordance with this schedule.

"POSTAL FIELD SERVICE SCHEDULE

"Level	Per annum rates and steps						
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
1	$2,880	$2,980	$3,080	$3,180	$3,280	$3,380	$3,480
2	3,090	3,195	3,300	3,405	3,510	3,615	3,720
3	3,330	3,445	3,560	3,675	3,790	3,905	4,020
4	3,660	3,785	3,910	4,035	4,160	4,285	4,410
5	3,880	4,005	4,130	4,255	4,380	4,505	4,630
6	4,190	4,330	4,470	4,610	4,750	4,890	5,030
7	4,530	4,685	4,840	4,995	5,150	5,305	5,460
8	4,890	5,060	5,230	5,400	5,570	5,740	5,910
9	5,280	5,465	5,650	5,835	6,020	6,205	6,390
10	5,800	6,000	6,200	6,400	6,600	6,800	7,000
11	6,380	6,600	6,820	7,040	7,260	7,480	7,700
12	7,020	7,260	7,500	7,740	7,980	8,220	8,460
13	7,730	7,990	8,250	8,510	8,770	9,030	9,290
14	8,500	8,780	9,060	9,340	9,620	9,900	10,180
15	9,350	9,650	9,950	10,250	10,550	10,850	11,150
16	10,300	10,600	10,900	11,200	11,500	11,800	12,100
17	11,400	11,700	12,000	12,300	12,600	12,900	13,200
18	12,500	12,800	13,100	13,400	13,700	14,000	14,300
19	13,600	13,900	14,200	14,500	14,800	------	------
20	14,800	------	------	------	------	------	------

"(b) The basic salary for hourly rate employees shall be computed by dividing the per annum rates prescribed in the Postal Field Service Schedule (1) by 2,080 in the case of hourly rate employees other than substitutes, and (2) by 2,016 in the case of substitute employees.

"RURAL CARRIER SCHEDULE

"SEC. 302. (a) There is established a basic salary schedule which shall be known as the Rural Carrier Schedule, and for which the symbol shall be 'RCS', for carriers in the rural delivery service, which is based in part on fixed compensation per annum and in part on specified rates per mile per annum. Basic salary shall be paid to rural carriers in accordance with this schedule.

"RURAL CARRIER SCHEDULE

	"Per annum rates and steps						
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Carriers in rural delivery service:							
Fixed compensation per annum	$1,566.00	$1,611.00	$1,656.00	$1,701.00	$1,746.00	$1,791.00	$1,836.00
Compensation per mile per annum for each mile up to 30 miles of route	65.00	67.00	69.00	71.00	73.00	75.00	77.00
For each mile of route over 30 miles	22.00	22.00	22.00	22.00	22.00	22.00	22.00
Temporary carriers in rural delivery service on routes to which no regular carrier is assigned:							
Fixed compensation per annum	1,566.00	------	------	------	------	------	------
Compensation per mile per annum for each mile up to 30 miles of route	65.00	------	------	------	------	------	------
For each mile of route over 30 miles	22.00	------	------	------	------	------	------
Temporary carriers in rural delivery service on routes having regular carriers absent without pay or on military leave	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)
Substitute carriers in rural delivery service on routes having carriers absent with pay	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)

[1] Basic compensation authorized for the regular carrier.

"(b) A rural carrier serving one triweekly route shall be paid on the basis of a route one-half the length of the route served by him. A rural carrier serving 2 triweekly routes shall be paid on the basis of a route one-half the combined length of the 2 routes.

"(c) The Postmaster General may pay such additional compensation as he may determine to be fair and reasonable in each individual case to rural carriers serving heavily patronized routes not exceeding 61 miles in length. He may not pay additional compensation to a carrier serving such a route in an amount which would exceed $4,700, when added to the basic salary for the maximum step in the Rural Carrier Schedule for his route. In case any such heavily patronized route is extended in length, the rural carrier assigned to such route at the time of such extension shall not be reduced in pay.

"(d) The Postmaster General may pay additional compensation to rural carriers who are required to carry pouch mail to intermediate post offices, or for intersecting loop routes, in all cases where it appears that the

carriage of such pouches increases the expense of the equipment required by the carrier or materially increases the amount of labor performed by him. Such compensation shall not exceed the sum of $12 per annum for each mile such carrier is required to carry such pouches.

"(e) In addition to the other compensation, rural carriers shall be paid the authorized fee for making special delivery of mail. Such fee shall not be paid when (1) no special-delivery service is rendered, (2) delivery is made into a rural mail box, or (3) delivery is made to the addressee or his representative on the rural carrier's route.

"FOURTH-CLASS OFFICE SCHEDULE

"SEC. 303. (a) There is established a basic salary schedule which shall be known as the Fourth-Class Office Schedule, and for which the symbol shall be "FOS", for postmasters in post offices of the fourth class which is based on the gross postal receipts as contained in returns of the post office for the calendar year immediately preceding. Basic salary shall be paid to postmasters in post offices of the fourth class in accordance with this schedule, and basic salary so paid, together with other forms of compensation provided by this act, shall replace all existing forms of compensation for such postmasters.

"FOURTH-CLASS OFFICE SCHEDULE

"Gross receipts	Per annum rates and steps						
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
$1,300 to $1,499.99	$2,514	$2,598	$2,682	$2,766	$2,850	$2,934	$3,018
$900 to $1,299.99	2,304	2,381	2,458	2,535	2,612	2,689	2,766
$600 to $899.99	1,886	1,949	2,012	2,075	2,138	2,201	2,264
$350 to $599.99	1,467	1,516	1,565	1,614	1,663	1,712	1,761
$250 to $349.99	1,048	1,083	1,118	1,153	1,188	1,223	1,258
$200 to $249.99	838	866	894	922	950	978	1,006
$100 to $199.99	629	650	671	692	713	734	755
Under $100	419	433	447	461	475	489	503

"(b) The basic salary of postmasters in fourth-class post offices shall be readjusted for changes in gross receipts at the start of the first pay period after the beginning of each fiscal year. In adjusting a postmaster's basic salary under this section the basic salary shall be fixed at the lowest step which is higher than the basic salary received by the postmaster at the end of the preceding fiscal year. If there is no such step the basic salary shall be fixed at the highest step for the adjusted gross receipts of the office. Each increase in basic salary because of change in gross receipts shall be deemed the equivalent of a step-increase under section 401 of this act and the waiting period, for purposes of advancement to the next step, shall begin on the date of adjustment.

"(c) The basic salaries of postmasters at newly established offices of the fourth class shall be fixed at the lowest salary rate. Whenever unusual conditions prevail at any post office of the fourth class the Postmaster General may advance such office to the appropriate category or class indicated by the receipts of the preceding quarter. Any fourth-class office advanced to the appropriate category or class pursuant to this subsection shall not be reduced in category or class until the start of the first pay period after July 1 of the calendar year following the calendar year in which it was so advanced, at which time it shall be assigned to the category or class indicated by the receipts for the preceding calendar year.

"(d) Persons who perform the duties of postmaster at post offices of the fourth class where there is a vacancy or during the absence of the postmaster on sick or annual leave, or leave without pay, shall be paid the same basic salary to which they would have been entitled if regularly appointed as such postmaster.

"(e) The Postmaster General may allow to postmasters in fourth-class post offices additional compensation for separating services and for unusual conditions during a portion of the year, in lieu of an allowance for clerical services for this purpose.

"(f) At seasonal post offices of the fourth class, the Postmaster General may authorize the payment of the basic salary prorated over the pay periods such office is open for business during the fiscal year.

"(g) Where the gross postal receipts of a post office of the third class for each of 2 consecutive calendar years are less than $1,500, or where in any calendar year the gross postal receipts are less than $1,400, such post office shall be relegated to the fourth class and the basic salary of the postmaster shall be fixed in the manner provided in subsection (b) of this section.

"CONVERSION

"SEC. 304. (a) Each employee whose basic salary is paid under the Act of July 6, 1945 (59 Stat. 435), as amended, or under the Classification Act of 1949 (63 Stat. 954), as amended, and who on or prior to the effective date of this section has earned but has not been credited with a higher automatic salary grade increase under the Act of July 6, 1945, or a higher within-grade step-increase under the Classification Act of 1949 for his position, or whose basic salary would have been increased on July 1, 1955, by reason of changed postal receipts, shall be given credit for such increase before his basic salary is adjusted under subsection (b) of this section.

"(b) The basic salary of each employee in effect immediately prior to the effective date of the Postal Field Service Schedule, the Rural Carrier Schedule, and the Fourth-Class Office Schedule, shall be adjusted to the basic salary in the schedules in the following manner:

"(1) If the basic salary of the employee is equal to any step established for his position in the appropriate schedule, such step shall be established as the employee's new basic salary.

"(2) If the basic salary of the employee is less than the entrance step established for his position in the appropriate schedule, such entrance step shall be established as the employee's new basic salary.

"(3) If the basic salary of the employee falls between any two steps established for his position in the appropriate schedule, the higher step shall be established as the employee's new basic salary.

"(4) If the basic salary of the employee is greater than the highest step established for his position in the appropriate schedule, such basic salary shall be established as the new basic salary of the employee.

"ADDITION OF LONGEVITY STEP-INCREASES

"SEC. 305. (a) When the basic salary of an employee, except an employee whose basic salary immediately prior to the effective date of the Postal Field Service Schedule was fixed by the Classification Act of 1949, is established under section 304 of this Act, each longevity step-increase which such employee has earned prior to the effective date of his schedule shall become a part of his basic compensation and shall constitute a longevity step-increase under section 404 of this act.

"(b) In the case of an employee whose compensation immediately prior to the effective date of the Postal Field Service Schedule was fixed by the Classification Act of 1949, all creditable service under section 404 shall be counted in order to determine such employee's eligibility for longevity step-increases under such section.

"TITLE IV—STEP-INCREASES

"AUTOMATIC ADVANCEMENT BY STEP-INCREASES

"SEC. 401. (a) Except as to a substitute employee in the Postal Transportation Service whose position is allocated to salary level PFS-5 as a distribution clerk in a railway or highway post office, each employee whose position is allocated to the Rural Carrier Schedule, the Fourth-Class Office Schedule, or salary level PFS-9 or a lower salary level of the Postal Field Service Schedule, who has not reached the highest step for his position, shall be advanced successively to the next higher step for his position at the beginning of the first pay period following the completion of each 52 calendar weeks of satisfactory service, if no equivalent increase in basic salary from any cause was received during such period of 52 calendar weeks. The benefit of successive step-increases shall be preserved, under regulations prescribed by the Postmaster General, for employees whose continuous service is interrupted by service in the Armed Forces.

"(b) Each employee whose position is allocated to salary level PFS-10 or higher salary level of the Postal Field Service Schedule shall be advanced to and including step 4 of his salary level in the manner provided in subsection (a) of this section. Advancement of such employee to steps higher than step 4, exclusive of longevity, step-increases, shall be granted by the Postmaster General on the basis of superior performance under regulations issued by him, but no such employee is eligible for more than one step-increase within the time period specified in subsection (a) of this section.

"(c) Each substitute employee in the Postal Transportation Service, whose position is allocated to salary level PFS-5 as a distribution clerk in a railway or highway post office, shall be advanced in the manner prescribed for other employees under subsection (a) of this section, but such substitute shall not be advanced beyond step 4 of salary level PFS-5.

"CREDITABLE SERVICE FOR ADVANCEMENT

"SEC. 402. Each employee in the postal field service is eligible to earn step-increases in accordance with this act. Except for temporary rural carriers serving in the absence of regular rural carriers on leave without pay or on military leave, credit shall not be allowed for time on the rolls under a temporary appointment for 1 year or less unless such time on the rolls is continuous to the date of appointment to a position of unlimited duration.

"ADJUSTMENT OF SERVICE CREDIT

"SEC. 403. In order to retain to the maximum possible extent promotion credits earned by employees under the act of July 6, 1945, as amended, and in order to prevent the advancement by step-increases of junior employees ahead of senior employees, employees whose basic salaries are adjusted on the effective date of the schedules in this act shall establish credit toward advancement by step increases under section 401 in the following manner:

"(1) Each employee in the automatic grades who had not reached the maximum grade for his position under the provisions of the act of July 6, 1945, as amended, shall retain the anniversary date established for his next automatic promotion under such act unless the amount of increase in basic salary which he receives upon adjustment to the appropriate schedule is equal to or greater than the difference between the salary for his

automatic grade and the next higher automatic grade for his position under such act.

"(2) Employees in the automatic grades who do not retain their anniversary dates under paragraph (1), above, employees who had reached the maximum grades for their positions, and employees who occupied positions for which single rates were established under the act of July 6, 1945, as amended, shall begin the waiting period for advancement to the next step for their positions on the date of adjustment to the schedules in this act.

"LONGEVITY STEP-INCREASES

"SEC. 404. (a) There are established for each employee longevity steps A, B, and C. For each promotion to a longevity step—

"(1) each postmaster at a post office of the fourth class shall receive an amount equal to 5 percent of his basic salary, or $100 per annum, whichever is the lesser, and

"(2) each employee (other than a postmaster at a post office of the fourth class) shall receive $100 per annum.

In computing the percentage increase under this subsection the amount of the increase shall be rounded to the nearest dollar. A half dollar or one-half cent shall be rounded to the next highest dollar or cent, respectively.

"(b) Each employee shall be assigned to—

"(1) longevity step A at the beginning of the pay period following the completion of 13 years of service;

"(2) longevity step B at the beginning of the pay period following the completion of 18 years of service; and

"(3) longevity step C at the beginning of the pay period following the completion of 25 years of service.

"(c) (1) There shall be credited, for the purposes of subsection (b)—

"(A) all time on the rolls, except time on the rolls as a substitute rural carrier, in the postal field service or in the Post Office Department;

"(B) all time on the rolls in the custodial service of the Department of the Treasury continuous to the date of the transfer of the employee to the custodial service of the Post Office Department in accordance with Executive Order No. 6166, dated June 10, 1933;

"(C) all time on the rolls as a special-delivery messenger at a first-class post office; and

"(D) all time on the rolls as a clerk in a third-class post office for which payment is made from authorized allowances.

"(2) In determining longevity credit for the purposes of subsection (b) in the case of an employee whose continuous service in the postal field service or in the departmental service of the Post Office Department shall have been interrupted by service with the Armed Forces or to comply with a transfer during war or national emergency as defined by the United States Civil Service Commission, all time engaged in such service with the Armed Forces or on such transfer shall be credited pro rata for each week of such service. All service specified in this subsection, whether continuous or intermittent, shall be credited on the basis of 1 week for each whole week the employee has been on the rolls, except that credit shall not be allowed for time on the rolls under a temporary appointment for 1 year or less unless such time on the rolls is continuous to the date of appointment to a position of unlimited duration.

"(d) Employees on the rolls on the effective date of this section who are entitled to promotion credit for longevity purposes under section 2 of the act approved May 3, 1950 (64 Stat. 102; 39 U. S. C. 889), shall retain all rights and benefits established or continued under such section to the same extent as though such section had remained in effect.

"(e) Increases under this section shall not be deemed equivalent increases within the meaning of section 401.

"TITLE V—GENERAL COMPENSATION RULES

"APPOINTMENTS

"SEC. 501. The Postmaster General may appoint any person who has been employed in a civilian capacity in any branch of the Government to any position in a regional or district office or to any professional or scientific position and may place such person in any step in the salary level of the Postal Field Service Schedule which is less than one full step above the highest basic salary which such person received from the United States.

"PROMOTION

"SEC. 502. (a) Any employee who is promoted or transferred to a position in a higher salary level of the Postal Field Service Schedule shall be paid basic salary at the lowest step of such higher salary level which exceeds his existing basic salary by not less than the amount of difference between the entrance step of the salary level from which promoted and the entrance step of the salary level immediately above the salary level from which promoted. If there is no step in the salary level to which the employee is promoted which exceeds his existing basic salary by at least the amount of such difference, such employee shall be paid (1) the maximum step of the salary level to which promoted, or (2) his existing basic salary, whichever is higher.

"(b) Regular clerks and carriers in first- and second-class post offices are not eligible for promotion to positions of higher salary levels in their respective offices unless they are in the maximum steps of their respective salary levels. If for any reason such clerks and carriers in such maximum steps are not available those clerks and carriers in the lower steps in such offices shall be eligible for such promotion.

"COMPENSATION OF CERTAIN TEMPORARY EMPLOYEES

"SEC. 503. Each temporary employee who is hired for a continuous period of 1 year or less for a position under the Postal Field Service Schedule shall be paid a basic salary at the entrance step for the salary level of the position to which he is appointed.

"PROHIBITION ON REDUCTION OF FORMER COMPENSATION

"SEC. 504. (a) Nothing in this act shall be deemed to reduce the per annum or hourly basic compensation of any employee on the rolls on the effective date of the Postal Field Service Schedule, the Rural Carrier Schedule, or Fourth-Class Office Schedule to an amount less than his basic compensation immediately prior to adjustment to such schedules.

"(b) For the purposes of this section, 'basic compensation' includes basic compensation under the Classification Act of 1949.

"TITLE VI—PAY ADMINISTRATION

"PAY PERIODS AND COMPUTATION OF RATES

"SEC. 601. (a) Employees in the postal field service shall be paid compensation in 26 installments. Each such installment shall be the compensation for a pay period of 2 weeks.

"(b) As basic compensation for a full pay period, an employee, other than an hourly rate employee, shall be paid an amount equal to one twenty-sixth of his annual basic compensation. As basic compensation for a portion of a pay period, such employee shall be paid basic compensation computed in accordance with subsection (d) of this section for the number of days and hours of service for which he has credit.

"(c) As basic compensation for the pay period, an hourly rate employee shall be paid an amount equal to the product of his hourly rate of basic compensation and the number of hours of service for which he has credit.

"(d) For purposes of computing rates of compensation other than annual rates the following rules shall govern:

"(1) To compute an hourly rate of basic compensation for employees other than substitute employees, the annual rate of basic compensation shall be divided by 2,080.

"(2) To compute an hourly rate of basic compensation for substitute employees, the annual rate of basic compensation shall be divided by 2,016.

"(3) To compute the daily rate of compensation for postmasters, postal inspectors, and rural carriers, the annual rate of compensation shall be divided by 312.

"(4) To compute the daily rate of basic compensation for annual rate employees other than postmasters, postal inspectors, and rural carriers, the hourly rate of basic compensation shall be multiplied by the number of daily hours of service required.

"(e) Except for lump-sum payments for accumulated leave upon the termination of employment, an annual rate employee shall not be paid more than one twenty-sixth of his basic compensation as basic compensation for a pay period.

"(f) All rates shall be computed to the nearest cent, counting one-half cent and over as a whole cent.

"(g) When a pay period for employees to whom this act applies begins in one fiscal year and ends in another, the gross amount of the earnings of such employees for such pay period may be regarded as a charge against the appropriation or allotment current at the end of such pay period.

"HOURS OF WORK

"SEC. 602. Except as otherwise provided in this act, employees shall not be required to work more than 8 hours a day. The work schedule of employees shall be regulated so that the 8 hours of service shall not extend over a longer period than 10 consecutive hours.

"COMPENSATORY TIME, OVERTIME, AND HOLIDAYS

"SEC. 603. In emergencies or if the needs of the service require, the Postmaster General may require employees to work more than 8 hours in 1 day, or on Saturdays, Sundays, or holidays. For such service he shall grant employees in the 'PFS' Schedule compensatory time, or pay such employees overtime compensation under the following rules:

"(1) Each employee in or below salary level PFS-7 shall be paid for all work in excess of 8 hours in 1 day at the rate of 150 percent of his hourly basic compensation.

"(2) (A) Each employee in or below salary level PFS-7 who performs work on Saturdays or Sundays shall, under regulations prescribed by the Postmaster General, be granted compensatory time in an amount equal to the excess time worked within 5 working days, except that, in lieu of such compensatory time, the Postmaster General may, if the exigencies of the service require, authorize such employee to be paid, for work performed on Saturdays and Sundays during the month of December, at the rate of 150 percent of his hourly basic compensation.

"(B) If the work performed by such employees on Saturdays and Sundays is less than 8 hours, such service, in the discretion of the Postmaster General, may be carried forward and combined with similar service performed on other Saturdays and Sundays. The employees may be allowed compensatory time for such combined service or any part thereof at any time, except that, whenever at least 8 hours of such service has been accumulated, the employees shall be allowed 8 hours compensatory time on 1 day within 5 working days next succeeding the Saturday or Sunday on which the total accumulated service was at least 8 hours.

"(3) For time worked on a day referred to as a holiday in the act of December 26,

1941 (5 U. S. C., sec. 87b), or on a day designated by Executive order as a holiday for Federal employees generally, each employee in or below salary level PFS-7, under regulations prescribed by the Postmaster General, shall either be granted compensatory time in an amount equal to such time worked within 30 working days, or be paid premium compensation at a rate equal to his hourly basic compensation for the time so worked. For work performed on Christmas day, premium compensation shall be paid at a rate equal to 150 percent of the employee's hourly basic compensation.

"(4) Each employee in or above salary level PFS-8 who performs overtime or holiday work as described in this section, under regulations prescribed by the Postmaster General, shall be granted compensatory time in an amount equal to such overtime or holiday work.

"NIGHT WORK

"SEC. 604. Employees who perform work between the hours of 6 o'clock post meridian and 6 o'clock ante meridian standard or daylight saving time, depending upon which time is observed where such work is performed, shall be paid extra compensation for each hour of such work at the rate of 10 percent of their hourly basic compensation. The differential for night duty shall not be included in computing any overtime compensation to which such employees may be entitled.

"EXEMPTION OF CERTAIN EMPLOYEES FROM CERTAIN PROVISIONS RELATING TO PAY ADMINISTRATION

"SEC. 605. (a) Sections 602, 603, and 604 of this act do not apply to the heads of regional or district offices and such other employees of the headquarters staff of regional and district offices as the Postmaster General designates, or to postmasters, rural carriers, post office inspectors, traveling mechanicians, and traveling examiners of equipment and supplies.

"(b) Sections 602 and 603 of this act do not apply to substitute employees and to employees in the Postal Transportation Service assigned to road duty.

"(c) Section 602 of this act does not apply to employees in post offices of the third class.

"(d) The provisions of section 603 of this act relating to compensatory time and overtime compensation for work on Saturdays or Sundays do not apply to hourly rate regular employees and to employees in post offices of the third class.

"SUBSTITUTE EMPLOYMENT

"SEC. 606. (a) Subject to subsection (c) of this section, the Postmaster General shall prescribe the conditions under which substitute positions may be established.

"(b) Each substitute, hourly rate, and temporary employee who reports for duty in compliance with an official order shall be employed for not less than 2 hours following the hour at which such employee is ordered to report.

"(c) In the case of positions which are the same as or equivalent to the positions enumerated in the act entitled 'An act to provide for the appointment of substitute postal employees, and for other purposes,' approved June 4, 1936, as amended (39 U. S. C., sec. 834), the ratio of classified substitute employees to regular employees shall not be more than 1 classified substitute to 5 regular employees or fraction thereof with respect to each such position, except that in offices having fewer than 5 regular employees there may be 1 substitute clerk and 1 substitute carrier, and 1 substitute in the motor vehicle service.

"EMPLOYEES IN THE LOCAL TRANSPORTATION SERVICE

"SEC. 607. (a) The Postmaster General shall organize the work of employees in the Postal Transportation Service who are assigned to road duty into regularly scheduled tours of duty. Such tours of duty shall aggregate an average of not more than 8 hours a day for 252 days a year, including an allowance of 1 hour and 35 minutes for work to be performed on layoff periods. He shall not grant allowances of time for work performed on layoff periods to employees other than employees engaged in the distribution of mail.

"(b) Employees in the Postal Transportation Service assigned to road duty, except substitute employees, who are required to perform work in excess of the scheduled time of their regular tours of duty as established by the Postmaster General shall be paid at the rate of 150 percent of their hourly basic compensation for such overtime work. In arriving at the amount of overtime to be paid at any time during the calendar year, any deficiencies accrued up to that time during the same calendar year shall be offset against any overtime work by the employee.

"(c) Substitute employees in the Postal Transportation Service assigned to road duty shall be paid on an hourly basis for actual work performed according to the time value of each trip of such road duty, including an allowance of time for all work required on layoff periods.

"(d) In addition to compensation provided under this act, the Postmaster General, under regulations prescribed by him, may pay not more than $9 per day as travel allowances in lieu of actual expenses, at fixed rates per annum or by such other method as he deems equitable to regular and substitute employees in the Postal Transportation Service who are assigned to road duty, after the expiration of 10 hours from the time the initial run begins.

"(e) Substitute employees in the Postal Transportation Service shall be credited with full time while traveling under orders of the Post Office Department to and from their designated headquarters to take up assignments.

"EQUIPMENT MAINTENANCE ALLOWANCE FOR SPECIAL-DELIVERY CARRIERS

"SEC. 608. (a) In addition to the compensation provided under this act regular and substitute special delivery carriers at first-class post offices shall be paid an automotive equipment maintenance allowance at the rate of 7 cents per mile or major fraction thereof for miles traveled under the direction of the Department in making delivery of special-delivery mail or at the option of the Postmaster General at the rate of 90 cents per hour spent in making delivery of special-delivery mail. Payments for equipment maintenance shall be made at the same periods and in the same manner as payments of regular compensation.

"(b) The Postmaster General may provide or hire vehicles under an allowance basis for use in the delivery of special-delivery mail whenever the needs of the postal field service so require.

"EQUIPMENT MAINTENANCE ALLOWANCE FOR RURAL CARRIERS

"SEC. 609. (a) In addition to the compensation provided in the Rural Carrier Schedule, each rural carrier shall be paid for equipment maintenance a sum equal to 9 cents per mile for each mile or major fraction of a mile scheduled. The Postmaster General may pay such additional equipment maintenance allowance as he determines to be fair and reasonable, not in excess of $3 per day when combined with the equipment maintenance allowance provided by the preceding sentence, to rural carriers entitled to additional compensation under section 302 (c) of this act for serving heavily patronized routes. Payments for such equipment maintenance shall be made at the same periods and in the same manner as payments of regular compensation.

"(b) Any employee in the postal field service who is assigned to serve any rural route, and who furnishes the vehicle used in the performance of such service, shall be paid the equipment maintenance allowance provided for the route so served, in addition to his compensation.

"ALLOWANCES FOR POSTMASTERS IN FOURTH-CLASS POST OFFICES

"SEC. 610. Postmasters of fourth-class post offices shall be paid as allowances for rent, fuel, light, and equipment an amount equal to 15 percent of the basic compensation earned in each pay period, at the same time and in the same manner as their regular compensation.

"TITLE VII

"RETROACTIVE BASIC SALARY INCREASES

"SEC. 701. (a) The basic salary in effect immediately prior to the effective date of this section of each employee paid under the act of July 6, 1945, as amended (39 U. S. C., secs. 858, 859, 861a, 862, 863-866, 868, 869), or under the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, shall be increased by 6 percent effective March 1, 1955 (rounded to the nearest dollar in the case of per annum rates and to the nearest one-half cent in the case of hourly rates, a half-dollar or one-quarter of a cent being rounded to the next highest dollar or one-half cent, respectively). Such increase shall be applied (1) in the case of each rural carrier to his fixed compensation, his compensation per mile, and any additional compensation allowed him for serving a heavily patronized route, and (2) to the amounts specified in sections 3 (c), 3 (d), 12 (a), 12 (e), 15 (f), and 17 (d) of the act of July 6, 1945 (Public Law 134, 79th Cong.), as amended.

"(b) Retroactive salary shall be paid under this act only in the case of an individual in the service of the United States (including service in the Armed Forces of the United States) or of the municipal government of the District of Columbia on the date of enactment of this act, except that such retroactive salary shall be paid a retired postmaster, officer, or employee for services rendered during the period beginning March 1, 1955, and ending with the date of his retirement, or in accordance with the provisions of the act of August 3, 1950, for services rendered by a deceased postmaster, officer, or employee during the period beginning on March 1, 1955, and ending with the date of his death.

"TITLE VIII—MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS

"SEC. 801. At the beginning of each fiscal year, the Postmaster General shall divide post offices into four classes on the basis of gross annual postal receipts for the preceding calendar year. He shall place in the first class those post offices at which such receipts are $40,000 or more. He shall place in the second class those post offices at which such receipts are $8,000 or more, but less than $40,000. He shall place in the third class those post offices at which such receipts are $1,500 or more, but less than $8,000. He shall place in the fourth class those offices at which such receipts are less than $1,500, except as provided in section 303 (g).

"ASSIGNMENT OF EMPLOYEES

"SEC. 802. With the consent of the employee, the Postmaster General is authorized to detail any employee, including any employee of the departmental service, between the postal field service and the departmental service to such extent as may be necessary to develop a more efficient working force and more effectively to perform the work of the Department. Each such detail shall be made for a period of not more than 1 year and may be made without change in compensation of the employee so detailed.

"INCREASES IN BASIC COMPENSATION NOT 'EQUIVALENT INCREASES'

"SEC. 803. Any increase in rate of basic compensation by reason of enactment of this act shall not be considered as an 'equivalent increase' in compensation within the meaning of section 701 (a) (A) of the Classification Act of 1949, in the case of employees who transfer or are transferred to a position coming within the purview of the Classification Act of 1949.

"POSTAL EMPLOYEES OF THE CANAL ZONE GOVERNMENT

"SEC. 804. The Governor of the Canal Zone is authorized to adopt applicable provisions of this act for postal employees of the Canal Zone Government, as of the respective effective dates of such applicable provisions.

"REFERENCES IN OTHER LAWS WITH RESPECT TO PUBLIC LAW 134, 79TH CONGRESS

"SEC. 805. (a) Whenever reference is made in any other law to the act of July 6, 1945 (59 Stat. 435), as amended, such reference shall be held and considered to mean this act. Whenever reference is made in any other law to a 'grade' of such act of July 6, 1945, such reference shall be held and considered to mean the corresponding basic salary step in any schedule contained in this act.

"(b) The application of this act to any position or employee shall not be affected by reason of the enactment of subsection (a).

"APPLICABILITY OF ACT TO GUAM

"SEC. 806. This act shall have the same force and effect within Guam as within other possessions of the United States.

"REGULATIONS OF POSTMASTER GENERAL

"SEC. 807. The Postmaster General is hereby authorized to issue such regulations as may be necessary for the administration of this act.

"CIVIL SERVICE ACT AND RULES, VETERANS' PREFERENCE ACT OF 1944

"SEC. 808. This act shall not be construed to modify the application of the Civil Service Act and Rules or the Veterans' Preference Act of 1944 to the postal field service.

"AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS

"SEC. 809. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this act.

"EFFECTIVE DATES

"SEC. 810. (a) This section shall take effect on the date of enactment of this act.

"(b) This act, except title VII and this section, shall take effect on the first Saturday of the calendar month which begins more than 180 days after the date of its enactment.

"(c) Title VII shall take effect on the first day of the first pay period which begins after the date of enactment of this act."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I have a few more committee amendments to offer. These amendments represent merely a change in wording throughout the bill. They result from the close study which has been given to the measure during recent days by a great many different people. They are for the purpose of making the bill a better bill. They are noncontroversial and should be adopted. A great many of them were called to the committee's attention by the Post Office Department.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendments will be considered en bloc.

The amendments offered by Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina are as follows:

On page 8, line 4, strike out "packaging" and insert "packing."

On page 86, line 15, strike out "is" and insert "so."

On page 89, line 17, after "adjusted", insert ", as of such effective date."

On page 111, at the end of line 10, insert the following: "For the purposes of this subsection, service in the Armed Forces of the United States, in the case of an individual relieved from training and service in the Armed Forces of the United States or discharged from hospitalization following such training and service, shall include the period provided by law for the mandatory restoration of such individual to a position in or under the Federal Government or the municipal government of the District of Columbia."

On page 115, line 13, after "title VII", insert ", section 607 (d)."

On page 112, after "authorized", in lines 21 and 22, insert "and directed."

On page 115, lines 14 and 15, strike out "the first Saturday of the calendar month which begins more" and insert in lieu thereof the following: "such date as may be specified by the Postmaster General, but not later."

On page 115, line 17, after "title VII" insert "and section 607 (d)."

On page 115, after line 19, insert the following:

"(d) For the purpose of determining the amount of insurance for which an individual is eligible under the Federal Employees' Group Life Insurance Act of 1954, changes in the rates of compensation which result from the enactment of title VII shall be deemed to be effective as of the first day of the first pay period which begins on or after the date of enactment of this act."

On page 110, line 4, after the center heading "Title VII" insert: "Salary increases."

On page 111, between lines 12 and 13, insert the heading "Classes of Post Offices."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing en bloc to the amendments offered by the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON].

The amendments were agreed to.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I offer amendments to the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator wish to have the amendments read, or does he prefer to have them printed in the RECORD without their being read.

Mr. BUTLER. I should like to have them printed in the RECORD, without being read.

The amendments proposed by Mr. BUTLER were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

On page 1, line 3, before "this act", insert "titles I to VIII, inclusive, of."

On page 1, line 8, before "this act", insert "titles I to VIII, inclusive, of."

On page 3, line 8, strike out "This act applies" and insert "Titles I to VIII, inclusive, of this act apply."

On page 113, line 20, before "this Act" insert "titles I to VIII, inclusive, of."

On page 115, line 13, strike out "title VII" and insert "titles VII and IX."

At the end of the bill add a new title as follows:

"TITLE IX—CLASSIFIED AND OTHER EMPLOYEES

"SEC. 901. This title may be cited as the 'Federal Employees Pay Act of 1955.'

"SEC. 902. (a) Section 603 (b) and section 603 (c) of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, are amended to read as follows:

"(b) The compensation schedule for the General Schedule shall be as follows:

''Grade	Per annum rates						
GS-1	$2,700	$2,790	$2,880	$2,970	$3,060	$3,150	$3,240
GS-2	2,990	3,080	3,170	3,260	3,350	3,440	3,530
GS-3	3,200	3,290	3,380	3,470	3,560	3,650	3,740
GS-4	3,440	3,530	3,620	3,710	3,800	3,890	3,980
GS-5	3,690	3,825	3,960	4,095	4,230	4,365	4,500
GS-6	4,100	4,235	4,370	4,505	4,640	4,775	4,910
GS-7	4,530	4,665	4,800	4,935	5,070	5,205	5,340
GS-8	4,970	5,105	5,240	5,375	5,510	5,645	5,780
GS-9	5,440	5,575	5,710	5,845	5,980	6,115	6,250
GS-10	5,910	6,045	6,180	6,315	6,450	6,585	6,720
GS-11	6,380	6,595	6,810	7,025	7,240	7,455	
GS-12	7,550	7,765	7,980	8,195	8,410	8,625	
GS-13	8,950	9,165	9,380	9,595	9,810	10,025	
GS-14	10,250	10,465	10,680	10,895	11,110	11,325	
GS-15	11,530	11,780	12,030	12,280	12,530		
GS-16	12,800	13,015	13,230	13,445	13,660		
GS-17	13,800	14,015	14,230	14,445	14,660		
GS-18	14,800						

"'(c) (7) The compensation schedule for the Crafts, Protective and Custodial Schedule shall be as follows:

''Grade	Per annum rates						
CPC-1	$2,080	$2,170	$2,260	$2,350	$2,440	$2,530	$2,620
CPC-2	2,600	2,690	2,780	2,870	2,960	3,050	3,140
CPC-3	2,700	2,790	2,880	2,970	3,060	3,150	3,240
CPC-4	2,990	3,080	3,170	3,260	3,350	3,440	3,530
CPC-5	3,200	3,290	3,380	3,470	3,560	3,650	3,740
CPC-6	3,440	3,530	3,620	3,710	3,800	3,890	3,980
CPC-7	3,690	3,825	3,960	4,095	4,230	4,365	4,500
CPC-8	4,100	4,235	4,370	4,505	4,640	4,775	4,910
CPC-9	4,530	4,665	4,800	4,935	5,070	5,205	5,340
CPC-10	4,970	5,105	5,240	5,375	5,510	5,645	5,780

"'(2) Charwomen working part time shall be paid at the rate of $2,960 per annum, and head charwomen working part time shall be paid at the rate of $3,140 per annum.'

"(b) The rates of basic compensation of officers and employees to whom this section applies shall be initially adjusted as follows:

"(1) If the officer or employee was receiving basic compensation immediately prior to the effective date of this section at one of the scheduled or longevity rates of a grade in the General Schedule or the Crafts, Protective, and Custodial Schedule of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, he shall receive a rate of basic compensation at the corresponding scheduled or longevity rate in effect on and after such date;

"(2) If the officer or employee was receiving basic compensation immediately prior to the effective date of this section at a rate between two scheduled or two longevity rates, or between a scheduled and a longevity rate, of a grade in the General Schedule or the Crafts, Protective, and Custodial Schedule, he shall receive a rate of basic compensation at the higher of the two corresponding rates in effect on and after such date;

"(3) If the officer or employee, immediately prior to the effective date of this

section, was in a position in any one of the grades of the General Schedule or the Crafts, Protective, and Custodial Schedule and was receiving basic compensation at a rate in excess of the maximum longevity rate of his grade, or in excess of the maximum scheduled rate of his grade if there is no longevity rate for his grade, or was receiving an existing aggregate rate of compensation determined in accordance with section 208 (b) of the act of September 1, 1954 (Public Law 763, 83d Cong.), at such time, he shall be paid at a rate equal to the rate at which he was paid immediately prior to such effective date increased by an amount equal to the amount of the increase made by this section in such maximum longevity rate or maximum scheduled rate until he (A) leaves such position or (B) is entitled to receive basic compensation at a higher rate by reason of the operation of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended; but when such position becomes vacant, the rate of basic compensation of any subsequent appointee thereto shall be fixed in accordance with such act, as amended; or

"(4) If the officer or employee is a part-time char employee and was receiving basic compensation immediately prior to the effective date of this section at a rate in excess of the rate provided for his position in section 603 (c) (2) of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, he shall be paid at a rate equal to the rate at which he was paid immediately prior to such effective date increased by an amount equal to the amount of the increase made by this section in the rate for like positions under such section.

"(5) If the officer or employee, immediately prior to the effective date of this section, is in a position in grade 16 or 17 of the General Schedule, and is receiving a rate of basic compensation in excess of the maximum scheduled rate of his grade as provided in this section, he shall continue to receive basic compensation without change in rate until (A) he leaves such position, or (B) he is entitled to receive basic compensation at a higher rate by reason of the operation of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended; but when such position becomes vacant, the rate of basic compensation of any subsequent appointee shall be fixed in accordance with such act, as amended.

"(c) Each officer or employee (1) who with his position has been transferred, at any time during the period beginning January 1, 1950, and ending on the date of enactment of this section, from the Crafts, Protective, and Custodial Schedule or the General Schedule to a prevailing rate schedule pursuant to the Classification Act of 1949 or title I of the act of September 1, 1954 (Public Law 763, 83d Cong.), (2) who at all times subsequent to such transfer was in the service of the United States (including the Armed Forces of the United States) without break in such service of more than 30 consecutive calendar days, (3) who is on such date of enactment being compensated under such prevailing rate schedule, and (4) whose rate of basic compensation is less on the effective date of this section than the rate to which he would have been entitled on such effective date if such transfer had not occurred (unless he is receiving such lesser rate by reason of an adverse personnel action resulting from his own fault), shall be paid basic compensation at a rate equal to the rate which he would have been receiving on such effective date (including compensation for each within grade and longevity step-increase which he would have earned) if such transfer had not occurred until the day immediately following such effective date, until (A) he leaves the position which he holds on such effective date, or (B) he is entitled to receive basic compensation at a higher rate under prevailing rate schedules; but when such position becomes vacant, the rate of basic compensation of any subsequent appointee thereto shall be fixed in accordance with such prevailing rate schedules.

"SEC. 903. The Civil Service Commission shall make (1) a study of the effects and desirability of eliminating present grades 6, 8, and 10 of the General Schedule of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, including the desirability of changes in the salary ranges of the remaining grades of the General Schedule that should accompany the elimination of grades 6, 8, and 10, and (2) a study of the effects and desirability of establishing for supervisors whose compensation is fixed under the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, and who regularly have responsibility for the supervision of employees whose compensation is fixed and adjusted in accordance with prevailing rates, rates of compensation not less than 5 percent above the highest rate of basic compensation being paid to any such prevailing rate employee regularly supervised. The Commission shall submit a report to the Post Office and Civil Service Committee of the Senate at the earliest possible date, setting forth its findings and such recommendations as it may deem advisable.

"SEC. 904. (a) The rates of basic compensation of officers and employees in or under the judicial branch of the Government whose rates of compensation are fixed pursuant to section 62 (2) of the Bankruptcy Act (11 U. S. C. 102 (a) (2)), section 3656 of title 18 of the United States Code, the second and third sentences of section 603, section 604 (5), or sections 672 to 675, inclusive, of title 28 of the United States Code, or who are appointed pursuant to section 792 (b) of title 28 of the United States Code, are hereby increased by 8 percent.

"(b) The limitations of $10,560 and $14,355 with respect to the aggregate salaries payable to secretaries and law clerks of circuit and district judges, contained in the paragraph under the heading 'Salaries of Supporting Personnel' in the Judiciary Appropriation Act, 1955, or in any subsequent appropriation act, shall be increased by the amounts necessary to pay the additional basic compensation provided by this section.

"(c) Section 753 (e) of title 28 of the United States Code (relating to the compensation of court reporters for district courts) is amended by striking out '$6,000' and inserting in lieu thereof '$6,480'.

"SEC. 905. (a) Each officer and employee in or under the legislative branch of the Government (other than an employee in the office of a Senator) whose rate of compensation is increased by section 5 of the Federal Employees Pay Act of 1946 shall be paid additional compensation at the rate of 8 percent of the aggregate rate of his basic compensation and the rate of the additional compensation received by him under sections 501 and 502 of the Federal Employees Pay Act of 1945, as amended, sction 301 of the Postal Rate Revision and Federal Employees Salary Act of 1948, the provisions under the heading 'Increased Pay for Legislative Employees' in the Second Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1950, and the act of October 24, 1951 (Public Law 201, 82d Cong.).

"(b) Section 2 (b) of the act of October 24, 1951 (Public Law 201, 82d Cong.), is amended by striking out '$11,646' and inserting in lieu thereof '$12,578.'

"(c) (1) The aggregate amount of the basic compensation authorized to be paid for administrative and clerical assistance and messenger service in the offices of Senators is hereby increased by—

"(A) $5,220 in the case of Senators from States the population of which is less than 3 million;

"(B) $6,120 in the case of Senators from States the population of which is 3 million or more but less than 5 million;

"(C) $6,960 in the case of Senators from States the population of which is 5 million or more but less than 10 million; and

"(D) $7,080 in the case of Senators from States the population of which is 10 million or more.

"(2) The second proviso in the paragraph relating to the authority of Senators to rearrange the basic salaries of employees in their respective offices, which appears in the Legislative Branch Appropriation Act, 1947, as amended (2 U. S. C. 60f), is hereby repealed.

"(3) Notwithstanding the third proviso in such paragraph, any increase in the compensation of an employee in a Senator's office shall take effect on the effective date of this section or on the date such employee became employed, whichever is later, if (A) the certification filed by such Senator under such proviso so provides, (B) such certification is filed in the disbursing office of the Senate not later than 15 days following the date of enactment of this act, and (C) the amount of such increase does not exceed the amount of the increase which would be payable in the case of such employee if he were subject to the provisions of subsection (a) of this section plus any additional amount which may result from fixing the rate of basic compensation at the lowest multiple of $60 which will result in an increase not less than the amount of such increase which would be payable under subsection (a).

"(d) The rates of basic compensation of each of the elected officers of the Senate and the House of Representatives (not including the presiding officers of the two Houses), the Parliamentarian of the Senate, the Parliamentarian of the House of Representatives, the Legislative Counsel of the Senate, the Legislative Counsel of the House of Representatives, and the Coordinator of Information of the House of Representatives are hereby increased by 8 percent.

"(e) The provisions of subsection (a) shall not apply to employees whose compensation is paid from the appropriation contained in the paragraph designated 'Folding documents' under the heading 'Contingent expenses of the Senate,' or the appropriation contained in the paragraph designated 'Folding documents' under the heading 'Contingent expenses of the House,' in the Legislative Appropriation Act, 1955 (Public Law 470, 83d Cong.). The limitations contained in such paragraphs are hereby increased by 8 percent.

"(f) The official reporters of proceedings and debates of the Senate and their employees shall be considered to be officers or employees in or under the legislative branch of the Government within the meaning of subsection (a) and the provisions of law referred to in such subsection.

"(g) The additional compensation provided by subsection (a) and the provisions of law referred to in such subsection shall be considered a part of basic compensation for the purposes of the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended.

"(h) (1) The provisions under the heading 'Increased Pay for Legislative Employees' in the Second Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1950, section 2 (a) of the act of October 24, 1951 (Public Law 201, 82d Cong.), and section 4 (a) of this act are hereby amended by striking out '(other than an employee in the office of a Senator).'

"(2) The basic compensation of each employee in the office of a Senator on the effective date of this subsection is hereby adjusted to the lowest multiple of $60 which will provide basic compensation, plus additional compensation payable under subsection (a) and the provisions of law referred to in subsection (a), not less than the amount of basic compensation, plus additional compensation under the provisions of sections 501 and 502 of the Federal Employees' Pay Act of 1945, as amended, and section 301 of the Postal Rate Revision and Federal Employees' Salary Act of 1948, which he is receiving on the effective date of this subsection.

"(i) The aggregate amount of the basic compensation authorized to be paid for administrative and clerical assistance and messenger service in the office of each Senator shall be the amount authorized under provisions of law in effect immediately prior to the enactment of this act for Senators from States the population of which is less than 3 million increased as follows:

"States having a population of:	*Amount of increase*
Less than 3,000,000	$6,000
3,000,000 but less than 4,000,000	9,000
4,000,000 but less than 5,000,000	12,000
5,000,000 but less than 7,000,000	15,000
7,000,000 but less than 9,000,000	18,000
9,000,000 but less than 11,000,000	21,000
11,000,000 but less than 13,000,000	24,000
Over 13,000,000	27,000

"SEC. 906. Section 66 of the Farm Credit Act of 1933 (48 Stat. 269) is hereby amended to read as follows:

" 'SEC. 66. No director, officer, or employee of the Central Bank for Cooperatives, or of any production credit corporation, production credit association, or bank for cooperatives shall be paid compensation at a rate in excess of $14,800 per annum.'

"SEC. 907. (a) The rates of basic compensation of officers and employees in the Department of Medicine and Surgery in the Veterans' Administration whose rates of basic compensation are provided by Public Law 293, 79th Congress, approved January 3, 1946, as amended, are hereby increased by 8 percent.

"(b) Section 8 (d) of Public Law 293, 79th Congress, as amended, is amended by striking out '$12,800' and inserting in lieu thereof '$13,824.'

"SEC. 908. The rates of basic compensation provided by sections 412 and 415 of the Foreign Service Act of 1946, as amended, are hereby increased by 8 percent.

"SEC. 909. Nothwithstanding any other provision of this title, no rate of compensation which is $14,800 or more per annum shall be increased by this title, and no rate of compensation shall be increased by this title to an amount in excess of $14,800 per annum.

"SEC. 910. (a) This title, except subsections (h) and (i) of section 905, shall become effective as of the first day of the first pay period which begins after February 28, 1955, but no payment shall be required to be made under this title before the first day of the first pay period which begins more than 60 days after enactment. Subsections (h) and (i) of section 905 shall take effect on August 1, 1955.

"(b) Pay increases comparable to those provided by this title but granted by administrative action pursuant to law may be made retroactively effective on the same basis as if they had been provided by this title.

"(c) The rate of compensation of any employee who was changed from a position, the compensation of which immediately prior to such change was fixed and adjusted from time to time as nearly as is consistent with the public interest in accordance with prevailing rates, to a position under the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, and placed in the appropriate step of one of the scheduled grades under such act during the period beginning with the effective date, and ending with the date of enactment, of this act shall be adjusted retroactively in accordance with the rate provided in this section for the step in which he was placed at the time of such change.

"(d) The rate of compensation of any employee who was promoted from one grade under the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, to the appropriate step of a higher grade under such act and placed in the appropriate step of such higher grade during the period beginning with the effective date, and ending with the date of enactment, of this act, shall be adjusted retroactively in accordance with the rate provided in this act for the appropriate step of such higher grade.

"(e) The retroactive salary increase payable under the provisions of this title to any employee who transfers from one establishment of the Government to another between the effective date of this title and the first day of the first pay period for which payment is made under this title shall be chargeable to the appropriation or funds of the establishment from which the employee transferred for the period from the effective date of this title to the date of such transfer.

"(f) For the purpose of determining the amount of insurance for which an individual is eligible under the Federal Employees' Group Life Insurance Act of 1954, changes in the rates of compensation which result from the enactment of this act shall be deemed to be effective as of the first day of the first pay period which begins on or after the date of such enactment."

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, the Senate is thoroughly familiar with the language of the amendment I have just proposed. In fact it is not my language. It was originally offered by the Post Office and Civil Service Committee and passed by the Senate several weeks ago. I respectfully call attention to S. 67.

This amendment is identical with S. 67, with one exception. It changes the average increase for all nonpostal employees from 10 percent to 8 percent. This change would permit classified and nonclassified Federal workers to enjoy the same percentage of pay increase as the postal workers are granted in the measure we have under consideration today. And, Mr. President, it is in complete accord with the sentiment of the Senate as expressed during the debate and by the passage of S. 67.

The distinguished chairman of the Post Office and Civil Service Committee and many other Senators on both sides of the aisle have eloquently explained the desirability of a uniform percentage increase for all of Uncle Sam's workers. It would be repetitious and time consuming for me to attempt to reiterate those valid arguments.

It is sufficient to say that since 1947 the percentage increase of postal employees over other workers has been slightly higher than 3 percent and that my amendment merely attempts to provide equal treatment for all Government employees. By our vote on S. 67 we heartily endorsed this principle.

I may also say, Mr. President, that by amending the measure before us to include the thousands of nonpostal workers, we will save the time of our Post Office and Civil Service Committee and the Senate itself. It will be unnecessary for either the committee or the Senate to consider further pay legislation at this session of Congress.

I sincerely hope that the Senate will reaffirm its previously established position by voting for the amendment I have just proposed. In so doing we will discharge our obligation to thousands of our constituents who are loyal and efficient workers for the United States Government. They have every right to expect fair and equal treatment with their coworkers in other branches of the executive department.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I rise to make a point of order on the amendment.

I wish to say to the distinguished Senator from Maryland that I am sure the members of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service and other Members of the Senate are interested in making an equitable salary adjustment for the classified employees. However, they are the subject of separate legislation.

My point of order, Mr. President, is that the amendment offered by the Senator from Maryland is not germane to the bill, which deals with the field service of the Post Office Department. Since the bill deals with the Post Office Department, the amendment is not germane under the unanimous consent agreement entered into yesterday.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I completely agree with the statement made by the minority leader that it is desirable to enact legislation which would equalize the pay of all Federal employees. I do not understand how my amendments can be nongermane to the issue before the Senate, which is a proposal to increase the pay of certain Federal employees. I do not understand how anything could be more germane to the pending bill than the amendments I am proposing.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is ready to rule on the point of order.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I should like to join with the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] in his statement. I do not believe that the amendment proposed by the Senator from Maryland is germane to the bill under consideration. I want it clearly understood that I will insist that classified employees receive the same percentage increase as postal employees. I must remind the Senate, however, that it has already passed Senate bill 67, providing a 10 percent increase in the salaries of all classified employees, and that bill is now pending in the House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. I have been assured that it will receive quick action as soon as the postal bill has been sent to the President.

Mr. BUTLER. If the Senator from South Carolina is willing to have the purpose of this amendment carried out later, why is he not willing to have it done now?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. The amendment is not germane. We have already passed a bill increasing the salaries of classified employees.

Mr. BUTLER. The House has not taken any action on that bill, and has not shown any disposition to take any action on it. I am very anxious that the classified employees be accorded the same treatment postal employees receive.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. When we went into conference with the House on the previous postal-pay bill, we were assured that the House would treat the classified employees in the same way they would treat the postal employees. However, they said they would wait to see what the President would do with the previous bill before

taking any action on a bill raising the pay of the classified employees.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BARKLEY in the chair). The Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] has made a point of order against the amendment of the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BUTLER] on the ground that, under the unanimous-consent agreement, it is not germane to the bill.

The bill before the Senate is a bill granting an increase in compensation to certain field employees of the postal service. It does not apply to any other class of Government employees. The unanimous-consent agreement entered into provides that only germane amendments may be entertained. The Chair is of the opinion that the amendment offered by the Senator from Maryland is not germane to the pending bill. Therefore, the Chair sustains the point of order, and asks that there be printed in the RECORD a statement giving in more detail the Chair's ruling on the point of order.

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

Senate bill 2061 is entitled "A bill to increase the rates of basic compensation of officers and employees in the field service of the Post Office Department."

Section 102 of the bill provides that—

"This act applies to all positions and employees in the postal field service."

The unanimous-consent agreement, under which the bill is now being considered, provides that—

"No amendment that is not germane to the provisions of the bill shall be received."

In view of the fact that the provisions of the pending bill are expressly limited and restricted to positions and employees in the postal field service, any amendment that adds positions and employees in another department, agency, division, or bureau of the Government increases the scope or coverage of the bill beyond the limitation prescribed therein. For that reason it is not germane to the provisions of the bill and therefore in contravention of the unanimous-consent agreement.

On June 12, 1952, the Senate was considering the bill S. 2594, the Defense Production Act of 1952, under a unanimous-consent agreement, providing, among other things, for germaneness of amendments. An amendment was offered dealing with a housing project, against which a point of order was made by the late Senator Maybank, of South Carolina, chairman of the committee, on the ground that it was not germane.

The Vice President (Mr. BARKLEY, of Kentucky) sustained the point of order on the ground that the bill then under consideration was a measure extending the Defense Production Act and the Rent Control Act, and did not deal with housing projects.

An appeal was taken to the Senate, and the ruling of the Chair was sustained on a yea-and-nay vote.

In the recent so-called censure case involving the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER] submitted a parliamentary inquiry whether a resolution of censure concerning any other Member of the Senate would be germane.

The President pro tempore (Mr. BRIDGES, of New Hampshire) said:

"The Chair is of the opinion that an amendment of censure affecting any other Senator than the junior Senator from Wisconsin would not be germane."

The Chair therefore sustains the point of order.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I hope the distinguished Senator from South Carolina and my good friend, the distinguished Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON], the minority member of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, will give this matter early consideration. I think we should do this job in one piece and not treat classified employees on a basis different from that applied to postal employees.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I yield 10 minutes to the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON].

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I wish to join the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service in assuring the senior Senator from Maryland that immediately after action is taken on the pending bill we will immediately do something to take care of the classified employees. They are entitled to consideration, and we have their interests at heart.

The Senate Post Office and Civil Service Committee has unanimously reported Senate bill 2061.

All the Republican Members support this bill because it carries out substantially the wishes of President Eisenhower and the Post Office Department for an immediate pay raise for the postal employees. It calls for a general pay increase, as recommended by the Postmaster General, retroactive to March 1, and provides for many other benefits long sought by the administration.

The bill in its present form omits the unworkable and unfair features of the previous bill, Senate bill 1, sponsored by the chairman of the committee, which the President rightfully returned without his approval. It is almost identical with H. R. 4644 as reported by the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee after many weeks of hearings, and is essentially Senate bill 1489, the bill which I offered originally as a substitute for Senate bill 1.

The committee has now met each of the President's three requirements:

First, he said that the previous bill created "new discriminations or inequities which would affect many thousands of postal employees." Specifically it discriminated against rural letter carriers, special delivery messengers, and many supervisors and postmasters. In Senate bill 2061 practically all of these discriminations are removed. In fact the committee's report on the bill states:

This measure adopts with only minor modifications the basic classification plan and pay schedules recommended by the Postmaster General.

Second, the President said that the previous bill created "grave administrative problems such as the establishment of thousands of individual pay rates. It forced awkward and unfair administrative practices." These objectionable features have been eliminated in the new bill by the adoption of the provisions proposed by the administration.

Third, the President said that the previous bill imposed "a heavier burden upon the taxpayer than is necessary to establish salary rates throughout the Department which will compare favorably with rates for similar work elsewhere in Government and in private industry." The total cost of the present bill has been reduced to $166 million, a saving of $14 million compared with the previous bill. While the cost is still somewhat higher than that recommended by the President, he has said:

It has always been recognized that in the consideration of pay legislation, there can be a reasonable difference of opinion as to what constitutes an appropriate increase. But there can be no compromise with the principle of fairness, and any pay legislation much be fair to all to whom it applies.

I believe the present bill is now in the area of a reasonable difference of opinion as to cost. But most important of all, it is fair to all to whom it applies.

This will be an historic piece of legislation for the 500,000 postal employees. This administration has recognized that postal employees for many years have suffered under a haphazard system of wage determination which has wrecked their morale, stifled their incentive, and interfered with the efficiency of their service.

Their wages have been based on criteria which are unrelated to the requirements of their jobs. Their pay has not been in proper relationship to the pay of their fellow workers.

This bill acknowledges the extraordinary importance of straightening out the complex, inequitable, and at times ridiculous, salary structure in our postal department.

This bill corrects these inequities. It establishes for postal workers a proper relationship between their pay and the cost of living, between their pay and the requirements of their jobs, and between their pay and the pay of their fellow workers.

If an employee is called upon to assume work of a greater responsibility and difficulty, he will be assured of a corresponding increase in pay.

The bill contains a great many allied benefits, such as automatic annual step increases for all categories of employees, biweekly pay periods, longevity pay for substitutes, an increase from $6 to $9 a day in the authorized maximum travel allowance for postal transportation service clerks on road duty, and many other features for which employees have wanted a long time.

The bill preserves the rights of all employees. It injures none. It grants added rights, such as the right to appeal, which has not heretofore existed.

This measure is the culmination of months and years of study and analysis of what is wrong with the pay system in the postal service. The first Hoover Commission in 1950 recommended a system of pay determination for the postal service which is reflected in this bill, S. 2061. In the 83d Congress, the Advisory Council to the Senate Post Office and Civil Service Committee recommended a system of pay determination which is also reflected in S. 2061.

More than 2 years ago the present administration initiated a careful analysis of previous studies, and supplemented them with its own intensive study of the postal pay structure. In the last Con-

gress and in this session of the present Congress the administration has earnestly sought legislation of the kind represented by S. 2061.

A successful end to this effort is now at hand. I believe this measure has the support of the overwhelming majority of the postal employees and their associations. In my opinion, it fulfills the recommendations of the President and has the general approval of the Post Office Department. I urge its passage by the Senate. It is recognition of our and the President's responsibility to the American people in adopting his pay-increase plan which recognizes the increased cost of living, but does not obscure the fact that the proposed schedules will be used in the future for recruitment and promotions and to the advantage and betterment of the postal service.

Mr. President, if I may have the attention of the chairman of the committee, I should like to suggest that I think a correction should be made in the bill or, at least, a statement should be made as to one section of the bill. It is found on page 18, line 3, and relates to special-delivery carriers.

For many years the Post Office Department has had a group of workers known as special-delivery messengers. I would not wish the Senate to conclude action on the bill without inviting attention to what I believe might turn out to be a grave injustice to the group of special-delivery messengers. I have an amendment prepared to correct the situation. I do not intend to offer it, but I should like to have the RECORD show that so far as I am concerned, the term "special-delivery carriers" does not take care of, displace, or replace, special-delivery messengers, who have been so designated for many years. Here is a group of employees who have worked faithfully. They are not a large group. There are probably 6,000 such messengers, but their contribution to the postal service is inestimable.

I should like to ask the distinguished chairman of the committee if he does not agree with me that in keeping with the President's request for enactment of pay legislation which is fair to all of our loyal postal field employees this group should be taken care of and should not be interfered with in any way or discriminated against with respect to their present organization and that the pay level should not preclude the designation of name or position.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I have a great many telegrams from members of this group of postal employees with reference to the situation referred to by the Senator from Kansas. I have here a telegram which will illustrate the situation, and which I should like to read at this time:

DETROIT, MICH., *May 31, 1955.*

Hon. OLIN D. JOHNSTON, *Chairman, Senate Post Office and Civil Service Committee, Washington, D. C.:*

One hundred and twenty-five special delivery messengers in Detroit, Mich., Post Office, with postal service ranging from one to more than 30 years, unanimously endorse Senate bill 2061 and congratulate all members of the Senate Post Office and Civil Service Committee, including yourself, for having at long last recognized the principle of equal pay for equal work. It is most discouraging to be constantly referred to as special delivery messengers and receive considerably less pay than letter carriers. We are full-grown men who wear uniforms identical with those worn by letter carriers. We deliver the United States mails under identical conditions which confront letter carriers including rain, snow, heat and an occasional unfriendly neighborhood dog. We are special delivery letter carriers and want to be so classified in the departmental job description. Senate bill 2061 corrects a long-standing injustice. We are grateful for your support.

ARTHUR O. WOLIN.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that two additional telegrams on the same subject may be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

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

BAY CITY, MICH., *May 31, 1955.*

Senator OLIN JOHNSON, *Civil Service and Post Office Committee, Senate Building, Washington, D. C.:*

Urge that you report out bill S. 2061 also urge that special delivery messenger name be changed to carrier.

TED PIOTROWSKI, *Special Delivery Messenger,*
CLARK BRADY, *Secretary.*

OMAHA, NEBR., *May 31, 1955.*

Senator OLIN JOHNSTON, *Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.:*

We the undersigned special delivery messengers in the Omaha Post Office earnestly urge support of S. 2061 without amendment. Fulfills long-time desire to be classified with city carriers.

MIKE HECK.
WILLIAM ANSON.
GLENN FRISCH.
MAX HOLDORF.
MERRILL KELLEY.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I would say to the Senator from Kansas that I have discussed the matter with the chairman of the House committee, who said he would look into the question thoroughly.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I appreciate very much the statement of the Senator from South Carolina, chairman of the Post Office and Civil Service Committee. I know that he, too, is interested in seeing that no injustice is done in this situation.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I am prepared to yield back my time, and to suggest the absence of a quorum, if that be agreeable to the minority leader.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I am prepared to yield back my time now, and I think there should be a quorum call.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time is yielded back.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, and was read the third time.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

The question is on the passage of the bill. The yeas and nays having been ordered, the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. CLEMENTS. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], the Senator from Delaware [Mr. FREAR], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS], and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] is absent by leave of the Senate to attend the International Labor Organization meeting in Geneva, Switzerland.

I further announce that if present and voting the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], the Senator from Delaware [Mr. FREAR], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] would each vote "yea."

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BUSH], and the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA] are absent on official business.

The Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] and the Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPPEL] are absent by leave of the Senate.

I also announce that the Senator from New York [Mr. IVES], the Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH], and the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DUFF], the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL], and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] are detained on official business.

If present and voting, the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BUSH], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE], the Senator from New York [Mr. IVES], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPPEL], the Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DUFF], the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], and the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE] would each vote "yea."

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 78, nays 0, as follows:

YEAS—78

Aiken	Butler	Daniel
Barkley	Byrd	Dirksen
Barrett	Capehart	Douglas
Beall	Carlson	Dworshak
Bender	Case, N. J.	Eastland
Bennett	Chavez	Ellender
Bible	Clements	Ervin
Bricker	Cotton	Flanders
Bridges	Curtis	Fulbright

George	Lehman	Payne
Goldwater	Long	Potter
Gore	Magnuson	Purtell
Green	Malone	Robertson
Hayden	Mansfield	Russell
Hickenlooper	Martin, Iowa	Saltonstall
Hill	Martin, Pa.	Scott
Holland	McCarthy	Smathers
Humphrey	McClellan	Sparkman
Jackson	McNamara	Stennis
Jenner	Millikin	Symington
Johnson, Tex.	Monroney	Thurmond
Johnston, S. C.	Morse	Watkins
Kefauver	Mundt	Welker
Kerr	Neely	Wiley
Kilgore	Neuberger	Williams
Knowland	Pastore	Young

NOT VOTING—18

Allott	Hennings	Murray
Anderson	Hruska	O'Mahoney
Bush	Ives	Schoeppel
Case, S. Dak.	Kennedy	Smith, Maine
Duff	Kuchel	Smith, N. J.
Frear	Langer	Thye

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, how am I recorded?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California is recorded as having voted in the affirmative.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, how am I recorded?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Indiana is recorded as having voted in the affirmative.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, how am I recorded?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wisconsin is recorded as having voted in the affirmative.

Mr. PURTELL. Mr. President, am I recorded?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is recorded.

Mr. PURTELL. How am I recorded?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut is recorded as having voted in the affirmative.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, how am I recorded?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Dakota is recorded as having voted in the affirmative.

Mr. BEALL. Mr. President, how am I recorded?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland is recorded as having voted in the affirmative.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. President, how am I recorded?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maine is recorded as having voted in the affirmative.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, how am I recorded?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas is recorded as having voted in the affirmative.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, how am I recorded?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida is recorded as having voted in the affirmative.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the distinguished Presiding Officer.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, how am I recorded?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona is recorded as having voted in the affirmative.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, how am I recorded?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Hampshire is recorded as having voted in the affirmative.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I should like to make an inquiry. How am I recorded?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair wishes to advise the senior Senator from Massachusetts that he is recorded as having voted in the affirmative. [Laughter.]

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The senior Senator from Tennessee is not recorded.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I vote "yea."

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, how am I recorded?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland is recorded as having voted in the affirmative.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, how am I recorded?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah is recorded as having voted in the affirmative, if he voted. [Laughter.]

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The junior Senator from North Dakota is not recorded.

Mr. YOUNG. I vote "yea."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The junior Senator from North Dakota is now recorded as having voted in the affirmative.

The Secretary will recapitulate the vote.

The vote was recapitulated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this question the yeas are 78 the nays 0. So the bill is passed.

Mr. KUCHEL subsequently said: Mr. President, I have been detained downtown on business. I regret very much that I was not in the Chamber to vote in favor of the apparently unanimously agreed-upon postal pay bill. I believe my record with respect to adequate salaries for employees of the Federal Government is well known. However, in view of the fact that I regret having missed the 78 to 0 vote in favor of the postal pay bill, I make this brief statement.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, its reading clerk, announced that the House had disagreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 1142) for the relief of Capt. Moses M. Rudy; asked a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. LANE, Mr. FORRESTER, and Mr. REED of Illinois were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the President pro tempore:

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

H. R. 3879. An act to amend section 2 of the act of March 2, 1945, pertaining to the Columbia River at Bonneville, Oreg.;

H. R. 4646. An act to amend section 4421 of the Revised Statutes, in order to remove the requirement as to verifying under oath certain certificates of inspection, and for other purposes;

H. R. 4817. An act relating to the payment of money orders;

H. R. 5223. An act to continue until the close of June 30, 1956, the suspension of duties and import taxes on metal scrap, and for other purposes; and

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

MUTUAL SECURITY ACT OF 1955

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 2090) to amend the Mutual Security Act of 1954, and for other purposes.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business for the purpose of considering the convention on Great Lakes fisheries between the United States of America and Canada.

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 the consideration of executive business.

TREATY FOR REESTABLISHMENT OF AN INDEPENDENT AND DEMOCRATIC AUSTRIA—REMOVAL OF INJUNCTION OF SECRECY

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BARKLEY in the chair). The Chair lays before the Senate a message from the President of the United States, transmitting Executive G, 84th Congress, first session, being the State Treaty For the Reestablishment of an Independent and Democratic Austria, signed at Vienna on May 15, 1955.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the injunction of secrecy be removed from the treaty and that the President's message, together with the accompanying papers, be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and that the President's message of transmittal be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The message from the President is as follows:

To the Senate of the United States:

With a view to receiving the advice and consent of the Senate to ratification, I transmit herewith the State Treaty For the Reestablishment of an Independent and Democratic Austria, signed at Vienna on May 15, 1955.

There is further transmitted for the information of the Senate the report made to me by the Secretary of State regarding the aforesaid treaty.

The Austrian State Treaty represents the culmination of an effort by the Western Powers extending over a period of more than 8 years to bring about Soviet agreement to grant Austria its freedom. The restoration of Austria's freedom and independence has been a major objective of United States policy since the pledge of Austrian liberation made by the Governments of the United States, the United Kingdom, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and France in the Moscow Declaration of November 1, 1943. Until last April, the Soviet Union, while professing a desire for Austrian independence, by its actions and policies blocked the redemption of that pledge. The reversal in policy by the Soviet Government following its failure to prevent ratification of the Paris Pacts has now permitted the conclusion of an Austrian treaty and has won for freedom another important triumph. Moreover, it has emphasized clearly the significance of Western unity to the future of freemen in every part of the world.

The treaty provides for the termination of the occupation and the reestablishment of Austria, within the borders as they existed on January 1, 1938, as a sovereign, independent, and democratic state. All occupation forces will be withdrawn within 90 days of the coming into force of the treaty, and so far as possible not later than December 31, 1955.

After 17 years of occupation, the Austrian Government and people are naturally anxious that ratification of the treaty may be effected as quickly as possible. The pledge of the Moscow Declaration will have been fulfilled only upon entry into force of the treaty and the consequent withdrawal of foreign occupation troops from Austria. I urge, therefore, that the Senate take early and favorable action with respect to the Austrian State Treaty.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *June 1, 1955.*

(Enclosures: 1. Report of the Secretary of State. 2. Austrian State Treaty. 3. Treaty summary. 4. Soviet-Austrian agreement of April 15, 1955.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair lays before the Senate the treaty referred to by the Senator from Texas.

CONVENTION ON GREAT LAKES FISHERIES BETWEEN THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA AND CANADA

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the convention, Executive B (84th Cong., 1st sess.), a convention on Great Lakes fisheries between the United States of America and Canada, signed at Washington on September 10, 1954, which was read the second time, as follows:

The Government of the United States of America and the Government of Canada,

Taking note of the interrelation of fishery conservation problems and of the desirability of advancing fishery research in the Great Lakes.

Being aware of the decline of some of the Great Lakes fisheries,

Being concerned over the serious damage to some of these fisheries caused by the parasitic sea lamprey and the continuing threat which this lamprey constitutes for other fisheries,

Recognizing that joint and coordinated efforts by the United States of America and Canada are essential in order to determine the need for and the type of measures which will make possible the maximum sustained productivity in Great Lakes fisheries of common concern,

Have resolved to conclude a convention and have appointed as their respective Plenipotentiaries:

The Government of the United States of America:

Walter Bedell Smith, Acting Secretary of State of the United States of America, and

William C. Herrington, Chairman of the Delegation of the United States of America to the Great Lakes Fisheries Conference; and

The Government of Canada:

Arnold Danford Patrick Heeney, Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of Canada to the United States of America, and

Stewart Bates, Chairman of the Delegation of Canada to the Great Lakes Fisheries Conference,

who, having communicated to each other their respective full powers, found in good and due form, have agreed as follows:

ARTICLE I

This Convention shall apply to Lake Ontario (including the St. Lawrence River from Lake Ontario to the forty-fifth parallel of latitude), Lake Erie, Lake Huron (including Lake St. Clair), Lake Michigan, Lake Superior and their connnecting waters, hereinafter referred to as "the Convention Area". This Convention shall also apply to the tributaries of each of the above waters to the extent necessary to investigate any stock of fish of common concern, the taking or habitat of which is confined predominantly to the Convention Area, and to eradicate or minimize the populations of the sea lamprey (Petromyzon marinus) in the Convention Area.

ARTICLE II

1. The Contracting Parties agree to establish and maintain a joint commission, to be known as the Great Lakes Fishery Commission, hereinafter referred to as "the Commission", and to be composed of two national sections, a Cananian Section and a United States Section. Each Section shall be composed of not more than three members appointed by the respective Contracting Parties.

2. Each Section shall have one vote. A decision or recommendation of the Commission shall be made only with the approval of both Sections.

3. Each Contracting Party may establish for its Section an advisory committee for each of the Great Lakes. The members of each advisory committee so established shall have the right to attend all sessions of the Commission except those which the Commission decides to hold in camera.

ARTICLE III

1. At the first meeting of the Commission and at every second subsequent annual meeting thereafter the members shall select from among themselves a Chairman and a Vice-Chairman, each of whom shall hold office from the close of the annual meeting at which he has been selected until the close of the second annual meeting thereafter. The Chairman shall be selected from one Section and the Vice-Chairman from the other Section. The offices of Chairman and Vice-Chairman shall alternate biennially between the Sections.

2. The seat of the Commission shall be at such place in the Great Lakes area as the Commission may designate.

3. The Commission shall hold a regular annual meeting at such place as it may decide. It may hold such other meetings as may be agreed upon by the Chairman and Vice-Chairman and at such time and place as they may designate.

4. The Commission shall authorize the disbursement of funds for the joint expenses of the Commission and may employ personnel and acquire facilities necessary for the performance of its duties.

5. The Commission shall make such rules and by-laws for the conduct of its meetings and for the performance of its duties and such financial regulations as it deems necessary.

6. The Commission may appoint an Executive Secretary upon such terms as it may determine.

7. The staff of the Commission may be appointed by the Executive Secretary in the manner determined by the Commission or appointed by the Commission itself on terms to be determined by it.

8. The Executive Secretary shall, subject to such rules and procedures as may be determined by the Commission, have full power and authority over the staff and shall perform such functions as the Commission may prescribe. If the office of Executive Secretary is vacant, the Commission shall prescribe who shall exercise such power or authority.

ARTICLE IV

The Commission shall have the following duties:

(a) to formulate a research program or programs designed to determine the need for measures to make possible the maximum sustained productivity of any stock of fish in the Convention Area which, in the opinion of the Commission, is of common concern to the fisheries of the United States of America and Canada and to determine what measures are best adapted for such purpose;

(b) to coordinate research made pursuant to such programs and, if necessary, to undertake such research itself;

(c) to recommend appropriate measures to the Contracting Parties on the basis of the findings of such research programs;

(d) to formulate and implement a comprehensive program for the purpose of eradicating or minimizing the sea lamprey populations in the Convention Area; and

(e) to publish or authorize the publication of scientific and other information obtained by the Commission in the performance of its duties.

ARTICLE V

In order to carry out the duties set forth in Article IV, the Commission may:

(a) conduct investigations;

(b) take measures and install devices in the Convention Area and the tributaries thereof for lamprey control; and

(c) hold public hearings in the United States of American and Canada.

ARTICLE VI

1. In the performance of its duties, the Commission shall, in so far as feasible, make use of the official agencies of the Contracting Parties and of their Provinces or States and make use of private or other public organizations, including international organizations, or of any person.

2. The Commission may seek to establish and maintain working arrangements with public or private organizations for the purpose of furthering the objectives of this Convention.

ARTICLE VII

Upon the request of the Commission a Contracting Party shall furnish such information pertinent to the Commission's duties as is practicable. A Contracting Party may establish conditions regarding the disclosure of such information by the Commission.

ARTICLE VIII

1. Each Contracting Party shall determine and pay the expenses of its Section. Joint expenses incurred by the Commission shall

be paid by contributions made by the Contracting Parties. The form and proportion of the contributions shall be those approved by the Contracting Parties after the Commission has made a recommendation.

2. The Commission shall submit an annual budget of anticipated joint expenses to the Contracting Parties for approval.

ARTICLE IX

The Commission shall submit annually to the Contracting Parties a report on the discharge of its duties. It shall make recommendations to or advise the Contracting Parties whenever it deems necessary on any matter relating to the Convention.

ARTICLE X

Nothing in this Convention shall be construed as preventing any of the States of the United States of America bordering on the Great Lakes or, subject to their constitutional arrangements, Canada or the Province of Ontario from making or enforcing laws or regulations within their respective jurisdictions relative to the fisheries of the Great Lakes so far as such laws or regulations do not preclude the carrying out of the Commission's duties.

ARTICLE XI

The Contracting Parties agree to enact such legislation as may be necessary to give effect to the provisions of this Convention.

ARTICLE XII

The Contracting Parties shall jointly review in the eighth year of the operation of the Convention the activities of the Commission in relation to the objectives of the Convention in order to determine the desirability of continuing modifying or terminating this Convention.

ARTICLE XIII

1. This Convention shall be ratified and the instruments of ratification shall be exchanged at Ottawa.

2. This Convention shall enter into force on the date of the exchange of the instruments of ratification. It shall remain in force for ten years and shall continue in force thereafter until terminated as provided herein.

3. Either Contracting Party may, by giving two years' written notice to the other Contracting Party, terminate this Convention at the end of the initial ten-year period or at any time thereafter.

In witness whereof the respective Plenipotentiaries have signed the present Convention.

Done at Washington, in duplicate, this tenth day of September 1954.

For the Government of the United States of America:

WALTER BEDELL SMITH.
WM. C. HERRINGTON.

For the Government of Canada:

A. D. P. HEENEY.
STEWART BATES.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, since it is the practice of the Senate to require a yea-and-nay vote on treaties, and a large number of Senators are present, I think we can expedite action on the convention. I shall make a brief statement about it.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield so that I may ask for the yeas and nays?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield for that purpose.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, on the question of agreeing to the resolution of ratification I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, this convention with Canada on Great Lakes fisheries is designed to do two things:

First. To control and, if possible, to eradicate, the lamprey eel, which has already destroyed the trout in Lakes Huron and Michigan and is now moving into Lake Superior; and

Second. To stimulate coordinated research concerning the problems of Great Lakes fisheries which are of common concern to the United States and Canada.

The convention establishes an international commission to carry out the lamprey-eradication program and to conduct general fisheries research.

I emphasize that the Commission is given no regulatory powers whatever over Great Lakes fishing operations. That matter is left entirely up to the eight Great Lakes States which now exercise jurisdiction over these matters. The Commission is empowered to make recommendations, but its recommendations dealing with matters now under State jurisdiction will have to be transmitted to the States, for such action as they see fit to take.

In this respect, the present convention differs radically from an earlier convention on the same subject, which was signed in 1946, but never was acted upon by the Senate. The 1946 convention was withdrawn from Senate consideration by the President when the present convention was submitted; and the issue of international regulation of Great Lakes fisheries, which was presented by the 1946 convention, is no longer before the Senate.

In the process of negotiating the present convention, the Departments of State and Interior held extensive consultation with all interested State agencies and private organizations; and the convention comes before the Senate with the unanimous endorsement of all the States concerned. It also has widespread support among conservation groups and commercial fishermen.

At a hearing which was held by a subcommittee of the Foreign Relations Committee only one witness appeared in opposition to the treaty, and his chief objection was that the treaty was unnecessary.

The preponderance of the evidence, however, shows that the treaty is urgently necessary, Mr. President. The lamprey eel has virtually wiped out the trout in Lakes Huron and Michigan and is now rapidly increasing in numbers in Lake Superior. This creature can be controlled by means of electrical barriers placed across the streams up which it must go to spawn; but for these control measures to be effective they must obviously be applied on streams on both sides of the international boundary. Thus, joint action by the Canadian and American Governments is required.

For some reason, the lamprey eel has never established itself in Lake Erie, and it is no problem there. The fishermen of Ohio long opposed a Great Lakes fisheries treaty because they feared it would be the opening wedge to Federal or international control of fishing operations which are now under State jurisdiction. The distinguished senior Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER], however, has recently forwarded to me a telegram from the Ohio Commercial Fishermen's Association reiterating their opposition to Federal control and endorsing the present treaty "as a cooperative gesture to the neighboring Great Lakes fisherman." The telegram was received too late for inclusion in the subcommittee's hearings, and I now ask unanimous consent that it be inserted in the RECORD at this point.

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

LORAIN, OHIO, *April 27, 1955.*

Hon. JOHN BRICKER,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:

The Ohio Commercial Fisherman's Association representing the commercial fishing industry in Ohio approves and endorses an international treaty to eradicate or control the lamprey eel in the Great Lakes. We take this stand as a cooperative gesture to the neighboring Great Lakes fisherman. We know the lamprey has not, and will not be a problem in Lake Erie. We strenuously oppose any treaty or agreement of wide scope and we especially oppose Federal fishery controls of any degree in Lake Erie. We urge any agreement be limited to lamprey control only. Complete confidence in fish management and research by Ohio department of natural resources is present and our opposition to any degree of Federal fishery control exclusive of the lamprey eel in Lake Erie is reiterated.

NELSON G. PARSONS,
President, Ohio Commercial Fisherman's Association.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, the hearings already contain statements from Governor Lausche, of Ohio; the Ohio Wildlife Council; and the Ohio Department of Natural Resources, expressing similar sentiments.

Mr. President, it is estimated that the pending convention will cost the United States approximately $750,000 a year for the first 3 years, and something less thereafter. By contrast, it is estimated that American fishermen alone lose $3.5 million a year through the depredations of the lamprey eel. Surely, this convention represents a good investment to protect a valuable natural resource. I urge the Senate to give its overwhelming approval to the ratification of the convention.

Mr. POTTER obtained the floor.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, will the Senator from Michigan yield to me?

Mr. POTTER. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I should like to announce that after the Senator from Michigan makes his statement, there will be a yea-and-nay vote on the question of agreeing to the resolution of ratification of the convention. I hope all Senators will take note of this announcement.

Mr. POTTER. Mr. President, I assure my colleagues that my remarks will be brief.

Some time ago, as a Member of the House of Representatives, I addressed that body on the problem caused by the lamprey eel, a parasite which has to a great extent destroyed the fishing in the Great Lakes. I fortified my remarks on that occasion by presenting an exhibit

of the so-called sea lamprey. Many of of colleagues in the Senate have not had an opportunity to view such a specimen, so I now have at the clerk's desk two samples of the sea lamprey, one a jar containing young sea lamprey; and the other, the larger jar, containing a sea lamprey after 8 months of growth.

Mr. President, ratification of this convention or treaty is very desirable, for it is long overdue. The Great Lakes are probably the only international bodies of water which are not subject to international treaty.

The provisions of the convention have been eloquently stated by the junior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY].

The convention relates to two main problems. The first problem is to eradicate the sea lamprey, of which a specimen is now on exhibit at the clerk's desk.

The second problem involves the long-term work of research in regard to controlling and eradicating the sea lamprey and in regard to rehabilitating fisheries on the Great Lakes.

Mr. President, I reiterate and emphasize that ratification of the convention is long overdue.

To those who have concern regarding the effect of the treaty on State fishing laws and regulations, I state that the treaty will have no effect of that sort.

The primary purpose of the convention is to control the sea lamprey and to make it possible to conduct a unified research program in regard to the fisheries of the Great Lakes.

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

Mr. POTTER. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I wish to express my sincere personal appreciation to the Senator from Michigan for his very helpful cooperation in regard to this matter, and I also desire to express the appreciation of the committee for the very helpful testimony which representatives of various Michigan agencies gave before the subcommittee.

Mr. POTTER. I thank the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Michigan yield to me?

Mr. POTTER. I yield.

Mr. BRICKER. Let me state that it is my understanding that although there was some opposition to the treaty by representatives of Ohio groups, the opposition was not to control the predatory eel. Instead, the opposition was really to "putting the foot in the door," as we might say, as regards treaty control of fishing in the Great Lakes.

Mr. POTTER. That is correct. Let me say that I appreciate the courtesy of the Senator from Ohio in making available the telegram which the Senator from Minnesota has already had printed in the RECORD.

Mr. BRICKER. I was glad to do so.

Mr. President, let me say that although the sea lamprey does not constitute a problem in Lake Erie, nevertheless we are glad to join in the movement for control of this predatory eel.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BARKLEY in the chair). If there is no objection, the convention will be considered as having passed through its various parliamentary stages, up to the point of agreeing to the resolution of ratification.

The resolution of ratification will be read.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

Resolved (two-thirds of the Senators present concurring therein), That the Senate advise and consent to the ratification of Executive B, 84th Congress, 1st session, a convention on Great Lakes fisheries between the United States of America and Canada, signed at Washington on September 10, 1954.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution of ratification.

On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the Secretary will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. CLEMENTS. I announce that the Senators from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON and Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Delaware [Mr. FREAR], and the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] is absent by leave of the Senate to attend the International Labor Organization meeting in Geneva, Switzerland.

I further announce that if present and voting the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], the Senator from Delaware [Mr. FREAR], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], and the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] would each vote "yea."

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BUSH], and the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA] are absent on official business.

The Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] and the Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPPEL] are absent by leave of the Senate.

I also announced that the Senator from New York [Mr. IVES], the Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH], and the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DUFF] and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] are detained on official business.

If present and voting, the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BUSH], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE], the Senator from New York [Mr. IVES], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPPEL], the Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DUFF], and the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE] would each vote "yea."

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 79, nays 0, as follows:

YEAS—79

Aiken	Bennett	Byrd
Barkley	Bible	Capehart
Barrett	Bricker	Carlson
Beall	Bridges	Case, N. J.
Bender	Butler	Clements
Cotton	Johnson, Tex.	Neuberger
Curtis	Johnston, S. C.	O'Mahoney
Daniel	Kefauver	Pastore
Dirksen	Kerr	Payne
Douglas	Kilgore	Potter
Dworshak	Knowland	Purtell
Eastland	Kuchel	Robertson
Ellender	Lehman	Russell
Ervin	Long	Saltonstall
Flanders	Magnuson	Scott
Fulbright	Malone	Smathers
George	Mansfield	Sparkman
Goldwater	Martin, Iowa	Stennis
Gore	Martin, Pa.	Symington
Green	McCarthy	Thurmond
Hayden	McClellan	Watkins
Hickenlooper	McNamara	Welker
Hill	Millikin	Wiley
Holland	Monroney	Williams
Humphrey	Morse	Young
Jackson	Mundt	
Jenner	Neely	

NOT VOTING—17

Allott	Frear	Murray
Anderson	Hennings	Schoeppel
Bush	Hruska	Smith, Maine
Case, S. Dak.	Ives	Smith, N. J.
Chavez	Kennedy	Thye
Duff	Langer	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Two-thirds of the Senators present concurring therein, the resolution of ratification is agreed to.

Without objection, the President will be immediately notified.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

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

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

HELLS CANYON DAM AND MIGRATORY SALMON RUNS OF THE COLUMBIA BASIN

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, one of the most delicate tasks confronting the United States today is to develop the resources necessary for the economic prosperity of a nation of 165 million people and yet, at the same time, to conserve and save some of the wilderness values that are so essential to our spiritual and emotional well-being.

In no region is this task more dramatically symbolized than in the Pacific Northwest. The Northwest needs vast new hydroelectric-power facilities because falling water is the Northwest's only industrial fuel. Furthermore, it is the cheapest industrial fuel in the land—this water which surges eternally downhill through the canyons and gorges of the region.

But the rivers of the Northwest are the spawning ground for the most valuable and the most inspiring fish runs in the United States: the salmon migrations of the Columbia River Basin.

These migrations mean a great deal to the Northwest's people. They sustain a commercial fishery worth at least $10 million annually on the lower stretches of the Columbia near such communities as Astoria, Portland, Clatskanie, and The Dalles in my State of Oregon. They also provide sports fishing which exhilarates men who fish for fun and pleasure. Rudyard Kipling once wrote that the most wonderful experience of his life was fishing for Columbia salmon. "I have lived," he exulted after this adventure.

Furthermore, along the upland rivers of the Northwest lie wilderness realms that must be protected from commercial invasion if we are to preserve a few museums of the past—a handful of solitudes that perpetuate the great fastnesses through which Lewis and Clark trekked, on their way to the sea 150 years ago this autumn.

So when people in the Northwest who love the outdoors and who love wildlife have talked of damsites for power production, they have not thought exclusively in terms of kilowatts. They have asked this question:

> Where can hydroelectricity best be generated without destroying fish runs and scarring scenic grandeur?

That has been a $64 question, Mr. President.

GOP REVERSES CONSERVATIONISTS' SCHEDULE OF WISEST USE OF RIVERS

For many years the question has been answered in simple terms. It was obvious that the damsite which could most readily be developed according to these specifications was Hells Canyon on the Snake River. This is a narrow chasm, a full mile in depth, where the reservoir will flood out no magnificent forests, no forage fields for grazing animals, no colorful scenery. And the impact of the dam on fish life would be comparatively negligible.

In addition, Hells Canyon would make possible approximately 1,200,000 kilowatts of water power, thus rendering unnecessary for a considerable period certain other dams which might have an adverse effect on scenic and recreational values.

Conservationists also pointed out that one river had to be kept forever free of man-made obstructions if the Chinook salmon runs were to survive. This, of course, was the Salmon River of Idaho, where not less than 30 percent—and perhaps as much as 50 percent—of the extremely valuable spring Chinook salmon runs migrate and then spawn the next generation and cycle of fish.

On top of all this, it was agreed that the river which, next to the Salmon, had to be kept clear of new dams as long as possible was the Clearwater River, at the source of which foam and champ the two most majestic wilderness streams of the Northwest, the Selway and the Lochsa.

So this was the schedule of the conservationists:

First. The best dam for not destroying scenic and wildlife values was Hells Canyon on the Snake.

Second. The river never, never to be dammed was the Salmon.

Third. The river never to be dammed further, if possible, was the Clearwater.

But today, Mr. President, the Republican Party leadership has set out determinedly to reverse completely this schedule, regardless of the cost to commercial fishermen, to sports fishermen and to men, women, and children who hope to preserve some few realms of the wilderness where exploitation does not exist.

This attitude is particularly true of the Republican Party leadership in my own State of Oregon. It is an incredible attitude, in view of the many Oregon communities that are so totally reliant on commercial fisheries and on the income from the tourist trade to maintain their prosperity and jobs.

It is an attitude which was forecast as early as May 5, 1953, when the ex-Governor of the State of Oregon, Secretary of the Interior Douglas McKay, withdrew the Government's claim to the magnificent power site at Hells Canyon. When McKay made this unwise decision, a letter was sent by his Department to the Federal Power Commission. That letter declared in part:

> There appears to be no reason why other projects in the basin could not be used with the same logic as that proposed for Hells Canyon. Of these other projects there is Mountain Sheep and Nez Perce on the Snake River, several dams on the Salmon and more on the Clearwater River.

Now, what does this mean, Mr. President? Its meaning is very evident to anyone who knows a salmon egg from an elderberry. It means that the Interior Department, under the ex-Governor of Oregon, is willing—nay, eager—to have the Salmon and Clearwater Rivers choked off by dams, if this will help to save the Hells Canyon site on the Snake for the Idaho Power Co., with which this administration is so friendly. What other meaning can be placed on the Interior Department statement, if we are to accept the English language at its face value? And it is additionally significant that the Nez Perce site on the Snake is below where the Salmon and the Snake Rivers unite, so this project, too, would result in strangling the Salmon's vast salmon pilgrimages.

REPUBLICAN GOVERNOR WOULD SACRIFICE SALMON AND WILDERNESS GRANDEUR

That was Republican doctrine in May of 1953. It is still Republican Party official doctrine now. How do I know?

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. NEUBERGER. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. I wish to commend my colleague for calling attention to the effect of the administration's proposal with regard to the development of dams by the private utilities and the effect of that program upon the fishing industry and upon wildlife in the Pacific Northwest. I believe it needs to be emphasized in the RECORD at this point, because my colleague is performing a great service in the speech he is now making. I would have every conservationist in America pay heed to the speech.

Is it not correct that the Hells Canyon Dam, which the Senator and I are urging by means of Senate bill 1333, would be a dam which would produce a minimum of injury to the fishing industry, for the reason that the water in and above Hells Canyon site is not a spawning ground for salmon, as the Salmon River is? And is it not so that the dams which McKay and Patterson urge as alternatives to Hells Canyon would do irreparable damage to the salmon runs up the Salmon River?

Mr. NEUBERGER. My colleague is absolutely correct. Of course, I remember that when the senior Senator from Oregon introduced S. 1333 and became its principal sponsor, he mentioned the obvious fact that Hells Canyon was a desirable damsite, because it is located above the mouth of the Salmon River. In other words, at Hells Canyon vast quantities of cheap hydroelectric power, plus important flood control benefits, can be obtained without blocking off the important watercourse up the Salmon River, where from 30 percent to 50 percent of the valuable Chinook salmon run must spawn.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. NEUBERGER. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. Does the Senator agree with me it is very important that the conservationists of the Pacific Northwest realize the fact that their real enemies, so far as the devastating effect on the fishing industry is concerned, are Secretary McKay and Governor Patterson and the others, who are proposing dams on the rivers where the salmon run, in lieu of the high multiple-purpose dam at Hells Canyon, which would not cause any injury to the fishing industry?

Mr. NEUBERGER. That is definitely the situation. The administration is so eager to save the Hells Canyon site for the Idaho Power Company that it will suggest as alternatives any possible set of dams no matter what their effect may be on fishing, on wildlife, and on scenic values generally.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. NEUBERGER. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. Is the Secretary of the Interior, the former Republican Governor of Oregon, the only Republican leader or spokesman in our State who favors a program which would cause such great damage to the interest of the conservationists?

Mr. NEUBERGER. No, he is not; but he is one of the most prominent and influential and important, of course. The Senator asked me to yield exactly at the point in my speech where I detail the precise words of another important Republican leader who advocates dams which would in effect cause great damage to fish and wildlife.

Mr. MORSE. I shall listen with great interest.

Mr. NEUBERGER. For example, on April 6, 1955, the Governor of Oregon, the Honorable Paul L. Patterson, testified at Portland against S. 1333, our bill authorizing a high multipurpose Federal dam at Hells Canyon. In one portion of his testimony, the Governor of Oregon argued that superior flood control could be obtained by damming the Salmon and the Clearwater Rivers rather than the Snake River. Listen to his words:

> If it is flood control which is paramount in the committee's consideration, then I would call your attention to the fact that the difference in the cost of Hells Canyon Dam and the John Day Dam would go a long way toward building the dams on the Clearwater and Salmon Rivers, which contribute more than 80 percent of the Snake River's floodwaters in the Columbia; and that the Hells Canyon high dam would have no effect whatever on the spring runoff from the Clearwater and the Salmon.

The Governor later, under questioning, tried to quibble his way out of the Salmon River Dam commitment because he must have realized that the blockad-

ing of the Salmon would just about eliminate the commercial fishing industry in his State. But the foregoing words are his own considered, written testimony before the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. He put himself on record as favoring the damming of the Salmon and Clearwater Rivers to achieve flood control. Let me emphasize one phrase of Governor Patterson's. It is this one:

The Hells Canyon high dam would have no effect whatever on the spring runoff from the Clearwater and the Salmon.

The Governor of Oregon, the Honorable Paul L. Patterson, is absolutely right about that. I, too, regret that Hells Canyon high dam will not retard the champing floodwaters which course down the Salmon and the Clearwater Rivers every spring. But, Mr. President, every single consideration does not devolve upon flood control—or even upon waterpower, important though that may be.

In drawing up S. 1333, my senior colleague [Mr. MORSE] and I also had other considerations in mind. Two of these considerations were, in order, first, protection of the valuable salmon migrations of the Columbia River system; and, second, safeguarding the wilderness solitudes which give birth to the Clearwater and its feeder streams. Therefore, we deliberately saw to it that in S. 1333 we were promoting a dam which did not—and I repeat the word "not"—throttle the Salmon and the Clearwater Rivers. We knew there was additional flood-control storage to be achieved on those rivers—lots of it. But we were not thinking only of flood control, as apparently the Governor of Oregon is doing these days. We were thinking, too, of Astoria and of those other downstream communities which must pack many thousands of pounds of firm pink salmon or else stagnate economically and suffer the outward migration of their young people in quest of jobs.

And we were thinking of recreationists, of people who cherish vacations in the outdoors, and we were not willing to flood out the majestic timbered fastnesses that are the bassinet of the Clearwater River system. So, Mr. President, we who are sponsoring S. 1333 plead guilty to the charge leveled against us by Governor Patterson—we did not plan a dam which would retard the floodwaters of the Salmon and the Clearwater Rivers.

But, conversely, we say, in reply to Governor Patterson: "Sir, are you so eager to see the Hells Canyon damsite bestowed upon the Idaho Power Co. that you will promote alternate sites which threaten to wipe out fish runs vital to many families in the State of which you are the chief executive?"

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. NEUBERGER. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. I attended the Portland hearings at which Governor Patterson testified and at which the junior Senator from Oregon did such a fine job of cross-examination and brought out the Governor's statement of preference really for what amounts to the Idaho Power Company's proposals in regard to the dam. So that the record may be straight and so that the conservationists of the Pacific Northwest will understand who it is who is fighting to protect the conservation interests—and it does not happen to be the present Governor of the State of Oregon—let me put this question:

If we build the high dam at Hells Canyon which the Governor of Oregon has testified against, we will build a dam which not only will develop the maximum potential of electric power at that reach of the Snake River, but will give to the people of the State of Oregon maximum flood-control protection, and, at the same time, protect the fishing industry of the State of Oregon. Is not that correct?

Mr. NEUBERGER. The Senator is quite correct. By building Hells Canyon Dam we will also postpone for many, many years into the future the time when there might be compelling economic pressure to draw on the remaining power resources of the Clearwater River and of the Salmon River. In other words, it is a balanced project. It offers vast quantities of power and no adverse impact in any substantial degree on either scenery, fishing, or wildlife. Yet that is the project which the ex-Governor of Oregon and the present Governor of Oregon would abandon to the Idaho Power Co.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for another question?

Mr. NEUBERGER. I shall be happy to yield.

Mr. MORSE. The opponents of Hells Canyon, as a matter of argumentative pattern, usually suggest as an alternative dams on the Salmon River and Clearwater River. But is it not true that the findings of the conservationists show that these dams would have a devastating effect upon the fishing industry in those particular waters, because they are the spawning waters, the waters which the salmon must traverse in order to get to their spawning grounds, and would do irreparable damage to the fishing industry?

Mr. NEUBERGER. That is correct.

Mr. MORSE. Therefore, the opponents of Hells Canyon Dam must meet us head-on in regard to the effect of their program on not only the fishing industry, but on the recreation and wildlife assets that would accrue from the building of Hells Canyon Dam as contrasted with the damage that would result by building the alternatives to the Hells Canyon Dam which opponents use in justifying their advocacy of the Idaho Power Co. dam.

Mr. NEUBERGER. That is absolutely correct. When ex-Governor McKay and Governor Patterson say they suggest the damming of the Salmon and Clearwater Rivers they are saying that the death knell of commercial salmon fishing means nothing at all to them.

Mr. MORSE. The Senator will recall that one of the arguments of the Governor in his testimony at Portland was the fallacious one that Oregon would not receive very much benefit from a high Hells Canyon Dam. But the Governor failed to point out that the State of Oregon would receive much less benefit from a dam on the Salmon River, so far as power potentials are concerned. Is not that true?

Mr. NEUBERGER. Not only is that true, but I did not hear him say anything about the benefits the State of Oregon would get from the Idaho Power Co.'s dams.

Mr. MORSE. It is true, is it not, that in our bill we guarantee 500,000 kilowatts of power to be set aside for the benefit of the territory adjacent to the Snake River, which includes the whole chain of eastern counties in the State of Oregon, but that there is nothing in the program of the Idaho Power Co. which guarantees a single kilowatt of power to the State of Oregon. Is not that correct?

Mr. NEUBERGER. That is true. Further, the Governor of Oregon would relinquish the Hells Canyon site to the Idaho Power Co. which for the electricity it furnishes to farmers, housewives, and industry has the highest rate structure of any private power company or any electric operation in the Pacific Northwest.

CONSTRUCTION OF LOW-HEAD DAMS BY THE IDAHO POWER CO.

Mr. MORSE. And, of course, would really defeat our purpose in attempting to induce more private enterprise to come into the Pacific Northwest, because it could not afford to pay the prices for power the Idaho Power Co. would charge. Several companies are standing by, each one of them willing to invest several millions of dollars in plants to develop the commercial fertilizer area of the Pacific Northwest which awaits development if cheap power can be made available to those fertilizer beds. The Idaho Power Co.'s rates would make it uneconomical for them to build those plants. So they are saying to us, in effect, "Give us a high dam at Hells Canyon and we will bring to Idaho and the adjacent States benefits to the tune of a good many millions of dollars." Is not that correct?

Mr. NEUBERGER. That is true. In support of what the Senator has said, all we have to do is to look at the recent record.

In the first 10 years after low-cost Bonneville power became available, which were the years 1939 to 1948, Oregon and Washington had a 329 percent gain in industrial payrolls, as contrasted with the national average of 284 percent. That was the only period in the history of those States when there was a greater gain in industrial employment than the national average. It coincided with the first decade when low-cost public power from the Bonneville system went over the transmission lines.

Yet in the same period Idaho had a relative small increase in industrial employment. While Oregon and Washington were witnessing great gains in population, Idaho barely held its own when compared with the national rate of gain.

Mr. MORSE. I think the conversationists of our section of the country will be deeply thankful for the record which the junior Senator from Oregon is making today in his great speech. I want him to know that I intend to stand shoulder to shoulder with him in the

fight to protect the conservation interests of our State.

We have an alternative. On the one hand, we can build a high dam at Hells Canyon and protect the conservation interests. On the other hand, we can follow McKay and Patterson, of Oregon, and the Governors of Idaho and Washington, who are, in effect, pleading the case of the Idaho Power Co. to sell the conservation interests down the Snake and Columbia Rivers.

I do not intend to sell the conservation interests of our section of the country down those rivers. I shall continue to support the junior Senator from Oregon in the great fight he is making to protect the conservation interests of the Columbia and Snake Rivers.

Mr. NEUBERGER. I know that the conservationist and recreation groups will value the support of so interested and influential a Member of the Senate as is the senior Senator from Oregon.

We have read editorials and letters and resolutions from various fisheries groups protesting the construction of Ice Harbor Dam on the lower Snake River. These people undoubtedly have a valid point. It is possible that Ice Harbor might have some unfavorable effect upon salmon migrations upstream. Yet the impact of Ice Harbor Dam upon these runs would be as Council Crest in Portland is to a great peak in the Himalayas, when we compare the effect of Ice Harbor with the damming of the Salmon River itself.

HIGH-CONTROL DAMS BLOCK OFF SALMON RUNS TO SPAWNING GROUNDS

In referring to dams across the Salmon, both Governor Patterson and Secretary McKay have discussed flood control; this would mean relatively high structures for storage. To thus seal off the principal fish-spawning sanctuary of the entire Columbia River Basin would be to risk the destruction of the whole Chinook salmon spring fishery, an outcome not even remotely associated with the erection of Ice Harbor.

"Civilization and salmon don't mix," I was told long ago by a fine United States Forest Ranger named Grady Miller, who still lives in Enterprise, Oreg. But it is the task of us who serve in Government to make our fisheries resources last as long as possible. By building Hells Canyon Dam, we can avoid for a good many years the necessity of seeking alternative hydroelectric power production and flood control on the Salmon and Clearwater Rivers. That is a predominant reason why Senator MORSE and I are sponsoring S. 1333 for Hells Canyon.

Mr. Patterson and Mr. McKay, conversely, would rule out Hells Canyon by relinquishing that site to the Idaho Power Co. Then, they would atone for this by building dams on the two rivers of paramount importance to fish and recreation—the Salmon and the Clearwater. Mr. Patterson and Mr. McKay undoubtedly are perfectly sincere and honorable about their position, but it is a position which can only result adversely for people interested in sports fishing, commercial fishing, and outdoor recreation in the wilderness. Why barricade streams of such importance to salmon pilgrimages when sites like Hells Canyon, not involving these considerations, are presently available?

Is the welfare of the Idaho Power Co. more basic and important than the livelihood of thousands of commercial fishermen and the pleasure of thousands of campers, hikers, and sports fishermen? This utility corporation must be a mighty Caesar, indeed, to feed on resources so essential to the people of our Northwest region.

Of course, we must realize that private power companies, in spite of their crocodile tears in the 1930's about the fish ladders at Bonneville, never have really cared sincerely for the future of wildlife. Although Rudyard Kipling became enthusiastic long ago over the marvelous fishing in the Clackamas River of Oregon, a series of private utility dams on that stream have just about ended the wonderful spring Chinook runs of the Clackamas. Nor should we forget the power-company dam that closed off the prodigious spawning runs of Blueback salmon into Oregon's Wallowa Lake. And what of the fact that the Oregon Game Commission and Fish Commission are fighting even now to save the fish runs of the Deschutes River from a proposed private power dam which would shut off these hegiras?

At Bonneville Dam the Federal Government spent $7,200,000 for a series of costly fish ladders to save the migrating salmon. This was possible because Bonneville is a low dam with a comparatively short drop in the spillway, which does not necessarily kill downstream-traveling fingerlings. But the Pacific Northwest is dotted with private power dams that are lacking utterly in proper protective equipment for pilgrimaging salmon.

The United States Fish and Wildlife Service is the author of the statement that "the Salmon River is by far the most productive for fish of any of the tributaries in the Columbia River." What do the ex-Governor of Oregon, Mr. McKay, and the present Governor of Oregon, Mr. Patterson, have to say to the commercial and to the sports fishermen of Oregon about their desire to see dams thrust across the Salmon River for power and flood control?

OUTDOOR RECREATION AND SPORT FISHING DESERVE PROTECTION

Mr. President, I may be a "nut" on conservation, as some of my critics claim. I admit that I belong to the Wilderness Society and the Izaak Walton League. I admit that I have fought hard against commercial developments or exploitation inside the boundaries of Dinosaur National Monument, of the Olympic National Park, and of the Three Sisters Wilderness Area. I will continue to fight on that frontier because that is the way I think and feel. The wilderness and the outdoors mean a lot to me. My wife, Maurine, and I are among the few people who have traveled the whole rugged Lolo Trail, where Meriwether Lewis and William Clark experienced their sternest hardships. On that lonely trail, we came upon the original rock cairns which guided these first of all westbound Americans through the Bitterroot Mountains. As I stood there in that wilderness, I rejoiced in my heart that we Americans had spared at least one isolated spot; that, somewhere, there was a fortress of the outdoors free of scars from ax and saw, bulldozers, dynamite, or piledrivers.

I do not share the philosophy of Douglas McKay and Paul Patterson. If it meant my complete and total elimination from political life, I never would say, as they seem to be saying, that the country does not need high Hells Canyon Dam because we can get flood control and power on the Salmon and the Clearwater Rivers, instead, and what difference does it make that some fish and wildlife and scenery are wiped out in the process?

On May 3, 1955, the gill-net fishermen at the mouth of the Columbia River had their largest opening-day catch in 10 years. And the fish counters at Bonneville Dam tallied the third largest single day's count of fish in history. This resulted from a marvelous 1955 spring run of Chinook salmon. But remember the statement of the Fish and Wildlife Service that from 30 percent to 50 percent of the spring salmon pilgrimage spawns up the Salmon River. How many fish do you think, Mr. President, those gill-net fishermen in Oregon would have caught on May 3, 1955, if the proposals of Oregon's leading Republicans had been in effect—the proposals to dam the Salmon River? I dare say there would not have been enough salmon in the nets of those men to keep the stores and shops and offices in their hometowns prosperously open more than a few months of the year.

The senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] and I are fully aware that there is power production and flood control to be obtained by wedging a dam into the chasms of the Salmon and Clearwater Rivers. But we realize what this would do to fish runs and to scenery. We also realize that comparable benefits can be obtained on the Snake River at Hells Canyon, without this ruinous damage to salmon migrations and to outdoor grandeur. That is part of the basic philosophy underlying our bill S. 1333—waterpower and flood control, to be sure, but peril to fish runs and to the majestic wilderness, no.

OREGON STATE AGENCIES HAVE OPPOSED DAMS WHICH GOVERNOR SUGGESTS

I am aware, Mr. President, that the man who is Governor of Oregon must be very busy, indeed. It is an occupying job, although being a United States Senator takes a good deal of time, too. But I regret that neither the past Governor of Oregon, Mr. McKay, nor the present Governor of Oregon, Mr. Patterson, appear to be all aware of the stand taken by State agencies and commissions under their own direction.

I think I might bring them up to date.

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

Mr. NEUBERGER. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. I cannot begin to express to my colleague the feeling of appreciation I have for his being in the Senate, and joining with me, shoulder to shoulder, in the various fights in which we are trying to protect the people's interest and heritage in the natural resources of the Nation.

I have not had an opportunity to call this matter to his attention, but I feel certain he will be pleased to have me do so.

The junior Senator from Oregon is recognized as being one of the outstanding authorities on conservation problems in the United States. He is so recognized by the conservationist leaders of the Nation, who have written to me about the position which the junior Senator from Oregon has taken on conservation matters.

I am sure the Senator will be interested to know that on May 27, 1953, I spoke at some length in the Senate in opposition to the sellout by Secretary of the Interior McKay to the Idaho Power Co. when he announced that the Department of the Interior was not going to continue to intervene in the Hells Canyon Dam matter before the Federal Power Commission, even though the Secretary of the Interior knew at that time that the greatest collection of data and evidence in support of Hells Canyon Dam was to be found in two files. One of them was the file of the Bureau of Reclamation of the Department of the Interior, to be specific, whose engineers had for years recommended the building of a high dam at Hells Canyon. The other was the file of the United States Army Corps of Engineers, which organization likewise for years had recommended the building of a high dam at Hells Canyon.

In my speech on May 27, 1953, I referred to the findings of the Department of the Interior and the Corps of Engineers in regard to the fish problem. I call the Senator's attention to what I said on that occasion, when I critized the Department of the Interior for its runout on the American people by its failure to protect their interests in the Hells Canyon Dam issue. The Secretary of the Interior could be charged with the knowledge that the scientific data in his own files showed the Hells Canyon Dam plan to be superior to the low-head plan of the Idaho Power Co.

It is very interesting that the examiner for the Federal Power Commission in his recent report had to admit the soundness of the position which the two Senators from Oregon have taken on this matter, from the standpoint of engineering, from the standpoint of the supply of cheap power, and from the standpoint of cost.

On May 27, 1953, I said this on the floor of the Senate:

> Certainly, the Department of the Interior knows that projects on the Salmon and Clearwater Rivers entail great difficulties because of interference with fish runs. The statement also suggests that Nez Perce might provide the power revenue needed to defray the irrigation costs of Mountain Home.

Back in 1953, as the junior Senator from Oregon has pointed out today, the Secretary of the Interior was trying to alibi his inexcusable position on Hells Canyon by suggesting a dam on Nez Perce.

I went on to say:

> In the selected information already cited—

That is, the information out of the files of the Interior Department itself which was printed as a House document in 1952—

> the Department of the Interior in 1952 stated:
>
> "Since Nez Perce would effectively block off the salmon run from the Lower Snake River to the Salmon River, Nez Perce should not be built at this time, nor until a solution to the salmon situation is found. The Hells Canyon Dam portion of this plan can proceed, however. Hells Canyon is an essential part of this best plan. Also Hells Canyon avoids the Salmon River fish problem."

I recommend to the Secretary of the Interior that he do a little bookwork, a little study, on the data to be found in his own files in the Department of the Interior. If he will do that, he will find his own experts in the Department have been on record for years as forewarning the American people exactly what the junior Senator from Oregon is forewarning them about today.

Mr. President, if the kind of program that the Secretary of the Interior is now supporting should be carried out, the fish runs on the Salmon would be destroyed. That has been a matter of official documentation before the Congress of the United States for some years, but the Secretary of the Interior, and obviously the present Governor of Oregon, would like to forget that. They would like to forget what the experts have proved in regard to this matter.

Again I wish to commend my junior colleague, who is my senior, let me tell you, Mr. President, in the matter of conservation. My junior colleague from Oregon is to be congratulated for warning the people of Oregon where their former Governor and present Governor will lead them if they follow their bait in regard to this Hells Canyon issue.

I am very happy that at long last I have a colleague from Oregon standing with me on the floor of the Senate as a teammate, fighting to the end in support of the people's interest in this matter.

I congratulate my colleague for pointing out again what the loss of Hells Canyon and attempted substitution of other dams would do to the conservation interests, whereas the high Hells Canyon Dam would not do an iota of damage to the conservation interests.

Mr. NEUBERGER. I wish to commend my distinguished colleague for anticipating, more than 2 years ago, the great damage which would be done to the fish runs by giving, in effect, Hells Canyon to the Idaho Power Co. I should like to say that the Secretary of the Interior has perhaps been reading too many minutes and reports of utility companies, and not enough reports by distinguished biologists in the employ of the Fish and Wildlife Service, who are technically under his own direction.

In November of 1953, the Corps of United States Army Engineers held a series of hearings at Orofino, Idaho, on the proposals to dam the Clearwater River. These hearings were inspired by the groups which hoped that this would lift the "heat" off the Hells Canyon site, so that Hells Canyon then could be wrapped up in tinsel and given as a Christmas present to the Idaho Power Co. Happily, there were men interested in the outdoors and in wildlife who did not take this political subterfuge lying down.

At that hearing Mr. C. J. Campbell, representing the Oregon State Game Commission, said that his organization was opposed to the proposed dams on the Clearwater River "against valuable runs of migratory fish." He stressed the fact that "no one knows a way to successfully pass migratory fish both up and down stream past dams of the height of these three."

The Oregon State Game Commission, charged by Oregon law with protecting fish runs of recreational value and importance to Oregon, submitted additionally a formal statement announcing its firm opposition to the proposed dams on the Clearwater and the Salmon Rivers. The statement was as unequivocally against these dams as were other statements by Mr. McKay and Mr. Patterson favorable to these dams.

The difference was this: The game commission was thinking of protecting salmon migrations, but Oregon's Governors, past and present, were thinking of some political alternative which would make it expediently palatable to surrender the Hells Canyon site to the Idaho Power Co.

The game commission pointed out that no fisheries agencies had devised methods of passing fish up and down dams of the height contemplated for the Clearwater River. The commission added:

> Any diversion structure on the Salmon River would require, among other things, screening against downstream migrant fish on a scale never before accomplished.

Let me explain what is meant by that. It may be possible to get migrating adult salmon up and over the high dams planned for the Salmon River by building elaborate and intricate fish ladders. But when the fingerling salmon go downstream on their way to the distant sea they often are swept down and over the roaring spillways—in fact, this occurs most of the time. Drops of the height of the Salmon River projects would kill most of these baby fish by the terrific impact of the fall, thus wiping out the fish runs of greatest value in the Columbia Basin. "Since the Middle Snake area is one of the few remaining strongholds of the Columbia migratory fish runs, all possible effort should be made," urged the Oregon State Game Commission, "to maintain it in status quo until all upstream potentialities are exhausted or until answers to fish passage problems are obtained." And the commission concluded:

> The Oregon State Game Commission does not object to dams per se, but in this instance must oppose the construction of the planned dams in the Middle Snake area until current research has provided the answers to maintaining migratory fish in the face of such structures.

The Oregon State Fish Commission has precisely the same responsibility to

commercial fishing that the game commission has to sports fishing. It reported to the Corps of Engineers:

The Oregon Fish Commission is opposed to the construction of any dams in the Middle Snake area which will block the migratory path of the very valuable salmon and steelhead (trout) runs.

In the Middle Snake area, the principal spawning grounds are, of course, the Salmon and the Clearwater Rivers. Over a decade ago I was assigned to write some articles for such national magazines as the Saturday Evening Post and Harper's about the fish pilgrimages in the Columbia Basin, for these are the most marvelous migrations of this kind on earth. A Chinook salmon may be spawned in a last, lingering headwater of one of the Columbia's remote tributaries, like the Salmon River. Yet that fish, as an adult, will return 5 years later from the Pacific Ocean to lay or fertilize eggs in the exact tributary where it was spawned. This anadromous urge has baffled scientists for decades. Upon that urge depends the continuation of the fabulous salmon runs of the Columbia Basin.

FAMOUS BIOLOGIST WARNED AGAINST DAMMING SALMON RIVER

When I was writing the articles which I have mentioned I traveled to the remote headwaters of the rivers where these fish runs spawn. I also spent many hours talking with one of the greatest biologists this country ever has produced, Dr. Ira Noel Gabrielson, then Director of the Fish and Wildlife Service, now head of the National Wildlife Management Institute. Dr. Gabrielson, one of the illustrious graduates of Oregon State College, constantly emphasized one theme. He said the last of all rivers to be blocked off in the Pacific Northwest, if the fish migrations are to endure, was the Salmon River of Idaho. When this river was plugged, warned he, the valuable spring Chinook runs, which include the tastiest and biggest fish, would possibly be one and the same with the dinosaur and the dodo bird: extinct.

Mr. President, I never have forgotten that. All my advocacies of further power development in the Northwest are predicated upon what Dr. Gabrielson told me: "Leave the Salmon River clear and free for fish pilgrimages, if at all possible." That is why I am a cosponsor of Senate bill 1333, which would build the dam at Hells Canyon, far above the union of the Salmon and the Snake Rivers, and in no way impeding the passage of fish up the Salmon. And that is why I oppose with all the force and vigor at my command the willingness of Douglas McKay and Paul Patterson to circumvent the Hells Canyon project by damming the Salmon and Clearwater Rivers.

I have been concerned for many years with maintaining the spawning grounds in the Salmon River Basin. In the September 13, 1941, issue of the Saturday Evening Post, there appeared an article of mine, entitled "The Great Salmon Mystery." This article, quoting B. M. Brennan, the then veteran director of the Washington State department of fisheries, emphasized the need for keeping open the Salmon River. The article reads in part as follows:

Brennan believes that the next step in the protection of the Columbia salmon runs must be to bring Idaho into a tristate compact with Washington and Oregon for the management of the fisheries in the basin. This has never been done in the past, because the Columbia does not wash Idaho soil at any point, yet the Columbia's largest tributary, the Snake, threads across Idaho for 750 miles. And of the Snake's largest tributary Brennan recently declared: "The Salmon River in Idaho is the only major Chinook salmon spawning ground remaining in the entire upper Columbia River watershed that is generally unaffected by dams, water diversions, pollution, and other hazards to the future abundance of salmon."

Both private and Government dams are athwart the Snake itself, although some of these are above the impassable barrier of Shoshone Falls. Idaho is one of the principal irrigation States and its farmers constantly demand water for their land and kilowatts to pump it there. But the Salmon is a wilderness river and to date its peaks and crags have stood off civilization's encroachments. Along with its various forks, the Salmon flows in chasms nearly a mile deep. It empties into Hells Canyon, where the Snake has trenched a 6,100-foot gash which is the deepest abyss on the continent. Most of the Salmon's course is through the fastnesses of the Nez Perce, Idaho, Challis and Salmon National Forests. No boats, only fish on their way to spawn, have ever traveled the Salmon upstream, and so it is known in Idaho as "the river of no return."

WITH DRAWN SWORDS, IF NEED BE

A graying Scotsman, Hugh C. Mitchell, Oregon's head fish culturist says, "I wouldna be surprised if the Salmon is now the gr-reat spawning spot of the Northwest. We must protect that river with drawn swords, if need be." Keeping the Salmon River open and uncontaminated is a No. 1 order of business among fishermen and wild-life enthusiasts. Federal experts, now surveying this wilderness river, believe it is fully as important from a Chinook propagation standpoint as the main stem of the Columbia. Lloyd Royal, biologist for the State of Washington, contributes the added fact that most of the Columbia River steelhead trout passing Bonneville Dam, and 185,174 did so last year, go up the Salmon to lay their eggs. With these circumstances in mind, the Washington legislature memoralized Congress to appropriate funds at once for the preservation of fish-spawning areas in Idaho.

Mr. President, another article entitled "The Great Salmon Experiment," and published in Harper's magazine of February 1945, quoted the Fish and Wildlife Service as follows:

The piecemeal destruction of the Columbia River spawning grounds has proceeded to such a point that no more tributary streams can be sacrificed if the largest salmon river in the United States is to continue to contribute material to the Nation's food supply.

But fish sanctuaries are not the only reason why I favor Hells Canyon over and above the proposed sites on the Salmon and the Clearwater Rivers, Mr. President.

In my opinion, the Selway-Bitterroot Wilderness Area in Idaho is a great national asset. Untrammeled and untouched, it still beckons to us in our frenzied way of life—it beckons from afar, all the way back to Lewis and Clark and to Chief Joseph. I am opposed to flooding any part of that wilderness area with dams on the Clearwater until every other potential power site in the Northwest has been tapped. The Selway and the Lochsa Rivers unite at the settlement of Lowell, Idaho, to form the Middle Fork of the Clearwater. They are lovely streams—crystal clear, alive with fish, picturesque in setting. I do not want dams or commercial developments here, and neither do 2,000 members of the Coeur d'Alene Wildlife Federation of Idaho.

At this point, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a letter to the Corps of Army Engineers from the Coeur d'Alene Wildlife Federation, opposing the Clearwater dams which would destroy scenic and recreational values.

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

COEUR D'ALENE WILDLIFE FEDERATION,
Coeur d'Alene, Idaho,
November 19, 1953.

CORPS OF ENGINEERS,
United States Army Office of District Engineer, Walla Walla, Wash.:

We, the directors, officials, and members of the Coeur d'Alene Wildlife Federation, do hereby formally protest the proposed construction of storage dams on the tributaries of Snake River, mainly the Salmon and Clearwater Rivers.

The resultant destruction of the fisheries resource that accompanies man-made obstructions in previously undeveloped streams is augmented in this area by the prospects of inundation of vitally needed winter ranges for Idaho's largest elk herds.

Both of these resources would be forever lost to the people of Idaho and others in the United States that travel here to enjoy the unspoiled splendors of this dwindling primitive paradise. The temporary financial reimbursement to the business interests of the Clearwater and Salmon Rivers communities would soon vanish with the completion of these structures which as yet have not been proven necessary or at most vital, in the interests of regional welfare. The wildlife values alone are more than enough argument against these structures. The additional responsibility of maintaining areas for the enjoyment and recreation of many thousands of citizens annually should not be overlooked. The withdrawal of each primitive area, of each recreation spot, merely serves to concentrate the pressure on others. With dozens more dam sites being surveyed it is obvious that the public and private interests will not be satiated until every canyon in the country is blocked—and for what?

In view of the reasons herein set forth, the Coeur d'Alene Wildlife Federation, which represents a membership of 2,000, does forcefully and unalterably oppose all of the proposed storage reservoir sites in the Salmon and Clearwater drainages.

Respectfully yours.

FRANK CULLEN.

ARMY ENGINEERS RECOGNIZE PRIORITY OF SALMON RUNS

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, even the Corps of Engineers has taken greater cognizance than have ex-Governor McKay or Governor Patterson, of the fish runs to be jeopardized by the Salmon and the Clearwater projects. Listen to these excerpts from the report of the engineers board on the proposed dams:

The district engineer concludes that the Clearwater River is the principal and most frequent flood-producing stream in the Snake River Basin and that floods on this

stream must be controlled. While the Salmon River is the second major flood-producing stream in the area and even exceeds the flood-producing capacity and flood frequency of the Snake River above the Salmon, it is additionally one of the principal spawning areas for salmon and steelhead trout. Its importance to the salmon industry is such that full solution of its flood control and power-generation problems should not be undertaken until proven methods of passing migratory fish past high dams are available. The district engineer, therefore, concludes that no development for flood control or power generation on the Salmon River should be recommended at this time.

Mark well those words of the Engineer Corps, Mr. President. Occasionally the Engineers Corps is spoken of as a cold, harsh organization interested only in pouring concrete across rivers and inlets. Yet the Engineer Corps properly recognize the fact that, despite the vast importance of the Salmon River to power generation and to flood control, its role in the migration of fish is greater still, and that this role must not be disturbed or imperiled. How ironic it is that, while the supposedly cold and impersonal Army engineers demonstrate profound concern for the Salmon's vital fish runs, the past and present Governors of Oregon cavalierly suggest that the Salmon River be plugged with dams, so they will not have to face up to the brutal political issue of public versus private control of Hells Canyon.

I am not afraid to face that issue, however, Mr. President, nor is my senior colleague [Mr. MORSE].

HELLS CANYON DAM ALONE PROVIDES POWER AND FLOOD CONTROL WITHOUT DESTROYING SALMON RUNS OR SCENIC VALUES

In S. 1333 we have proposed the most reasonable and logical compromise for orderly development of the resources of the Columbia basin. At Hells Canyon we will bring into production a huge bloc of perpetual and low-cost hydroelectric power—for farms, for homes, for stores, for factories. We will do so without marring scenic grandeur; we will do so with only a relatively minor adverse impact upon migrating fish. We will push far into the future the time when it may be urgently necessary to scar the Clearwater's wilderness with a dam reservoir or to thrust a concrete barrier in the path of the fish pilgrimages which turn up the Salmon River, thus giving true symbolism to that river's expressive name.

By passing S. 1333, the Congress of the United States will rescue the fish runs of the lower Columbia River—fish runs vital to Oregon—from the desire of the two most recent Governors of Oregon to save Hells Canyon for the Idaho Power Co. by wiping out the spawning beds of those runs on the sources of the Salmon and Clearwater Rivers.

Bernard De Voto, a westerner by birth, one of the most distinguished historians of the West, a winner of the Pulitzer prize for his understanding writings about the West, once conceived a phrase: The West against itself. He was referring to the willingness of certain western public officials to win the favor and support of absentee-dominated financial interests by agreeing to the unwise exploitation of the West's resources, to the detriment of the West's future prosperity. Will that attitude continue to characterize the Republican Party today?

I stand by our bill, S. 1333, calling for a Federal dam at Hells Canyon, a high dam dedicated to multipurpose development. I oppose vigorously the alternative projects recommended by ex-Governor McKay and Governor Patterson across the scenic Clearwater and the fish-filled Salmon Rivers. I believe in my heart that the rank and file members of the Republican Party in the State of Oregon stand wholeheartedly beside us in being unwilling to bail out the Idaho Power Co. with a sacrificial offering of the great Chinook salmon runs of the Columbia River basin.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, first of all, I wish to commend the junior Senator from Oregon [Mr. NEUBERGER] and his senior colleague [Mr. MORSE] upon their splendid presentation in behalf of Hells Canyon Dam. I realize the many years of hard work and concentrated attention the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] and, more recently, the junior Senator from Oregon [Mr. NEUBERGER] have devoted to the proposal for this project.

Let me assure the junior Senator from Oregon that although I do not come from a part of the country which would be directly affected by the constructive proposal advanced in the bill jointly sponsored by the senior Senator from Oregon and the junior Senator from Oregon, I strongly support their measure because I happen to be one who believes that what is good for one section of America is good for all sections.

We are indebted to the Senators from Oregon for their constructive and enlightened leadership in conservation and the development of our great natural resources. It is a blessing to the Senate and to the country that we have men of their vision and, let me say also, their persistence and dedication to resource development.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SCOTT in the chair). Does the Senator from Minnesota yield to the Senator from Oregon?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. NEUBERGER. I wish to thank the distinguished Senator from Minnesota for his kind words. I should also like to say that there is no one who could, in speaking those words, give greater pleasure, I know, to both my senior colleague and myself.

I remember that in 1954, when I was talking to a group of sportsmen in Oregon, they were greatly enthused about the profound interest of the Senator from Minnesota in conservation matters; and they were particularly grateful for his efforts, as I remember, to prevent diversion of the duck-stamp funds, and for his long fight to protect the flyways and the nesting grounds and wildlife sanctuaries which are so important to the wildfowl of the North American continent, which migrate so miraculously each year between the Arctic and the tropics. I remember that those sportsmen, located nearly 2,000 miles from the State of Minnesota, spoke in deep appreciation of what the Senator from Minnesota had done for conservation and wildlife protection, not only in our own country, but also in the entire North American Continent.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I thank the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield to me?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I am happy to yield to the senior Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I do not wish this opportunity to pass without saying a word in regard to the wonderful cooperation and support the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] has given me during my years in the Senate when we have had the privilege of serving together.

At this time I wish to say that the distinguished junior Senator from Minnesota has always recognized, as I do, that when we help build the economic strength of any area of the country, we help build the economic strength of the entire Nation. I do not know of a better example I could give of that than the Hells Canyon Dam, because if we build the Hells Canyon Dam, we shall develop the phosphate beds of Idaho and Utah—phosphate beds which, without the availability of cheap power, will remain undeveloped. The development of those beds will reduce the cost of phosphate fertilizer to the farmers in the State of Minnesota from $10 to $20 a ton.

As the Senator from Minnesota knows, the farmers throughout the Midwest need all the phosphate fertilizer which can be developed for them. So that situation is a good example of how helping one section of the country, in connection with an important project, such as Hells Canyon Dam, has a tremendously beneficial effect elsewhere in the country. So when the Senator from Minnesota supports the Senators from Washington and the Senators from Oregon in the Hells Canyon Dam fight, he is really striking very effective blows in defense of the economic interests of the farmers of the State of Minnesota and the Midwest. However, I know that his support of us is not dependent upon that kind of special benefit to his State, but is based upon a philosophical principle, namely, that as Senators we represent in the Senate the Nation as a whole; and when we help the economy of one section of the United States we help the entire United States.

I thank the Senator very much for the wonderful support he has given us in this fight.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I thank the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE subsequently said: Mr. President, earlier this afternoon my colleague, the junior Senator from Oregon [Mr. NEUBERGER] and I engaged in a discussion of the Hells Canyon Dam issue.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD, immediately following our discussion on that subject, and as a part of the discussion, a series of resolutions which have

been passed in the Pacific Northwest in support of the position taken by the two Senators from Oregon in regard to the Hells Canyon Dam.

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

LOCAL UNION NO. 942,
UNITED BROTHERHOOD OF
CARPENTERS AND JOINERS OF AMERICA,
Fort Scott, Kans., April 28, 1955.

At a meeting of Local Union No. 942, United Brotherhood of Carpenters and Joiners of America, Fort Scott, Kans., on the above-designated date, a large number of the members of the said union being present, the following resolution was introduced and adopted by unanimous vote of members present:

"*Resolved*, That Local Union No. 942, United Brotherhood of Carpenters and Joiners of America of Fort Scott, Kans., gives its approval to and recommends that the Congress pass Senate bill 1333, by Senator WAYNE MORSE, of Oregon, providing for the erection of a federally financed high dam at Hells Canyon. It is our judgment that the development of river resources is for the best interest of all people."

HENRY E. BROWN,
President.

RESOLUTION OF UNITED BROTHERHOOD OF CARPENTERS AND JOINERS OF AMERICA, LUMBER AND SAWMILL WORKERS LOCAL UNION NO. 2649, RIGGINS, IDAHO, MAY 2, 1955

Whereas there is now pending before Congress of the United States, a bill proposing authorization of a high dam at Hells Canyon on the Snake River; and

Whereas members of this union are primarily interested in the greatest development, for the greatest good, to the most people; and

Whereas we have followed the many arguments put forth by opponents to this project, led by a well-financed and well-organized private monopoly; and

Whereas, such opposition does not give a true picture of public feeling in the issue under consideration: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That Lumber and Sawmill Workers Local Union, No. 2649, A. F. of L., Riggins, Idaho, wishes to be placed on record of being in full support of full development of the Hells Canyon site, and urge the enactment of Senate bill No. 1333 for authorization by Congress for the federally financed high dam at Hells Canyon.

Respectfully submitted.

LEONARD J. HAMRICK,
President.
A. J. SARRIUGARTE,
Recording Secretary.

RESOLUTION OF THE MIAMI VALLEY CARPENTER'S DISTRICT COUNCIL OF DAYTON, OHIO

Being aware of the fact that the greatest good for the most people in any given area can only be obtained by Government-sponsored projects, and that Senate bill 1333, which was introduced by Senator MORSE, of Oregon, and sponsored by a large number of other Senators from other parts of our country, has been introduced in favor of a high dam development in the Hells Canyon area: Be it

Resolved, That we, the members of Miami Valley Carpenters District Council of the United Brotherhood of Carpenters and Joiners of America, Dayton, Ohio, go on record as recommending a federally financed high dam, which would develop the full hydroelectric potential of the site; and

Whereas it would provide water for irrigation, navigation, and maximum amount of flood control; and

Whereas we feel that private interests would fail to develop an area which would cover the greater number of possibilities that may be obtained from a project of this manner; and

Whereas the private interests are only interested in skimming off the cream of a development of this source and not interested in the greatest potentiality of the citizens of the surrounding area: Therefore be it further

Resolved, That we, the members of Miami Valley Carpenters District Council and taxpayers of this Nation, go on record in support of Senate bill 1333 and the erection of a federally financed high dam at Hells Canyon.

CENTRAL TRADES AND LABOR COUNCIL,
Kalispell, Mont., May 4, 1955.

DEAR SIR: I am taking the liberty of enclosing a copy of a resolution that has been unanimously approved by the Central Trades and Labor Council, of Kalispell, Mont., and I respectfully request your serious consideration of this resolution.

I believe the resolution is self-explanatory and that the creation of the Hells Canyon Dam will be most helpful now, not only to those in the Pacific Northwest but also to all of the people of the United States.

A copy of this resolution has been forwarded to all members of the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, as well as to all members of the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Trusting your committee will give this resolution of ours very serious attention, I am,

Sincerely yours,
NOEL M. GIES, *Secretary.*

RESOLUTION FAVORING PUBLIC CONSTRUCTION OF HELLS CANYON DAM

Whereas there has been introduced in the Senate of the United States by the Honorable WAYNE L. MORSE, senior Senator from Oregon, with the cosponsorship of 29 other distinguished Senators, a bill known as S. 1333, to authorize the Federal Government to construct, operate, and maintain a public multipurpose dam, to be known as Hells Canyon Dam, on the Snake River between Idaho and Oregon; and

Whereas the Idaho Power Co. now has pending before the Federal Power Commission a request for authority for private construction of three low-head private electric-power dams on the Snake River at or near the site proposed for the public construction of the multipurpose Hells Canyon Dam, and such private construction would practically prevent the construction of the Hells Canyon Dam; and

Whereas public construction of the multipurpose Hells Canyon Dam promises immense and widespread benefits for industry, agriculture, and individuals in the Pacific Northwest, and the enrichment of our entire Nation, by providing a large supply of low-cost electric power, by aiding flood control, irrigation, soil conservation, and river transportation, and by furnishing new recreational facilities; and

Whereas the Federal Government, through its appropriate administrative agency, the Department of the Interior, is alone capable of developing the greatest remaining multiple damsite in the country for the realization of all the beneficial purposes that are envisioned; and

Whereas in contrast the private construction of three smaller dams by the Idaho Power Co. at Hells Canyon would virtually deprive the American people of the vast benefits to be derived from the public construction of multipurpose Hells Canyon Dam, and would mean immediate gain for one private power company at the sacrifice of opportunities for the future growth and development of private enterprise on a much broader scale: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Central Trades and Labor Council of Kalispell, Mont., go on record as favoring the immediate enactment of Senate bill 1333 for the public construction of Hells Canyon Dam, as essential for the full development of the rich natural resources of the Snake River Valley, which, without such construction, would be impossible, and as a public undertaking that properly belongs to all American citizens acting in concert through their Federal Government; and be it further

Resolved, That the Central Trades and Labor Council of Kalispell, Mont., is firmly and basically opposed to any grant of authority to the Idaho Power Co. or other privately owned utility to construct electric power dams at or near Hells Canyon, on the Snake River; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to the Honorable JAMES E. MURRAY, senior Senator from Montana and chairman of the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs; to the Secretary of the Interior, the Honorable Douglas McKay; and to the Federal Power Commission, in order that they may be advised of the position taken by this Central Trades and Labor Council of Kalispell, Mont.

GEORGE H. GOHN,
Chairman.

Attest:

NOEL M. GIES, *Secretary.*

LOCAL NO. 2554, A. F. OF L.,
PLYWOOD AND VENEER WORKERS,
Lebanon, Oreg., May 3, 1955.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

SENATOR MORSE: I am writing this letter as instructed by the labor union I represent, Local No. 2554, Plywood and Veneer Workers, A. F. of L., chartered by the United Brotherhood of Carpenters and Joiners of America, to support bill 1333 in favor of a high dam on the Snake River in Idaho. We have a membership of 836.

Respectfully,

KIZER COX,
Business Agent and Financial Secretary.

MILLMEN'S UNION, LOCAL 550,
UNITED BROTHERHOOD OF
CARPENTERS AND JOINERS OF AMERICA,
Oakland, Calif., May 4, 1955.

JAMES E. MURRAY,
Chairman, Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: At a special called meeting of our local union held April 25, 1955, a motion was passed to request your support of Senate bill No. 1333, introduced by the Honorable WAYNE MORSE, of Oregon, and 29 other Senators, authorizing a Federal dam at Hells Canyon.

The bill proposes a federally financed high dam which would develop the full hydroelectric potential of the site. In addition it would provide water for irrigation, navigation, and a maximum of flood control.

Thanking you for full consideration on this bill, we remain

Respectfully yours,

M. D. CICINATO,
Recording Secretary.

LOCAL UNION, NO. 1697,
UNITED BROTHERHOOD OF
CARPENTERS AND JOINERS OF AMERICA,
Stevenson, Wash., May 5, 1955.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: This local No. 1697 of the United Brotherhood of Carpenters and Joiners of America goes on record that by motion from

the floor and unanimous vote by the body that we as a union are for Senate bill 1333, for Government construction of the high Hells Canyon Dam and full Government development of the Northwest power potential.

Fraternally yours,

FRANK FINCH,
Recording Secretary.

LOCAL UNIONS NOS. 701, 701B, 710A,
INTERNATIONAL UNION OF
OPERATING ENGINEERS,
Portland, Oreg., April 6, 1955.

At the Eleven Western States Conference of Operating Engineers held in Los Angeles in 1953, the delegates representing approximately 40,000 members elected unanimously in favor of the Government building a high Hells Canyon Dam.

L. E. EGAN,
Vice President, Eleven Western States Conference of Operating Engineers.

RESOLUTION OF UNITED ASSOCIATION OF JOURNEYMEN AND APPRENTICES OF THE PLUMBING AND PIPE FITTING INDUSTRY OF THE UNITED STATES AND CANADA, LOCAL UNION NO. 684, KALISPELL, MONT., MAY 5, 1955

Hon. WAYNE L. MORSE,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: You will undoubtedly recall meeting me in Kalispell in August 1953 at the Montana State Federation of Labor convention.

I was appointed as a committee of one to draw up a resolution for our Central Trades and Labor Council, a copy of which I am enclosing with this letter, together with a copy of a letter sent to each one of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs from both the Senate and the House. A clipping from today's local paper is also enclosed.

Since the adoption of this resolution by Central Trades and Labor Council, the Building and Construction Trades Council and the Metal Trades Council have unanimously endorsed this resolution, which I thought might be of interest to you.

If at any time I can be of service to you, do not hesitate to call on me, for I will always be more than glad to assist in anything that I can.

With kindest personal regards to you, I remain,

Sincerely yours,

GEO. H. GOHN,
Business Manager, Local No. 684.

LOCAL UNION NO. 1697,
UNITED BROTHERHOOD OF
CARPENTERS AND JOINERS OF AMERICA,
Stevenson, Wash., May 5, 1955.

NATIONAL HELLS CANYON ASSOCIATION,
Portland, Oreg.

DEAR SIRS: This local 1697 of the United Brotherhood of Carpenters and Joiners of America goes on record that by motion from the floor and unanimous vote by the body that we as a union are for Government construction of the high Hells Canyon Dam and full Government development of the Northwest power potential.

Fraternally yours,

FRANK FINCH,
Recording Secretary.

Whereas after a careful study of both sides of the question of 1 high dam at Hells Canyon, or 3 low dams on the Snake River, as the arguments appeared in the daily press; and

Whereas we have in mind the most benefit to the most people, and after due consideration of both sides of the question, we are convinced that it would not be to the best interest of the majority of the people living in the States of Montana, Idaho, Oregon, and Washington to build three low dams on the Snake River: Therefore be it

Resolved by Kellogg Marsh Grange, No. 136 (Washington) in session the 19th day of March 1955, That we instruct and urge our Senators and Representatives in Congress to work for a high dam on the Snake River at Hells Canyon.

GERTRUDE BRITSCH,
Secretary.
C. A. BRITSCH,
Master.
A. G. ZIEBELL,
R. C. FRANSKIE,
Resolutions Committee.

RESOLUTION OF CARPENTERS' LOCAL UNION NO. 345, MEMPHIS, TENN.

Whereas this local union is located in an area which has known the damage and human suffering caused by flooded streams; and

Whereas its members have seen the great benefits to both workers and property owners from the construction of dams to be used for the development of electric power and also to be used as flood control projects; and

Whereas we believe that the erection of the Hells Canyon Dam will be of like benefit to the territory in which it is located: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That this local union go on record as urging the passage of Senate bill No. 1333, and approving of the erection of a federally financed high dam at Hells Canyon; be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to the National Hells Canyon Association, Senators and Congressmen from Tennessee, and to Senator JAMES E. MURRAY, Chairman, Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, with the plea that these persons use every honorable means to accomplish the passage of Senate bill No. 1333.

Respectfully submitted.

H. WELCH,
H. A. KELLUM,
C. N. HAINES,
J. R. GREEN,
H. E. BLACKMAN.

Adopted by Carpenters' Local Union, No. 345, April 15, 1955.

LA GRANDE, OREG., *May 11, 1955.*

GENTLEMEN: In order for your committee to be advised of the position of Lumber and Sawmill Workers, Local Union, No. 2851, which is made up of some 300 men working in the lumber industry in the city of La Grande, Union County, Oreg., we wish to submit for the record the following resolution as directed by action of our local membership:

"Whereas there is before Congress a bill for authorizing Federal construction of a high dam in Hells Canyon on the Snake River; and

"Whereas the members of our union are much concerned about proper development and use of our water resources; and

"Whereas the future economy of this area will depend on an abundance of hydroelectric power, sold at a rate which will encourage enterprise; and

"Whereas any program which provides less than full development of the Snake River Canyon is not in the best interest of this or future generations; and

"Whereas all private power schemes so far proposed will make power come at a high cost and fall far short of making full use of the water resources by failing to provide maximum flood control and storage which would help downstream generators: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved,* That we urge your committee and the Congress to do everything within its power to secure passage of Senate bill 1333 at the earliest possible date, for we cannot afford to allow these water resources to be wasted or only partly developed at this time, leaving the future generations with the mistakes to correct."

Very truly yours,

LOCAL UNION, NO. 2851, LUMBER AND SAWMILL WORKERS, A. F. OF L.
WARREN E. CARROLL, *President.*
JACK BROWN, *Recording Secretary.*

RESOLUTION OF WILBUR GRANGE, NO. 798, PATRONS OF HUSBANDRY, FAVORING THE BUILDING OF HELLS CANYON DAM

Whereas bill S. 1333 authorizes Federal construction of a high dam at Hells Canyon; and

Whereas we favor the building of a high dam at Hells Canyon; we urge that fish ladders be built at the time of construction of Hells Canyon Dam: Therefore be it

Resolved by Wilbur Grange, No. 798, meeting in regular session this 26th day of March, That we favor bill S. 1333 and urge our Congressman to support the bill, S. 1333.

Adopted by Wilbur Grange, No. 798, at Wilbur, Wash.

EUGENE BAHR, *Master.*
LILLIAN RETTKOWSKI,
Secretary.

SEATTLE, WASH., *April 19, 1955.*

NATIONAL HELLS CANYON ASSOCIATION,
Portland, Oreg.

DEAR SIRS: Shipwrights, Ship Joiners, and Boat Builders, Local 1184, United Brotherhood of Carpenters and Joiners of America, at their regular meeting on April 15, 1955, unanimously went on record in support of Senate bill 1333, providing for a Federal-built dam at Hells Canyon.

Our membership is fully aware of the necessity of this project in order that the fullest possible use can be made of the natural resources of the Northwest.

Sincerely,

JOHN B. WIGEN,
Business Representative.

LOCAL UNION NO. 2785,
LUMBER & SAWMILL WORKERS,
The Dalles, Oreg., April 21, 1955.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: This is to certify that local No. 2785 of the Lumber & Sawmill Workers of this city as well as those throughout the Northwest heartily endorse the introduction of your Senate bill 1333 for the construction of Hells Canyon Dam.

We will constantly be with you and your coworkers in your vigilant fight until its construction becomes a reality.

Yours respectfully,

ARTHUR V. MEANS,
President.
ELMER J. EDGERTON,
Secretary.

RESOLUTION OF LUMBER & SAWMILL WORKERS LOCAL, NO. 3050, SALEM, OREG.

Whereas Hells Canyon represents the last great natural dam site in the Nation; and

Whereas the McKay proposal would turn the dam site over to private utilities; and

Whereas by turning the dam site over to private utilities, the full possibilities of the site for navigation, irrigation, and flood control would be lost forever; and

Whereas there is much to be done on flood control on all the Nation's major rivers and, if left entirely to the Federal Government, the full potential of said major rivers could be utilized; and

Whereas what happens at Hells Canyon will have a great bearing on how these resources will be developed: Therefore be it

Resolved, That Lumber and Sawmill Workers Local, No. 3050, go on record as favoring

a Government-built dam at Hells Canyon; and be it further

Resolved, That the United States Government keep full control over all rivers and streams.

Respectfully submitted.

WILLIAM C. BARNWELL,
President.

HARRY LEURINGER,
Recording Secretary.

RESOLUTION OF COLUMBIA COUNTY POMONA GRANGE, RAINIER, OREG.

Whereas a bill authorizing the construction of a high Hells Canyon Dam has been introduced in Congress; and

Whereas we believe that in order to have an integrated power system of maximum value that this dam be constructed as called for in this bill, for the following reasons:

First. That it will tie in with the Northwest power pool to insure needed power for this area, and for national defense; and

Second. That it will serve as a large storage basin, thereby helping to regulate an even flow of water right on down through the Columbia chain of power dams and proposed dams, serving to increase the output of each dam and make a steady and greater power supply that cannot be had by any other means; and

Third. That it will help to supply cheap power for agriculture and industry and encourage industry, and make jobs for thousands and thousands of people, these added industries, this added payroll, added homes, and all other benefits all building a foundation on a substantial basis for securing added tax money for the operation of Federal, State, and county governments; and

Fourth. That it will be developing a natural resource by the people and for the people who own it, and will pay a return to all the people, eventually paying back the full cost of construction, and thereafter be a financial source of income for governmental operation; and

Fifth. That we know from past experience the value of a liberal supply of power at a low cost, and realize the last war could have had a different ending for America, had it not been for the speedy output of boats and war materials, all of which was directly dependent on our supply of low-cost power in the Northwest; and

Whereas we realize that our Congress will be under pressure, and at the point of focus of the highest paid, most powerful lobby in America, and feeling that our congressional delegation are in need of home support for this measure: Therefore be it

Resolved, That we, of the Columbia County Pomona Grange, urged the passage of the above-said bill.

The above resolution was approved at a regular meeting of the Columbia County Pomona Grange, held May 7, 1955, at the Vernonia Grange hall.

WALTER I. TRACY,
Master.

ELSIE E. TRACY,
Secretary.

LOCAL UNION NO. 3091,
UNITED BROTHERHOOD OF CARPENTERS AND JOINERS OF AMERICA,
Vaughn, Oreg., May 23, 1955.

Senator WAYNE L. MORSE,
Senate Office Building:

DEAR SIR: It was moved at our last meeting that I be authorized to write you asking you to support the Gore bill, S. 1048, and bill 1333, in support of a high dam in Hells Canyon.

Respectfully yours,

L. D. MONTGOMERY,
Recording Secretary.

P. S.—If you can, would you please put me on your mailing list?

Thank you. L. D. M.

LOCAL NO. 2597,
LUMBER AND SAWMILL WORKERS,
Portland, Oreg., May 20, 1955.

Senator WAYNE L. MORSE,
United States Senator from Oregon.

DEAR SIR: Local 2597, Lumber and Sawmill Workers Union of Portland, Oreg., has instructed me to write you and tell you that we are fully in accord with the construction of a multipurpose high dam federally financed at the Hells Canyon site.

Sincerely yours,

JOSEPH OLIVER,
Recording Secretary.

SAFEGUARD OUR RESOURCES

"Whereas redtape, delay, and filibuster tactics by FPC, Department of the Interior, and others, and in our minds with the assistance and influence of the Power Trust lobbies' free and excessive spending of money, has resulted in a serious situation which affects the Northwest and the Nation as a whole; and

"Whereas that we join with the vast majority of the people that believe we are beyond the point of being satisfied with wishful thinking and are firmly convinced that it is high time for action that will authorize and instigate construction of the high Hells Canyon Dam; and

"Whereas that we are disgusted with the delay and seeming inclination of the FPC to favor 1 or more of 3 dams to be constructed by the eastern-controlled so-called Idaho Power Co.; and

"Whereas that we believe it is high time to demand protection of our future demands in order to develop industry, produce phosphate products, provide for development facilities that will be in the interest of our national security and our national economy; be it further

"*Resolved*, That we certainly see this high Hells Canyon Dam construction as a vital necessity in protecting and increasing the downstream power potentials; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That there is no justification in providing private profit at the expense of proper and full development of natural resources which rightfully belong to the people."

Directed by Pierce County Pomona Grange, No. 16, in regular session, May 14, 1955.

FRANK SMALANLER,
Master.

LUCILLE OCKFEN,
Secretary.

P. O. Box 243,
Lebanon, Oreg.

RESOLUTION

Whereas the State Grange of Oregon and the Linn County Pomona Grange have repeatedly announced their support of a federally constructed dam at Hells Canyon, and their opposition to the partnership plan; and

Whereas our Senators, WAYNE MORSE and RICHARD NEUBERGER, and our Congresswoman, EDITH GREEN, have worked hard to carry out the known wishes of the Grange in these matters, often in the face of hostile comment: Therefore be it

Resolved by Linn County Pomona Grange, No. 12, That we do appreciate and uphold our Senators and Congresswoman for their efforts in behalf of a federally erected Hells Canyon Dam, and that the Secretary of Linn County Pomona Grange be instructed to transmit this resolution to each of our Senators and Congresswoman GREEN.

Resolution adopted May 19, 1955.

LINN COUNTY POMONA GRANGE,
G. R. TRUAX, *Master,*
WENONAH WILEY, *Secretary.*

DESCHUTES COUNTY
POMONA GRANGE, NO. 25,
ROUTE 2,
Redmond, Oreg.

Whereas a bill authorizing the construction of a high Hells Canyon Dam has been introduced in Congress; and

Whereas we believe that in order to have an integrated power system of maximum value that this dam be constructed as called for in this bill, for the following reasons:

First. That it will tie in with the Northwest power pool to insure needed power for this area, and for national defense; and

Second. That it will serve as a large storage basin, thereby helping to regulate an even flow of water right on down through the Columbia chain of power dams and proposed dams, serving to increase the output of each dam and make a steady and greater power supply that cannot be had by any other means; and

Third. That it will help to supply cheap power for agriculture and industry and encourage industry, and make jobs for thousand and thousands of people, these added industries, this added payroll, added homes, and other benefits all building a foundation on a substantial basis for securing added tax money for the operation of Federal, State, and county goverments; and

Fourth. That it will be developing a natural resource by the people and for the people who own it, and will pay a return to all the people, eventually paying back the full cost of construction, and thereafter be a financial source of income for governmental operation; and

Fifth. That we know from past experience the value of a liberal supply of power at a low cost, and realize the last war could have had a different ending for America, had it not been for the speedy output of boats and war materials, all of which was directly dependent on our supply of low-cost power in the Northwest; and

Whereas we realize that our Congress will be under pressure, and at the point of focus of the highest paid, most powerful lobby in America, and feeling that our congressional delegation are in need of home support for this measure; so, therefore be it

Resolved, That Sixes Grange go on record as heartily supporting this Hells Canyon bill, and that we forward copies of this resolution to Senators WAYNE MORSE and RICHARD NEUBERGER and to Congressman HARRIS ELLSWORTH, requesting their undivided support of this bill, and also that a copy of this resolution be sent to every Pomona Grange in the State of Oregon, requesting their support.

ALBERT BRITTON,
Master, Sixes Grange.

FRANK NORRIS, Jr.,
Secretary, Sixes Grange.

Adopted by Deschutes County Pomona Grange, No. 25, while in regular session May 14, 1955.

HOMER H. BROWN, *Master.*
HELEN H. BROWN, *Secretary.*

ORDER FOR RECESS UNTIL 10 O'CLOCK A. M. TOMORROW

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate concludes its business today it take a recess until 10 o'clock tomorrow morning.

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

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.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, the unfinished business before the Senate is the foreign-aid program, better known as the Mutual Security Act of 1955. I wish to invite the attention of my colleagues to the very fine report which was prepared by the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, with the assistance of its competent and expert staff. The report discusses the pending legislation, namely, the authorization, Senate bill 2090, for the foreign-aid program for the coming fiscal year. It gives documentary evidence of the urgent need for the continuation of this particular endeavor on the part of our Government.

I also urge that careful attention be paid to the breakdowns of the various amounts authorized, and to the many graphs and charts in the report.

I suppose the American people often ask themselves the question, "When will the program of foreign aid by the Government of the United States come to a halt?" Our people have paid heavy taxes, and our Government has expended literally billions of dollars in a program known as mutual security.

The answer to the question as to when we shall be able to halt our efforts in the field of foreign aid is pretty much predicated upon the condition of the world in which we live. We in the United States have an unusual responsibility in the present situation of world affairs. We are literally the leaders of the free nations and free peoples of the world. We have not sought this leadership; we did not conspire to have the mantle of leadership fall upon us; but, whether by divine destiny or by accident, the fact is that we are world leaders, and we have a grave responsibility for peace, security, and freedom in the world.

But, Mr. President, I have always felt that we should look upon our mutual security program, in all its aspects, not as a means of charity, not merely as a means of assistance to other people. It is essentially self-defense. We Americans need to understand that the Communist conspiracy is worldwide in scope, and is held together and directed by a worldwide apparatus. It is entirely impossible to meet the threat of international Communist aggression and subversion by considering only those things which are immediate or within the confines of our own geographical and legal jurisdiction. We cannot meet a worldwide conspiracy by parochial and provincial programs and attitudes. If democracy is to survive in this world, it must also have a worldwide program. If democracy is to progress, if the areas of freedom are to be extended, we in the areas of democratic living, in the areas of free nations, must have a coordinated, comprehensive program which touches every area of the world.

We have been designing that kind of program for the past several years. Since the end of World War II our Government has taken on increasing responsibilities in the field of international cooperation and international relationships. We have had to rebuild our own military defenses. We had to assume the terrible responsibility of halting Communist aggression in Korea. We had to step into the breach, so to speak, in the Mediterranean, at the time of the Greek-Turkish aid program. We had to meet the threat of Communist and Soviet imperialism in West Berlin when Berlin was cut off from the free world. We have had to organize collective security pacts, regional organizations for common defense. We have done this in the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, the Rio Pact, and the Southeast Asia Collective Defense Treaty. We have created a fabulous network of alliances which lead toward collective security.

Mr. President, I believe the best test and the best means of measurement of the success of what we have been doing is to look at what is now happening in the world. The Soviet Union today is indicating, at least outwardly, that it is deeply concerned about Western World strength. The Soviet leaders are at least outwardly expressing a desire to talk and to negotiate. In my humble judgment, none of these happenings would have taken place had we not created conditions of strength and areas of strength. There is no way of meeting communism except by being fortified with economic, diplomatic, military, political, and moral strength.

I should like to quote from the committee report at page 6:

> The positive results of these past programs are impressive. Western Europe has been rehabilitated economically. It has been strengthened militarily. Communist aggression has been checked in the Far East, and the basis for the further generation of military strength in that area has been laid. There is every reason to expect that the Asian economic phase of the program will be as successful and as beneficial to the United States as the preceding phases. The American people can well be proud of the determination with which they have followed their enlightened self-interest since World War II. The results now provide convincing refutation of criticisms that the program was a giveaway, a pouring of American wealth down foreign ratholes.
>
> These results, in fact, are the strongest argument for vigorous continuation of the program. It is certainly unwise to abandon a policy that is paying dividends.

This program has paid dividends, Mr. President. I speak specifically of the mutual security program. It has paid dividends to the American people by stimulating our own industry, our own production, and our own distribution. It has paid dividends to the American people by challenging our own imagination, our own inventiveness, our own ingenuity. It has paid dividends to the American people by bringing us into closer contact with the other areas of the world and by bringing people closer together in mutual understanding and mutual respect.

It has paid dividends in many other ways. It has paid the great dividend of serving notice upon the totalitarian nations that the American people will not stand idly by and see areas of freedom crushed and absorbed.

Therefore I stand here today, as a member of the Committee on Foreign Relations, to support vigorously S. 2090, the Mutual Security Act of 1955. I realize that there may be those who will find some weaknesses here and there in the bill. There will be honest differences of opinion. There will be differences with respect to funds which are authorized for different areas of the world, and with respect to functions under the program. However, I will not be in any way diverted by such details from my own overall support of the mutual security program.

The truth is that after several years of operation under this program we have each year more carefully pieced together a workable program. We are doing everything in our power to protect the integrity of the program in terms of the personnel that operate the program, as well as in the use of the funds made available.

A moment ago I mentioned the fact that we had been confronted with many challenges. As an American I am proud that we had the fortitude and courage to meet those challenges. While there were many doubting Thomases and while there were many who thought more of their own pocketbooks, their current checking accounts, and their current bank balances, I am glad there were more Americans who were willing to place principle above the dollar sign, and that the majority of Americans were willing to place security and safety and the protection of their country and its relationship to the rest of the world above their current or temporary leisure.

We met the threat in the Mediterranean, and as a result Greece and Turkey today stand as powerful allies and free nations. We met the threat of Communist aggression in the encirclement of Berlin, and today Western Germany stands as an ally of the United States. Those who were vanquished and defeated we treated in a spirit of kindliness and compassion and friendship, and today our two former enemies, Germany and Japan, are, in fact, real allies of the Western Free World and of the United States.

By doing good deeds and by standing on right principles, we have been able to get positive results. Let us consider Italy, for example. For years she was under Fascist control, and was literally led to destruction by a Fascist dictatorship. We helped Italy, and so did other countries, particularly through some of the agencies of the United Nations. We helped Italy regain her own self-reliance, her own self-confidence, her own self-respect. Only recently we were privileged to have visit in America the Prime Minister of Italy, who was graciously and enthusiastically received by the American people.

Therefore, if we look at this program in the main and in its totality, we realize that it has led to constructive results in the interest of world peace and world security.

What I have said should not lead anyone to believe that the task is completed. I do not believe there are any immediate answers to complex problems. I do not believe there is any panacea or any cure-all for the great economic, political, and moral ills which confront the world today. As one United States Senator, I do not believe there will be any quick or easy or cheap answer to Soviet aggression. There is no simple answer to

aggression in all of its economic, political, and ideological ramifications, or to the subversion that comes with communism.

Therefore, it is all the more necessary for us to support a continuation of the mutual security program. I think we Americans must gear ourselves and our economy for the long pull. We must be prepared constantly to reevaluate what we do, but to have an objective in mind, namely, to roll back the tide of world communism by the use of our economic power and our political power and our great heritage of political independence and liberty.

Many people believe that the holding of conferences may ease the tension. That is possible, but the holding of conferences will not immediately lead to the solution of the difficulties. That is all the more reason we need to continue what we have been doing. We could not make a greater mistake or a more tragic error in international policy than to weaken our military defenses at this hour or to weaken our mutual security program at this hour, or in any way to limit or restrict or weaken our foreign policy. If there ever was a time when our Nation must have its full strength, ready and mobilized and at work, it is in the summer, fall, and winter months of the coming year. It will be a period when great decisions will have to be made; and in such a period our leadership must be prepared and equipped with the full support of the American people, with proper legislative enactments, with an understanding and responsive public attitude, and with a willingness on the part of the American people to make any sacrifices which may be necessary. Thus our leaders can be sure of making the right decisions at the right time.

I have been reading some comment in the press and I have received many letters which have indicated to me that, in light of the fact that the Soviet Union and its leadership seem to be a little more peaceful, at least in their statements, and that the Soviet Union seems to be having some internal troubles, perhaps now we could relax; and possibly we could cut the costs of Government.

Mr. President, if we were to fall into that trap we would be guilty of gross dereliction of public duty and public responsibility. Frankly, the authorizations under the Mutual Security Act are not what we might call Government expenditures or Government costs. They are costs or expenditures for the common defense of this land of freedom and the other areas of freedom throughout the world. I think we should look upon the program we are now considering as an investment in our future, as an investment in the ultimate emancipation of mankind, as an investment in the creation of more wealth, and of better standards of living throughout the world, because, as I proceed to discuss the program in some detail, I think it will be revealed that the major portion of it is dedicated to economic rehabilitation and to better social standards throughout the world, to helping those who cannot help themselves, to improving markets throughout the world. I believe the dollars we put into the program represent the best investment we can make in expanded commerce.

How often do we hear it said that we should have more trade with other people? Mr. President, we cannot trade with impoverished people. The beginning of trade is to build up the economic climate in the poor nations so that they will have the means to consummate trade. We have our great industrial system and our great agricultural industry which can produce goods not only in fantastic quantities, but of high quality. We are looking for markets throughout the world. Where will new markets be found for American agricultural products and for American industrial commodities? They will be found in Asia, in Africa, in the Near East, where millions and millions of people live. It seems to me to be quite elemental and, basically, quite fundamental, too, that for new markets for American commerce we should look to the areas where there is such great need and where there is tremendous capacity for absorption of goods and services.

Mr. President, we have recently passed a reciprocal-trade bill. The bill is still in conference, but it will be back for us to take final action upon it, and the President will sign the bill. The reciprocal-trade program is no better than the amount of trade consummated under its terms.

I look upon the Mutual Security Act of 1955 as a further investment in the expansion of world trade. If it has the will and the ingenuity, which I am sure it possesses, the United States of America will be able to get its fair share of this new-found commerce and this new-found economic activity.

Let me, therefore, Mr. President, direct my attention, first, to the European aspects of the pending bill. As they review the record I would call to my colleagues' attention the fact that the report on the bill gives descriptive information and detailed analyses.

Let us take, for example, the European sector. I am happy to be able to state as one member of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations that this bill does not include a great deal of money for Europe. This is, I would say, one of the finest tributes to the effectiveness of what has been taking place. Western Europe is already producing above prewar levels. It is enjoying a boom. Western Germany, which was laid waste as the result of World War II, is again on the economic march. The French, the British, the Belgians, the Dutch, the Danes, and the Norwegians, citizens of countries which have been allied or joined with us are today making unbelievable economic progress and experiencing great economic growth.

So, Mr. President, our program for Europe in fiscal 1956 is authorized in the sum of $95 million. That is a far cry from the days when we talked of European economic aid in figures of three or four billion dollars.

I have had the privilege of serving only one full term in the Senate, but I can recall that in the second year of my first term we were then discussing an economic-aid program for Europe for 1 year which ran well over $4 billion. Today Western Europe is getting back on its feet, standing its own ground; and the very fact that European nations speak up and make their own decisions and even disagree at times with their friend, the United States of America, is a sign of good health.

I have always looked upon the political independence and willingness of European nations to say what they feel, and of their leaders to express their own point of view in recent months and recent years, as the best sign of our times. It clearly demonstrates that they now feel strong again after the terrible tragedy of World War II.

What does the $95 million for Europe encompass? First of all, there is $4 million for what we call direct-forces support. That is aid directly for the maintenance of troops.

There is $70 million for defense support. This money is to be used to back up the military supplies and the military strength created in Western Europe.

Then there are what we call joint-control areas, representing an outlay or an authorization by our Government of $21 million.

Let me break down the direct-forces support, Mr. President. Four million dollars is authorized for direct-forces support. This goes to Yugoslavia for common-use items such as aviation fuel, for consumption by the military forces.

I think it is to the credit of the United States, at least from what I read in the newspapers, that Marshal Tito, of Yugoslavia, is not acting as a satellite of the Soviets. We shall, of course, look over very carefully any reports which come from the conference between the Soviet leaders and the Yugoslavian leaders. But under this proposal we are contemplating for the fiscal year 1956 an expenditure of $4 million in direct-forces support in Yugoslavia where there are more than 30 divisions of trained troops essential for Western European collective security.

I remind my colleagues, Mr. President, that Yugoslavia has joined with Greece and Turkey in a further alliance to strengthen Western Europe and the Mediterranean area against Communist or Soviet aggression.

For defense support in Europe there is authorized $70 million. Of this amount, $28 million goes to Spain and $36,500,000 to Yugoslavia. For a technical-exchange program in Western Europe, $5,500,000 is authorized.

Let me describe for a moment what we mean by defense support, using Spain, for example, with the $28 million allocated to her.

As the committee report outlines, in Spain the principal emphasis will be upon the improvement of transportation facilities, particularly railroads; upon the development of thermal power sources, to supplement hydroelectric facilities which are affected by drought; and upon an agricultural program likewise aimed at reducing the effects of drought areas. The principal compo-

nents of the Spanish program are as follows:

	Millions
Improvements in railroad lines supplying joint military bases	$6.9
Transmission lines and substation and switchgear for the power industry	6.0
Irrigation and reclamation equipment to make possible resettlement of underemployed agricultural workers	5.0
Imports of United States cotton	5.0

Of the local currency counterpart of $26 million, 60 percent will be used for local currency costs of the United States base construction program. As is well known, the United States is establishing some large military bases in Spain as a part of our Western defense system.

Ten percent of the local currency counterpart will be used for general United States purposes, and 30 percent of the funds will be used for agreed projects in transportation and defense production.

I think the money which the United States is placing in the Iberian Peninsula as a part of the common defense of Western Europe is money well expended. I call the attention of the Senate to the fact that a large amount of American surplus agricultural commodities has been utilized in Spain, to the benefit of the Spanish people—and a fine and noble people they are—and to the equal benefit of collective security in the construction of the bases and military equipment in the Spanish defense system.

Referring back to the Yugoslav defense support, I mentioned the figure $36.5 million. I have gone into this detail because I believe the American people deserve to know what the money is intended for. In the Yugoslav program, $1 million is planned for technical exchange; $35.5 million is planned for commodity imports, the most important of which would be bread grains, chiefly wheat. For that item, $11 million is planned.

For cotton, $5.5 million is intended; and for machinery and vehicles for eliminating transportation and industrial bottlenecks, $7 million.

I think it is interesting to note that those commodities will come from America. So not only will we help strengthen the Western European security, but also we will utilize the production of the farms and factories of the United States in a very constructive manner.

Speaking further of defense support in Europe, I mentioned that $5.5 million was planned for technical exchange on a regional basis. This money is to be used primarily to promote economic expansion through the development of improved management techniques, the encouragement of competitive business practices, and the promotion of improved collective-bargaining practices.

We have directed the Department of State and the Foreign Operations Administration to do these things: To emphasize free collective bargaining and the development and encouragement of the free trade-union movement; to emphasize the growth of private industry in the countries of Western Europe; and also to emphasize the importance of modern management techniques.

So the $5.5 million will be used primarily in this particular area of activity.

I point out that the technical exchange program carried on under the Mutual Security Act in Europe and elsewhere, and the exchange of persons programs carried on under the Smith-Mundt and Fulbright Acts are not exactly identical; they are separate programs to themselves. Both the purposes and methods of these programs are different. In view of the fact that the mutual security program is now to be administered by the State Department, which also administers the Smith-Mundt and Fulbright programs, it becomes more important than ever that this distinction be kept firmly in mind.

Finally, I mentioned some $21 million for assistance in joint-control areas. This item is related primarily to assistance for Berlin, but it also includes a small technical exchange program in Austria.

I shall make no further comment upon the European aspects of the mutual security program, because it is one of the minor points of the bill.

I should like to direct my attention now to the important aspect and the important part of the bill, namely, the Asian program.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a unanimous-consent request, with the understanding that what transpires will appear at the conclusion of his remarks?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I am glad to yield upon that understanding, and also because I have now reached a new topic in my speech.

(At this point Mr. HUMPHREY yielded to Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, who moved the consideration of the bill (H. R. 5559) to make permanent the existing privilege of free importation of gifts from members of the Armed Forces of the United States on duty abroad, and the bill was considered and passed.

(On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the proceedings relating to H. R. 5559 were ordered to be printed in the RECORD following Mr. HUMPHREY'S speech.)

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I wish to direct my attention for a moment to the sections of S. 2090 which relate to programs in the Asian area.

The total nonmilitary program for Asia under the Mutual Security Act of 1955 amounts to $1,451,000,000. Needless to say, this is a very substantial sum of money.

Of the $2,130,000,000 authorized by the bill for programs other than military assistance, $1,451,000,000, or 68 percent of the entire amount, is for Asia.

This amount consists of:

Direct forces support, $285,700,000.

Defense support, $827,800,000.

Development assistance, $71 million.

Technical cooperation, $66,500,000.

President's Fund for Asian Economic Development, $200 million.

Furthermore, Mr. President, I should note that some of the funds appropriated to United Nations agencies will undoubtedly be utilized, in large part, in the Asian area.

One might ask, first of all, what we mean by the Asian territory, or what we mean by Asia, since there are parts of Asia under Communist domination.

As the committee report points out, Asia means the territory from Afghanistan on the west eastward across south Asia to Vietnam and Indonesia and northward to Japan and Korea.

It has a population of approximately 771 million, or about one-third of the total population of the world, and it has an average per capita gross national product of $105, compared to $148 in the Near East and Africa, $300 in Latin America, and $2,200 in the United States.

I mention these per capita gross national product figures, Mr. President, because earlier in my discussion I pointed out that I felt this program was really a long-term investment in better commerce and better trade. I think it becomes pretty obvious that if the per capita gross national product in the Asian area is only $105, we are going to have some difficulty stimulating the kind of foreign trade American industry and agriculture need. Therefore, we propose to use the mutual security program to buttress, to strengthen, to enlarge, and to enrich the economies of these areas or countries in the Asian region, and thereby not only strengthen them against Communist subversion and infiltration, but also strengthen them in terms of trade or economic relationships with other nations, particularly the United States of America.

Other facts pertaining to the Asian area will indicate the importance of this program. The Asian area has some of the world's greatest and richest natural resources, particularly such strategic items as tin, rubber, oil, and manganese. This area is the source of 32 percent of United States supplies of chromite, 37 percent of United States supplies of manganese ore, 69 percent of United States supplies of tin, and 22 percent of the supplies of tungsten.

The Asian area has the world's longest common boundary with the Soviet Union and Communist China, and it is currently the primary target of Communist infiltration, subversion, and military pressure.

I wish to emphasize that particular observation because I am firmly convinced that although we may have a period of so-called relaxed tensions between the Soviet Union and the United States and other countries, yet the objective of the Soviet Union and of world communism remains the same, namely, to take over area after area, nation after nation, and region after region throughout the world. I have cautioned the Senate before, and in doing so again, I hope at least to express a word of advice, namely, that as we negotiate—and that we will—we should recognize that the design of world communism is to move into areas of the world where conditions are inviting. The conditions which are conducive to Communist growth are certainly to be found in the most fertile and most elaborate form in

the Asian and African areas. Given the characteristics of those areas, namely, poverty, political inexperience, and military weakness which is underlined because of the nearness of Communist power, the surprising thing is not that those areas are in difficulty, but, rather, that they are not in a state of chaos. I think we would do well to look at these areas and really feel somewhat gratified that conditions in them are not much worse than they are.

Frankly, Mr. President, many of the new nation-states in Asia have been making considerable progress. In fact, in light of their difficulties and problems, their progress is nothing short of phenomenal.

Nationalism is one of the new dominant forces in the Asian area. If that nationalism is directed into channels of constructive good for the people of the countries concerned, it, too, can be a psychological force in behalf of the freedom, independence, and liberty of the people.

At this point let me direct my attention to a breakdown of the $1,451,000,000 authorized in the pending bill for the Asian regions of the world.

Mr. President, I have used before the terms "direct forces support." By that is meant direct aid to military forces. The bill authorizes $285,700,000 for direct forces support in Asia. That will be distributed as follows: To Pakistan, $20 million; to Formosa, $37 million; to Korea, $180 million; to the Philippines, $2,300,000; to Thailand, $8,200,000; and to Cambodia, Laos, and Vietnam, $38,200,000—making a total of $285,700,000. This assistance will be administered by the Department of Defense, and will be given directly to the military forces of the countries concerned.

I am sure we recognize that some of these countries are associated with us in the Southeast Asia Collective Defense Treaty. Surely we have made a strong commitment to Formosa. Surely we have an obligation and a commitment to Korea; and surely we have a keen and a paternal interest in a nation such as the Philippines. I imagine that in recent days all of us have recognized the importance of military strength in the areas of Indochina which are still in free hands, namely, Cambodia, Laos, and Vietnam. So, Mr. President, I repeat that of the total amount authorized by the bill, $285,700,000 is for direct forces support in Asia.

The next item is what we call defense support, and for it there would be authorized the sum of $827,800,000.

Mr. President, I have heard many persons say they believe the bill places far too much emphasis upon military aspects. At first glance and on cursory reading, one would think so. But I call attention to the fact that the $827,800,000 proposed to be authorized for defense support, is essentially money which will be used to strengthen the fabric of the economy of these countries. The money will not be used for guns and munitions, as such. Instead, the money will be used for the improvement of the industrial base and the agricultural base, and to promote the health of the economy of these countries. Many of these countries are being called upon to raise large contingents of troops which would overtax their financial resources. Therefore, our defense support funds are to be utilized to add extra strength to the countries which are associated in common defense and collective security.

More than three-fourths of the total proposed for defense support for Asia is for Cambodia, Laos, Vietnam, and Korea. I certainly believe that those countries are entitled to our support as they struggle to maintain themselves independent and free. If anyone thinks this item extravagant, I ask him to think in these terms: What would be our position, and how costly would it be for us, if all of Vietnam, Korea, Cambodia, and Laos were to lose their freedom?

We often hesitate to think in terms of alternatives. Too frequently we think only of the direct cost involved. In this instance, the direct cost will be $827,800,000. That is a substantial sum of money; but, Mr. President, I respectfully suggest that the loss of South Vietnam, the loss of South Korea—for whose freedom and independence more than 30,000 Americans gave their lives—or the loss of the associated states of Cambodia, Laos, and Vietnam, in the Indochina area, would be a great tragedy to the United States of America, both from the point of view of political prestige and from the point of view of the strategic defense of the United States of America, and particularly from the point of view of our economic welfare. So the amount of money requested to be authorized in this instance is not at all extravagant; in fact, it may be an irreducible minimum.

I stated that the money would go into what I consider to be constructive and productive uses in the economies of these countries. For example, imports estimated to be financed through Korean defense support or direct forces support funds include raw cotton, $40 million; fertilizer, $61 million; petroleum, $47,200,000; coal, $34,800,000; machinery and vehicles, $52 million; and clothing, $85,200,000. These are items that country needs.

Of course, Mr. President, what happens in Korea is also happening in Pakistan, the Philippines, Formosa, and Thailand, where great quantities of foodstuffs and fiber and other materials are needed for the care and the welfare of the people.

The item in the bill which constitutes direct economic assistance, but without any title to it which could in any way deceive or in any way be misinterpreted, is what we refer to as development assistance. The development assistance component of the Asian-aid program amounts to $71 million, of which $70 million is for India, and $1 million is for Nepal.

The development assistance recommended for India, under the provisions of this bill, has been carefully planned in light of the fact that India's 5-year plan, which has been extremely well prepared, is now entering its last year. Mr. President, it is as important that India's 5-year plan be a success as it is that there shall be prosperity in the United States, because India is, in Asia, the counterpart to Communist China. Despite the fact that we have our differences with India, and despite the fact that from time to time the leaders of India seem to cause us great difficulty and irritate many Americans, the fact is that throughout the world India is being judged or is being compared in terms of her economic and political progress as contrasted with that of the great forces to her north, namely, the forces of China.

Is it not encouraging Mr. President, that a nation of more than 350 million people, with an independence of less than 10 years' duration, has been able to maintain its political stability and to conduct nationwide elections, in which almost 100 million people participated? But is it not equally encouraging for us to note that a recent study made by Stanford University proves that India's program of industrialization is well ahead of that of Red China? Despite the fact that Red China was able to take over hundreds of millions of dollars' worth of resources which we had once given to China before the Communists took over and despite the further fact that Red China has used the discipline of the police state to mobilize her forces, India, working on the principles of representative government and private investment plus government investment, has been able to outstrip China in the race for industrial progress.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks an editorial entitled "India Ahead," which was published in yesterday's Washington Evening Star.

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

INDIA AHEAD

An economic study just completed at Stanford University presents impressive evidence that India's program of industrialization is well ahead of Red China's. What the study shows is that democratic techniques in the production of such things as cotton yarn, cloth, cement, and finished steel are yielding more rewarding results than the harsh totalitarian methods of communism—methods that deliberately and systematically impose bitter hardship on the masses.

Assuming its accuracy—and there appears to be no reason for doubt on that score—the Stanford study thus may be regarded as a significant and encouraging report on one of the most crucial tests in Asia. The test revolves around Prime Minister Nehru's effort to demonstrate that India, by adhering to democracy, can do a much better job for its people, can achieve a more prosperous and far happier way of life, than can Communist China with its detestable Marxist system of force, regimentation, and police-state terrorism.

This is a test that all of Asia and the free world at large have reason to watch with the utmost interest and anxiety. Say what one will of Mr. Nehru's exasperating "neutralism," he is nonetheless a champion of human liberty and a man intent upon proving that the peoples of the Far East will be better off if they emulate India's system instead of Red China's. To that extent, therefore, to the extent that it fully supports him, the Stanford study certainly constitutes a piece of good news.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks

an article entitled "India Said To Top China In Industry," published in the New York Times of May 22, 1955.

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

INDIA SAID TO TOP CHINA IN INDUSTRY—UNITED STATES ECONOMISTS FIND REDS LAGGING IN PRODUCTION

WASHINGTON, May 22.—India is ahead of Communist China in the race toward industrialization, two Stanford University economists reported today.

In the current issue of Problems of Communism, published by the United States Information Agency, Yuan-li Wu and Robert C. North compare the per capita output of various commodities in the two Asian countries.

The economists, both members of the Asiatic and Slavic studies department at Stanford, report that India produces more cotton yarn, cloth, finished steel, and cement per capita, although she used democratic planning techniques, while the Chinese used totalitarian methods.

"So far, the more rapid pace of industrialization in China has not been able to rival India's present stage of development on a per capita basis, even within the industrial sector in which China has concentrated its investment program," they report.

Peiping, according to their analysis, still is leveling down the living standard in the avowed hope of being able to level up at a later stage. India, on the other hand, has been more considerate of her people.

The article contrasts India's 5-year plan, calling for slight but gradual improvements in per capita consumption, with the Chinese plan for accelerated industrial expansion with the extremely low consumption standard reduced even further.

MAIN POINTS ARE OUTLINED

They make these main points:

India has deliberately chosen a slower rate of capital investment so as not to impose an unbearable burden on the people.

The Indian plan is one of broad development, rather than of concentration on heavy industry. The peaceful land reform in India also has led to impressive gains in agricultural production.

Forced labor, a mainstay of Chinese industrialization, has been avoided in India.

India has been getting more foreign economic assistance than China.

"India looks upon economic development as the way toward a better life for its people," the authors say. "Why? one must ask. Has China adopted the opposite policy of 'austerity' and 'bitter struggle' when its people are also in immediate and often desperate need?

"One factor is ideology. The regime is committed to the achievement of Bolshevik-style collectivism, and hence cannot afford too great tolerance for the kind of individualism which a small peasant-proprietor economy is likely to encourage.

"It is likely, too, that Communist China finds it desirable to strengthen as rapidly as possible its relative independence, power, and capacity for initiative within the Sino-Soviet alliance. And in terms of the cold war and Red Chinese ambitions in Asia, Peiping undoubtedly sees the need for building an industrial complex capable of supplying modern weapons and military equipment for the use of its armed forces."

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I have in my possession—and I refer to it only for purposes of an adequate record—a bulletin entitled "Problems of Communism," published by the Special Materials Section of the United States Information Agency. In this particular issue, the May-June issue, there is a report on China and India, entitled "Two Paths to Industrialism." This report gives elaborate and detailed documentation as to the accomplishments in India, as compared to what has been happening in China.

Mr. President, I have before me an article entitled "Famine Hits 180 Million in Red China," published in the Washington Post and Times Herald of May 29, 1955. I ask unanimous consent to have that article printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

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

FAMINE HITS 180 MILLION IN RED CHINA

NEW YORK, May 28.—More than 180 million persons are starving in half the Chinese mainland and farmers are trading their implements and children for food, according to a report of the Chinese News Service, based on stories in Communist newspapers.

The food shortage was caused by last year's floods, an abnormally cold winter, wholesale Communist requisitions of grain, and heavy taxation, the service said.

Newspapers from Anhwei, Kiangsi, Hunan, Kwangsi, and Changchiang were quoted as saying livestock was being butchered by the hungry peasants, thousands of whom were trying to keep alive by eating grass.

The Ta Tao News Agency reported that more than 60 of the 98 counties in Kwantung Province were in dire need and that government relief rations had been cut from 7 ounces of rice a day per person to 5.

In some provinces the Communists have set up roadblocks to turn back starving peasants seeking food in the cities.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I bring this to the attention of the Senate to point out that while, at times, it seems that we have grave difficulties in the Asian area, particularly with the highly sensitive new-born nation of India, the truth is that the money we have invested, the money and the aid we have made available to the Indian authorities and the Indian people, using that country as one example, have produced constructive results. I ask my fellow Americans one question, "Do you want a pat on the back and a note of gratitude every time we expend or invest or lend a dollar? Or do you want accomplishments, constructive results which will make possible the maintenance, preservation, and extension of freedom?"

I can answer that question for myself. I should like, of course, to have every country send a note of thanks and appreciation to our Government and our people for what we do. But I would rather that something good be done with the aid which we afford. I have noticed that all too often the countries or peoples who send us great bouquets of gratitude for our foreign aid are the ones who do the least with the foreign aid. What is most important today is that the funds which are made available from the resources of the people of the United States through our Government, be used for constructive good, to build up the economy and strengthen the political institutions of representative government, to give meaning to the new-found independence and nationalism of the countries of Asia, Africa, the Near East, and, in fact, all over the world, including the Latin-American areas. That is what we are really looking for. Let us not be so immature, so adolescent, so juvenile, as to want to have someone say "Thank you" every time we provide some aid. I must warn my colleagues that if that is what we are expecting, we shall be sorely disappointed.

Parents ought to know something about this problem. Mothers and fathers must frequently wait a long time before receiving thanks which are long overdue. I believe that a great nation like the United States ought to know that in our position of wealth and power we encounter a certain amount of envy and jealousy. Sometimes we do a great deal to aggravate such envy and jealousy by our comments and our actions. We are not in a popularity contest. Our foreign policy is not a part of the art of making love. What we are really trying to do is to give leadership in the world, economically, politically, and socially, so that other peoples may stand on their own feet and be free and independent peoples and nations.

If we can realize such returns, as one American I will not be disturbed even if other peoples say unkind words about us as we help them. Many a patient who starts to get well curses the doctor. One of the first signs of recovery of health is the extent to which the patient abuses the doctor, and sometimes his own family and friends. Frequently we find those who are prostrate, who have lost almost all hope of living, to be very docile, very accommodating, very generous and gracious to the doctor and to members of their families who are helping them. But when they begin picking up their crutches and beating the doctor over the head, that is a good sign that recovery is well on the way. I think we must be prepared, in a certain sense, not always to be thanked, but to find our thanks in the accomplishments of those we help.

The development assistance program is a part of the policy in connection with the investment we are making for the long-term good of the United States of America and the free areas of the world. I should like to note that of the money which will be made available to India, for example, for the coming year, some $30 million, will be used in the purchase of surplus agricultural commodities. The local currency proceeds from these transactions will be used for local costs of irrigation, flood control, and power projects. It is very revealing to note that under this program the Government of India will receive aid in the form of fertilizer to the extent of $4 million; deep irrigation wells, $4 million; river valley development to assist in the further expansion of irrigation, $2 million; construction of electric power facilities, $5 million; steel industry, $15 million; transportation—particularly rehabilitation of their railroad system—$6 million; and malaria control, $4 million.

We have been able to utilize our surplus commodities for a humane purpose, and, at the same time use for constructive, progressive development in India the local currency used to purchase such commodities.

Mr. President, at this point I should like to have the comments of the Senate

committee report printed in the RECORD. I do not believe there will be found a more succinct or concise, and yet persuasive, argument in behalf of the aid program as it relates to India, than the committee report outlines. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD at this point, as a part of my remarks.

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

The development assistance component of the Asian aid program amounts to $71 million, of which $70 million is for India and $1 million for Nepal.

The development assistance recommended for India in this bill has been thought out with great care and ties in with India's 5-year plan which is itself extremely well prepared. The bulk of the expenditures called for by this plan are financed from India's own resources. American assistance is a small, but crucial fraction of the total. The biggest item of American aid will be $30 million in surplus agricultural commodities, the local currency proceeds from which will be used for local costs of irrigation, flood control, and power projects. Other assistance will consist of:

	Millions
Fertilizer	$4
Deep irrigation wells	4
River valley devolopment to assist in the further expansion of irrigation	2
Construction of electric power facilities	5
Steel	15
Transportation, principally rehabilitation of Indian railways	6
Malaria control	4

The $1 million development assistance program proposed for Nepal this year is intended to supplement a technical cooperation program and to begin meeting the needs for better transportation and communication facilities and for development of isolated areas.

India has almost half the population of non-Communist Asia, one of the lowest per capita incomes in the world ($56 a year), a literacy rate of 20 percent, and a life expectancy of 32 years. It is resolutely embarked on one of the most important experiments in history to make self-government work and to bring about economic development in the context of a free society.

It is a tribute to the steadfast purpose of the Indian people and to their deep attachment to democratic processes that this experiment is succeeding despite the appalling difficulties. Economically, industrial production has increased by one-third since 1948, and agricultural production is 16 percent above the prewar average. Politically, the Communist Party continues to make little headway. It received a surprisingly small percentage of the vote in the recent elections in the state of Andhra.

The Indian 5-year development plan is now entering its last year. The progress which has been made so far has been only by dint of the most resolute efforts. There will be general elections in 1956, and it is important that the rate of progress in the first 4 years of the plan be maintained, not only for the sake of India alone but also for the sake of the other free nations of Asia who are comparing the progress made by India in a free economy with that made by China in a totalitarian economy.

The committee is aware that from time to time demands are heard in the United States that assistance to India should be stopped in view of India's foreign policy of attempting to steer a middle course between the United States and the Soviet Union. The committee feels that such action on the part of the United States would be a mistake. India is a free, sovereign nation which, in its domestic policy, follows a firm anti-Communist line. Its foreign policy is one which seems to India best designed to protect and promote India's interests. Despite their differing policies toward the Soviet Union, the United States and India share a common devotion to free representative forms of government. A strong free India is an immeasurable influence for a strong free Asia. Certainly, it is far preferable for India to be neutral than to become a member of the Soviet bloc. The committee recommends approval of the full amount requested for India, which is approximately the same as last year, and which will be used to a considerable extent in the form of loans.

Mr. HUMPHREY. One of the other parts of the Asian aid program is technical cooperation. I notice that the distinguished senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] has taken an interest in this program, in particular. I was present in the Senate on the day when he delivered one of the finest addresses I have ever heard on the subject of technical assistance. I wish I could incorporate at this point a review of some of the projects and programs which the Senator from Illinois discussed, but I shall not duplicate the RECORD. The information is already in the RECORD. I believe the address was delivered some time in the month of April. I commend to Members of the Senate a re-reading of the fine speech of the Senator from Illinois on the subject of technical cooperation.

The technical-cooperation program proposed for Asia amounts to $66½ million. This is exclusive of the United Nations activities.

I ask unanimous consent that the breakdown of that program, country by country, be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

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

The technical cooperation program proposed for Asia amounts to $66,500,000, distributed as follows:

	Millions
Afghanistan	$2.0
India	15.0
Nepal	1.0
Pakistan	9.0
Formosa	3.0
Indonesia	8.0
Japan	1.0
Korea	8.0
Philippines	6.5
Thailand	5.5
Cambodia, Laos, Viet-Nam	7.5
Total	66.5

This money will be used mainly for the continuation of programs already underway. By major field of activity, it is divided as follows:

	Thousands
Agriculture and natural resources	$18,672
Industry and mining	8,904
Transportation	1,540
Labor	1,410
Health and sanitation	9,196
Education	12,670
Public administration	7,695
Community development, social welfare, and housing	3,973
General and miscellaneous	2,080
Other costs	360
Total	66,500

Of the total, $26,408,000, or more than one-third, will be used for supplies and equipment. This relatively high proportion is explained by the almost total lack in some countries of local supplies and equipment and of local resources with which to procure supplies and equipment.

Technical cooperation in Asia in the current fiscal year amounts to $45.5 million. The $66.5 million authorized by the bill would thus mean an increase of $21 million. This is largely accounted for by new programs of $8 million in Korea and $7.5 million in Cambodia, Laos, and Viet-Nam. In previous years technical-cooperation-type activities in these countries have been financed out of other funds. Attention should also be called to the inclusion of $1 million in the fiscal 1956 program to finance a productivity center in Japan.

Aside from these new programs, which seem to the committee to be justified, the increase for all the rest of Asia is only $5 million, which the committee feels is reasonable.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I point out that this money will be used mainly for the continuation of programs already underway. Those programs are in the field of agriculture, industry, transportation, health and sanitation, education, public administration, community development, social welfare and housing, development of management and free labor throughout the countries to which we are extending this technical assistance.

I happen to have a soft spot in my heart for the technical assistance program and a firm resolution in my mind about it. It is what I call a thoroughly American program and provides for doing that which comes naturally. We Americans are essentially builders. We like to see things grow. We like to use our imagination and creativeness for the common good. We have given evidence of it in industry and in the arts and in technology, and, of course, in agriculture.

I am under the impression that most of us come from rural areas. At least whenever I talk to people they always like to remind me that they are country folk, too, or that they once lived in the country. That is a part of the American tradition. All Americans like to think in terms of what we call the extension service, or the county agent. The extension service is a part of America. It is as American as Bunker Hill, the Statue of Liberty, or the Liberty Bell, or the Constitutional Convention. What we have done in the pending bill is to take the principle of the extension service and move it onto the international scene.

I know of no program which has built more goodwill, created more positive results, and brought about greater benefit to more people than the technical assistance program. We get more out of every dollar we spend on this program than from any other program America has authorized or supported.

If I have any complaint to make about the pending bill it is that we are not authorizing enough money for this program. I think we are authorizing as much as the administration has been able to program; but I said in the committee, and I repeat on the floor, that, in my opinion, the administration could have programed a great deal more. They

have a big enough field in which to do it. I am convinced that every dollar we put into what we call the technical assistance program in the underdeveloped and underprivileged areas will not only make for good will and peace and security, but will yield millions of dollars in good business between the people of the United States and the people of other nations.

I wish that more emphasis could be placed on technical cooperation. I want to serve a word of warning now for those who review this RECORD. The RECORD may not be closely reviewed by our colleagues, but I know that the administrative agencies of the Government go over the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD very carefully. They hire people for that purpose. I want to serve a word of warning that I shall be carefully watching the administration of the technical assistance program. I hope that the new Administrator of the Foreign Operations Administration—incidentally, we are changing the name of that agency to the International Cooperation Administration, and setting up the agency as an autonomous unit in the State Department—I hope that the new Administrator will realize that some Senators and some Members of the other body are deeply concerned about the technical assistance program.

I am a charitable person. I like to think kindly of every man. However, I want to serve warning now that if I think anyone is monkeying around with this program and not giving it the support, the imaginative development, and the imaginative helpfulness it needs, he will hear from the junior Senator from Minnesota; and I am sure he will also hear from the present Presiding Officer, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], and the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG], who because he comes from an agricultural State, knows the principle of the extension service, the principle of self-help through trained technicians, and knows that that extension service has produced great dividends beyond human calculation.

I call to my colleagues' attention the fact that the bill does provide a substantial sum of money for the so-called bilateral programs in various countries. It is my hope that they will continue to grow as we are privileged to reduce the economic assistance in terms of defense, and that we will expand more and more the technical cooperation program.

Mr. President, this is the beginning of the good life. People can really become emancipated when they learn to use modern science and modern technology, and to mix their labor with the land and their brainpower with their God-given resources of water and timber and land and minerals. There is no program I know of which does more along that line than the technical-assistance program.

I have called the attention of the Senate to the fact that this program encompasses almost every country in Asia which is on the side of freedom or which is fighting for its own national independence.

There is a new section in the bill. It is called the President's Fund for Economic Development. It relates particularly to the Asian area. It is a fund of $200 million. I would be less than candid if I did not say that some members of the committee, indeed, I think most members of the committee, were a little bit dubious as to whether we should turn over this amount of money to any President. I want my words to be interpreted objectively and not in a partisan sense. We were dubious whether we should turn over $200 million to any President. We did not know whether we should turn that amount of money over without any strings attached to it at all, so to speak, and with no protection or standard or criteria established for its use, except the broad language that it shall be used for the economic development of the Asian region as a whole.

However, I reconciled my doubts on this matter in favor of the President of the United States, the Chief Executive. I gathered that there had not been set forth a specific blueprint of action for the use of the money. In fact, there may be good reasons why there should not be such a blueprint, from a strategic and psychological point of view. However, I want to make it clear that in the bill, as a result of the deliberations of the committee, we are asking for a report from the Chief Executive every 6 months on the progress he makes with this program. We ask him for a progress report with respect to what projects are underway and how the money is being utilized. I am sure that in the executive sessions of our committee the President, through the appropriate agent—in this instance the Secretary of State or the administrator of the program—will present to us the blueprint for future action.

There may be some reason why it should not be made available for general discussion, but I have not been able to discover any such reason. I usually find that most of the secrets we guard are kept only from our own people and that our enemies know all about them, anyway. Sometimes I think we would be better off if we told our own people a little more about what we were doing and what course we were following.

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

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, usually a Senator can find out what the secrets are by reading the nationwide magazines or the daily newspapers. That has been my experience. After we have been told that some information was classified top secret, and have had it whispered in our ears, I have found that same information spread in photographic detail in a magazine or newspaper.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I believe the Senator from Louisiana is basically correct. I would not say that it is any indication as to the ineffectiveness of the secrecy program. Rather, it is in high tribute to the great journalistic reporting capacities and abilities of the members of the fourth estate. They are able to find out information which even the most carefully trained investigators are unable to ascertain. I must say that we do make it a little difficult for them, but at the same time in doing so we sharpen their techniques. A certain relaxation of the rigid standards might cause a little softness on their part, and therefore it might be well not to slow up or to restrict the secrecy program.

Mr. SPARKMAN . Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Of course, I agree fully with what has been said by both the Senator from Minnesota and the Senator from Louisiana. I think it could be illustrated by many incidents which have occurred. But with reference to the particular fund which the Senator from Minnesota has been discussing, is it not fair to say that as of now perhaps it is impossible to give a blueprint?

Mr. HUMPHREY. It is; yes.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Because we are starting out on an uncharted course.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I think it is fair to say that.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Is it not true, also, that there is envisaged in this program perhaps a coordination of the technical assistance and the economic development programs, in that under the technical assistance program undoubtedly surveys will be made to determine useful projects which might be developed to help the economy of a country which the country itself is not able within its own resources, and this fund is to make it possible for the President of the United States to step in and assist both by loan and by grant in working out such projects?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes. The Senator's explanation is very helpful and is thoroughly in line with the discussion which took place in committee.

Furthermore, the fund is designed for capital investment in the non-Communist Asian areas and thus to lift the general level of the economic activity in those areas. As the Senator from Alabama has pointed out, we might find that this money provided in the President's special fund can be the difference between really effective progress and mere piecemeal limited efforts.

In other words, this fund can be utilized to support the technical assistance projects but not in the technical assistance areas as such. It may be used for improvement of transportation systems, investment in a plan, or something else which may be necessary for the general economic progress of a country.

Mr. SPARKMAN. For the building of plants which will give employment to the people in the processing of their own natural resources?

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is correct.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Which, in turn, would increase the purchasing power of those people. I may say it is not altogether an altruistic move on our part, because we certainly look forward to the opportunity of helping to sell to those people goods which are manufactured in our own country.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I wish to thank the Senator for that observation. I think it is one of the most important observations that can be made in terms of our own self-interest in this matter. We actually do business on the basis of this program.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator indulge me for another moment?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Certainly.

Mr. SPARKMAN. The Senator made reference to the misgivings that many of us had with reference to turning virtually a blank check over to any President. Is it not true that the committee did write into the provision some conditions to safeguard the fund, although, as the able Senator has so well pointed out, it had to be left largely to the discretion of the President to handle?

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is correct.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Is it not true, for instance, that we put a limitation on the amount which would have to be disbursed in the form of loans rather than grants? In other words, that the whole amount cannot be granted?

Mr. HUMPHREY. At least 50 percent of it must be in repayable loans, and not more than 25 percent can be used in any one country.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Then, of course, as the Senator has pointed out, we have required that after the program is started a report of what has been done and what is projected for the future must be submitted each 6 months.

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is correct.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Does not the Senator consider this particular part of the program and various other elements making up what so many persons refer to as economic assistance, of course, including technical assistance, a highly important part of the program in the fight which we are carrying on, the cold war, against the onrush of communism?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I consider it a basic part of our struggle against Soviet imperialism and communism. I think any attempt to weaken the program at this time would be like tapping one of our own arteries or veins and weakening our own bodies.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Weakening our strength and inviting communism to enter and make up for the strength sapped away from potential allies of the free world.

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is true.

I wish to thank the Senator for his observation. He has had many years experience in the field of foreign relations and has been an active participant in the preparation of the program which is now before the Senate.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the committee report relating to the President's Fund for Economic Development, amounting to $200 million, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

9. PRESIDENT'S FUND FOR ASIAN ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT (SEC. 8 (K))

A new element is added to the mutual security program this year in the form of a special fund of $200 million for the President, to be available for obligation until June 30, 1958, and to be used primarily for projects contributing to economic development of the Asian region as a whole.

There is a great need for capital investment throughout non-Communist Asia, but the area is relatively poor and finds it very difficult either to attract outside private capital or to amortize bankable loans in sufficient volume; nor can it generate enough capital internally. The level of economic activity does not provide a large enough margin beyond immediate subsistence requirements, and the institutions for pooling what local capital does accumulate are either nonexistent or poorly developed.

For the same reasons, all stemming from basic poverty, the area's capacity to absorb capital is limited. Large investments would have disrupting inflationary effects.

The committee particularly calls attention, however, to limitations which it wrote into the section authorizing the fund. These limitations are that not less than 50 percent of the appropriations made to the fund shall be available only for furnishing assistance on a loan basis, and that not more than 25 percent of the funds may be allocated for assistance to any one nation.

The bill also amends section 534 of the Mutual Security Act of 1954 to extend to the Asian development fund the requirements of that section for the President to report semiannually to Congress detailed information on the use of the fund. The committee expects that these reports will not only contain precise specific information on past expenditures and obligations, but also, to the extent that the national interest permits, plans and projections for future obligation and expenditure.

The bill also provides that "the President shall give preference to projects or programs that will clearly contribute to promoting greater economic strength in the area as a whole or among a group or groups of countries of the area."

It is the hope of the committee that through the wise use of this fund, the President can take advantage of opportunities to stimulate economic activity on a regional basis and that the results of the projects for which the fund is used will be cumulative and will themselves lead to other investment and further development. It should be noted, however, that the fund will be administered on a bilateral basis and that the United States will retain full control over its uses.

Among examples of projects for which the fund might be used are regional development of water and mineral resources, transportation and communications projects, and regional training centers.

This broad authorization of $200 million to the President for these purposes should be viewed in the context of other United States aid programs in Asia in recent years. Last year, for example, Congress authorized $700 million—3½ times as much—to be used under very broad authority to accomplish the policies and purposes of the Mutual Security Act in southeast Asia and the Western Pacific. And previously, over a period of 5 years, Congress authorized a total of more than $2.5 billion for the President to use in his discretion in the general area of China.

It seems to the committee that an investment of $200 million in the President's discretion for purposes of peaceful economic development in Asia is at least as justified and worthwhile as the earlier investment of much larger sums in the President's discretion for purposes of military assistance and direct forces support.

In point of fact, the President's discretionary power under this bill, though undeniably great, is less than it was under the Mutual Security Act of 1954. The $700 million fund authorized by that act for southeast Asia and the Western Pacific has already been noted. In other respects, the authority given the President under this bill and under the 1954 act is substantially the same. His authority to transfer funds from one section to another is unchanged, and his authority for special use of $150 million under section 401 is also unchanged in total.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I wish to emphasize the fact that this section of the report deals with the restraints and restrictions, or, at least, the counsel and advice about the use of the fund by the President.

I think it should be further noted that considerable discretionary authority is lodged in the President by the mutual security bill. However, it is not so great as it was last year, even with the $200 million special fund herein authorized. I read from page 12 of the committee report:

In point of fact, the President's discretionary power under this bill, though undeniably great, is less than it was under the Mutual Security Act of 1954. The $700 million fund authorized by that act for Southeast Asia and the Western Pacific has already been noted. In other respects, the authority given the President under this bill and under the 1954 act is substantially the same. His authority to transfer funds from one section to another is unchanged, and his authority for special use of $150 million under section 401 is also unchanged in total.

I wanted to have the record clear with respect to the discretionary authority of the President, because we should have a complete understanding of what we are doing. We must keep in mind that in an unstable world situation where changes come so rapidly, we must place trust in the Chief Executive, in the office of the President, to apply the funds which are made available so as to assure the safety, freedom, and security of ourselves, as well as our various allies. No matter what our partisan differences may be, when we come down to the crucial field of national security, common defense, and foreign policy, we must place our trust where the Constitution requires it to be placed, namely, in the office of the Presidency.

Mr. President, I move along to the part of the bill which relates to the Near East and Africa.

The total program is $309 million.

For direct forces support, $27,500,000.

For defense support, $102,500,000.

For development assistance, $73 million.

For technical cooperation, $41 million.

For United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees, $65 million.

The aggregate total for this region is $309 million.

I mentioned the item of direct forces support, of $27,500,000. Twenty million dollars of it goes to Turkey; $7,500,000 to Iran. The largest single item is approximately $12 million for fuel, which is, of course, a very important item in the economy of any country.

I am sure every American will agree with me that whatever funds we have been able to place in Turkey for purposes of military aid have been funds well expended. Turkey has become a valiant and powerful ally.

For defense support, which, as I have previously described, relates to the economic welfare and economic strength of a country, Greece will obtain $15 million; Iran, $37,500,000; Turkey, $50 million, or a sum total of $102,500,000.

Here, again, I may say that the Near East area is of crucial importance. It is the bridge between Asia and Europe. Certainly we want to do everything pos-

sible, in light of the success which has been attained in Iran, Greece, and Turkey, to keep those areas of the world strong and to further their progress, production, and general economic and social well-being.

I should like to note that the $15 million of defense support for Greece is all for the importation of wheat, again from our surplus stocks. This will be sold in the civilian economy, with the local currency proceeds going into the Greek defense budget. Without this aid, as the committee report points out, it appears doubtful that the Greek armed forces could be maintained at a level commensurate with NATO force goals. So I am certain that it will be agreed that aid to Greece is well deserved.

The defense-support program in Iran will consist of $15.4 million in sugar and wheat, and $22.1 million in industrial items. Again, the local currency which will be paid for those goods will be used to meet the local costs of defense construction projects and to give help to the country in the support of its military forces.

Iran will not begin to receive oil revenues on a full scale until 1957. When the oil revenue begins to come back in full force, I am quite confident that the financial situation in Iran will not necessitate any amount of American economic aid.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the portions of the committee report relating to defense support for Turkey may be printed at this point in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

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

In Turkey, defense support of $50 million will be used primarily for transportation and agricultural equipment and for machinery for development of small industrial plants. The local currency counterpart generated by these imports will be used in the Turkish defense budget to make up the difference between what the Turks themselves are able to spend and what is required to meet the defense levels set by NATO.

Although the Turkish economy has made substantial progress since United States aid began in 1947, it has been handicapped by high defense expenditures. Agricultural production suffered last year because of unfavorable weather conditions. Heavy capital investments, combined with defense spending, have contributed to inflation and to a large foreign exchange deficit. Yet the Turkish armed forces are the eastern anchor of NATO and the western anchor of Middle East defense. The Turks have themselves taken the lead in developing Middle Eastern defense alliances. They are firmly committed to collective security, and it is clearly in the interests of the United States to continue to help the Turks support their armed forces and particularly to help them through their present economic difficulties.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, as to development assistance in the Near East, $73 million has been authorized. This development assistance is for six Near East countries—Egypt, Israel, Jordan, Lebanon, Libya, and Syria. There is a very serious question as to whether the funds for this area are adequate. I believe the amount of the funds should be enlarged. I caution my fellow Americans that the Near East is potentially one of the richest plums in all the power politics of the modern world. Soviet Russia is close at hand, and its geographic proximity aggravates the danger of the situation.

Certainly we should look upon this area as a very vital part of the whole security system which we have created. No security system is any stronger than every link; or, as the old saying goes, a chain is no stronger than its weakest link. If in any part of the great free world system of collective security there is a weak link, the whole system will become lost, or at least jeopardized.

I am fearful that because of the passions and emotions which rage around the Israeli-Arab difficulties, the State Department and the Foreign Operations Administration have not been willing to come to grips factually and objectively with the needs in that area of the world. I think that both the Israeli area and the Arab States are in need of greater economic assistance. I think the money we will put into those areas will come back to us a thousandfold in the form of long-term security and long-term economic gains for all parties and peoples.

This year's authorization represents a substantial reduction from last year's, a little more than $40 million. Last year $115 million was authorized; this year's authorization is $73 million. So I am fearful that unless we look at the situation a little more carefully—and I hope we shall in the Senate debate—we may very well find some of our friends, particularly the State of Israel, in grave difficulty because of the lack of adequate assistance.

I further point out that a nation which aspires to freedom and representative government, as Israel does, and as it has been able to maintain it for 7 years, is a very powerful factor in the so-called cold war. There is no more important force than precept and example.

In the Near East area, an example of representative government, of free economic institutions, and of free political institutions is a perpetual weapon in the struggle between tyranny and freedom. I wish we would place a little more emphasis upon the psychological needs, the psychological factors and forces.

I shall never forget what Mr. Chester Bowles said before the Committee on Foreign Relations not long ago. He was giving a definition of power. I can only paraphrase the eloquence of his remarks. Mr. Bowles said that all too often our leaders define power in terms of dollars, guns, divisions, economic resources, industry, production, statistical tables relating to per capita wealth, and so forth. Then he went on to point out:

Senator GEORGE and members of the committee, in recent months I have asked several prominent Americans for their definition of power. Their answers have included the Strategic Air Command, Army, Navy, NATO, SEATO, industrial capacity, access to raw materials, communications and geography. Two additional factors which, in my opinion, are essential elements of power have usually been omitted. These two elements are people and ideas.

The changes which lately have been taking place in Asia and Africa are a dramatic illustration of this. In the last 8 years 1.2 billion people—half the population of the world—have changed their form of government without the benefit of atom bombs, jet fighters, flattops, steel mills, or modern transportation systems. Indeed in most instances, the preponderance of power as defined in these narrow terms, was largely arrayed against them.

I commend at least this portion of Mr. Bowles' testimony to the attention of all Senators, because I cannot help feeling that we Americans do not place the proper emphasis upon the impact of ideas and people. We have become so used to appropriating and appropriating, and talking in terms of our production and goals, in connection with tangible, materialistic factors, that we have forgotten the impact of people and of ideas.

If any country on the face of the earth ought to understand the meaning of ideas and people, it is the United States. The full power of George III and the British Empire was arrayed against this Nation 180 years ago. We were a small country, with only a few people—at least, not a sufficient number to entitle us to be called a major power—and none of the modern weapons of war of that period. But we had an idea—an idea that tore down the monarchies of half the countries of Europe. There were many persons in the new Nation who believed in it and were dedicated to it. We should keep these very human, spiritual, and intangible forces constantly in mind.

Mr. President, I have mentioned the total sum of money for development assistance. I ask unanimous consent that the portion of the report relating to Egypt, Israel, Jordan, Lebanon, Libya, and Syria, be included at this point in my remarks.

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

In Egypt, the program is designed to help the Egyptian Government carry out its overall 10-year, $2 billion economic development plan which is aimed principally at achieving maximum agricultural production, increasing the amount of arable land, expanding industrial production, and introducing new industries. United States assistance will consist chiefly of equipment for highway construction and port improvement, and construction of grain silos, irrigation pumping stations, and power plants.

In Israel, surplus agricultural commodities will account for a large part of the development assistance program, about half of which will probably be on a loan basis. Although Israel has made significant economic progress, and American assistance has been reduced, it is not yet feasible to terminate that assistance.

In Jordan, a country of low productivity and high population in relation to resources, the development assistance program will be concentrated on highway and water development, particularly well drilling.

In Lebanon, the program would concentrate on agricultural development, improvement of village water supplies, and public roads. A primary object is to encourage local capital formation through reducing the need for expenditures on food imports and through improving transportation facilities. It is contemplated that most of the assistance for Lebanon would be on a loan basis and that part of it would be in the form of commodities.

Libya—which provides the site for the United States Air Force Base at Wheelus Field near Tripoli—is one of the poorest and at the same time most important countries in the area. The development assistance program and the technical cooperation program will be operated together, wherever appropriate, in order to obtain maximum results, particularly in water exploration and development work and improved agricultural practices.

Although the United States has no agreements for either development assistance or technical cooperation in Syria, the bill includes funds for economic aid should Syria desire it in connection with unified planning of the project for utilizing the waters of the Jordan and Yarmuk Rivers. Maximum use of this water for irrigation might prevent full development of its hydroelectric power potential in which case Syria might need external credit for thermal power development.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, as to technical cooperation in the Near East and Africa, $41 million is authorized. I shall not elaborate further upon the importance of technical assistance. What I have said about technical assistance programs in Asia surely applies to the Near East. Those who have visited the near eastern section of the world know that poverty is one of the notable factors. Conditions of bad health and of the most abject form of misery and poverty are prevalent everywhere.

It appears to me that by the careful application of scientific know-how, technologic know-how, technologic assistance, training people to help themselves and to retrain themselves, we can, working with them, do much, and they can do much, working with us, to ameliorate the terrible conditions of social infection and personal tragedy.

Very frankly, I hope that our Government will be a little more dramatic and a little more imaginative about what we can do and what people in these areas of the world, who are beset by economic and social difficulties, can do.

Every time I pick up a newspaper I read either about the Russians having more bombers than we have or we having more bombers than they have. It depends on what column one is reading or when the last time was we had heard from the Pentagon.

I am convinced of one thing: Bombers are important for national security.

I have supported a national security program. I believe in a stronger one than that which our present leadership espouses. I did not vote for any cut in our Air Force program. I think such a cut was a mistake. But I also believe in one other thing: I believe that we Americans would do well to build our strength quietly, conscientiously, persistently, without any ups and downs. Let us move ahead methodically, building the military strength that a great Nation needs. Let us quit talking about it so much. Let us quit threatening to drop atom bombs. If we dropped half as many atom bombs as we have threatened to drop, we would not have a stockpile of them.

Let us proceed to point out what is really a part of our life. We are not Spartans or gladiators. We are doers of good, honest deeds. We really represent onward marching Christians, and we should live up to the nobility of that term. We ought to be talking about enabling little children to lead better and fuller lives. We ought to be talking about turning barren soil into fertile fields. We ought to be talking about how, working together as brothers and sisters, we can make a better world.

The Communists cannot talk about that, because they believe in bombers, guns, and atom bombs. They have more physicists than we have. But we have more decent motives than they have. We ought not to talk in their terms. We ought not to talk about how we can close our doors to their people. We frequently ape what this Government does. My plea is that in the programs we authorize we ought to emphasize the things we do best, the things that come naturally, the things that our parents taught us to believe in.

We have a wonderful tradition and history. It is one of constant emancipation. It is one of human liberty. It is one of social progress. It is one of expanding frontiers. It is a great history and tradition of more education for more people, better health for more people, better facilities for social welfare and recreation for more and more people, better jobs, and lifting the burden of labor from the backs of those who are the toilers in the fields and in the shops.

This is the great moral, spiritual, and psychological lesson of America. Every time we invest in technical cooperation, in student-exchange programs, in all the many great projects which are now underway, by our own efforts and through the United Nations, we really put our best foot forward.

Instead of rattling the saber, I suggest that we reveal to the world a very contrite and compassionate heart and a firm will. I shall never forget the lines of Lincoln when he spoke of our great country as being the last best hope on earth. He said:

> With malice towards none, with charity for all, with firmness in the right, as God gives us to see the right.

Most people can go through life without any malice, and most people can go through life with a spirit of charity, but it takes a real man to go through life with firmness in the right and still have a spirit of charity.

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

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. SPARKMAN. The Senator from Minnesota has referred quite ably to the program described as technical cooperation. I wonder if it would not be well to state for the RECORD the fact that technical cooperation really envisions two things, as people usually think of them. It embraces assistance through the United Nations in the technical-assistance field. I believe that contribution amounts to about $24 million. Is that correct?

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is the amount authorized in the bill.

Mr. SPARKMAN. That is our participation in the technical-assistance program through the United Nations, and $146,500,000 represents what is commonly known as the point 4 program. Is that not correct?

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is correct in reference to the Near East and Africa point 4 program. I should like to use that terminology. That was the original name. I always have difficulty keeping up with people who change their names.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I wish to make it clear that we carry on a two-phase program. That is, we do our part through the United Nations in a very fine technical-assistance program which is carried on by that organization; but, not content with that, we also engage in bilateral agreements, whereby we offer to share with underdeveloped areas our skills and techniques, in order to help them help themselves. A great many persons, not only in this country, but in other countries of the world, do not recognize the program when it is mentioned by the term "technical cooperation." They know it as the point 4 program. It was known by that name ever since 1949, I believe, when the then President delivered a message in which he recommended a bold new program in offering our techniques and skills to other peoples.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I think this program was one of the really great accomplishments, and I might even call it an invention, of the past decade. I resent the fact that, because of what I consider to be petty developments, an attempt was made to change the name. It indicates to me a sort of picayunish, partisan pettiness. I think we might just as well call it what it really is—point 4. If people want to change their names, they ought to go to court.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I am sure the Senator from Minnesota has had the same experience I have had. In talking with people in the countries affected, they always refer to the program as the point 4 program. They know it by no other name. I agree with the Senator when he refers to the pettiness, the littleness, of insisting on changing the name simply because the other name, which happened to become well known throughout the world, was applied by a previous administration.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I thank the Senator from Alabama.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have a breakdown of the point 4 program for the Near East and Africa, by countries and by major activity, printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

Near East and Africa—Technical cooperation

BY COUNTRY

Near East and Africa:	*Millions*
Egypt	$4.0
Ethiopia	3.4
Greece	1.5
Iran	10.0
Iraq	2.3
Israel	2.0
Jordan	2.8
Lebanon	2.5
Liberia	1.8
Libya	2.0
Turkey	2.5
Dependent overseas territories	4.0
Regional	2.2
Subtotal	41.0

BY MAJOR ACTIVITY

	Thousands
Agriculture and natural resources	$10,706
Industry and mining	3,726
Transportation	3,089
Labor	850
Health and sanitation	5,211
Education	7,866
Public administration	2,640
Community development, social welfare, and housing	3,857
Other	3,055
Total	41,000

Of the Near Eastern program, $7,291,000 is proposed for supplies and equipment.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, unless the Senator intends to take up other areas at this time, I suggest that the whole table be placed in the RECORD.

By the way, I think one thing should be emphasized. This is a $3½ billion bill, is it not?

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is correct.

Mr. SPARKMAN. But of that amount, only $146 million will go to this program, which probably makes a greater contribution to long-range peace-building than does any other part of the total program of the bill; and when this particular program is broken down, so as to show the amounts going to the various countries, we observe how relatively small is the amount for each one.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I certainly agree with the Senator from Alabama that, dollar for dollar, we obtain more results from this program than we do from any other program we have been able to develop to date.

Mr. President, another item for the Near East and Africa is the Palestine refugee program, at a cost of $65 million. I certainly support the committee's recommendation, and hope Congress will do so, for an authorization in the amount of $65 million. This particular activity is administered by the United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East. The committee report explains in detail the purposes of the project, and I ask unanimous consent that the detailed information contained in the committee report be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

28. PALESTINE REFUGEES (SEC. 8 (F))

The bill contains an authorization for $65 million to be contributed to the United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East (UNRWA). A standby authorization of $30 million was made for the same purpose last year, but it was not necessary to request appropriations and the authorization will lapse June 30, 1955.

This is the first request for new funds since fiscal 1953 when $60,063,250 was appropriated. Of that amount, it is estimated that $6.4 million will remain unexpended as of June 30, 1955. Additional funds have not been necessary sooner because to date UNRWA has been restricted largely to relief activities and funds intended to be used for rehabilitation projects have been carried over. The UNRWA relief program has cost about $25 million a year. Relief will continue at about the same rate during fiscal 1956, and $16.5 million of the requested United States contribution will be set aside for this part of the program.

The remainder of the proposed United States contribution, $48.5 million will be devoted to rehabilitation projects, which the administration hopes will be realized during the coming fiscal year.

A permanent solution of the Arab refugee problem can only be found through rehabilitation and resettlement, and the committee has repeatedly expressed its deep concern over the lack of progress in this direction. The committee was, therefore, encouraged to learn that final negotiations are nearing completion for two large-scale resettlement projects. One of these will provide for 60,000 to 70,000 people in Sinai at an estimated cost of $50 million. The other is the Jordan River Valley development which will benefit about 150,000 refugees at an estimated cost of $90 million. Both of these projects will take a number of years to complete but the administration is hopeful that a start can be made on them during the course of fiscal 1956, and UNRWA has tentatively budgeted $61.5 million for this purpose.

The committee believes that if projects of this character can be brought to fruition, a great contribution will have been made to reducing the tensions that now disturb the area.

In view of the great benefits which would flow from such a development, the committee feels the United States contribution here proposed of 70 percent of the total is justified, but at the same time it believes that greater effort might be made to increase worldwide participation in the program.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Finally, Mr. President, I come to what I consider to be an area both close to home and close to the hearts of the American people, namely, the Western Hemisphere. The total program proposed for the Western Hemisphere amounts to $52,500,000. Earlier today, I discussed this matter with the junior Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS], who indicated to me that it was his intention later to submit some amendments for the expansion of what we call development assistance. My feeling is that slowly but surely—and I believe it is a little too slowly, although I hope it is very surely—we are beginning to appreciate the strategic importance as well as the economic and political importance of our Latin-American neighbors, the countries in Central America and South America. We should be keenly interested in what is current in these countries, because of their geographical position, if for no other reason, but also because they are in the New World, and because they came into being as new States at about the same time that our country became a sovereign, free state.

Our Government was the first to recognize our friends and neighbors to the south as sovereign, independent countries. They broke away from the old system of aristocracy and monarchy. They are a part of the New World and the new era. It is gratifying to me to realize that we have a continuing interest in their economic and political well-being. But I repeat that much more needs to be done. I regret that more attention has not been paid to these areas. Very frankly, Mr. President, our relationships with the Latin American countries after World War II simply subsided and went from bad to worse. We virtually ignored their existence. It has only been in recent days that attention has been paid to them by us.

So I think we owe a debt of gratitude to the junior Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS] for arousing keen interest in the Senate in this situation. He has joined with others, but he has given leadership to the work. I am of the opinion that the State Department is well aware of his keen interest in it.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield to me at this point, to permit me to make an observation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. DOUGLAS in the chair). Does the Senator from Minnesota yield to the Senator from Florida?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. SMATHERS. First, Mr. President, I wish to say that I appreciate very much the kind and generous remarks of the Senator from Minnesota regarding my efforts and regarding the countries of South America and Central America. Let me say frankly, however, that none of the things which have been done in that connection would have been done without the very able assistance of the Senator from Minnesota and all the other Senators whom I happen to see at this time on the floor.

Earlier, it was my privilege to talk with the able chairman of the committee, who expressed the same feeling about the importance of our relationships with the countries of Central America and South America that has been expressed by the Senator from Minnesota. I am sure the Senator from Minnesota hits upon a sensitive point, however, when he states that including all the grants and measures of assistance we have adopted, we have never yet done for Central American or for South America more than 1.5 percent of the total amount we have done for the other areas of the world.

As the Senator from Minnesota has pointed out, it does not make a great deal of sense for us to be fighting communism and the conditions which breed communism, such as chaos, poverty, and ignorance, 7,000 or 8,000 miles away from home, and at the same time to let those conditions prevail in our own backyard, so to speak.

So I appreciate the great assistance the Senator from Minnesota has given in connection with this program, and I thank him for his remarks.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I thank the Senator from Florida.

Mr. President, I think I am at liberty to say that the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations spent more time, this year, than in any other periods, at least those with which I am acquainted, on the Latin American program. I think there is a growing interest and a growing concern in regard to our relationships with the countries of Latin America.

At this time I shall simply submit a brief statement of the facts in connection with this part of the program, because I know that other Senators will wish to speak on this point.

For the Western Hemisphere, the total program, which, of course, relates to our Latin American friends and neighbors, is made up of $21 million for development assistance, and $31,500,000 for

technical cooperation, or a total of $52,500,000. That is a little more than half of what we are contributing to Western Europe this year, after having spent billons of dollars in Western Europe. I remind my colleagues that we have gone through a trying experience resulting from certain developments in Guatemala, and we have witnessed some other difficulties in that area. I cannot help but say—and I say it in all kindness and charity—that one of the countries which will receive some aid under the program is Guatemala, but it did not get much aid from us before it went Communist. In other words, three countries were mentioned, as I recall, for development assistance. They were Haiti, Guatemala, and Bolivia. One of those countries had a devastating hurricane, and they received a little help from us. Another of those countries went Communist, and then it finally received a little help from us. Bolivia is fighting for its very life, and much of its industry is being handled by State ownership. Other countries are trying to make the political institutions in which we believe work; and I hope we will not wait until one of them is almost wrecked by another hurricane, or until another of them goes Communist, or until another one of them has other serious difficulties. I believe we should be of help to these countries before disaster strikes them and before helping them costs so much more than it would previously have cost us to be of any real assistance to them.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield to me?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I am glad to yield. First, I should like to say that our friend, the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], has been in the forefront of the effort to strengthen our relationships with Latin-America; and I am sure the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS] will agree with me when I make that statement.

Mr. LONG. I thank the Senator from Minnesota for yielding to me.

Mr. President, I wish to say that this particular aid program is only a small fraction of what is being done by the United States, both directly and indirectly, to aid Latin-America. The greatest aid by the United States has come in terms of loans, which have been good loans, and have been repaid; and also much of our aid to Latin-America has been in terms of American investments—good, modern, up-to-date, capitalistic help—to raise the standard of living of the people of those countries. I am sure the Senator from Minnesota would not wish to overlook mentioning the fact that it is along those lines that much of the support from this country has come, and that it has paid off.

Although one area of Guatemala went Communist for a brief period, I am sure the Senator from Minnesota realizes that was not in accordance with the will of the people of that area, but that, to the contrary, when the people there learned what had happened, they rose up and threw out communism, which is contrary to the ideology in which they believe.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator is correct. I thank him for his word of caution and balance in connection with my comments. I am just coming to the subject of the flow of capital into the Latin American areas. I should like to state the figures which the staff of the Foreign Relations Committee was kind enough to gather for the purposes of this RECORD. I think we need the full picture, including not only Government assistance and aid, but loans by private capital, and other forms of aid.

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

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. SMATHERS. Before the Senator from Minnesota discusses the subject of private capital, let me point out that in his remarks he spoke of the hurricane which hit the Island of Haiti. I had the opportunity to be down there shortly thereafter, and to observe the tremendous damage which had been done to that island, particularly to the agricultural crops which are so essential to the economy of the island.

As I understand, in this program there is not now specified any money for Haiti. The way it is approached in the report is this: It is suggested in the report that the State Department, or whichever agency will be in charge of trying to obtain this money, ask for it from a contingent fund. Whether it would be available from such a fund, no one can possibly say. If another emergency such as the Korean emergency should arise, and all the money from the emergency or contingency fund should be needed to meet it, there would be no money at all available for Haiti.

Let me say to the Senator from Minnesota that it is my hope, sometime tomorrow, to offer a very modest—and I think sensible—amendment, which would correct that particular project so far as Haiti is concerned.

I wish to join with the Senator from Minnesota in commending the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG]. He has done a great deal to improve relationships between our country and the countries of Central and South America.

However, I am sure the Senator would recognize that there is considerable difference in the treatment of various countries. We say to some countries, "We will give you billions of dollars," and we say to other countries, "We will make a loan to you, but you must pay it back."

The fact of the matter is that most of the loans which have been made to Latin American countries have been repaid. They have been good loans. But there is not a great deal of justification for us, with our bounty and generosity, saying to one section of the world, "We will give you all this for the sole purpose of fighting the conditions which breed communism," and then saying to another section of the world, "Even though you have such conditions, we will not give you anything, but we will lend you what you need." That is a discrimination which I am sure the Senator from Minnesota as well as the Senator from Louisiana would like to eliminate.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I thank the Senator for his observation.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the statement pertaining to Bolivia and Guatemala be printed in the RECORD at this point, as a part of my remarks.

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

Western Hemisphere—Development assistance

Bolivia	$16,000,000
Guatemala	5,000,000

Bolivia's present reform government came to power in 1952 in what had long been one of the poorest, most exploited, and most politically volatile countries in the world. Bolivia's poverty does not result from lack of resources but from maldistribution of wealth and backward land tenure and social systems. The present Government of Bolivia has attacked those problems vigorously and on the whole realistically.

The Bolivian Government's efforts to improve the conditions of its own people were severely handicapped by the precipitous decline in world tin prices from about $1.20 a pound to 80 cents a pound in early 1953. Bolivia has to import more than half its food, and tin exports alone account for two-thirds of its foreign-exchange earnings.

In this situation, economic conditions in Bolivia deteriorated rapidly and a real threat of political chaos developed. In November 1953, a United States assistance program was started to relieve the immediate threat of famine and to help remove the basic cause of the crisis by increasing agricultural production and diversifying economic activity generally.

This program, which is tied in with the Bolivian Government's own development plans, has made considerable progress, and for the first time in many years there is legitimate ground for optimism as to the future of Bolivia. The country has not yet reached the point where it could continue without foreign help, however.

The development-assistance program for Bolivia for fiscal 1956 includes $10 million in food and agricultural imports, principally bread grains ($7 million) and fats and oils ($2 million), and $6 million in machinery and vehicles, chiefly agricultural and road-building equipment. Local currency accruing from the sale of the commodities will be used to carry out additional portions of the Bolivian development plan.

GUATEMALA, $5 MILLION

The new Government of Guatemala, which overthrew the Communist-dominated Arbenz regime last year, came into power in a country which had always been poor but which had been further impoverished through the systematic looting carried on by the preceding government. The situation has been further complicated by a decline in the price of coffee, which is Guatemala's principal export.

It is obviously in the interests of the United States to help demonstrate to the people of Guatemala that they can make more economic progress under an anti-Communist than under a Communist government. For this purpose, the development assistance authorization in the bill includes $5 million for Guatemala to be used principally for financing the construction of roads and other public-works projects. These activities will not only alleviate unemployment but should also stimulate economic activity generally by opening up hitherto isolated sections of the country. Part of the money will also be used for completion of Roosevelt Hospital in Guatemala City.

The committee has some doubts that the $5 million authorization in the bill for Guatemala is sufficient. It is possible, depending upon future developments, that perhaps as much as $10 million more may be required to help the Castillo Armas liberation government repair the economic damage left by the Communist regime. In this connection, the committee calls attention to the authorization in section 8 (a) of $100 million for a worldwide contingency fund and urges the administration not to hesitate

to use this fund to provide additional assistance to Guatemala, should such action prove necessary.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Before I yield, I ask to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks the figures relating to the technical cooperation program, or the point 4 program, showing, first, the amount which each country will receive; and, secondly, the activities involved.

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

Western Hemisphere—Technical cooperation, $31.5 million

BY COUNTRY

Latin America:	*Millions*
Bolivia	$2.5
Brazil	3.5
Chile	2.4
Colombia	1.5
Costa Rica	1.0
Cuba	0.6
Dominican Republic	0.4
Ecuador	1.6
El Salvador	1.0
Guatemala	1.8
Haiti	1.5
Honduras	1.1
Mexico	1.8
Nicaragua	0.9
Panama	1.3
Paraguay	1.5
Peru	2.7
Uruguay	0.4
Venezuela	0.2
Dependent overseas Territories	1.1
Regional	1.2
Subtotal	30.0
Organization of American States	1.5
Total	31.5

BILATERAL PROGRAMS BY MAJOR ACTIVITY

	Thousands
Agriculture and natural resources	$10,711.5
Industry and mining	2,440.1
Transportation	1,492.6
Labor	1,009.7
Health and sanitation	5,734.3
Education	4,197.5
Public administration	1,912.6
Community development, social welfare, and housing	944.5
Other	1,557.2
Total	30,000.0

Mr. HUMPHREY. I carefully note that the total amount of funds for the point 4 program, or the technical cooperation program, for the Western Hemisphere, is $31.5 million—$30 million to various countries, country by country, and $1.5 million for the Organization of American States, which conducts a sort of multilateral program of its own in the Latin American countries.

It is interesting to note that the greater share of the funds for the point 4 program goes into agricultural and natural resource development. The next largest amount goes into health and sanitation. The next largest amount is for education. I think the programs are well directed and well planned.

The first point 4 program, or technical cooperation program, was in the Latin American countries. I believe that was under the Institute of Inter-American Affairs.

I now yield to the Senator from Alabama.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I appreciate the courtesy of the Senator from Minnesota in yielding.

One thing which I wished to bring out was the fact that so far as the point 4 program is concerned, we really cut our teeth—if that expression may be used—in Latin America. However, I believe that the program antedates even the time mentioned by the Senator from Minnesota. I think it goes back to the Good Neighbor policy, in the early days of the Roosevelt administration.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I think that is true. I believe it is fair to say that Cordell Hull, as Secretary of State, had a great influence in developing better relations with our Latin American neighbors.

Mr. SPARKMAN. That was a part of his program.

The particular point I wish to make—and this is in line with the very fine suggestion made by the very able Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG] to the effect that a great deal of the best help we have been able to give to Latin American countries was in the form of capital loans to help them develop various projects—is that before we were able to determine the economic feasibility of those particular projects or loans we had used the point 4 program and the surveys made under that program in order to obtain the facts relating to such projects. In other words, has not the point 4 program in Latin America been basic, fundamental, and essential for carrying out the loan program mentioned by the distinguished Senator from Louisiana?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I am sure one could say frankly that there is a direct relationship. When the Army Engineers are authorized to make a survey for a flood control project, that is equivalent to the point 4 program, which does the pioneer work and starts the development. Later comes the mass of capital which is needed. In this instance much of it is private capital, to carry out agricultural and industrial expansion and development.

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

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. LONG. Is the Senator able to tell us the amount of loans, dollarwise, that have been made to Latin American countries under the so-called Good Neighbor Policy, through the Export-Import Bank and various other agencies?

Mr. HUMPHREY. If the Senator will bear with me, I should like to read the statistical material. I wish to be accurate. Some of these figures involve estimates, in terms of some of the overall figures.

The average annual rate of flow of private capital to Latin American countries—Central America and South America—is approximately $650 million a year. This figure is derived as follows:

The United States private investment average, from 1951 to 1953, was $436.3 million. The average for the Export-Import Bank and International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, from 1950 to 1954, was $218 million.

So there is an average annual rate in recent years of approximately $650 million of new capital in Latin America. This figure does not reflect private investment from non-United States sources. The Economic Commission for Latin America estimates European investments in that area at more than $100 million a year, mainly in short- and medium-term loans connected with trade operations.

Coming directly to private investment, the total as of December 31, 1953, in Latin America was $6,175,000,000 of United States private investment.

Mr. LONG. Over what period of time?

Mr. HUMPHREY. That was up to 1953.

Mr. LONG. Starting at what date—1932 or 1933?

Mr. HUMPHREY. That was the total value of American investments in that area.

The flow of net new capital investment plus re-invested earnings in 1951 was $449 million; in 1952, $601 million; in 1953, $259 million.

The flow of United States investment per capita in the period 1951 to 1953 was $7.65.

Coming to the Export-Import Bank and the International Bank, the total cumulative authorized credits in the case of the Export-Import Bank, through April 1955, were $2,466,000,000; for the International Bank, through March 1955, $553,000,000, or an aggregate of $3,019,000,000, through April of 1955. Of the amount disbursed from those loan authorizations—this is cumulative—up through December 31, 1954, or the first of 1955, the Export-Import Bank disbursed out of its total authorization of $2,466,000,000, $1,406,000,000, and the International Bank, out of its authorized credits of $553,000,000, actually disbursed $316,000,000, or a total of $1,722,000,000.

The annual rate from 1950 to 1954 of the Export-Import Bank disbursements was $162,000,000 every year, and from the International Bank, $56,000,000, or a total of $218,000,000 each year. In order to make these figures more understandable and to show them in greater detail, I ask unanimous consent that the table listing the credits authorized by the Export-Import Bank and the International Bank for reconstruction and development be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

Credits authorized by Export-Import Bank and IBRD

[Figures shown in millions]

	Credits other than exporter credit lines		Exporter credit lines	Total credits
	Latin America	Other areas		
Export-Import Bank:				
Cumulative total: February 1934–December 1953	$2,152	$4,328	-------	$6,480
1954:				
January–June	40	37	-------	77
July–December	116	156	$21	293
Total	156	193	21	370

Credits authorized by Export-Import Bank and IBRD—Continued

[Figures shown in millions]

	Credits other than exporter credit lines		Exporter credit lines	Total credits
	Latin America	Other areas		
Export-Import Bank—Con.				
1955:				
January-March	151	18	58	227
April	7	28	37	72
Total authorizations February 1934-April 1955	2,466	4,567	116	7,149
IBRD:				
Cumulative total: May 1947-December 1953	437	1,344	-------	1,781
1954:				
January-June	29	104	-------	133
July-December	82	68	-------	150
Total	111	172	-------	283
1955:				
January-March	5	100	-------	105
April (not available)	-------	-------	-------	-------
Total authorizations, May 1947-March 1955	553	1,616	-------	2,169

Source: Compiled from information received from Export-Import Bank and IBRD.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I wish to add one final word. Mr. Norman Paul, the Deputy Director of the Foreign Operations Administration, testified before our committee that more than 37 percent of all United States private investment abroad was in Latin America. It appears to me that that is one of the soundest investments we have ever made. We have not heard of any people complain that those investments were poor investments.

I would justifiably feel that the investment of private capital in Latin-American countries is not only a good investment, but is good economics and good international policy and good national security.

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

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. LONG. It seems to me that the experience we have had in Latin-America so far has been much better than anyone thought it would be when we first started to develop these investments. Many people then thought that the loans under the Export-Import Bank would be unsound investments. However, the record has been so good and the repayment schedule has been so good that today these loans are regarded as very conservative, Wall-Street-banker type investments.

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is correct.

Mr. LONG. As a matter of fact, the experience under them has been so good, and we have had such a low loss record, that the Export-Import Bank has become more conservative than I would have recommended that it become. I would have felt that occasionally we should have taken some long risks on the loans, in order to help people develop their country, and in order to go along with them in their endeavors to help them pull themselves up by their bootstraps, so to speak.

The experience we have had under the Export-Import Bank would indicate that we should do more of that type of thing. It costs so much less in the long run to get our money back.

That is what appeals to the junior Senator from Louisiana, in terms of development expenditures in other countries. If we pick a project wisely, it will pay off, whether it be a railroad in Turkey or a steel mill in India. The people of such countries will make money by the use of modern tools imported from the United States. If we make grants in some instances, but in most instances insist on loans at low interest rates, with long periods for repayment, the people who receive them will prosper, and out of their profits they will be able to repay us.

I wonder whether that appeals to the Senator from Minnesota, and whether he believes we ought to begin to enter upon a policy of lending money to the people of other countries on long terms; and if they cannot meet their payments on time, give them a moratorium, perhaps, and even let the interest payments lapse for a while, if necessary, until they are again able to pay us.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I believe that emphasis is appropriate, and it is becoming the considered judgment of Congress that more and more emphasis should be placed upon loans. Some of our colleagues sometimes say that a country occasionally defaults on a loan. So what? In the main, we are still better off than under grants. Most of the countries are desirous of having loans made to them, particularly if they can get long-term loans at reasonable rates of interest, and can know that the loans will not be foreclosed on a technicality.

I believe we ought to emphasize that point, and that we should impress it upon the representatives of the State Department and of the International Cooperation Administration. We should make plain to them that we want the loan program emphasized.

We do stress that point in the bill and in the report. For example, of the $200 million Presidential fund for Asian development, at least 50 percent must be in loans.

I should like to read from page 22 of the committee report:

> The bill repeals the requirement in the Mutual Security Act of 1954 that 30 percent of development assistance funds be available only for furnishing assistance on a loan basis.
>
> In fact, something more than 30 percent of these funds were used on a loan basis in the current fiscal year, and it is expected that an even greater percentage will be so used in fiscal 1956. The committee was impressed, however, with the argument that a percentage figure written into the law militates against the placement of a greater percentage of loans. Experience under the 1954 act shows that some recipient countries want to limit their borrowing to 30 percent, whereas if that figure were not in the law, they would be more readily agreeable to a higher percentage.

We removed that percentage figure, and the committee report more or less lays down the general admonition to the administration: "Emphasize loans more and more." When loans are made the banking facilities of the Export-Import Bank are utilized. That is the technical facility. I think we ought to emphasize ever more and more the loan aspect of the program.

I read an item on the ticker to the effect that the Senator from Michigan [Mr. POTTER] spoke quite vigorously on the importance of emphasizing long-term international loans. I commend the Senator, and say that the more we impress this fact upon our responsible officials, and the more we let countries around the world know we want to help them, but that we would like to help them on businesslike terms, the better off we will be.

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

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Minnesota yield to the Senator from Illinois?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Now that we are on the subject of loans, even though this may be a slight departure from the subject matter of the bill, I should like to ask the Senator whether he has given any attention to the loan which the Export-Import Bank recently announced it was going to make to Mr. Peron's government in Argentina. I believe it is a loan of $150 million.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I regret to say that I have not.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The Peron government, as I understand, received a loan from us in 1950. The result was that the Government of Argentina became immediately more hostile to the United States. The whole record of the Peron government has been one of hostility to the United States ever since it came into existence.

I hold no brief for the American & Foreign Power Co., but it has had its property confiscated by the Argentine Government without payment for it, if my information is correct.

I believe that the Otis Elevator Co. and the Swift Co. have suffered severe disabilities at the hands of the Argentine Government.

In times past I have always opposed military intervention by our Government to protect American investors. I did that in the case of Nicaragua in the 1920's and I think I had some influence in getting my fellow marines out of Haiti. I do not believe in military intervention to protect American investors. I believe when American capital goes abroad it must necessarily take risks. However, I do not believe there is any obligation upon us to give money to nations which adopt policies hostile to America and unjust to American business. I believe the least we can do is not to make loans to such governments.

I have asked the State Department for an explanation on this point, and their reply is that recently there has been a change in the policy of the Peron government and that that government is now more friendly to the United States.

I would trust the friendship of Peron just as much as I would trust the friendship of an extremely unreliable man. I believe the Export-Import Bank were simpletons to make the loan to his government. I hope the Senator from Minnesota will give the matter attention and from the vantage point of the Commit-

tee on Foreign Relations turn the heat on the Export-Import Bank.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I thank the Senator for his graphic description of what has transpired. I may say it is very persuasive. I do not feel that one of the qualifications for getting a loan is to see how offensive one can be to the American people and the American Nation. It appears to me that good manners and reasonable attitudes are minimum essentials, and notice should be taken of it if the government seeking the loan engages in confiscation. I think a country which has spent so much time as we have talking about the evils of socialism ought to see to it that our lending agencies are not engaged in fortifying governments that move periodically to confiscate something that may be in their way.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am not defending the corporation to which I referred. I think they had to take their chances when they went to Argentina, and I am not advocating that we militarily intervene, but I do say we should not lick the boots of those who confiscate our property.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I think the Senator has placed a very valid qualification upon the foreign-aid program and the loan program. I am sure I should like to pursue with the Senator the inquiry which he is making at the State Department with reference to the Export-Import Bank. The Senator will be interested to know that there is no money in the bill for Argentina.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I understand that. I realize that my question was somewhat apart from the bill, but it was germane to the issue of loans.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I had concluded the analysis of the bill as it relates to the geographic areas, and I wish now to sign off with the mention of the international aspects, under the United Nations.

The United Nations programs mean a great deal to our country. I think it should be clearly understood that the foreign policy of our Nation is based upon active participation in the United Nations. Within a few days we shall be celebrating the 10th anniversary of the signing of the United Nations Charter.

The Mutual Security Act authorizes $222,500,000 for certain international activities on a nonregional basis.

There is United Nations technical assistance in the amount of $24 million.

United States bilateral technical assistance, interregional expenses, $9 million.

Intergovernmental Committee for European Migration, $12,500,000.

United Nations Refugee Fund, $1,400,000.

Escapee program, $6 million.

United Nations Children's Fund, $14,500,000.

NATO civilian expenses, $3,700,000.

Ocean freight for shipment of American relief goods and surplus agricultural commodities, $15 million.

Battle Act administration, $1,200,000.

Mutual Security Act administration, other than Defense Department, $35,200,000.

The President's special contingency fund, $100 million.

Those items amount to an aggregate total of $222,500,000.

Those are the other items which lead to the overall figure for the authorization under this bill of $3,408 million for the Mutual Security Act programs for the fiscal year 1956.

Mr. President, I commented a moment ago on the item of $24 million for United Nations technical assistance. It should be clear that this sum is for an 18-month period. We are trying to get the program on a calendar-year basis rather than on a fiscal-year basis. The United Nations works on a calendar-year basis, and we find ourselves sort of a sore thumb, so to speak; we stand out on our own and make it rather difficult for the United Nations program of technical assistance to be charted and planned properly when the United Nations is uncertain as to our contributions. This will mean that for calendar year 1956 a contribution of $15,500,000 is authorized, and for the last six months of this calendar year, $8,500,000.

Mr. President, I strongly support the United Nations technical assistance program. I think it is doing great work. In fact, Mr. President, the statement of the Deputy Assistant Secretary of State for International Organization Affairs, in his testimony before the committee, was most revealing, and, I may say, rather exciting, as to the accomplishments under technical assistance. The United Nations program for technical assistance accomplishments are listed in several pages of testimony. I shall not burden the RECORD with all of it, but I point out the accomplishments, country by country, such as Ethiopia, Iraq, Pakistan, and, of course, the Far East in general, countries such as India and Japan.

In the Latin America areas we include Haiti, Colombia, and Bolivia. In the Near East, Israel.

I again refer to the report of the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] in his compilation of the programs of United Nations Technical Assistance. Let us make it clear that the United Nations Technical Assistance program is separate and distinct from our own bilateral program.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a portion of the comments in the executive branch presentation book concerning interregional expenditures under bilateral technical assistance be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

NONREGIONAL—UNITED STATES BILATERAL TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE, INTERREGIONAL EXPENSES, $9 MILLION

The projects are of two general types. First, are activities required to implement continuing training programs such as the provision of orientation and language training for participants; contracts with land-grant colleges, universities, and professional societies to provide training to FOA participants; and preparation of visual aids, technical literature, and technical exhibits.

Second, are projects of a developmental nature and of a less routine character such as training of foreign nationals in the peaceful uses of atomic energy; contracts with American universities to train foreign nationals in the processes and techniques of national economic development; and preparation of manuals and other materials on the processes of industrial development of a country.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the portion of the report dealing with migrants, refugees, and escapees, be made a part of the RECORD, along with the explanation of the United Nations Children's Fund.

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

26. MIGRANTS, REFUGEES, AND ESCAPEES (SEC. 8 (d))

Three separate programs deal with the problems of migrants, refugees, and escapees. The Intergovernmental Committee for European Migration (ICEM), composed of 24 nations, concerns itself with the movement of persons from Europe to ease population pressures. Included among these persons are refugees and escapees.

The United Nations Refugee Fund (UNREF) is set up on a temporary basis under the terms of a U. N. General Assembly resolution to deal with the relatively small residue of World War II refugees who were previously the concern of the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration (UNRRA) and later of the International Refugee Organization (IRO).

Persons who have escaped from Communist-controlled areas during the years since World War II are dealt with by the United States escapee program.

All three programs provide for the temporary care and permanent settlement of certain groups of people. The committee was concerned with the possibility of duplication and overlapping, and considered the feasibility of combining all or some of these programs. Such a move appears impractical at this time in view of the different numbers of nations participating in the various programs, and in view also of the different problems the programs are designed to meet. Nevertheless, the committee hopes that the executive branch will continue to explore ways of simplifying administration, and in the meantime exercise the utmost vigilance to assure well-coordinated efforts.

Intergovernmental Committee on European Migration (ICEM) (sec. 8 (d) (2))

The bill authorizes appropriation of $12,500,000 for contributions to ICEM, compared to $11,189,190 authorized and $10 million appropriated in fiscal 1955.

The task of ICEM is to assist the movement of persons from overpopulated countries in Europe such as Italy, Austria, the Netherlands, Germany, and Greece to countries willing to receive them, principally Argentina, Australia, Canada, Brazil, and the United States. During the span of ICEM operations, the number of migrants moved annually has increased from 77,600 in 1952 to an estimated 142,000 in 1955 and 174,400 in 1956.

ICEM operations are financed by contributions of its 24 members, made on 2 different bases. Administrative expenses are fixed on a percentage scale by which the United States pays 31.32 percent of the administrative budget. Operational expenses are financed by voluntary contributions which include reimbursements by governments receiving migrants. ICEM's budget for calendar 1956 is $54,736,618, of which $2,545,507 is for administration and $52,191,111 for operations. The contemplated United States contribution of $12,500,000 is less than one-fourth of the total budget and is broken down into $790,989 for administration and $11,709,011 for the operations.

United Nations refugee fund (sec. 8 (d) (3))

The bill authorizes appropriation of $1,400,000 for contribution to the United Nations Refugee Fund (UNREF), compared to $500,000 authorized but not appropriated for fiscal year 1955.

UNREF is the latest of temporary agencies set up to deal with the problem of the post-World War II refugees. These now number only about 300,000, but they include so-called difficult cases—persons who for reason of health or age must be permanently institutionalized. Most of them are in Austria, Germany, Greece, and Italy—all areas which are already overpopulated and which have found it beyond their resources to maintain and assimilate these refugees without external assistance.

The proposed United States contribution will be about one-third of the $4,200,000 UNREF budget for calendar year 1955. The committee endorses the administration's stated intention to limit payment of the United States contribution to approximately that percentage of total government contributions paid into the central account of UNREF.

The table below shows that by far the greatest proportion of the 1955 UNREF budget will be devoted to seeking permanent solutions to the refugee problem.

United Nations Refugee Fund—Proposed program for calendar year 1955

Country	Total estimates	Permanent solutions	Emergency assistance	
			Placement difficult cases	Supplementary assistance
Austria	$1,699,000	$1,440,000	$259,000	
Germany	420,000	420,000		
Greece	820,000	700,000	95,000	$25,000
Italy	399,000	280,000	98,000	21,000
Turkey	31,000		22,000	9,000
China	391,000		90,000	301,000
Iran	21,000		9,000	12,000
Egypt	25,000		15,000	10,000
Middle East	24,000		6,000	18,000
Undistributed (contingency)	10,000			10,000
Subtotal, integration projects		2,840,000		
Emigration activities	250,000	250,000		
Administrative costs	110,000	110,000		
Total	4,200,000	3,200,000	594,000	406,000

UNREF was established by the U. N. General Assembly in 1954 for a 4-year period. Any refugees remaining at the end of that time, for which an estimated $16 million program has been drawn up, will become the sole responsibility of the country of residence.

The committee feels that United States support of UNREF involves the important principle of the right of asylum. The United States is relatively remote from the turbulent areas which have produced refugees, and it has a responsibility to help the free nations which were geographically accessible to absorb this flow without economic dislocation. The committee wants to stress, on the other hand, that this humanitarian effort does not in any way relieve the nations in which the refugees reside of the final and ultimate responsibility for finding a solution to this problem.

Escapees (sec. 8 (d) (4))

The bill authorizes $6 million in appropriations for the continuation of the escapee program, which was begun in 1952 under the so-called Kersten amendment. This amendment, which is now contained in section 401 of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, permits the President to use up to $100 million of funds appropriated under the act for—

"Any selected persons who are residing in or escapees from the Soviet Union, Poland, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Rumania, Bulgaria, Albania, Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia or the Communist-dominated or Communist-occupied areas of Germany and Austria, or any Communist-dominated or Communist-occupied areas of Asia and any other countries absorbed by the Soviet Union."

In the past, the escapee program was financed from military assistance funds under authority of section 401. This year, inasmuch as the escapee program is not an "unforeseen contingency" of the type for which section 401 was provided, a separate appropriation has been authorized.

The escapee program is declining gradually but steadily. It amounted to $7.2 million in fiscal 1954 and $6.3 million in 1955, compared to $6 million proposed in 1956.

The reduced activities reflect a lightening of the caseload, as illustrated by the table below.

Caseload projection

	On hand Dec. 31, 1954	Additions to caseload	Reductions in caseload	On hand Dec. 31, 1955	Additions to caseload	Reductions in caseload	On hand Dec. 31, 1956
Office of Field Coordination	4,374	+776	−1,992	3,158	+100	−1,853	1,405
Austria	6,097	+4,149	−5,520	4,726	+2,220	−5,280	1,666
Germany	5,889	+2,836	−3,999	4,726	+382	−2,218	2,890
Greece	4,675	+469	−1,716	3,428	+271	−1,640	2,059
Italy	3,124	+870	−1,806	2,188	+336	−1,350	1,174
Trieste	2,981	+1,117	−3,229	869	+1,085	−1,767	187
Turkey	265	+60	−262	63	+72	−96	39
Iran	661	+28	−174	515	0	−255	260
Middle East	257	+15	−95	177	0	−107	70
Total [1]	28,323	+10,320	−18,793	19,850	+4,466	−14,566	9,750

[1] In addition, it is estimated that 17,000 refugees in the Far East will receive assistance in 1956.

It will be noted that the rate of resettlement outstrips the rate of new escapees, and that a gross reduction of 14,566 will be made in the caseload during calendar 1956.

27. UNITED NATIONS CHILDREN'S FUND (SEC. 8 (E))

This bill authorizes appropriations in fiscal 1956 of $14.5 million for United States contributions to the United Nations Children's Fund (UNICEF). Of this amount, $4.8 million is to complete payment of United States contributions for calendar 1955, bringing the total United States contribution for that year to $9 million. The remainder of the authorization ($9.7 million) is for the entire calendar year 1956.

Because of the discrepancy between United States and United Nations fiscal years, the United States has been making its contributions late in the U. N. year, and it is the purpose of this 18-month authorization to put United States payments on a more current basis. The Senate has consistently supported UNICEF's work, and this work can be carried out more efficiently if contributions are known sufficiently far in advance to permit adequate planning.

Total United States contributions to UNICEF have amounted to $9.8 million in calendar 1953 and $8.3 million in 1954, with $9 million proposed for calendar 1955 and $9.7 million for calendar 1956. At the same time, the percentage of United States contributions to the central fund has decreased from 71 percent in 1952 to 61 percent in 1954, with 60 percent proposed in 1955 and 57.4 percent in 1956.

Established as an emergency program for children in war-devastated areas, UNICEF has now shifted the emphasis in its activities to long-range child welfare operations in underdeveloped countries. Whereas 76 percent of its efforts were concentrated in Europe in the period 1947–50, the European program amounted to only 7 percent of the total in 1954. Conversely, assistance in Africa increased from 0.4 percent to 1 percent in the same period. Comparable figures for Asia are 10 percent and 47 percent and for Latin America 3 percent and 22 percent.

The committee takes this opportunity to endorse again the work of UNICEF and to recommend that the Senate authorize the full amount requested.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I wish to emphasize in particular the United Nations Children's Fund. I think it has done great good. I was particularly pleased to see that our committee authorized the full amount the administration requested. The program has endeared itself to the hearts of millions of Americans because of the fine activities which have been conducted under its auspices.

The matter of refugees and escapees is one of the most perplexing problems before us, and we again authorize funds for those programs in the sums which I mentioned earlier.

Mr. President, I conclude my remarks today by an appeal to support the bill. I do not say that the action of the committee is the final one. I suppose there will be those who can make a strong case for further increases or for further decreases. But, whatever we do, let us keep one thing in mind: We have entered upon a great, long-range program of trying to build peace, security, and freedom for ourselves and for other nations of the world.

I think that what is authorized by the pending bill is as much a part of the defense of America as is any air force we can put in the skies, or any army or navy which we can create. These programs are all interrelated and interdependent—they involve everything from the prosperity and the productivity of our own economic system to the well-being and increased productivity of countries thousands of miles away.

It is with this thought in mind, and in this spirit, that I support the plea made yesterday by the chairman of the committee, the distinguished senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], the President pro tempore of the Senate, who is now presiding, that the United States back up its international efforts with a continuation of mutual security.

I recall that the Senator from Georgia said this was no time to let down, that this was the time to stand our ground, and continue to build strength.

Whatever doubts I may have had with respect to any area, I have reconciled in support of what I believe to be in the best interests of our country—the continued building of strength in the areas of freedom and the backing up of our negotiators and leaders as they go to the conferences, without any indication at all that there is a lack of will or a lack of determination on the part of the American Nation or the American people.

Mr. President, I hope the Senate will pass the bill which is now under consideration.

FREE IMPORTATION OF GIFTS FROM MEMBERS OF THE ARMED SERVICES

During the delivery of Mr. HUMPHREY's speech,

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 390, H. R. 5559.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the bill by title.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (H. R. 5559) to make permanent the existing privilege of free importation of gifts from members of the Armed Forces of the United States on duty abroad.

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. 5559) which had been reported from the Committee on Finance, with amendments, on page 1, at the beginning of line 7, to strike out "repealed" and insert "amend by striking out 'July 1, 1955' and inserting in lieu thereof 'July 1, 1957' "; and after line 8, to insert:

SEC. 2. (a) Paragraph 412 of the Tariff Act of 1930 is hereby amended by inserting before "wood flour" the following: "hardboard, whether or not provided for elsewhere in this act, and whether or not cut, stamped, or shaped for boxes or other articles, 33⅓ percent ad valorem;".

(b) For the purposes of section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, the rate of duty existing on January 1, 1945, for hardboard provided for in paragraph 412 of such act, as amended by subsection (a) of this section, shall be deemed to have been 33⅓ percent ad valorem: *Provided, however,* That so long as any foreign trade agreement that shall have heretofore been entered into pursuant to section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, and any amendments thereto, that is applicable "to manufacturers of wood or bark, or of which wood or bark is the component material of chief value, not specially provided for" in paragraph 412 of the Tariff Act of 1930 that are not specifically described in said foreign trade agreement, shall remain in force and effect, the rate of duty for hardboard provided for in paragraph 412 of such act, as amended by subsection (a) of this section, shall be 16⅔ percent ad valorem, with like effect as though that rate had been included in said foreign trade agreement, excepting that said rate shall be subject to being increased or decreased hereafter by foreign trade agreements entered into pursuant to amendments to said section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, or other statutes that shall authorize the President to proclaim modifications of existing duties and other import restrictions, or additional import restrictions, or the continuance for minimum periods of existing customs or excise treatment of any article. Such hardboard, when the product of any nation or area designated by the President pursuant to section 5 of the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1951, shall be subject to a duty of 33⅓ percent ad valorem.

(c) The amendment made by this section shall be effective with respect to hardboard, whether or not provided for elsewhere in the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, and whether or not cut, stamped, or shaped for boxes or other articles, entered or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption on and after the 30th day following the date of enactment of this act.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, yesterday the Senate was prepared to consider this measure, which had been cleared by the distinguished minority leader. The bill was reported unanimously by the Committee on Finance; but at the request of the distinguished senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN] consideration of the bill was postponed until today. I have now been notified that it is agreeable to him that the bill be considered.

The bill is most urgent, and the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Finance [Mr. BYRD] wishes to make a brief explanation of it.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, H. R. 5559, as passed by the House, extended for 2 years the time to accord free entry into the United States of bona fide gifts from members of the Armed Forces of the United States on duty abroad. It has been customary to make this extension on the basis of a 2-year period.

In addition, the Committee on Finance adopted unanimously an amendment classifying hardboard imported into the United States. It is presently classified for tariff purposes under paragraphs 1402 and 1413 of the Tariff Act of 1930. When the 1930 act was passed, hardboard was a relatively unknown product. When first developed, it had some of the qualities of paperboard and was administratively classified as a paper product. However, later developments resulted in the production of hardboard, which not only had the principal properties of wood, but was also a counterpart of wood in general usage.

Hardboard is composed of lumber scrap and waste which would otherwise be destroyed and lost as a beneficial product.

The same classification was adopted by the House a year ago. The bill then came to the Senate. The distinguished Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN], the chairman of the committee at that time, moved to refer the matter to the Tariff Commission. Two of the three members of the Tariff Commission agreed to the reclassification as being proper, because of the fact that hardboard is unrelated to paperboard and is not a paper product. So the Committee on Finance adopted an amendment to the bill, making this classification.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendments.

The amendments were agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I do not rise to urge any further amendment to the bill. There may have been made some trade treaties which bound the United States not to make reclassifications which would result in an increased tariff. Perhaps that matter has been taken into consideration by the State Department. But none of the agreements which bind us not to take from the free list any article on the free list, or to reclassify so as to result in higher duties, can mean, properly interpreted, that we will not make a reasonably sound, fair, equitable classification of an article which has been misclassified, or the failure to classify, which has resulted in its being put into another bracket.

That is this case, in my opinion. It is not for the purpose of embarrassing a State, or for the purpose of challenging any of the reciprocal agreements entered into by our Government with other countries under the Trade Agreements Act, that this amendment is offered.

When this particular product was first used or first made, the Tariff Act of 1930 did not classify it or attempt to classify it; but there is, of course, in all tariff-making, a basket provision into which all other like products are put. After this product was made and after it got into use, it was classified as a paper product. That was an erroneous classification. The true classification always should have been as a wood product, because it is wood, and nothing but wood, and the board is made without the use of chemicals or any outside assistance. It results from the mere pressure of a wood product itself into the board form.

Therefore, I have no doubt that anyone who thinks that the passage of the bill might constitute an infringement of any of our reciprocal trade agreements stands upon perfectly firm ground when he says this is not a reclassification for the purpose of affecting a duty rate; it is simply the making now of a correct classification of a product which was not in existence at the time when the tariff law itself was enacted.

I therefore hope that the bill as amended will pass.

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 of the amendments and the third reading of the bill.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

The title was amended, so as to read: "An act to extend for a period of 2 years the existing privilege of free importation of gifts from members of the Armed Forces of the United States on duty abroad, and for other purposes."

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the bill (H. R. 5559) was passed.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from California to lay on the table the motion of the Senator from Texas.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

NINETY-PERCENT PRICE SUPPORTS ON FARM PRODUCTS

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, on May 27 the Secretary of Agriculture, Ezra Taft Benson, delivered a speech at Hutchinson, Kans. The occasion was Kansas Wheatfield Day.

The Secretary's speech contained the usual condemnation of 90-percent price supports. He also took a crack at the proposed two-price, or certificate, plan for supporting wheat prices. He went out of his way to make unfavorable mention of Representative CLIFFORD HOPE and other Republican Congressmen from Kansas who recently voted to reinstate 90-percent supports.

Aside from these points, the speech was one of his better ones. Secretary Benson devoted considerable attention to the need for providing better price-support differentials for good milling wheat.

One of the chief causes of our large surplus of wheat today is that the Federal Government is providing high support levels for very poor quality wheat—sometimes even higher than for the best wheat produced in America.

Such a policy, if continued, would destroy any price-support program for wheat, whether it was based on 90-percent supports or flexible supports. The Secretary of Agriculture has authority to correct this situation, and I hope he will.

Mr. President, the speech, which, as I have said before, was one of the Secretary's better ones, was marred by an unfortunate reference to one of the top agricultural leaders of this Nation and a great Republican—Representative CLIFFORD HOPE, of Kansas.

In referring to past endorsements of the idea of flexible supports, the Secretary of Agriculture had this to say:

> Representative CLIFFORD HOPE, of Kansas, then chairman of the House Agriculture Committee, teamed with Senator GEORGE AIKEN, of Vermont, the chairman of the Senate Agriculture Committee, in drafting and pushing to enactment the Agricultural Act of 1948. The very heart of the Hope-Aiken law was the provision for flexible price supports ranging between 60 and 90 percent of parity for the basic commodities, with a minimum level of 72 percent when acreage allotments or marketing quotas were in effect.

Nothing could be further from the truth. Representative HOPE had nothing to do with the writing or promoting of the Aiken flexible price-support law of 1948.

The statement by the Secretary simply is not based on facts. During the session of Congress in 1948 the House Agriculture Committee, under the leadership of its chairman, Representative CLIFFORD HOPE, secured passage by the House of Representatives of a 1-year extension of 90-percent price supports.

In the same year the Senate Agriculture Committee, under the leadership of the senior Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], worked out and secured approval by the Senate of a flexible price-support program ranging from 60 to 90 percent of parity.

These conflicting price-support viewpoints of the two Houses of Congress went to conference during the closing days of the 80th Congress. I was one of the Senate conferees, so I think I know something about the history of this legislation.

For the better part of 2 days and 2 nights the House conferees, led by Representative HOPE, refused to accept any part of the flexible price-support program approved by the Senate. Finally, at about 2 o'clock in the morning of the last day of the session—which was the first day of the Republican Convention in Philadelphia—the conferees reached agreement.

The agreement provided for a 1-year extension of 90-percent supports, and permitted the Aiken flexible price-support program to go into effect the following year.

Mr. President, I recall very well the many heated arguments which the House-Senate conferees had on the proposed price-support legislation. Representative HOPE and all of his conferees were very much opposed to the flexible price-support provision of the Senate bill.

The only possible way in which the House could get a majority of their conferees to accept the Senate bill with the flexible price-support provision was for one of their Members to resign as a conferee. The late Representative Murray, of Wisconsin, resigned, and a new conferee was appointed. Thus, early in the morning of the last day of the session, the Aiken-Hope Act was approved by the House-Senate conferees and by Congress.

This is the record with respect to the adoption of the Aiken flexible price-support program by Congress. On many occasions Secretary Benson has expressed a lack of understanding and knowledge of the facts with respect to agricultural programs.

Representative CLIFFORD HOPE became a Member of the House of Representatives in 1927. He has been a member of the House Committee on Agriculture ever since. Through his sympathetic and keen understanding of farm problems and his devotion to duty, he soon became recognized as one of the great agricultural leaders of this Nation.

He is an honest and sincere person, one who has always been tolerant of the views of others.

For 20 years or more, Representative HOPE has spearheaded the Republican drive for farm votes in every presidential election. He has been a top adviser to many Republican candidates for President. He took part in the last presidential campaign, that of 1952. It has been largely through his efforts that most of the Midwest and Plains States have so often been in the Republican column.

My guess is that the farmers of Kansas will reelect him to Congress so long as he desires to serve in that body. The people of Kansas are to be congratulated for the great contribution they have made to all the agricultural interests of the Nation by sending CLIFFORD HOPE to Congress.

Mr. President, I am quite familiar with the history of the enactment of the Aiken flexible price-support law. I had some part in writing it. I supported it.

When the measure went to conference with the House, 4 of the 7 Senate conferees were determined that if there were to be any agricultural legislation during the session of 1948, the Aiken flexible price-support provision would be a part of it.

I was 1 of the 4 Senate conferees who refused to agree to any conference report which did not contain the flexible price-support program approved by the Senate.

That was my position, right or wrong. I may have made a grave mistake, but I did so in all sincerity of purpose.

I maintained this position at that time for 2 major reasons. First, the only permanent price-support legislation on the books at that time was that providing for price supports ranging from 52 to 75 percent of parity. Thus, the Aiken Act, providing 60 to 90 percent supports, was a great improvement over the Agricultural Act of 1938.

My second major reason for supporting the Aiken Act of 1948 was that it appeared at that time that we were entering into a long period of peacetime years. We had no idea that we would soon be engaged in another war—the Korean war—with a still further inflation of prices.

We all hoped then that the prices of the things the farmers and others had to buy would return to somewhere near pre-World War II levels. The Aiken Act would have provided price supports for wheat at approximately $1.30 to $1.50 a bushel.

If the prices of many of the things that farmers had to buy had returned to pre-World War II levels, they would have represented a fair price to farmers. They could have gotten along very well with wheat prices ranging from $1.30 to $1.50 a bushel.

It soon became apparent, however, that the prices of things farmers had to buy were going to continue to rise. The cost of farm operations continued to increase, and it was for this reason that in 1949 I became a cosponsor with the distinguished Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] on legislation which would continue 90-percent supports. That shall be my position until we find a better way of making possible decent and fair prices for basic agricultural commodities.

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.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I have prepared some remarks in relation to

the bill now being considered, the mutual security or the collective security bill. I ask unanimous consent that the statement I have prepared be printed in the RECORD.

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

STATEMENT BY SENATOR WILEY IN SUPPORT OF MUTUAL SECURITY ACT OF 1955

I wish to express my support for the Mutual Security Act of 1955. Due to other commitments, I was unable to take part in as much of the Foreign Relations Committee's consideration of the bill as I would have liked. Other members are, therefore, better able to speak on the details of the legislation. I do wish, however, to associate myself with the remarks of the able and distinguished chairman of the committee.

I have supported the mutual security program since its beginning, for two major reasons. First, it is the best way to fight communism without resort to arms—and we hope we can carry on without resort to forceful means.

Second, it is also a good way to help ourselves and to keep our country a strong and going concern. Not only has the program enhanced our military security; it has helped the worker, the farmer, the businessman, and the manufacturer of America.

In the 10 years since the war, the mutual assistance program has cost the United States over $40 billion. Of this, about $12 billion was in military aid, over $16 billion in economic and technical assistance, and the rest in various other programs, like UNRRA, winding up lend-lease, and Greek-Turkish aid. These figures are staggering. Grant foreign aid has averaged over the past 10 years about $4 billion a year. It has been declining in recent years so that average is not truly descriptive. But it serves to illustrate my point. About $4 billion a year has been used to buy the manifold production of the American people for use and consumption in foreign lands. The sum has bought wheat and cotton from the farmer, coal from the miner, and machines and other products from the manufacturer, much of which otherwise would not have been bought.

It has often been charged that this program is a giveaway or a do-good boondoggle. But, let us never overlook the fact that the program has been of great benefit in many ways to the people of the United States.

President Eisenhower, in his message to us, emphasized that $3 out of every $4 he asked for will be spent in the United States. These dollars will not even leave the United States. They will go straight into American pockets. The other dollars will go overseas and do their work for us abroad, through offshore procurement contracts which will help build a military production base in nations allied with us. But even these dollars will ultimately come back to us when they are used to purchase needed commodities here. So, every one of these dollars will help keep our factories humming, tractors and harvesters going, and our economy on a healthy expanding curve.

This may all sound selfish and cold, and I do not mean to detract from the Christian principles which also lead us to help those less fortunate than we are. Our first duty as Senators is, however, to look out for the safety and well-being of the United States, and I submit to you that this bill will do just that. We should never overlook the fact that an average of $4 billion a year has been diffused through our economy with resulting benefits to millions of American workers, farmers, and manufacturers.

Now to look for a minute at the other side of the coin—the greater safety which we get as a result of ever-stronger allies across the seas. Every passing day science shrinks the world a little more. On Armed Forces Day not long ago, a young man flew from California to New York and back to California—all during daylight hours. We rejoice over technological developments which make this possible, but there is a sinister, dangerous side to such developments. They bring the big heart of America closer also to the evil forces that seek to stop its beat.

As the world shrinks, we must look for our security beyond our borders. Formosa, Greece, the Philippines, Germany—all these once remote countries have become essential to our defense. Their military strength is part of our protection. Again, it is our national interest that requires us to continue to help them maintain and increase that strength which is so vital to us.

Our self-interest dictates that we go even further. The economic and technical assistance that is part of this bill will encourage stable governments, sound economies, and prosperous people in friendly countries. That may not sound as if such assistance will redound to our benefit immediately. But, over the long haul, we will gain materially from the achievement of these aims for two very important reasons.

In the first place, we have found that a stable, developed country is a much better customer of the United States than an underdeveloped country. Our best buyers last year were Canada, the Netherlands, and the United Kingdom. Every Canadian bought an average of $181.97 worth of our production; every Netherlands citizen $39.65, and every Englishman spent an average of $13.46 on American products. In sharp contrast stand Pakistan, India, and Indonesia which purchased 42 cents, 43 cents, and 88 cents worth, respectively, for every one of their inhabitants. So, I believe that in a very important way, we are investing in our own future when we help the underdeveloped areas of the world with economic and technical assistance. We are lending a hand to future customers for our expanding economy. This is a good business proposition which every thinking American should endorse.

In the second place, we are learning to our dismay that our natural resources are not unlimited. There are many vital resources in which we are in short supply. Our access to these resources must remain secure and not be imperiled by subversion and unrest. In order to remind the Senate just how dependent we are on imports for some strategic materials, I cite these figures: We are importing now 100 percent of our natural rubber, 100 percent of industrial diamonds, 100 percent of tin, 99 percent of chromite, 95 percent of manganese, 92 percent of cobalt, 90 percent of platinum, 85 percent of both mercury and antimony, and 72 percent of our tungsten. And as we deplete our own resources our dependence on the rest of the free world will become heavier. So our interests demand that we not only make these sources of essential materials secure but that we also encourage the development of additional resources for the future. Our economic and technical assistance is working toward these ends.

Our economic and technical assistance, I believe, therefore, is a hardheaded proposition based on our self-interest primarily, as it should be to justify the expenditure of the American taxpayers' money.

I have so far discussed the mutual security program from the point of view of the benefits accruing to American citizens in terms of money in their pockets, greater military safety, and greater future economic gains. I do not want to overlook the many fine humanitarian acts we are performing by this legislation. I refer to the funds for refugees, escapees, for the Palestine refugees, for ocean freight subsidies to encourage private American relief shipments, and for the United Nations International Children's Fund.

As one who has been deeply impressed and moved by the splendid work of the Children's Fund, I want to commend it to my colleagues in particular. There is nothing more heart rending and pathetic than a hungry and sick child. We are fortunate not to have many in the United States and to be able to take care of those we have. The Children's Fund by stretching its inadequate means is attempting to minister to the needs of children in many parts of the world. It is a tribute to the fund that it has done so much with so little. Last year more than 28 million children benefited from its activities through vaccination against tuberculosis, through protection from malaria and other insect-borne diseases, through treatment for yaws, through food supplements, and through the maternal and child health centers in rural areas assisted by the fund.

The $14,500,000 approved by the committee as our 18-month contribution beginning July 1, 1955, is only .004 percent (four-one thousandths of 1 percent) of the total aid funds provided in this bill. Four-tenths of every penny spent from this year's funds will go to a hungry or sick child. The significance of the Children's Fund work certainly cannot be measured in terms of the dollars we contribute. We could hardly do less.

The amount for children's welfare work is larger this year because it covers an 18-month period in an effort to provide for the full calendar year of 1956, as well as the remainder of 1955. Those of us who have had the honor of serving as United States delegates to the United Nations General Assembly know what uncertainty our fiscal year operations have created in some of the U. N.'s calendar-year activities. These programs have had to be planned without any definite notion of what the United States would put up. Since we are the largest contributor to the special programs of the U. N., like the Children's Fund and Technical Cooperation, a pall of indecision hampers these programs until our contribution becomes known, usually long after the planning state is finished and the U. N. fiscal year begun. Authorizing and appropriating for our Children's Fund contribution for the calendar year ahead will help to make its operations more effective and stable. More money will go to the children instead of to the revamping of plans. I cannot, therefore, urge too strongly that the full 18-month amount of $14,500,000 be authorized and appropriated.

In closing, I should like to say a few words about the world situation at the present time. The free world's relations with the Soviet Union are in a state of flux. The Communists seem to be dangling olive branches in all directions—a peace treaty for Austria, new disarmament proposals before the U. N., talks about a cease-fire in the Formosa Straits, unification for West Germany, and a Big Four meeting. Most thoughtful observers agree that this represents a change of tactics and not of heart on the part of the Communist world. The Soviet Union and China are buying time. They hope to lull us into a false sense of security which will lead us to relax the efforts and sacrifices required of us for the long haul. So long as there is no freedom behind the Iron Curtain, so long as the peoples there cannot decide their own destiny, we cannot be sure that the Soviet Union will not dangle guns instead of olive branches in front of us tomorrow. It is incumbent upon us to remain steadfast in our purpose to reinforce the free world militarily, politically, and economically.

If, as we all fervently pray, there is to be a breathing spell in the cold and hot wars, let us use that time wisely. Any faltering on our part now would be taken as a sure sign in the world's capitals that our foreign policy is determined by the attitude of the Soviet Union—that our concern and preparations for the future depend on whether Moscow is

blowing hot or cold. I beseech my colleagues, Mr. President, to bear this in mind as they cast their votes on this bill.

One last word. The distinguished chairman of the committee referred to the importance of united Senate action on this, the most vital foreign policy measure we will have before us this session, as a sign to the world that the American people are united behind their President as he moves forward in his search for peace and security in the highest councils of the world. I want to associate myself entirely with these remarks. Let us, therefore, weigh our vote carefully and give our President a firm vote of confidence to lend the strength of the American people to his words and actions in the hopeful but uncertain days ahead.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, I send an amendment to the desk, and ask to have it printed and lie on the table.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be received and printed, and will lie on the desk.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, the amendment I have proposed would reduce the amount of foreign aid, under titles I, II, and IV, to $2,236,000,000, or a reduction of $1 billion in the overall authorization.

I have supported the foreign-aid program in past years, and I expect to vote for it on this occasion, but it has been my feeling that year by year we should undertake to have less and less outright grants, and that the amount of money that we give to foreign nations, both for arms and economic assistance, should be steadily reduced.

There are reasons why we should reduce the appropriation this year and authorize a lesser amount than we have in previous years. There is no war going on at the present time. World tension is somewhat less. Aid we have given foreign countries in the past presumably should have had a good effect, with the result that there should not be as great a need for economic development. Nor should there be as great a need for implements of war, in that there is not at present the attrition of an open war. Therefore, it seems to me the policy of Congress should be one of gradual reduction of foreign aid.

For those reasons I have offered the amendment which is now at the desk.

Mr. President, I cannot overlook the fact that there is already on hand an unexpended balance of $8,728 million. It would be my proposal that this bill should provide about $2,408 million in addition. Therefore, there would be on hand for foreign aid an unexpended amount well in excess of $11 billion, including an unobligated sum of more than $2,408 million. That would represent only a slight reduction from the amount appropriated last year, a reduction of only a few hundred million dollars. It would mark a trend in Congress toward reduction of foreign aid expenditures.

Mr. President, I have heard the argument that we should back the President, and I am in accord with that argument. I do not believe that a gradual reduction in foreign aid could be interpreted as not supporting the President, particularly a reduction which was in line with the trend of Congress in steadily reducing the amounts appropriated for foreign aid. I do not think such action would indicate that Congress lacked faith in the President. Quite the contrary, because there is granted in the bill unprecedented authority and discretion to the President. This shows we have put more trust in the President than we have in any other piece of legislation, providing $200 million to be spent by the Executive more or less without consulting the Congress, but which amount must be accounted for every 6 months to explain what was done with the money.

I expect to offer the amendment tomorrow. If the amendment is not agreed to I expect to offer an amendment making a lesser reduction. I think the Congress would be unwise in appropriating even more money this year than was appropriated last year for foreign aid.

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

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Secretary will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I am glad to take this opportunity to discuss very briefly the pending foreign-aid bill.

As the Senate knows, when the committee voted to report the bill, prior to the preparation of the report on it, I voted against the bill. I did so for three principal reasons. I am very happy to say that the report on the bill clears up my major objection. I shall vote for the bill in its final form, when we come to the final vote on it.

Mr. President, no other Member of the Senate, I believe, has a stronger record in support of foreign aid than I do; but I wish to make clear that I think our foreign-aid program must be moved more and more in the direction of a loan program to these countries, rather than a grant program. As I said in debate yesterday afternoon with the chairman of the committee, who at this moment is presiding over the Senate as its President pro tempore, I think the step forward which we take by means of this bill, as regards increasing the percentage of loans, is due primarily to the leadership of the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE].

Mr. President, when I speak of foreign aid by way of loans, I speak of it in a somewhat different way than do most of my colleagues. I wish to discuss briefly a theory of mine in the field of foreign policy for our country, one which I say most respectfully I think we shall have to come to in the years immediately ahead if we are to establish political freedom in the sections of the world which have to be won over to the side of freedom. I refer to exporting enlightened capitalism and exporting economic freedom of choice for the individual.

After all, Mr. President, political freedom cannot be separated from economic freedom. Without economic freedom, there can be no political freedom. That is why I have been heard to say before that one cannot cite a single civilization in all of history in which the people were the economic servants of the state and at the same time were the political masters of the state. The two are irreconcilable. Therefore, Mr. President, in our foreign-aid program it seems to me we must work in an increasing degree, each time we pass a foreign-aid bill, toward the goal of a loan program which really will result in investing enlightened capitalism in the backward areas of the world.

Let us consider this hypothesis of mine, which some call an ideal or a theory. Let us consider how it could be put into practice. In that connection, let us refer to India.

As I said this morning, before the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, when I testified in support of the bill S. 1770, which my junior colleague from Oregon [Mr. NEUBERGER], the two Senators from Washington, and I have introduced—a bill calling for a so-called two-price program for wheat—what we should be doing with a great deal of our surplus food supply is investing it in the areas of the world where stomachs are empty and where natural resources await development, so that the people themselves can build up an economy which will make them self-sustaining.

So let us refer for a moment to India. We know that from time to time India finds itself in a very critical situation because of widespread hunger, due to bad weather, which results in crop failures. I see no reason why our surplus wheat cannot be used as the "coin of the realm" in developing what we might call an investment program in such areas of the world. India needs powerplants; India needs river development; India needs highway development.

In my judgment, we need to change the old figure of speech, "The flag follows the dollar"—a figure of speech describing a policy which, of course, led to dollar diplomacy and economic exploitation abroad by American investors. In its place we should adopt a new figure of speech, "The dollar follows the flag." The latter is quite a different concept, because if the dollar is to follow the flag, that means the flag must get in first. How would I put the flag into these backward areas? Certainly not by military exploitation. Certainly not by military conquest. Certainly not by the use of arms. I would put the flag in first by way of economic-treaty agreements between the United States and the countries in which the fight for freedom must be won.

What I am talking about is one of the great concepts of foreign policy of the late Arthur Vandenberg. It was Arthur Vandenberg who pointed out to us many times that, after all, we must win the fight for freedom on the economic front, or we shall not win it at all. That is why I think it is so important that we recognize the need for economic treaties between the United States Government and the Governments of India, Thailand, Burma, Indonesia, South Africa—yes; every area in which the fight for freedom must be won. Such agreements would strengthen economic freedom and opportunity in backward areas of the world. Under such economic treaties American investors would be urged and

invited to come in and invest their money and to help build up the economic resources of those countries. In return, the people would enjoy a higher standard of living and learn to sustain themselves. It means, of course, that if the dollar is to follow the flag, the dollar must be invested under economic treaties which provide for fair and reasonable profits, and the assurance of no exploitation. It means that the old decadent concept of economic imperialism and exploitation must be brought to an end. It means we must recognize, after all, that if we are to have political brothers around the world, if we are to have political allies around the world, we must have economic brothers and economic allies.

I am talking about an ideal. Some criticize it as only an ideal, although it is a practicality, as every ideal is. Once an ideal is put to work, it becomes a practicality. What we must do is to urge American investments, under economic treaties with foreign countries. The rest of us, as a people, would support such investments by way of a Federal insurance principle. The American investor would no longer resort to self help. He no longer would ask for American arms to come in and protect his property, which might be nationalized or confiscated.

One of the arguments made in decades gone by in justification of economic exploitation by Americans, by the British, the Dutch, the French, and other nations of western civilization, particularly in Asia and other backward areas of the world, has been that investors had to go in and make their economic killing quickly and get out, because they never knew when the foreign power would confiscate or nationalize their property.

It was the old story. It was very difficult to determine which came first, the hen or the egg, because the economic policies of exploitation were causative of nationalization and confiscation.

We must raise our sights into the future and see the importance of economic treaties, whereby investments will be made, and will be encouraged, and the entire American population will stand behind the investments economically. We would insure the investments. That represents a pretty good expediture of a defense dollar. I cannot imagine a defense dollar which offers a greater hope of paying a dividend in terms of peace than that kind of economic investment.

Under such an economic treaty, if a country violates the terms of the treaty, and the treaty sets out the terms and conditions under which American investments will be made, what do we do? Do we send over jet bombers? Do we threaten with hydrogen bombs? Do we send a fleet into one of the harbors of the offending country and threaten that unless they yield to our superior military strength the flag will follow the dollar? Not at all, Mr. President, because under the theory I am discussing, the dollar will have already followed the flag, the flag being symbolized by the economic treaty which has been entered into between the United States and the foreign country. Then, by the very treaty itself, there is an understanding and a commitment that we will take the alleged violating country into a juridical tribunal for a determination, by way of judicial processes, as to whether or not American rights have been violated.

Our Government becomes subrogated, so to speak, to the rights of the individual investor in that situation. It no longer is a case between the foreign government and the American investor. It is a case between the foreign government and the United States Government, because under our insurance principle we have made whole the investor. Then our Government represents the American people in the case involved in the juridical process.

Impossible, say some. Let us try it. I think we would be surprised to find in what a different light we would be judged in India, Burma, and other parts of the world, if we demonstrated this kind of economic statesmanship.

As the Presiding Officer, the President pro tempore [Mr. GEORGE] knows, when the proposed legislation was before the committee I again raised my voice in support of the larger horizon, the higher ideal, the more objective goal. I commended the chairman and the committee for the fact that the bill goes somewhat in the direction of the theory I am defending, in that it would increase the loans and decrease the grants.

But loans are not enough, Mr. President. We must go further, in the years immediately ahead, if we are to establish political freedom in those parts of the world, by exporting a system of enlightened capitalism which will automatically take root and blossom into a higher standard of living in India and other parts of the world. Such a program will succeed if we take advantage of this kind of investment opportunity.

I know it is said that such a system cannot work. It was pointed out in the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry this morning, when I again urged the use of surplus wheat in this country as a form of investment dollars abroad in a country such as India, that the State Department is opposed to dumping surplus food in various parts of the world.

Mr. President, I am not frightened by the word "dumping." I do not care what the State Department calls it. I respectfully point out, however, that there are great potential opportunities for investing surplus wheat abroad, to meet hunger situations as they arise. It requires some statesmanship, vision, and courage. I think we ought to look forward to another year of the foreign-aid program, in which we shall carry to the next step the loan principle. The chairman of the committee has done a magnificent job in more firmly establishing it in the pending bill.

I am hoping that the American people will recognize that the economic theory I have been advancing in this phase of American foreign policy will pay off, to our self-interest. Of course it will pay off to our self-interest if it enhances the chances of peace. I have not the slightest doubt that peace will be more firmly established when economic freedom is more firmly established. Let us not forget how much we are outnumbered in the world already. Let us not forget how much more outnumbered in the world our great grandchildren and our great, great grandchildren are going to be. The American people in our generation must face the fact that we are becoming more and more a minority group in the world. With each passing century the prospects are perfectly clear, that we are to become a smaller and smaller group in terms of world population.

That is why it is so important, in my judgment, that we leave a heritage of economic freedom in parts of the world where the fight for freedom must be won. That is why it is so important, as I see the problem, that we win those people over to the side of economic and political freedom. The difficulty with so many Americans is that they talk only in terms of freedom. We seem to think that we can sell political freedom to empty stomachs. It cannot be done.

It cannot be done, Mr. President, because we cannot separate the economic welfare of a people from their political conceptions. If we are to try to sell the superiority of our political system—and it is superior to any other political system in the world—we must carry in our sales kit economic freedom of choice. We will never do it unless we follow a foreign economic policy which really helps to develop the economic resources of other people.

I do not believe that fact can be stressed too much. However, I am frank to say what I have to say does not have direct application to the bill before us. It is the best bill we can get this year. We have taken a step toward the goal I am pleading for by increasing the percentage of loans in the bill, in contrast to out and out grants.

If these loans are wisely made, we can export some enlightened capital through them. We can help to develop great economic resources with our funds in many parts of Asia. For example, such funds can assist in the building of dams, power plants, or waterworks. In fact, employing these funds in drilling wells will, in many instances, constitute excellent investments of enlightened capitalism.

However, I wish to stress that the bill does not go far enough. We must work toward a broader program of fewer grants and more investments, and then have the investments by private enterprise backed up by the American people, with the United States taking over when these economic treaties are violated by a foreign power. Incidentally, I believe there will be few violations. I believe there will be very few indeed.

We have heard a great deal about expropriation of oil company property in Mexico. I was critical and still am critical of what the Mexican Government did in that situation. However, I do know that the expropriation of oil in Mexico would never have occurred if American, British, and Dutch oil interests had not followed an inexcusable and shocking program of oil exploitation in Mexico. Mr. President, I have traveled through the jungles of Mexico. I have seen what these oil companies did. I have seen what some American oil companies did. I have seen what remained

of the narrow-gage railways that were laid through the Mexican jungle, with which to reach deep into great oil fields. I recall the waste of precious gas by these companies. They gave no thought to the fact that such gas could have supplied years and years of benefits for the native Mexicans. They followed drilling policies that were inexcusably wasteful, and which could be best described, as the Mexicans described them, as economic rape of the country.

That has been the policy of the American, British, and the Dutch oil companies in Mexico. What happened? The people became aroused, and Mexico confiscated the oil properties.

Two wrongs never make a right, and Mexico did not make a right by the course of action she followed. In my opinion, she engaged in what I think is an inexcusable course of conduct for a nation. There were other remedies which Mexico could have followed, instead of a confiscation program.

However, Mr. President, what I wish to point out is that if the program I am outlining this afternoon—in broad brush strokes, to be sure—were followed, we would have very few instances of confiscation and expropriation, such as Mexico engaged in. I say that because we would provide a remedy. We would have a treaty which would provide for fair profits. We would have a treaty which would assure that a much larger investment would go to a country for the benefit of the people of that country. Then, in case of an alleged violation or failure to keep an agreement, the offending party could be taken before a juridical tribunal of the United Nations for a legal determination of the respective rights of the countries involved.

Mr. President, this is not a new vision of mine. I held to this point of view in 1945. I held to the point of view when, on the floor of the Senate in 1945, I offered my resolution urging compulsory jurisdiction by the world court in any dispute with any nation in which the other nation was willing to go with us into the judicial atmosphere of that courtroom to settle our differences by the applications of rules of reason.

If Senators will check the arguments I made in support of the world court resolution—and I shall always be proud of the fact that it passed the Senate by a vote of 60 to 2 after a very interesting debate—they will find that I tried to point out then the importance of our setting up a system of international justice through law, which was being so eloquently spoken for by the great Vandenberg in those days. In that way economic issues can be settled in the world court, on the basis of free men bringing their disputes to a judicial tribunal which settles their differences by way of juridical processes.

There is no hope for peace until we come to such an era in the history of mankind. We must work toward that goal consistently. We will not reach that goal overnight, and I believe we have made strides toward that goal in the pending bill. However, there is a much longer road yet to travel.

Therefore I hope that when we come before the Senate next year with a new foreign-aid bill, we will have included in it a section which will provide for the kind of procedure I have outlined here this afternoon.

I am delighted to be able to say this to the Presiding Officer, the distinguished President pro tempore. One of the reasons for my casting a dissenting vote in committee was because I felt it gave me an educator's opportunity to point out that this is not a perfect bill. We have not gone as far as I think we must go in the interest of economic freedom abroad. However, I have accomplished my purpose, and I am proud to stand on the floor of the Senate today and join with the Presiding Officer and my other colleagues on the committee in support of a bill which I believe in part overcomes my two objections, which I shall name very briefly.

As the Presiding Officer knows, I led the fight in committee against the provision in the bill which gives to the President such sweeping powers as the bill gives him, in placing at his disposal under his discretion huge sums of money for expenditure abroad. I refer to the $200 million Asiatic fund.

When the matter first came before the committee, and before we had our debate in committee and our final decision, there were no checks placed on the President. Now we do have some checks.

I must say quite frankly I wish the checks could be made more specific. However, what is in the bill is at least a recognition of our system of checks and balances. The distinguished Presiding Officer, the chairman of the committee, was kind enough to say that there was merit in the principle for which I was fighting, but that we were confronted with a very realistic and difficult situation in world affairs, as we find them today, and therefore the President cannot know in advance what he is going to spend $10 million for or what he is going to spend $20 million for, and that, therefore, very broad powers seem to be necessary. However, with the assistance of the Presiding Officer, there has been written into the report language which makes very clear that the President will have to make a report to congressional committees every 6 months, including a listing of his expenditures.

I believe that is a very salutary check. My position on this matter of checks and balances is the same no matter whether X, Y, or Z happens to be the President of the United States, and is irrespective of which political party he belongs to.

It has been my position for 10 years in the Senate that not once to my knowledge in those 10 years have I gone along with an unchecked Presidential grant. Whether the President was a Democrat or a Republican, I have stood up on the floor of the Senate time and time again and warned of the danger of giving arbitrary discretionary power to any President. I did not teach the checks-and-balance system of government for so many years only to forget all about it when I came into politics. I happen to believe that the checks-and-balance system is no political cliché in American political life.

It happens to be one of the greatest safeguards of the freedom of our individual citizens. That is why, Mr. President, I shall always raise my voice urging the maximum checks that are feasible and possible in an important situation. Thus, in this instance, as the Presiding Officer knows, I spoke out rather frankly and bluntly against giving so much unchecked spending power to the President. I am not talking about the President who now holds office. I am speaking about any President—the President of the United States.

I wish to point out that it is dangerous to give to a President of the United States the power to spend abroad hundreds of millions of dollars unless we know for what he is going to spend it, because, in my hypothetical, I think it is highly conceivable that a President who might wish to abuse his power—and all men are frail—might follow a course of foreign policy through such expenditures as might jeopardize the peace. I will not say any more about that. But we can spend hundreds of millions of dollars and can hasten the possibility of war. But I think that in this bill checks have been written which at least call upon the President to report to the Congress and make clear the purpose for which he has spent the money.

There was a third point, Mr. President, which has disturbed me very much. It is a delicate point. I propose to handle it with dignity and with delicacy.

I do not like to go as far as we seem to find it necessary to go in our foreign-aid bill in the direction of unearmarked funds. I recognize that the whole theory of the bill is that we must set aside foreign-aid funds for different sections of the world. I should like to invite the attention of the Senate to what would happen if we followed that plan on the domestic front, in the way we appropriate funds in the foreign-aid bill. I wonder what would happen if it were proposed that Federal-aid grants should be made available to the South to the tune of $500 million, or to the Pacific Northwest to the tune of $250 million, or to the East in the amount of $300 million or any other amount.

We know very well, Mr. President, that we could not get any such blanket appropriation through the Congress, and we should not. I happen to believe we are dealing with the taxpayers' money whether we are dealing with it on the domestic front or on the foreign front, and I think the American people might have a very different reaction if they knew, for example, that some of these earmarked funds were for certain purposes about which they could not possibly be informed in the terms of this bill. So I think that as rapidly as we can in future foreign-aid bills we should try to work in the direction of earmarking the funds for specific project purposes. If we are going to develop an irrigation system in Egypt, for example, we should say so. We should say in the bill that so many millions of dollars will be appropriated for that purpose.

If in Korea, for example, we propose to spend several millions of dollars for the building of dams, we should say so.

My criticism, Mr. President, is not a criticism of the committee. It is a criticism of the State Department. I think it sells us too many pigs in a poke. I think it sells us too many proposals which are drafted in the most general way, leaving to executive discretion the decision of specific expenditures. I think that is risky and dangerous. Again, Mr. President, I recognize the merits of the arguments against me on that point, that it is difficult at this time to know for what we are going to need the funds. But it does create some dissension in our country when it becomes known that funds are being used for certain purposes, such as for military purposes in Iran.

It was a year ago, about last August 3, I think, that on the floor of the Senate I discussed the problem from a slightly different angle when I raised my voice in protest of the funds then in the bill to provide for military assistance to Iran. I think it is a mistake, the Middle East being the tinderbox it is, that any of the funds are to be used for military assistance in the Arab States or in Israel. We may as well face the fact that this is a tinder-box situation, and I think it is as important there, if not more important there than anywhere else in the world, to stress the first point I made in my speech this afternoon, namely, economic freedom, economic development, the development of the resources of that section of the world. I am just as much interested in building up the economic productive power of the Arab States as I am in building up the productive power of Israel. I take cognizance of the fact that Israel is the only area in the entire Middle East in which enlightened capitalism is the form of the economy of the nation. I take note of the fact that it is the only democratic country in the Middle East. I take note of the fact that the other countries to which we are giving aid—and some of it is military aid—are not democracies. They are not nations in which economic freedom of choice exists for the individual. But, nevertheless, Mr. President, I am as much interested in coming to the economic assistance of the people of the Arab States as I am in coming to the assistance of the people of Israel. But I wish to point out that the major part of the problem of the Middle East is to be found on the economic front. The solution is not to be found in stirring up animosities which are bound to be stirred up by giving military aid to a nation such as Iran, because I am not wooed by the argument that military aid is necessary in order to handle internal disorder on the part of dissident groups. I have a lurking suspicion that if I were a resident of Iran or any other country in which the free choice of the citizen does not exist I would probably belong to one of those dissident groups. I think that is true also of my colleagues in the Senate, because my colleagues in the Senate, even though we have political differences and although our differences are in degree as to economic theory and political theory, we are all of one mind when it comes to the relationship between economic freedom for the individual and political freedom.

So, Mr. President, as the chairman and the members of the Foreign Relations Committee know, I expressed in committee a dissenting voice over the failure to earmark in this bill the expenditures in the Middle East, because I think the American people are entitled to know the purpose of those expenditures.

As part of this third point, Mr. President, I also felt that more funds should have been made available to the South American Republics. On this point I speak as the chairman of the Subcommittee on South American Affairs of the Foreign Relations Committee. I recognize that there is a limit to the funds which can be made available, and yet it is of the greatest importance to the security of the United States that we keep freedom strong on this continent.

Freedom is very weak in certain parts of South America. In recent months we have witnessed a threat of communism in one of the Latin American countries. I think it is in our own national self-interest that we spend more money, primarily by way of loans to the South American countries, for the development of their economic resources.

I say to the American people that I do not think there is the slightest basis in fact for the propaganda in the United States that if we build up economic freedom abroad, we lower the standard of living of Americans at home. The contrary is true.

It is now pretty generally known that there is ample expert economic testimony to the effect that if in the next 25 years we could raise the standard of living of the millions of people of India by only 5 percent, it would result in such an impetus to international trade, of which we would be the primary beneficiaries, that we would thereby enjoy prosperity in the United States, the like of which we have never enjoyed to date.

Do not forget, Mr. President, that when we invest American dollars under the economic-trade treaty theory which I am again advancing this afternoon, much of it comes home to the benefit of our own people. When it is invested in India, we do not lose dividends from it. The dividends come home. When we build up the standard of living of the people in the backward areas, where the fight for freedom has to be won, we increase prosperity at home, because international economic trade is bound to flow from a higher standard of living in India. The moment India has the wherewithal to buy in foreign trade, we shall see the result in American manufactures.

So for the reasons I have outlined this afternoon, I dragged my feet on the bill, so to speak, in the Committee on Foreign Relations. I felt I should register my protest because the bill does not go as far, idealistically, as I think it should go. It offers me the opportunity on the floor of the Senate, of which I have just availed myself, to set forth my reasons as to why I think it is necessary for the United States to move faster down the road of exporting enlightened capitalism abroad.

In closing, I think the Senate is indebted to the chairman of the committee and to my colleagues on the Committee on Foreign Relations for the highly objective attitude the committee took in preparing a bill which I think represents, unquestionably, the most favorable bill on which a majority vote can be had in the Senate.

I think some additional funds should be made available to the South American Republics; but I think most of any additional funds ought to be based strictly on a loan principle. I think the United States should be willing to lend money to the South American Republics on a long-term basis and for specific projects, projects which really will have a very clear chance of raising the economic standards of the communities in which the projects will be built.

For the reasons I have set forth, I shall continue, so long as I am a Member of the Senate, to try to work for the kind of foreign economic policy I have outlined; and when the bill comes to a vote, I shall vote for its passage.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, pursuant to the order previously entered, the Senate will convene at 10 o'clock tomorrow morning. I have been informed that 4 or 5 amendments are at the desk. I hope that Members who read the RECORD will be prepared to be present and to vote on the amendments as they are called up. I have asked the Senate aides to notify the authors of the amendments of the order of the Senate entered today for the early hour of convening tomorrow. It is hoped that the Senate may be able to conclude consideration of the bill tomorrow.

I expect the Committee on Appropriations during the week to report the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare appropriation bill and also the independent offices appropriation bill. I am hopeful that the reports on those bills will be filed on Friday, and that the bills may be considered in the early part of next week.

The housing bill has been reported by the Committee on Banking and Currency. The report has been filed and will be made available to all Members.

In the event the Senate acts on the two appropriation bills—and, of course, appropriation bills always have priority on our schedule—it is intended to have the Senate proceed to the consideration of the housing bill.

That is the schedule at the moment. If any bills which are not controversial are reported and placed on the calendar, then, when they have been cleared by the minority leader and his ranking colleagues, and if they are acceptable to the leadership on this side of the aisle, it will be the intention to reserve the right to call them up so as to try to keep the calendar reasonably clear for other bills which will be reported.

APPOINTMENTS TO SERVICE ACADEMIES

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair has been requested to announce the following appointments made by the Vice President:

To the Board of Visitors to the Military Academy: the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE];

To the Board of Visitors to the Naval Academy: the Senator from Nevada [Mr. BIBLE]; and

To the Board of Visitors to the Merchant Marine Academy: the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. CASE].

RECESS TO 10 A. M. TOMORROW

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, if no other Senator desires recognition, then, pursuant to the order previously entered, I move that the Senate stand in recess until 10 o'clock tomorrow morning.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 57 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess, the recess being, under the order previously entered, until tomorrow, Thursday, June 2, 1955, at 10 o'clock a. m.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, JUNE 1, 1955

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, humbly and reverently we are again turning unto Thee in prayer, lifting up our hearts in adoration and thanksgiving, in confession and supplication.

Grant that our President, our Speaker and all the Members of the Congress who are engaged in the high vocation of statecraft may be wise and obedient servants of Thy holy will.

May they seek to do Thy will faithfully and courageously without fear or favor and regardless of circumstances or consequences.

Inspire us with a deep and sincere longing to always bring our own human will into oneness with Thy divine will for "our wills are ours, we know not how, our wills are ours, to make them Thine."

In Christ's name we pray. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

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

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

H. R. 3879. An act to amend section 2 of the act of March 2, 1945, pertaining to the Columbia River at Bonneville, Oreg;

H. R. 4646. An act to amend section 4421 of the Revised Statutes, in order to remove the requirement as to verifying under oath certain certificates of inspection, and for other purposes;

H. R. 4817. An act relating to the payment of money orders;

H. R. 5223. An act to continue until the close of June 30, 1956, the suspension of duties and import taxes on metal scrap, and for other purposes; and

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

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

S. 414. An act 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;

S. 528. 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;

S. 928. An act to provide research and technical assistance relating to air-pollution control;

S. 1093. An act to fix and regulate the salaries of schoolteachers, school officers, and other employees of the Board of Education of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes;

S. 1187. An act to amend section 5221 of the Revised Statutes, relating to voluntary liquidation of national banks;

S. 1188. An act to amend section 5240 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, relating to the examination of national banks;

S. 1189. An act to permit national banks to make 20-year real-estate loans, 9-month residential-construction loans, and 18-month commercial-construction loans;

S. 1250. An act to declare Pike Creek above the easterly side of the highway bridge at Sixth Avenue in the city of Kenosha a nonnavigable stream;

S. 1289. An act to establish a domestic relations branch in the municipal court for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes;

S. 1300. An act to declare a certain portion of the waterway at Greenwich, Conn. (in which is located the Greenwich Harbor), a nonnavigable stream;

S. 1318. An act 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;

S. 1340. An act to authorize the conveyance by quitclaim deed of certain land to the Brownsville Navigation District of Cameron County, Tex.;

S. 1419. An act to lower the age requirements with respect to optional retirement of persons serving in the Coast Guard who served in the former Lighthouse Service;

S. 1469. An act to declare the portion of the waterway at Bridgeport, Conn., known as the west branch of Cedar Creek, a nonnavigable stream; and

S. 1736. An act to amend section 5146 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, relating to the qualifications of directors of national banking associations.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 5502. An act making appropriations for the Departments of State and Justice, the judiciary, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the foregoing bill; requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. KILGORE, Mr. ELLENDER, Mr. MCCLELLAN, Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. GREEN, Mr. BRIDGES, Mr. SALTONSTALL, and Mr. MCCARTHY to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Armed Services may have permission to sit during general debate today.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

Mr. POWELL (at the request of Mr. MULTER) was given permission to address the House for 30 minutes on tomorrow, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered.

Mr. MOLLOHAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 5 minutes today, following the legislative program and special orders heretofore entered.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON EDUCATION OF THE COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR

Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Education and Labor of the House Committee on Education and Labor may sit this afternoon during general debate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

THE FLAGS OF ALASKA AND HAWAII

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alaska?

There was no objection.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Speaker, I request this time to make a protest against a situation which has existed here in Washington for the past 7 years, a situation so repugnant to the people of Alaska and, I am sure, to the people of Hawaii, that my time will be far too short a time to express the indignation which has been growing through the years.

We are a proud people in Alaska and the Hawaiians, too, are proud as well they should be. We have sacrificed and will sacrifice in the future in the interest of national defense. We pay our taxes with as good grace as any other citizens. We love our country and revere its flag.

But in spite of our patriotism, our loyalty, and our love for our country, we are discriminated against in a most

flagrant manner. Our humiliation is beyond measure and description. So I sum up our protest in a simple question, why are not the flags of Alaska and Hawaii carried into Griffith Stadium as are the flags of the 48 States in the military pageantry preceding the congressional baseball game?

JUNE DAIRY MONTH

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, as a Member of Congress representing the congressional district which produces more cheese and milk than any other congressional district in the United States, I have continually worked to promote the use of dairy products. In my congressional office, every day is dairy day.

June has been designated as dairy month. June dairy month serves to dramatize the contribution of dairy producers not only to our Nation's health but to every segment of our economy. American dairy farmers and their families have made a real contribution to our Nation's welfare.

June Dairy Month is meeting with terrific acceptance all over the United States. The efforts of the Department of Agriculture, State Departments of agriculture, the land-grant colleges, agricultural extension service and other agencies in cooperating for the proper observance of National Dairy Month is particularly noteworthy this year. Dairy organizations have reported that never before in their history have they received the cooperation accorded them by all agencies this year.

Testimony before the House dairy subcommittee indicates that the dairy industry is approaching the end of surpluses in the very near future. Increased per capita consumption of dairy products is the main basis for this optimistic outlook for the dairyman's future.

Commodity Credit Corporation statistics show that in the marketing year which ended March 31, 1955, the price support program resulted in Government purchases of 4.8 percent of the total milk produced, as compared with 9.3 percent in the previous marketing year. This decline came in spite of greater milk production.

Domestic civilian consumption of milk increased by 6 billion pounds, or almost 2,800,000,000 quarts of milk, in the 1954–55 marketing year. The rapidly increasing population in the United States accounted for almost 2 billion pounds of the gain. Economists figure that about one-third of the additional 4-billion-pound gain was the result of retail price drops and the balance the effect of increased sales promotion by the dairy industry.

Americans increased their per capita consumption of milk by 4.3 quarts in the marketing year, and they also ate .64 pound more butter and .58 pound more cheese. Slight drops in per capita purchases of evaporated milk and ice cream in 1954 were reported, but in the first 3 months of 1955 consumers are eating 5 percent more ice cream than they did the year before.

The industry faces the task of selling an additional 6.3 billion pounds of milk in 1955. Further increases in population will again account for almost one-third of this. If we can convince consumers to add one more glass of milk per week to their present dairy foods diet, then the surplus situation will be licked.

I commend the activities of the American Dairy Association for its sales campaign for dairy foods. Dairymen are investing in the future and are beginning to see the real fruits of their present investments in the American Dairy Association. In the contributing of $5 million to the sales campaign of the American Dairy Association, the dairy producer is developing a comprehensive merchandising program for dairy distributors and retail outlets. The effect of this program today, although great, will be multiplied many times in the future.

If the increased trend of dairy consumption can be maintained through the tremendous efforts of our dairy farmers, we will face June dairy month 2 years in the future with the greatest agricultural success story this Nation has ever seen.

The dairy farmers deserve the support of this Congress and of every department of our Federal Government in their present efforts.

HIGHWAY TRANSPORTATION

Mr. AYRES. 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 Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Speaker, we have just heard the able gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LAIRD] state that he represented a district that produced more dairy products than any district in the United States. I represent a district that produces more automobile and truck tires than any district in the United States.

Mr. MORANO. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AYRES. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. MORANO. I represent a district that produces more hats than any other district in the United States.

Mr. AYRES. I presume other Members could get up here and state that they produce particular products in their own districts.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, we grow cranberries, the only place in the United States that produces them, in substantial volume.

Mr. AYRES. Now, the gentleman has cranberries in his district, and it is the only place in the United States that raises cranberries, which brings up the point that I am inserting in the RECORD today a statement discussing the importance of the trucking industry to the dairy products, the hats, and the cranberries, because if it were not for tires and the great trucking industry, you gentlemen who have basic products in your communities would not be able to get them to market. I trust you will all read in the RECORD tomorrow the extension of remarks by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. AYRES].

SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA INTEREST IN THE COLORADO RIVER STORAGE PROJECT

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, I took the well yesterday to explain that the interest of southern California in the Colorado River storage project was not a selfish one but only one to preserve the rights to certain waters of the Colorado River which it had acquired by contract, by appropriation, and by the Colorado River compact. I reiterated that California observes that compact and must insist that the upper-basin States do so in the planning and operation of their projects. Our opposition is not based on selfish interests as was stated yesterday by one of the gentlemen who spoke following me, but is only and solely with the desire to protect and preserve our existing rights. I want to make that clear to the House so that during this entire controversy, as it may be waged here, there will not be motives impugned to us that are other than honest, sincere, and purely in a desire to protect the 6 million residents of southern California who must depend upon Colorado River water for the lifeblood of their economy, their homes, their agriculture, and their industry.

BANKING MERGERS

Mr. PATMAN. 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 Texas?

There was no objection.

MERGERS ENCOURAGED BY TAX LAWS

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, financial and banking journals are estimating that there will be 350 more banking mergers this year notwithstanding the fact that we have 50 percent fewer banks than we had in 1929.

The same thing is going on in other businesses and industry. There is one principal reason why there are so many banking mergers and that is because there is a premium upon mergers under our present tax laws. If the owners sell out, if they make a sale of the bank or business or industry, they pay a minimum tax—capital gains—of 25 percent whereas, if they merge, they do not have to pay any tax at all. So there is a premium on merging.

TAX LOSS SOLD AS ASSET

In addition to that, if a concern accumulates a tax loss over the years, that tax loss all at once becomes a great asset. Certain concerns even offer to buy them. They are advertised for in the newspapers. Concerns are advertising for other concerns that have tax losses; in other words, "sell your tax losses to us and make money."

SUBCOMMITTEE ON TERRITORIES

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Territories be permitted to sit this afternoon during general debate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

UPPER COLORADO RIVER COMPACT

Mr. McDONOUGH. 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. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, I want to supplement the remarks of my colleague [Mr. HOSMER] concerning the upper Colorado River question and the fact that California entered into a compact in good faith with the upper States and has adhered to that compact, for the amount of water we believe is necessary to take care of a growing population of some 6 million people, as compared to the possibility of diverting that water in an area that does not have even one-half or one-third of that population.

We have no desire to curtail the development of irrigation and reclamation and conservation of soil in the upper Colorado States, but we do believe that since we entered into this compact a number of years ago and we have adhered to it that our water supply from the Colorado River should not be curtailed or threatened. We are now seeking to defend what we have agreed to and what they have agreed to in order to protect the industrial, domestic, and agricultural assets of the great empire in southern California.

CAPT. MOSES M. RUDY

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 1142) for the relief of Capt. Moses M. Rudy, with a Senate amendment thereto, disagree to the Senate amendment, 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 Massachusetts? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. LANE, FORRESTER, and REED of Illinois.

BIRTHPLACE OF DAVY CROCKETT

Mr. REECE of Tennessee. 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 Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. REECE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, a few days ago the gentleman from North Carolina, my good and able friend, Mr. JONAS, made reference to the birthplace of Davy Crockett as having been in North Carolina. In the interest of historical accuracy I want to state that Davy Crockett was born in what is now Greene County, Tenn., but actually he was born in neither North Carolina nor Tennessee. He was born in the State of Franklin, which existed as a State from 1784 until 1788.

The State of Franklin is lost in the memory of many people, but it was organized as a sovereign State and exercised all the functions of a State, legislative, judicial, and executive. The Governor of the State of Franklin was John Sevier, who led the over-the-mountain men at the Battle of Kings Mountain. He later became the first Governor of the State of Tennessee.

The early governments in this area constitute an interesting and important phase of history. The State of Franklin was preceded by what is known as the Watauga Association. The Watauga settlement, the Noli-Chuckey settlement—of which one of my great, great, great grandparents was a founder—together with the other early settlements in what is now east Tennessee, went together and organized the Watauga Association.

The Watauga Association was governed by a commission of 13, elected by the people. This commission exercised the legislative, judicial, and executive functions of government, and it was referred to by Theodore Roosevelt, in his book The Winning of the West, as the first free government to be established on the American Continent.

The establishment of the State of Franklin was an outgrowth of the early settlements to find a suitable government to administer their affairs. It was not known at that time what State, if any, may have had jurisdiction over all of this area, and the people found themselves without any form of government until they organized one of their own.

It was during the life of the State of Franklin that Davy Crockett was born, in 1786, near the confluence of Limestone Creek and Noli-Chuckey River, in what is now Greene County, Tenn. His place of birth is designated by a limestone marker which bears the following inscription:

On this spot Davy Crockett was born August 17, 1786.

His place of birth was visited last Sunday by Mr. Fess Parker, who so ably portrays Davy's life in the movies. But on Sunday, May 22, his place of birth was visited by a great American, our distinguished Speaker, the Honorable SAM RAYBURN, who was a guest of east Tennessee on that day as the Commencement Day speaker at Tusculum College, Greeneville, Tenn., the oldest college west of the Alleghany Mountains, which conferred upon him a degree of doctor of laws. The splendid address which Speaker RAYBURN delivered upon that occasion, as well as his long and distinguished career in public life, amply justified the fullsome citation which was given him by Tusculum College on that occasion. East Tennessee, where Speaker RAYBURN was born, is justly proud of him.

Davy Crockett was honored when Speaker RAYBURN visited the place of his birth.

After I retired, a few nights ago, my mind in some way turned to Davy Crockett, and the following words, which could hardly be called a song, which I jotted down, occurred to me:

DAVY CROCKETT, OH!

Davy Crockett, Oh! He died in the Battle of the Alamo.
He left the hills of Tennessee; left the bears and the wildcats too,
To fight for liberty which he won, away out yonder under the sun.

Davy Crockett, Oh! He died in the Battle of the Alamo
He fought Old Mexico and Santa Ana, too.
He fought in the dark, damp Alamo by night and day,
And now Texas is part of the USA.

Davy Crockett, Oh! He died in the Battle of the Alamo
Freedom shrieked when Davy fell.
He fought furiously and furiously well.
He fought for freedom and glory, too.

Davy Crockett, Oh! He died in the Battle of the Alamo
Come on boys, let's go, Davy is dying in the Alamo.
Yes, Davy Crockett fought and died in the Battle of the Alamo
In the Battle of the Alamo.

RELOCATION TEST FOR THE EXECUTIVE BRANCH OF THE GOVERNMENT

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, the distinguished minority leader, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN], conferred with the Speaker and myself about a memorandum in relation to the relocation test for the executive branch of the Government that is scheduled to start at noon on June 15 and to run until the afternoon of June 17.

The memorandum I have in my hand is from Arthur S. Flemming, Director to the President, and given by the President to our distinguished friend from Massachusetts. I will read the memorandum in full:

MAY 31, 1955.

Memorandum for Hon. JOSEPH W. MARTIN.

This is just a reminder of the discussion that took place at the conference with the President last week relative to the relocation test for the executive branch of the Government that is scheduled to start at noon on June 15 and to run until the afternoon of June 17.

It is my understanding that you are planning to talk with Speaker RAYBURN relative to the possibility of hearings by committees of the House of Representatives being held to a minimum on these 3 days so that there can be maximum participation in the relocation test by the heads of the departments and agencies and their immediate deputies.

We deeply appreciate your willingness to cooperate with us on this matter.

ARTHUR S. FLEMMING.

The Speaker and I sincerely hope, and we are confident, that the chairmen of all committees will cooperate as outlined in the memorandum and program their hearings so that heads of departments and agencies and their immediate deputies will not have to testify on any 1 of those 3 days.

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce may sit during general debate this afternoon.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

INTER-AMERICAN HIGHWAY

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, last month in company with four other Members of the House of Representatives, GEORGE FALLON, Maryland; THOMAS STEED, Oklahoma; WALT HORAN, Washington; WALTER NORBLAD, Oregon; and Senator HOLLAND, Democrat, of Florida, I journeyed to Central America, at the request of the Departments of State and Commerce, because of our interest in the building of the inter-American highway. On that journey, it was unanimously agreed that Senator HOLLAND would speak for our group wherever it were necessary to make a statement. This he did. This morning's Washington Post and Times Herald contains an article by a columnist named Pearson to the effect that the Senator and I had engaged in words—that we had a tiff as to who would present to President Somoza, of Nicaragua, a desk set sent to him by Vice President NIXON, of the United States, in token of friendship and an expression of his appreciation of the courtesies extended to him during his recent visit to the Central American Republics. I am here to say that no such argument as indicated in that column ever took place. It was never dreamed of. This morning's article was the first I ever heard of it. I want the RECORD to show that our journey to the Central American governments was in the interest of the United States and was not a junket. We went there to perform our task, and did it.

In view of the fact that we are building an inter-American highway between the United States and those republics to the Panama Canal, I ask unanimous consent, Mr. Speaker, that I may extend these few remarks on this subject so that the American public may know the facts.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, I want the country and the Members of the House of Representatives to know that no argument took place as indicated in the article by Mr. Pearson. The trip was one of good will both on the part of we who represented the United States Government and those of the Central American Republics. Complete harmony existed throughout the entire journey from start to finish.

At this point I wish to include as a part of my remarks a short letter from my colleague, Congressman TOM STEED, the gentleman from Oklahoma, a member of the Public Works Committee of the House, and one of the five Members making the journey to Central America, as well as one from my colleague the Honorable GEORGE H. FALLON, of Maryland, also a member of the party:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., June 1, 1955.

DEAR GEORGE: Since I was present throughout the entire proceedings, I felt compelled to send you this note of regret that the article in today's Drew Pearson column regarding the presentation of Vice President NIXON's gift to President Somoza at Managua recently was so far from the true facts.

In this instance, as was true throughout our 5-day trip, only the most cordial relations existed between all members of the delegation.

Strangely enough, both you and Senator HOLLAND most generously urged the other to take the lead in making the presentation, which is just the contrary of the situation as reported. At no time was there the slightest misunderstanding or friction of any kind. No group was ever more thoughtful or considerate of each other than this one. In fact, the cordiality of all those making the trip was unusually outstanding and impressive.

For such a wholly untrue picture to have been given of this affair is completely unfair and does injustice to two of the finest gentlemen I have ever had the privilege of knowing, Senator HOLLAND and yourself.

Sincerely yours,

TOM STEED.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., June 1, 1955.

Hon. GEORGE A. DONDERO,
Member of Congress,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN DONDERO: I read with regret an article appearing in Drew Pearson's column of today stating that there was some unpleasantness between Senator HOLLAND and yourself in regard to the presentation of a desk set to President Somoza, of Nicaragua.

I might emphatically state that on that occasion, like all other occasions, it was decided that Senator HOLLAND would be the spokesman for the group. I might also state that I was present when you most cordially, in your very pleasant and gracious manner, suggested that Senator HOLLAND make the presentation to the President. I might further say that the same harmony and pleasantness prevailed not only with our group but with the representatives of all countries we visited during the trip.

I felt it incumbent upon me to drop you this note, inasmuch as Mr. Pearson has apparently been given misinformation.

Sincerely yours,

GEORGE H. FALLON.

CONSENT CALENDAR TO BE CALLED ON TUESDAY AND SUSPENSION OF RULES

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Consent Calendar scheduled for Monday under the rules of the House may be called on Tuesday, and also that the Speaker on that day may recognize Members for suspensions of the rules.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

APPROPRIATIONS FOR EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT AND SUNDRY GENERAL GOVERNMENT AGENCIES, 1956

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up the resolution (H. Res. 256) waiving all points of order against the bill (H. R. 6499) making appropriations for the Executive Office of the President and sundry general Government agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That during the consideration of the bill (H. R. 6499) making appropriations for the Executive Office of the President and sundry general Government agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, and for other purposes, all points of order against the bill are hereby waived.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ALLEN].

Mr. Speaker, I rise to urge the adoption of House Resolution 256, which will make in order the consideration of the bill (H. R. 6499) making appropriations for the Executive Office of the President and sundry general Government agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, and for other purposes.

House Resolution 256 would simply waive all points of order against this appropriation bill. The Committee on Appropriations felt that this simple type of rule would be all that was needed to expedite the consideration of the bill.

The committee report on this bill, Mr. Speaker, shows some figures which I think the House membership will find interesting. While the Committee on Appropriations recommends for fiscal year 1956 the amount of $21,890,700, which is $7,313,850 more than was appropriated last year, nevertheless the amount recommended is $5,810,000 less than was originally submitted in the budget estimate for this appropriation bill for fiscal year 1956.

According to the committee report on H. R. 6499, the increase of $7,313,850 in this year's recommended appropriation is due to the addition of a recommended appropriation of $8 million for "Payment

of Korean claims" by the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission. This is a new addition, and there have been no previous appropriations to take care of these claims. However, it is interesting to note that the $8 million which is recommended in this bill is $4,200,0000 less than was requested in the budget estimate.

Up to the present time war claims had been financed from the assets of enemy countries in the war claims fund, but in this particular instance there are no North Korean assets available, and the appropriation is thus made necessary.

The bill contains recommended appropriations for the Executive Office of the President, the American Battle Monuments Commission, the Subversive Activities Control Board, as well as for the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission.

Mr. Speaker, this bill is the customary appropriation bill to take care of the functions I have listed above. I hope that the House Members will adopt the rule which will allow for the consideration of the bill without the possibilities of points of order being made against it. I move the adoption of House Resolution 256 so that we may proceed to the consideration of the bill H. R. 6499.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MADDEN. I yield.

Mr. GROSS. Why was it deemed necessary to waive all points of order on this bill?

Mr. MADDEN. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. The general provision refers to other appropriations than those provided for in this bill. The provisions are included in this bill so as to avoid putting them in each appropriation bill. This has been the custom for many years.

Mr. GROSS. Does this provide for the upgrading of any employees by this process?

Mr. MADDEN. No; it does not.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the remainder of my time.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, there is no opposition on this side to the rule, and I reserve my time.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 6499) making appropriations for the Executive Office of the President and sundry general Government agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, and for other purposes; and, pending that motion, I ask unanimous consent that general debate on the bill be limited to 1 hour, the time to be equally divided and controlled by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FENTON] and myself.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 6499, with Mr. PRICE in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the unanimous-consent agreement, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. ANDREWS] will be recognized for 30 minutes, and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FENTON] will be recognized for 30 minutes.

The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. ANDREWS] is recognized.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON].

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, the President has just issued to the press one of the most important statements made during his administration.

He has appealed to Congress to balance the budget.

No more imperative, no more urgent request could come from the White House. And there is no appeal, the disregard of which would be fraught with more serious consequences.

Never before has any Nation been so deeply in debt as the United States is today. Never before has our financial situation as a Nation been more desperate.

And the distressing feature of it is that this sky-rocketing national indebtedness comes at the end of a long period in which year after year we have spent more money than we had. Continuously, year after year, our expenditures have exceeded our revenues.

We realize, of course, that so far as national defense is concerned we had no alternative. In the most dangerous period of our national existence it was necessary to provide for national defense and self-preservation.

But, along with these necessary and essential expenditures for national safety, we have continued to spend money we did not have for things we could get along without.

As a result our debt has mushroomed to astronomical proportions, our financial situation has grown every year more untenable, the cost of living has risen to unprecedented peacetime proportions, and the purchasing power of the dollar has dropped to the lowest point since our currency was established.

All reporting financial agencies call attention to the fact that for the last 10 years money has grown steadily less valuable in terms of commodities.

Those on fixed incomes, whether salaries, annuities, or interest must accept a steadily dwindling standard of living. Those who have planned ahead through the purchase of insurance to arrange their fiscal affairs, establish estates and to provide for dependents find themselves every year in a more precarious situation.

And this is just the beginning. Authorities on finance are now warning money has consistently depreciated in the last 10 years and will continue to decline in value for the next 10 years. Fiscal agencies are advising investors to get money into commodities, into something that will appreciate as the dollar depreciates.

Mr. Chairman, the greatest duty devolving upon this Congress is to balance the budget.

Members of the House find on their desks this morning copies of the bill H. R. 6558. The bill has been very carefully considered. It has been in process of preparation for a number of years. It has been reviewed by experienced authorities on finance and on the technique of legislation.

It will balance the budget.

There are few responsibilities confronting this Congress that are more important than that.

The metropolitan newspapers of the Nation are this morning carrying in headlines the carefully considered request of the President to balance the budget. The alternative is fiscal disaster. Carried to its eventual conclusion it means repudiation of Government bonds. It means printing press money—carried in baskets—as in Germany. It means an incredible handicap in our defense against communism—the debacle which Stalin predicted and for which the Politbureau is waiting.

There is little time left. There is no course open but to balance the budget.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 15 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, this is one of the smallest appropriation bills that will come before the House this year. It contains appropriations for 14 Government agencies. These agencies formerly were handled by the Committee on Independent Offices and through the years have been reduced a little each year, and they have about reached the point where there is not much left to take from them. The total amount of the budget request for the next fiscal year was $27,700,700. The committee has allowed in this bill $21,890,700, which is a decrease from the budget request of $5,810,000 and an increase over the amount appropriated for these agencies in 1955 of $7,313,850.

The first item in the bill provides for the compensation of the President, which, as you know, is fixed by statute at $150,000. That amount is allowed in this bill.

The next item is for the White House Office. We have allowed an increase of $160,500 over the amount appropriated in 1955. This increase is due to additional staff to coordinate public works planning.

The next item in the bill is for the Executive Mansion and grounds. We have allowed the amount requested by the budget, which is the same amount contained in the 1955 appropriation bill, $366,200.

The next item is for the Bureau of the Budget, which has a slight decrease from 1955, recommended by the Bureau, of $33,500. In 1955 the amount of the appropriation was $3,382,500, which supported 433 positions. In the budget for next year we have allowed $3,349,000, a decrease of $33,500 under the 1955 appropriation and $63,000 under the 1954 appropriation. This item for next year

for the Bureau of the Budget will support 425 positions, which is 8 less than 1955 and 21 less than 1954.

The next agency is that of the Council of Economic Advisers. We have increased their appropriation over 1955 by $40,000 and decreased it $15,000 from the amount estimated for this agency in 1956. This reduction was made possible by the fact that one of their functions has been transferred from the Council of Economic Advisers to an agency in the White House. That activity had to do with public works planning and is now in another unit under the Office of the White House. This agency expects to have a balance of $25,000 unexpended at the end of this fiscal year.

The next item in the bill is for the National Security Council. That shows an increase of $25,000 over the amount appropriated for the fiscal year 1955.

The National Security Council, in my opinion, is one of the most important agencies of this Government. The Council was established pursuant to Public Law 253 of the 80th Congress, approved in 1947, and by Reorganization Plan No. 4, effective in 1949, the Council was transferred to the Executive Office of the President.

The statutory function of the Council is to advise the President with respect to the integration of domestic, foreign, and military policies relating to the national security so as to enable the military services and other departments and agencies of the Government to cooperate more effectively in matters involving the national security. Subject to direction by the President, it is the responsibility of the Council to assess and appraise the objectives, commitments, and risks of the United States in relation to our actual and potential military power, to consider policies on matters of common interest to the departments and agencies of Govenment, and to make such recommendations and such other reports to the President as it deems appropriate or as the President may require.

This slight increase in the appropriation for the National Security Council is due primarily to the necessity of employing additional guards. This service in the past has been rendered by another Government agency. The most secret papers in this country are in the custody of this Council and of necessity must be under guard 24 hours a day every day in the year.

The next agency for which this committee has recommended appropriations in this bill is that of the Office of Defense Mobilization. That shows a slight reduction under the budget request of $95,000. This cut was made by the committee because, in the opinion of this committee, it was not necessary for the ODM to have the services of as many consultants as the Bureau of the Budget requested. It allows for a slight increase for travel and a slight increase for consultants but not as much as requested by the Bureau of the Budget.

The amount recommended for the Office of Defense Mobilization is $2,125,000, which is a reduction of $36,000 from the 1955 appropriation and a reduction of $95,000 from the budget request.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDREWS. I yield.

Mr. GROSS. Plans are underway to stage a defense mobilization program on June 15, 16, and 17, as I understand it. Did the committee develop in the hearings anything in respect to what would be done if this country were attacked in the matter of meeting places for Congress and housing for Members of Congress?

Mr. ANDREWS. We had quite a lengthy discussion about the plans, but most of it of necessity had to be off the record.

Mr. GROSS. What the gentleman from Alabama is saying to the gentleman from Iowa is that he cannot tell us anything about it?

Mr. ANDREWS. That is right.

Mr. GROSS. But plans are being made for the meeting of Congress at some point distant from Washington, I take it?

Mr. ANDREWS. That is my understanding.

Mr. GROSS. With respect to the employees in the Office of Defense Mobilization, it is my understanding that there were this year some 254 employees. Is that correct?

Mr. ANDREWS. I think that is right.

Mr. GROSS. It is my understanding that out of that 254 some 97 are in grade 12 or above and 6 of the 254 are grade 18 employees. Does not the gentleman think this is a rather lush setup from the standpoint of highly graded civil-service employees?

Mr. ANDREWS. I think the record will show, and it is in the testimony, that this agency has the highest per capita salary of any agency in Government, but most of the employees are experts or consultants or specialists in their fields. Our information is that their services are needed because of the technical planning that is necessary to carry on the functions of this office.

Mr. GROSS. I call the attention of the gentleman to one employee in this agency who in 1949 was a transportation analyst and paid $6,700 a year. In 1954 he became a research director, bomb damage analysis, at $12,000 a year, or approximately double the salary. Does the gentleman think the gentleman referred to here is an expert?

Mr. ANDREWS. I think the question the gentleman raises there is a matter for the Civil Service Commission, not for this committee. This committee does not say what grade an employee will have.

The bill includes $60,000 for the President's Advisory Committee on Government Organization, the same amount as was available to them in 1955, and the same as the budget estimate.

The next item is for the Emergency Fund of the President. We have allowed this year for the first time since fiscal year 1951 the total amount requested for this item. Last year the budget request was for $1 million and the committee allowed $750,000.

The purpose of this fund is to furnish the President with funds necessary to meet emergencies affecting the national interest, security, or defense, which may arise at home or abroad during the fiscal year. The President may be faced at any time with sudden emergencies and unforeseen problems which affect the national interest or security and which do not fall within the scope of the regular activities of any one of the Government agencies. The President must have sufficient funds at his disposal to deal swiftly and effectively with the problems and emergencies when they arise.

I have always thought that the President should be given $1 million minimum for his Emergency Fund. Many governors of this country have emergency funds of $1 million. I think if you will take a look at the record you will find that the President last year and the year before has spent this money very judiciously and wisely, and in most instances in cases of real emergency.

The record shows that last year he spent $50,000 of his $750,000 with the Office of Defense Mobilization, $80,000 to finance a conference at Rio de Janeiro for the State Department, and $100,000 to finance a Commission on Pensions headed by General Bradley. Of the $750,000 appropriated last year, the President spent only $230,000, and expects to return to the Treasury at the end of this fiscal year the balance of the $750,000.

There is an item in here for the Subversive Activities Control Board. The committee allowed the budget request of $300,000, which is $15,000 more than the total amount of money that the agency had available last year. The workload of that agency, as you know, depends entirely upon the number of petitions filed by the Department of Justice. They expect to file, during the fiscal year 1956, 20 petitions. There are 10 petitions pending there at this time. So if the Department of Justice files 20 new petitions, there will be a total workload for the fiscal year 1956 of 30 petitions.

There is an item in the bill for the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission. That is one agency of government which I thought would be out of existence at this time. When the Chairman of that Commission was before our Independent Offices Subcommittee in 1954, I asked him when he thought he would be able to lock up his office, lock, stock, and barrel. He said, without question, we will lock up our shop and discontinue business on March 31, 1955. I told him, off the record, if he did I would give him a medal, because he would have the first Government agency I would ever see close up in 11 years that I have served in the Congress. Here is a request before the committee for $550,000 for administrative expenses. The committee reduced that amount $100,000, and we allowed $450,000 for administrative expenses. There are two types of claims for which the money has been requested. One is for the payment of World War II claims, which are estimated to be $16,714,800. This money will come from a fund established by the Alien Property Fund and is not appropriated money. Congress passed Public Law 615 last year, which provides for the payment of Korean claims on the same basis as World

War II claims. There was a budget request for $12 million. The committee cut that request $4 million, making it $8 million, because we did not feel that within the time limitations there would be $12 million worth of claims processed.

Another agency for which this committee recommends funds in the bill is the American Battle Monuments Commission. We made a slight reduction in the amount appropriated for construction purposes solely on the basis of the thought that the committee had, that that money could not be spent during the next fiscal year. That agency, as you know, is headed up by General North, who, I think, has done one of the finest jobs of any man in the Government. He started out this program with 14 cemeteries overseas, and the end is in sight for the construction of those 14 cemeteries. His original estimate was $35 million, and he has cut it down $2 million.

That concludes the items contained in the bill before you.

Mr. FENTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, the chairman of our subcommittee, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. ANDREWS], has explained in very thorough detail the items in this appropriations bill, H. R. 6499.

This appropriation bill has to do with general Government matters, principally the Executive Office of the President; emergency fund of the President; American Battle Monuments Commission; Foreign Claims Settlement Commission, and Subversive Control Board.

There was a budget estimate of $27,700,700 for fiscal year 1956 for all the items in this bill. The Committee allowed $21,890,700, or a decrease of $5,810,000. However, this was an increase over the 1955 funds of $7,313,850. This increase of $7,313,850 over the current funds is due to war claims authorized by Public Law 615 of the 83d Congress.

The funds for the Executive Office of the President was cut only $110,000. The budget estimate was $8,780,700 and the committee allowed $8,670,700. The cut was made in two items, $15,000 in the Council of Economic Advisers, and $95,000 in the Office of Defense Mobilization.

We allowed the budget estimate of $1 million for the President's emergency fund. No funds were requested for expenses of management improvement since it is estimated that there will be $549,000 in the fund at the beginning of fiscal year 1956. This is on account of these funds being available until expended from year to year.

I was very much impressed with the testimony of Brig. Gen. Thomas North, Secretary of the Commission on American Battle Monuments.

The committee allowed the full budget estimate for the salaries and expenses in the amount of $920,000, broken down as follows:

First. Departmental, $57,000.

Second. World War I memorials and cemeteries, $241,900.

Third. World War II memorials and cemeteries, $615,100.

Fourth. Mexico City National Cemetery, $6,000.

This item takes care of 8 World War I cemeteries, containing the graves of approximately 31,000 of our men, and 14 World War II cemeteries, containing the graves of 93,100 of our men. It also takes care of 1,563 graves in the Mexico City National Cemetery, of which 700 are from the War of 1847 with Mexico, and veterans and others of their families who have a right to be buried there.

In addition to the care and maintenance of these cemeteries and graves, these funds take care of 18 large memorial structures plus service buildings.

To continue construction of our World War II cemeteries to completion, which is estimated to be at the end of calendar year 1956, there was a budget request for $4,500,000. The committee was informed that at the end of fiscal year 1955 there would be an unobligated balance of $3 million, which would give them a total of $7,500,000 for fiscal 1956.

The committee allowed $3 million, a cut of $1,500,000. The committee thought that this amount plus the unexpended balances would be adequate to continue the construction for fiscal 1956. General North explained to us the various delays that they encounter and as our report says:

> There is no intention on the part of the committee to impede the construction program in any way.

Foreign Claims Settlement Commission: These claims are of two types, namely: World War II claims and Korean war claims.

Payments for war claims previously had been financed from assets of enemy countries in the war claim funds; however, an appropriation is made necessary for the Korean war claims because there are no North Korean assets available.

The budget request was for $12,200,000 and the committee allowed $8 million which was authorized by Public Law 615 of the 83d Congress. In this estimate was the amount allowed for administering the claims, $200,000.

Since there will be a great many claims coming in later on, it was thought by the committee that $8 million would suffice for 1956, which includes $150,000 for administrative expenses.

The World War II claims as heretofore explained, comes out of funds, under Public Law 774 of the 83d Congress, which amended the War Claims Act of 1948, from war claim funds. There was a request in this item for $16,714,800, together with $350,000 for administrative expenses. The committee allowed them the use of $300,000 for administration.

The budget request for the Subversive Activities Control Board was $300,000, which the committee allowed because of the importance of keeping guard against communism.

Mr. Chairman, this is by far the smallest general appropriation bill we will be called upon to consider. There are some very, very important commissions for which we appropriate, and while the committee decreased the budget estimate by $95,000 in the Office of Defense Mobilization, I think as our chairman has said, they can get along with the amount we allowed, although I must admit that particular agency is one of the very, very important agencies of our Government at this time. I think the job they are doing under Dr. Fleming is worthy of recognition. I think they have done a splendid job, as do others of us who are in high unemployment areas. They are trying to do a good job for the country as a whole.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FENTON. I yield.

Mr. GROSS. Under the President's Advisory Committee on Government Organization, it is my understanding an attempt was made to get a super-grade position; is that correct?

Mr. FENTON. I believe they asked for one additional grade.

Mr. GROSS. Is it contained in this bill?

Mr. FENTON. It is not.

Mr. GROSS. I notice that the appropriation for the President's Advisory Committee on Government Organization has increased from some $13,000 when it was originally established until now it is something like $60,000 a year. Is that correct?

Mr. FENTON. That is right. We think if they come up with some really important reorganization plans it will be well worth the money.

Mr. GROSS. It has been in existence 2 or 3 years, as I understand. Has this committee come up with any reorganization plans or organization plans worthy of note?

Mr. FENTON. This committee?

Mr. GROSS. Yes.

Mr. FENTON. The gentleman, of course, is aware of the various reorganization plans that have already gone into effect.

Mr. GROSS. The Hoover Commission plans, but not this committee.

Mr. FENTON. They go over the Hoover Commission plans as presented by that Commission, and, of course, advise the President on those various plans.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California [Mr. PHILLIPS].

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Chairman, I take this time only to commend the committee on the report and the recommendations they are bringing in today. The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. ANDREWS] served for 8 years as a very able member of the Subcommittee on Independent Offices. When that committee grew so large with so many agencies that it seemed necessary to divide it into two subcommittees, he became chairman of the new subcommittee which is presenting this bill to us today; so it is no surprise that the committee brings in a commendable report. That is true also of the other members of the subcommittee. Their backgrounds of experiences have enabled them to bring us this bill. As I say, Mr. Chairman, I took this time only to say I believe they have presented a well-considered and good report.

Mr. FENTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. WILSON].

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I rise for the purpose of paying due respects to the distinguished chairman of this subcommittee, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. ANDREWS]. I sat through the entire hearings on this bill and I appreciate the very thorough interrogation and airing that my colleague from Alabama [Mr. ANDREWS] indulged in so far as this bill is concerned. I think it is a fine bill and deserves the support of every Member of the House.

Mr. FENTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FULTON].

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, I favor the pending appropriation legislation and want to compliment members on both sides of the subcommittee for the thorough job that has been done.

We who have responsibility under the committee system for policy abroad must, of course, first see that adequate appropriations are made to take care of matters that are necessary at home. We who are members of the Foreign Affairs Committee who pass on matters that affect our United States foreign policy, must likewise take part of the burden of seeing that the appropriations and the authorizations are made for those necessary items of United States domestic and local policy. That is the reason that we on the Foreign Affairs Committee should be here supporting appropriation bills of this kind,

Likewise, we members should also support resolutions that are based on a bipartisan foreign policy on the ground that our American policy is the United States policy rather than a Republican or a Democratic policy.

In that vein I would like to comment on the resolution that has been offered by the majority leader, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK] yesterday, in which he urges the United States Congress to speak strongly against Communist imperialism and against other forms of colonialism which constitute a denial of the inalienable rights of man in foreign countries and in subject territories. The age of colonialism is fast receding, and we Americans should restate our strong opposition to colonialism and imperialism in any form.

When we in America realize that we live in this great world of 2,500,000,000 people and are simply 165 million people, we should then be interested to see that our United States policy and our program stand squarely for freedom, equality, and liberty in all countries. That firm stand has been one of the greatest protections this country has had during its history. The people who founded the country have been the ones who stood strongly against colonialism, and we in this Congress should restate this policy by the McCormack concurrent resolution.

If Members have not seen this particular resolution I refer them to page 7291 of the RECORD of yesterday where the resolution had been outlined at the time the majority leader gave a 10-minute address to the House, entitled "The United States and Colonialism." May I ask the gentleman from Massachusetts, What is the number of the resolution if it has been given a number yet?

Mr. MCCORMACK. I am unable to answer that. It was introduced yesterday and I imagine that copies of it are now available in the document room.

Mr. FULTON. I will support that resolution on a bipartisan basis, and hope that the Members of Congress will study this proposal and likewise approve such a firm position of the United States against colonialism and imperialism of all kinds.

Mr. FENTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DEANE].

Mr. DEANE. Mr. Chairman, in support of H. R. 6499, making appropriations for the Executive Office of the President and sundry general Government agencies, including the American Battle Monuments Commission, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, I want to take this time to especially commend the American Battle Monuments Commission, under the chairmanship of that distinguished American, Gen. George C. Marshall, for the splendid job the Commission is doing in maintaining, supervising, and developing our war memorial cemeteries and memorials overseas.

The testimony before the committee indicates that the Commission now has under its supervision 8 World War I cemeteries and 6 World War I memorials overseas, and 15 World War II cemeteries and memorials in foreign lands and 1 which will be in Hawaii.

The American Battle Monuments Commission is performing an everlasting service to our beloved dead. I recall a few years ago visiting the World War II memorial cemetery in Honolulu. It is indeed a tremendous experience to study the row upon row of white crosses, and I would like the RECORD to show that we of the House of Representatives commend General Marshall and the American Battle Monuments Commission for the outstanding service they are rendering in preserving and maintaining the last resting place for thousands upon thousands of American heroes.

As a part of my statement, Mr. Chairman, I wish to include the remarks of a distinguished predecessor of mine from the Eighth Congressional District of North Carolina, the Honorable J. Walter Lambeth, who had the honor to serve on the National Commission from our Government which dedicated the American War Memorial at Bellicourt—Aisne—France on August 9, 1937. Today as we appropriate funds with which to carry on the work of the American Battle Monuments Commission, which has supervision over this great World War I memorial cemetery and memorial in France, I feel it most appropriate that we include at this place in the RECORD the inspiring and soul-stirring address given by Mr. Lambeth at Bellicourt on August 9, 1937:

REMARKS OF HON. J. WALTER LAMBETH AT DEDICATION OF THE AMERICAN WAR MEMORIAL AT BELLICOURT (AISNE) AUGUST 9, 1937

I

We have returned to France to write the postscript to the last chapter of our participation in the World War.

We are nearing the end of a solemn pilgrimage dedicating monuments on the battlefields of France and Belgium, where American soldiers fought side by side with their British and French allies in the greatest drama—yea, tragedy—of human history; beginning on August 1 at Montfaucon, where the largest concentration of American troops in the military history of our Republic went forward to complete victory, and ending this afternoon at Cantigny, where our forces made their first attack and another glorious victory was won by our gallant soldiers.

We come this morning to dedicate the monument here at Bellicourt. While not one of the largest of the memorials, it is nonetheless impressive in the same dignity and simplicity which have characterized these monuments. The architect was Dr. Paul P. Cret, who has been the consulting architect of the Commission. Doctor Cret was born a Frenchman, but has lived for many years in Philadelphia and is now an American citizen, having served with distinction, first with the French Army and later with the First Division of the American Army. How well he has wrought his work in the field of creative genius and how superb has been his talent and the infinite care with which he has prepared and approved the designs, every member of our official party and everyone who has viewed the work, or who will, in the years to come, look upon these monuments, will bear witness. The sculptor was Mr. A. Bottiau.

The central feature of the monument is the coat of arms of the United States (shield and eagle). On the left side is a figure representing Valor: a young man resting after the battle with the trophy of flags, the laurel of victory, conquered arms.

On the right side: A figure represents Remembrance or the pious memory kept of those who gave their lives. A woman is shown in mourning garb, praying in front of a funeral urn shaded by willows.

II

It is fitting, therefore, that my remarks this morning center about the dual theme of the artist: Valor and Remembrance.

Peaceful the scene which greets the eye today where desolation and destruction reigned supreme 19 years ago. On September 29, 1918, these fields were enveloped by autumn mists and lowhanging clouds.

General Hill and General Lhéritier have already spoken to you of the strongly intrenched position of the enemy in this sector. In the St. Quentin canal tunnel, beneath the very spot on which we stand, was located one of the most completely fortified positions of the vaunted Hindenburg line, hitherto considered impregnable by friend and foe alike. This soil is sacred to all Americans, particularly to the citizens of New York, Tennessee, and the Carolinas, for here during the period from September 24 to 30, that line was broken through by the American Second Corps comprising the 27th and 30th Divisions of our Army, supported gallantly by their British and Australian cousins. While it cannot be said that the battle fought here was the decisive engagement of the World War, in the sense of Gettysburg or Waterloo, it is a fact of military record and history that here for the first time the Hindenburg line was smashed, and thereafter the enemy was intermittently retreating.

The 27th and 30th Divisions, in the true sense of the word, never served with the AEF, but trained and served with the British Army through the summer of 1918. Previous to this engagement, they took part in operations near Ypres. In the early part of September they entered the lines north of St. Quentin as a part of the British Fourth Army.

The Hindenburg line followed roughly the St. Quentin Canal and made use of that obstacle as a primary feature in its defense.

The tunnel of this canal, 6,500 yards long, was constructed by Napoleon. The Germans used it as a huge underground shelter and storehouse. Very large reserves of men and munitions were kept in this tunnel and entered the lines by means of many smaller tunnels driven from its sides.

Toward the middle of September the British began to drive in outposts of the Hindenburg line in order to establish a good line of departure for a general attack. They were only partially successful in their efforts.

The II Corps went into the line on September 24 and 25 and was designated to be used as a spearhead to break the Hindenburg line. The 30th Division on the south took over a sector west of Bellicourt; the 27th Division to its left went into the line in an adjoining sector just west of Bony.

The 30th Division undertook a night operation on September 26 in order to drive in the remaining outpost positions. The 118th Infantry made the attack and succeeded in advancing some 300 to 400 yards.

On the 27th Division front the 106th Infantry made preliminary attacks, advancing with extreme difficulty because of the strength of the strong points known as the Knoll, Guillement Farm, and Quennemont Farm. These strong points were on the reverse slope of the ridge and had successfully resisted all previous attacks. The 27th Division continued the attack to September 27 Great difficulty was experienced in advancing.

Both divisions went over the top on the 29th, drove ahead through Bellicourt on the 30th, and in particularly severe fighting overran in a few hours the greater portion of the Hindenburg line. The 27th Division met great resistance, but considerable gains were made. The infantry had to fight largely without the protection of a barrage and had little effective help from the tanks. The troops attacked boldly and incessantly, suffering tremendous casualties. The afternoon of September 29 Australian troops passed through the 27th and 30th and continued the drive.

The divisions were relieved early on September 30, although some of the 27th stayed in the line and continued the attack with the Australians during September 30 and October 1. Losses were tremendously heavy.

Following the battle the 27th and 30th Divisions received many commendations for their heroic conduct. General Pershing, Field Marshal Haig, as well as the commander of the Australian Corps, were warm in their praise of the splendid fighting of the Americans and the results they had achieved.

After this attack the 2d Corps was withdrawn for a short rest, while the British continued the pressure, and on October 5, after the Germans had been pushed back about 3½ miles, the divisions went back into the line, the 30th Division being in the front line and the 27th remaining in reserve.

The 30th Division was in every sense of the word a "shock" division. It had trained under that great soldier, General Pershing, on the Mexican border in 1916. It never disappointed, it always accomplished every task assigned to it and achieved all its objectives. On this spot they carried in a single dash over the entire front what was undoubtedly the strongest part of the Hindenburg line. In this sector the 27th Division on the left with the 30th Division on the right attaeked on the morning of September 29, and were the first to crash through the Hindenburg line.

I can add but very little to the statement made by our Commander in Chief, General Pershing, who, writing of the many heroic divisions of his Army, carefully considered every word and every phrase. General Pershing wrote (vol. II, p. 304): "The 30th Division did especially well. It broke through the Hindenburg line on its entire front and took Bellicourt, and part of Noroy, by noon of the 29th.

"The 27th Division, due to no fault of its own, had been unable to take full advantage of the accompanying barrage, which was laid down over 1,000 yards ahead of the line from which the troops started the attack. Despite the handicap, it took the enemy trenches of the Hindenburg line south of Bony, captured the Knoll, and established its line south from that position to a point just west of Gillemont Farm."

As an example of the many unheralded feats of valor performed on this spot, I will read two citations of men who were awarded our highest military decoration, the Congressional Medal of Honor. Time and space will permit no more:

It was at the Knoll during this fighting that 1st Lt. William B. Turner, 27th Division, performed the heroic deeds for which he was awarded the Congressional Medal of Honor. Under terrific artillery and machinegun fire he led a small group of men in the attack after they became separated in the darkness from their company. Singlehanded he rushed an enemy machinegun that suddenly opened fire on his group, and killed the crew with his pistol. He then pressed forward to another machinegun nest, 25 yards away, and killed one gunner before the remainder of his detachment arrived and put the gun out of action. With the utmost bravery and disregard for 3 wounds he had received, he continued to lead his men over 3 lines of hostile trenches, killing several of the enemy in hand-to-hand combat. After his pistol ammunition had been exhausted, this gallant officer seized the rifle of a dead soldier, bayoneted several members of a hostile machinegun crew, and shot the other. Upon reaching the fourth-line trench, which was his objective, Lieutenant Turner with nine men remaining in his group captured it and resisted a hostile counterattack until he was finally surrounded and killed.

Sgt. Milo Lemert, 30th Division, seeing the left of his company held up, located the enemy machinegun emplacement which had been causing numerous casualties. In spite of heavy fire he rushed it singlehanded, killing the entire crew with grenades. A third machinegun emplacement opened fire upon him from the left and with similar skill and bravery he destroyed this also. Later, in company with another sergeant, he attacked a fourth machinegun nest, being killed as he reached the parapet of the emplacement. His courageous action in destroying in turn four enemy machinegun nests prevented many casualties in his company and materially aided it in achieving its objective.

In recounting the valorous deeds of the 27th and 30th Divisions, it should not be forgotten that these men were at all times during the war separated from the AEF proper. They received their supplies and munitions through the British and operated under British higher command. For this all the more credit is due them. They afforded to our British cousins a shining example of the best type of American soldier. And because of their deeds here, our flag wears a new luster.

III

I come now to discuss the second theme of the monument, remembrance.

In 1920 I had the honor of delivering an address in my home county at Lexington, N. C., upon the occasion of the presentation of certificates of honor by the French Government to the nearest relatives of the men who made the supreme sacrifice in this battle. At that time I said: "Some critics have been so thoughtless as to say that France is not truly appreciative of the deliverance which these men and their allied comrades brought to that fair country. They do not know the heart of France. These diplomas bear witness to the gratitude of our former allies."

I remember that in December 1918 I was on leave in a province of southern France untouched by the horrors of war. My journey brought me to a little village where no American soldier had been before. As I walked along the narrow street, from a doorway a voice speaking perfect English invited me to enter. It was the voice of a woman past middle age. As I sat in her little room she poured forth the gratitude of her heart. She told me how for months they had prayed for the Americans to come and how one day when the allies were fighting with their backs to the wall our men came; but they were only boys, smiling and singing, with flowers spiking the muzzles of their guns. Tears rolled down her cheeks and she shook her head as she told me how the people feared it would be of no avail. And then on that July day in 1918 the blessed news came that the enemy had been halted on the Marne. Her face glowed as she finished the narrative of how they marched on and on, never stopping until the enemy was on his knees crying "kamarade."

My friends, I believe that the blood of English, French, and Americans shed on the soil of France will unite and cement our democracies into a friendship which can never be broken.

Our Government, through the Commission under whose auspices this beautiful memorial of valor and remembrance has been erected, provides perfect physical care and upkeep of the cemetery in nearby Bony; but I am told that the children of this community along with their elders come to that cemetery with each reviving spring to pay a proper tribute of respect on our American Memorial Day. For this we thank you, and I give you now the proxies of their loved ones at home who preferred that they sleep until the glorious resurrection where they fell with their faces to the enemy. In other words, you will give to that hallowed spot the same care and devotion which would be given to them if they had been taken back to the soil of our native land.

"If I should die, think only this of me;
That there's some corner of a foreign field
That is forever England. There shall be
In that rich earth a richer dust concealed;
A dust whom England bore, shaped, made aware,
Gave, once her flowers to love, her ways to roam,
A body of England's breathing English air,
Washed by the rivers, blest by suns of home.

"And think, this heart, all evil washed away,
A pulse in the eternal mind, no less
Gives somewhere back the thoughts by England given;
Her sights and sounds; dreams happy as her day;
And laughter, learnt of friends; and gentleness,
In hearts at peace, under an English heaven."

Paraphrasing this beautiful poem written by the young English poet and soldier, Rupert Brooke, who breathed the fine idealism which this cynical world now needs so much to recapture, I might say that this spot upon the soil of a foreign land will be forever America. And that here the grass will grow a little greener, the grain a trifle more golden, the flowers a bit lovelier, because mingled in the good earth of France is the dust of young American heroes.

"These endured all and gave all that honor and justice might prevail and that the world might enjoy freedom and inherit peace." (Inscription on chapel, American Cemetery—Fére-en-Tardenois.)

IV

Why did the men who fought here together with 2 million of their comrades come across the wide Atlantic to unfurl the battle flag of our Republic upon European soil for the first time? The answer ought to be ob-

vious, but a new generation has arisen and a cynical school of thought, particularly in America, has promoted the idea that we were drawn into the war by special interests; that we sent the flower of our youth into battle to make international credits more secure and to assure the continuance of our foreign munitions trade, which at that time was creating an artificial prosperity in America; that we were beguiled by propaganda which came from overseas and entangled us in other people's quarrels for their benefit; that the black dollar mark was smeared across the red, white, and blue of the Stars and Stripes; that Congress was duped into declaring war; and that our action was influenced altogether by material considerations.

It has become the fashion for sensation mongers and phrase twisters to assert in many forums that we did not enter the World War for the reasons stated by President Wilson in his war message of April 2, 1917. Let me quote a few excerpts from that message:

"There is one choice we cannot make, we are incapable of making: we will not choose the path of submission and suffer the most sacred rights of our Nation and our people to be ignored or violated. The wrongs against which we now array ourselves are no common wrongs; they cut to the very roots of human life.

* * * * *

"We have no selfish ends to serve. We desire no conquest, no dominion. We seek no indemnities for ourselves, no material compensation for the sacrifices we shall freely make. We are but one of the champions of the rights of mankind. We shall be satisfied when those rights have been made as secure as the faith and the freedom of nations can make them.

* * * * *

"But the right is more precious than peace, and we shall fight for the things which we have always carried nearest our hearts—for democracy, for the right of those who submit to authority to have a voice in their own governments, for the rights and liberties of small nations, for a universal dominion of right by such a concert of free peoples as shall bring peace and safety to all nations and make the world itself at last free. To such a task we can dedicate our lives and our fortunes, everything that we are and everything that we have with the pride of those who know that the day has come when America is privileged to spend her blood and her might for the principles that gave her birth and happiness and the peace which she has treasured. God helping her, she can do no other."

This thesis merits the execration certainly of the 4 million who served under the banner of their captain, Woodrow Wilson. I remember well that day, December 14, 1918, when he arrived in Paris, aged beyond his years, carrying the burden of the world upon his shoulders, to begin the terrific and all but impossible task of writing the treaty of peace. Clever, sneering cynics may now smear him, but history will write his name among the stars.

The time has come when this calumny must be refuted upon every possible occasion, and I can think of none more suitable than this. Here in the presence of official representatives of our Government, distinguished members of the Battle Monuments Commission, chiefs of veterans' organizations, including those who were disabled, our friends of France, and above all in the presence of a Gold Star Mother, I am profoundly grateful for this opportunity to help keep the record straight.

Of course, in such a complex situation there were many factors involved, but I assert with all the conviction of my soul that no country ever entered a war with purer or more unselfish motives than America came into the Great War in 1917. If I did not believe this with all my heart, I would be here to apologize and to do penance. We sought no territory, we sought only to protect the rights for which "any man who is fit to live is not afraid to die" (inscription on memorial to Quentin Roosevelt, by Theodore Roosevelt).

Our sympathies had early been drawn to the Allied cause; first by the rape of little Belgium and the disregard of sacred treaty obligations, and later by the ruthless submarine warfare, culminating in the sinking of the *Lusitania*. During those first 3 years, often against a hostile press and bitter political criticism, President Wilson had clung tenaciously to the pathway of peace. During that time we had been subject to conspiracies at home and plots to involve our neighbors Japan and Mexico in war against us.

The policy of the German Government early in 1917 to apply unrestricted submarine warfare to the ships of all nations, to sink vessels without warning, no matter what flag they raised or what they carried, really forced us finally to make the momentous decision. That this was expected by the enemy is completely supported by the memoirs of Count von Bernstorff, German Ambassador to the United States, who said: "Nothing except the abandonment of the U-boat campaign could have prevented war."

When Germany made the fateful decision to apply unrestricted submarine warfare in a final desperate effort to choke supplies to the Allies from overseas, in the belief that she could bring the war quickly to an end before we could hurl our forces into the trenches of Europe, Count von Bernstorff cabled at once from Washington: "War inevitable in view of the proposed action."

Bethmann Hollweg, former German Chancellor, told a Reichstag investigating committee after the war: "I am of the belief that no doubt existed in the minds of the public on the whole, or in the minds of the political parties, that the U-boat campaign would ultimately bring the United States into the war on the side of the Allied Powers."

Of course, there were other considerations, but this was the major factor in the equation. Among the other factors, in addition to those which have been already recounted, were the traditional friendship of America for France, as well as the political philosophies then locked in mortal combat. Today they still contend and the issue hangs tremulously in the balance. Our country has always been a democracy and our natural sympathy lies, in peace and war, with those countries which like ourselves enjoy the blessed birthright of liberty and freedom. Nineteen years after the war ended, we find this conflict raging still throughout the world, and we rejoice in the continued understanding and friendly relations of the three democracies who once fought side by side in France and Belgium.

Let it also be said that those critics who would rewrite the history of that period have never said what would have been the consequence, not only to Europe but to America as well, had we not assisted in bringing the war to an early and conclusive victory for the Allied cause.

We do not come to France to claim that America won the war. Equal credit is due all the Allies. It is a fact that the French and British had waged with grim determination for 3 long years superb defensive warfare, holding back the enemy from Paris and the Channel ports, with occasional thrusts into his lines. They were tired, they were weary, as our own troops would have been under similar circumstances. The American soldiers who fought here, and in other strategic sectors along the western front, brought a freshness of spirit, an enthusiasm and audacity amounting sometimes to recklessness, which served to thrill our Allies and reinvigorate their morale. As Marshall Pétain said at Montfaucon: "A great Nation (the United States of America) resorts to arms, and places on the scale its enormous political influence, and all its military and economic power. The moral effect of this news, is immense. It comes as a mighty comfort in the difficult times that the Allies face." And further: "Invisible in the lines, the American Army, however, is there and its presence asserts itself in the confidence that it inspires to the Allies." And again he says: "The time when it was necessary to defer activities is now past; that when general offensives can be launched has arrived."

Thereafter, that combination of seasoned veterans among the Allied soldiers and the fresh enthusiasm and audacity furnished by the Americans brought the war to a speedy and triumphant end. The enemy was soon brought to his knees, and sought an armistice.

But with what terrible sacrifices of blood and treasure the victory was won.

Casualties of all belligerents in the World War

[Compiled by the U. S. War Department, checked upon Feb. 25, 1924; corrected June 30, 1928]

	Killed and died	Wounded	Prisoners missing	Total casualties
Allies	5,152,115	12,831,004	4,121,090	22,089,709
Central Powers	3,386,200	8,388,448	3,629,829	15,404,477
European total	8,538,315	21,219,452	7,750,919	37,494,186
United States	126,000	234,300	4,500	364,800

While our casualties were relatively light, it is a fact that our troops engaged in some of the fiercest fighting; and considering the time and numbers in the frontline, we suffered severely. For instance, Company L, 120th Infantry, 30th Division, lost 33 killed in action and 102 wounded, or casualties of approximately 50 percent.

Direct cost of the World War, 1914–18

(Figures were taken from Whitaker's Almanac and Encyclopedia Britannica)

Allies	$164,318,000,000
Central Powers	75,611,500,000
European total	239,929,500,000
United States	37,500,000,000
Grand total	277,429,500,000

There are no reliable statistics as to indirect costs which, of course, were colossal.

V

What we are more interested in now is not who won the war but who is going to win the peace: The brave men who fought and died here, gave or risked their lives in order to make the world safe for democracy, and to end war. Did these men die in vain? It is for us, their countrymen, for the statesmen of the world, and—above and beyond all—for the mighty and irresistible force of public opinion to give the answer by subordinating all selfish and nationalistic ambitions to the unquenchable thirst of the peoples of the world for peace. It is for us to take this occasion to rededicate our lives, our fortunes, and all that we hold dear, to the same principles for which these men died; to continue to strive by processes of reason, through peaceful means, to assure

the perpetual blessings of liberty and freedom, not only to our own nations, but by the example of democratic success to inspire others to follow in the same path.

But as we survey the world situation, the picture is dark. On 3 continents war is either now being waged or has been waged during the past 12 months. Nations are arming themselves at an alarming rate and are crushing their citizens beneath an unbearable burden of taxation.

In his seventh annual report made on May 3, 1937, the president of the Bank of International Settlements at Berne, Switzerland, remarked that in the larger, as well as in most of the smaller, countries of Europe expenditures for armaments had been increased in 1936 to a higher level than ever before in peacetime. The report continues: "It has been calculated that for the world as a whole the level of armaments expenditure in 1936 was, on a gold basis, three times as high as in 1913 and more than twice as high as in the years 1924–30. Moreover, the amount of money involved in the orders placed for armaments in 1936 was in many countries in excess of the current armaments expenditure in that year."

In its report of February 15, 1937, on the Rising Tide of Armament, the Foreign Policy Association of New York gave impressive figures illustrative of the trend toward rearmament in the seven great powers: Great Britain, France, Germany, Italy, Japan, Soviet Russia, and the United States, and added that very few of the smaller countries had remained immune from the effects of the armament race precipitated by their powerful neighbors. This report concluded significantly: "The rate of military expenditure is today more than three times as high as in 1913, and is still increasing. How long can this trend continue without disastrous results?"

The German Institute for Business Research estimates at $6 billion the period 1928–34, and at over $15 billion in 1936.

From these various sources we obtain a startling idea of the move toward heavier armaments. Accurate comparative figures are difficult to compile because of the hesitancy of certain powers to reveal their actual operations, fluctuation of currencies, variation of national costs, conducting of military construction as work relief projects and otherwise dissimulating war outlays.

We are impressed, however, to know that the latest available data reveal that all but one of the 7 major powers were spending more than 20 percent and some of them 50 percent of their national budgets on armaments.

To read the daily accounts of tragic events in the Far East and in Spain, to witness in the cinemas the glorification of military pageants and reviews, to contemplate the havoc that would be wrought by the latest destruction machines and methods, make one wonder whether we have profited from past experience except to perfect our weapons.

Finance ministers complain that their budgets cannot be balanced and that their currencies will collapse if the present pressure continues. Rulers as well as propagandists appeal to patriotism when oppressive taxes must be levied to pay for war materials, when butter must be sacrificed for cannon, and when funds sorely needed for alleviating the suffering of the masses must be forced into the molds whence come engines of war.

Think what it would mean to the uplifting of the masses who are underfed, ill-clothed, and poorly housed if these vast sums could be spent upon programs which would provide for them better standards of living.

I remember immediately after the armistice your great Prime Minister, the Tiger of France, Clemenceau, said "c'est beaucoup plus difficile de faire la paix que de faire la guerre." (It is vastly more difficult to make peace than to make war.) How prophetic was his utterance has been demonstrated by events of recent years in various parts of the world.

It is said that an officer of the Southern Army stood at the bier of that great soldier, Stonewall Jackson, saluted stiffly, and said: "General Jackson, when you come into the presence of Alexander, Hannibal, Caesar, Napoleon, and Washington, tell them that we still know how to make war." I wonder what the diplomats, statesmen, politicians, and citizens of the countries for which these heroic dead gave up their lives in the belief that they were fighting a war to end wars—I wonder what we would say if today we stood in the presence of the spirits of the millions who died in that titanic conflict from 1914 to 1918 and were asked this question in a mighty chorus by those millions: "Have you learned how to make peace?"

Recently in company with two of my colleagues I visited the Alps to behold for the first time the icy and rugged peaks of Mont Blanc, that monarch of mountains. For some time the summit was invisible because of the clouds which hung low over it. Standing on a high eminence facing Mont Blanc a tremendous figure of Christ points to its summit. When the clouds lifted and the sun burst forth, we were able to see the peak perfectly outlined against the sunset sky. Thus, we trust that the shadows and threats of war will yet pass away and the precepts of the Prince of Peace will yet rule the nations.

These monuments are erected not only to mark battlefields and cemeteries, but they stand as giant fingers of warning to all who see them, that war is man's supreme folly, and that differences between nations should be resolved by the arbitrament of reason, and not by resort to brute force. Let us take a solemn vow in this sacred place to hold our dead forever in precious memory by clinging resolutely to the path of peace.

In the name of the Government and people of the United States I dedicate this monument to the sublime valor of the brave men living and dead who fought here so gloriously, not only as a souvenir of our eternal remembrance but as a symbol of the unbroken friendship of France and America, and—most of all—as an expression of our common yearning for peace and good will unto all men.

Mr. Chairman, I feel that it is very easy to forget our rows of white crosses stretched across the world, and as we pause for a moment to pay our respects to these deceased heroes of ours, we should likewise think in terms of how we might bring about an answer to wars. I believe as we study this record today and the testimony given, we will see the results of trying to fight for an answer.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Chairman, I yield the remainder of my time to the gentleman from California [Mr. SHELLEY].

Mr. SHELLEY. Mr. Chairman, at the outset I want to say for myself that it has been a pleasure to serve on this committee under the able chairmanship of the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. ANDREWS] and to have served with the other members of the committee on both the majority and the minority sides. We got along very well, and I think the work of the committee speaks for itself.

However, I take this time to call your attention to one subject matter of government which is covered in this appropriation, and that was referred to by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS] a while ago, the President's Advisory Committee on Government Organization.

The Congress authorized the creation of the first so-called Hoover Commission some several years back which was to study the setup of the administrative and executive branches of the Government of the United States and to make recommendations to the President and the Congress for the purpose of reorganizing the executive branch of the Government to achieve greater efficiency and economy in government. The first Hoover Commission was terminated in 1949 and a great many of its recommendations for sound operating procedures in the Government were later adopted by the Congress and the executive branch—recommendations which carried out the mandate of Congress that I have just outlined. Then, in 1953, the 83d Congress created a second Commission and in Public Law 108 of that Congress directed it to carry out the declared policy of the Congress "to promote economy, efficiency, and improved service in the transaction of the public business in the departments, bureaus, agencies, boards, commissions, offices, independent establishments, and instrumentalities of the executive branch of the Government." In this declaration of policy, or in the specific instructions to the Commission which followed, nothing was said directing the Commission to force its way into the policymaking field.

Prior to the establishment of the present Commission and with the advent of the present administration there was created the President's Advisory Committee on Government Organization. In the colloquy between Mr. Nelson Rockefeller and myself at the time he appeared before this subcommittee, there was an explanation given by Mr. Rockefeller as to the difference in the functions of the two bodies; to the effect that after the Hoover Commission makes its field studies and surveys and its task forces compile their data and make their recommendations to the President and to Congress, then the President's Advisory Committee on Government Organization makes a study and recommends to the President how best to carry out those plans.

As the result of that colloquy we went a little further, which prompts me to call to the attention of the House and the American public something which I have noticed in the recent recommendations of the Hoover Commission and which I think must be given some thought by the Members of the Congress of the United States and by the American public generally. I asked Mr. Rockefeller what he meant when he referred to the policy decisions made by the Hoover Commission and the subsequent recommendations made by the President's Advisory Committee on Government Organization and asked where the policy determination was made. Mr. Rockefeller answered that the first Hoover Commission studies set up under the preceding administration, the Truman administration, did not go into basic policy matters but simply made studies for the amalgamation of functions of the departments on an organizational basis.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. FENTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes additional to the gentleman from California [Mr. SHELLEY].

Mr. SHELLEY. I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania very much for this additional time.

The present Hoover Commission goes into basic policies of government. As examples, they are preparing to bring out recommendations which would wipe out the water policies and the power policies established over the years by the Congress of the United States. They would change policies established by the Congress of the United States in operating naval shipyards for the construction and repair and maintenance of combat vessels, policies followed down through the years.

I asked Mr. Rockefeller—this is shown at pages 114 and 115 of the hearings—if this was not going into basic policy which, constitutionally, belonged to the Congress. He said that was not within his province to answer; that these studies were being made by the present Hoover Commission; however, the recommendations were being made and he frankly admitted they went into basic policy. I then asked him what need there would be in the future for congressional committees to make studies of our system of government or how the responsibility of the Congress under the Constitution should be carried out in writing the laws for the administration of the Government. It was interesting to see the amusement on the gentleman's face, but no reply. It was finally admitted in some discussion off the record that a continuation of this policy could perhaps obviate or eliminate any need for congressional committees to do the job which the Constitution places on the shoulders of Congress.

Mr. Chairman, this attempt at usurping the functions of the Congress in establishing basic policy governing the operations of the Federal Government is serious enough in itself. However, the nature of the policy recommendations by the present Commission makes the matter doubly serious. The great prestige attached to the work of this Commission, in large part a carryover of the reputation earned by the original Commission, will cause tremendous pressure for the adoption of their recommendations. Unfortunately, a great many of these recommendations such as I have cited, particularly in the basic policy field, make it quite clear that the second Hoover Commission is trying to live up to its popular name. The policies they recommend certainly smack of the philosophy of government exemplified by Mr. Hoover during his administration as President of the United States and are far more suited to his era than to this enlightened age. Should those policies be adopted b ythe Congress or the executive branch as the case may be we would be in a fair way to returning to the days of Hoover or even farther back to the dismal McKinley administration with their do-nothing-government type of thinking.

It is not surprising that a Commission appointed by a Republican President and the Republican leadership of the 83d Congress and with its task forces heavily dominated by people from the world of big business and conservative Republicanism should come up with this type of recommendation, but it is frightening. While 5 of the members of the original Commission were reappointed, including Mr. Hoover, the composition of the remainder of the 7 members was significantly different—so different that the majority thinking of the Commission is obviously far to the right of the original group. This change in majority philosophy carried over even more noticeably into the makeup of the various task forces, dictated by Mr. Hoover, as typified by the task force on water resources and power, heavily weighted by corporation executives, corporation lawyers, corporation consulting engineers, and other individuals rabidly opposed to Federal power and water development programs. With such a setup we could only expect a terrific contrast between the findings of the present body and the determinations of the original Commission appointed under the Truman administration and in which the voice of the liberals was allowed to be heard. To anyone who takes the time to read and compare the various reports the contrast is quite shocking. I certainly hope that the Members of Congress who are sincerely interested in fulfilling their constitutional obligation to establish national policy will take the time to read and compare with a view to preventing the return to Neanderthal government espoused in the latest reports.

I say to the Congress of the United States that the present distortion by the present administration of the basic theory under which the Hoover Commission was set up is a threat to democratic government in this country. I warn the people of this country and the Members of Congress of this situation as I call it to their attention.

Mr. FENTON. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

The CHAIRMAN. There being no further requests for time, the Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read the bill.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with the recommendation that the bill do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. PRICE, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 6499) making appropriations for the Executive Office of the President and sundry general Government agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, and for other purposes, had directed him to report the bill back to the House with the recommendation that the bill do pass.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill to final passage.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on passage of the bill.

The bill was passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate, by Mr. Carrell, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed a bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 2061. An act to increase the rates of basic compensation of officers and employees in the field service of the Post Office Department.

SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION

Mr. BOLLING, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 259, Rept. No. 704), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 6410) to authorize the construction of a building for a Museum of History and Technology for the Smithsonian Institution, including the preparation of plans and specifications, and all other work incidental thereto. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill, and shall continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Public Works, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

AMENDMENT OF FLOOD CONTROL ACT

On behalf of Mr. O'NEILL, Mr. BOLLING, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 261, Rept. No. 706), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 192) to amend Public Law 526 of the 79th Congress, section 10 of the Flood Control Act, July 24, 1946 (Rappahannock River).

After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill, and shall continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Public Works, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

INTER-AMERICAN HIGHWAY

On behalf of Mr. DELANEY, Mr. BOLLING, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 260, Rept. No. 705), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 5923) to authorize certain sums to be appropriated immediately for the completion of the construction of the Inter-American Highway. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill, and shall continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Public Works, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

INVESTIGATION OF HOUSING

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up the resolution (H. Res. 203) authorizing the Committee on Banking and Currency to conduct studies and investigations, and to make inquiries relating to housing, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Banking and Currency, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, is authorized and directed to conduct full and complete studies and investigations and make inquiries with respect to any matter or matters in the field of housing coming within the jurisdiction of such committee, including, but not limited to, (1) the current rate of construction of residential dwelling units in relation to housing requirements and demands, and the role of Government-assisted mortgage programs with respect thereto, (2) the rate of default and foreclosures of Government-insured mortgages, and the disposition of such properties, (3) the refinancing and extension of Government-insured project mortgages, (4) the status and adequacy of the several Government mortgage insurance funds, (5) the disposition of Government-owned war and related housing, (6) the operation of the slum clearance and urban renewal programs, and (7) the operation and activities of the National Voluntary Mortgage Credit Extension Committee. The committee shall not undertake any investigation of any matter which is under investigation by another committee of the House.

The committee shall report to the House (or to the Clerk of the House if the House is not in session) as soon as practicable during the present Congress the results of its investigation and study, together with such recommendations as it deems advisable.

For the purposes of carrying out this resolution, the committee or any subcommittee thereof is authorized to sit and act during the present Congress at such times and places within the United States, its Territories and possessions, and the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, whether or not the House is in session, has recessed, or has adjourned, to hold such hearings and to require, by subpena or otherwise, the attendance and testimony of such witnesses and the production of such books, records, correspondence, memoranda, papers, and documents as it deems necessary. Subpenas may be issued over the signature of the chairman of the committee or by any member designated by such chairman, and may be served by any person designated by such chairman or member. The chairman of the committee or any member thereof may administer oaths or affirmations to witnesses.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 3, strike out "and directed."

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ALLEN], and now yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, experience has demonstrated that the executive branch of the Government is most decidedly not the fountainhead of all knowledge or wisdom in regard to housing. There is certainly ample precedent for the type of investigation contemplated by House Resolution 203. Congress has played a vital, even a paramount role in the development of our postwar national housing program. The studies conducted in 1944 by the Subcommittee on Housing of the Special Committee on Postwar Planning in the other body under the chairmanship of the late distinguished Senator from Ohio, the Honorable Robert A. Taft, laid out in a broad general manner the housing program which we have pursued since V-J Day. In 1947 the Congress appointed a Special Joint Committee on Housing composed of members of the Banking and Currency Committee of both bodies. This committee was ably headed by the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. GAMBLE]. This committee filed a report in the spring of 1948. In it it recommended the following:

First. An expanded public-housing program;

Second. A new program for slum clearance and urban redevelopment;

Third. An expansion of the Government activities in the field of housing research;

Fourth. Direct loans to farmers to improve our rural housing; and

Fifth. Further liberalization of the private housing insurance program being carried out by the Federal Housing Administration and the Veterans' Administration.

The recommendations were, however, carried into effect by the enactment of the Housing Act of 1949, and of the Housing Act of 1950.

In 1949 the House Committee on Banking and Currency found itself called upon to provide a solution to another housing problem. During World War II because of the acute housing shortage near war plants and defense installations, the Federal Government was required to construct and operate hundreds of thousands of permanent and temporary housing units. These came to be known as Lanham housing because of the fact they were built under authority of a law which had been introduced in the Congress by the Honorable Fritz Lanham, of Texas. It had been the intent of the Congress in enacting the Lanham Act that the Lanham units should be disposed of as soon as possible following the end of hostilities. In the years between 1945 and 1949, however, neither the Housing and Home Finance Agency nor the Public Housing Administration had been able to come up with a disposal plan which was acceptable to all parties concerned—veterans, tenants, property owners, and the local communities where the units were situated. A subcommittee of the House Banking and Currency Committee headed by the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HAYS] was appointed. This subcommittee, working in close cooperation with a subcommittee of the Committee on Government Operations, traveled in several areas of the United States, held hearings and inspected the housing concerned in the autumn of 1949. It was my privilege to represent the Government Operations Committee at several hearings of the Hays committee which were held in California. As always, Mr. HAYS, the gentleman from Arkansas, did a fine job. The recommendations made by the Hays subcommittee in regard to Lanham housing disposition were embodied in the Housing Act of 1950. Because of the outbreak of the Korean conflict in June 1950, it was necessary to suspend the disposal program, but it was reactivated in 1953, and is now being carried out largely as recommended by the Hays subcommittee.

During 1951 and 1952, Members of Congress received an increasing amount of mail complaining about defective housing built under the FHA and VA housing programs. These letters told of leaky roofs, crumbling foundations, improper drainage and a host of other physical defects. The agencies concerned, the Federal Housing Administration and the Veterans' Administration, seemed to be unable to do anything about this scandalous situation. Once again the Committee on Banking and Currency moved to solve the problem. The gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SPENCE], appointed a subcommittee headed by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. RAINS], to survey the problem and make recommendations to the full committee for correcting it. The Rains subcommittee worked on the problem throughout 1952. It held hearings both here and throughout the country. It inspected many GI and FHA homes. It had the benefit of a study of the VA housing program made by the select committee on veterans benefits headed by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. TEAGUE]. The Rains subcommittee

made its recommendations to the full Banking and Currency Committee in January 1953. A number of them were put into effect by administrative action of the VA or FHA. One of the most significant recommendations of the Rains subcommittee—that each home buyer of an FHA or VA house be given a warranty that his house had been built in conformity with the plans and specifications on file with the appropriate agency—was embodied in the Housing Act of 1954.

The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. RAINS], is the author of the resolution now before us. It is our understanding that he will head the subcommittee of the Committee on Banking and Currency which will investigate the matters presented in the resolution. The gentleman from Alabama, with whom I have the privilege of serving on the Committee on Banking and Currency, is one of the great experts in the House in this field. He has demonstrated in many, many ways his ability to conduct an investigation in the best interests of the country and in a manner which will bring credit to the Congress.

I know of no substantial controversy over this resolution. It seems to me very clear that it should be passed by an overwhelming vote.

I reserve the remainder of my time, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ALLEN] is recognized.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I agree with the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BOLLING]. I know of no controversy over this legislation.

I reserve the balance of my time, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. RAINS].

Mr. RAINS. Mr. Speaker, I doubt that I shall use the entire 10 minutes.

I appreciate the remarks of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ALLEN] that there is no substantial controversy over the resolution. As a matter of fact, I think it came out of the Committee on Banking and Currency without any substantial opposition, and likewise out of the Committee on Rules.

For the RECORD, I would like to make a few statements about the housing problem.

In the first place, Mr. Speaker, I would like to call to the attention of the House the part that the housing industry plays in our national economy and in so doing emphasize the importance of the studies and investigations that House Resolution 203 would authorize. We are all generally familiar with the number of new housing starts since the cessation of World War II, but the economic importance of this industry and the Government's stake in its success is often overlooked.

This industry provides work for millions of construction workers—carpenters, electricians, plumbers, masons, metal workers, excavators, architects, engineers, and surveyors. It supports millions of workers in industries directly related to housing such as furniture and fixtures, electrical appliances, heating, cooking, lumber producers and manufacturers, mining and metal producers and fabricators, oil, gas and electricity, textile, paper and paint, stone, clay and glass and transportation. It supports a great proportion of the wholesale and retail outlets ranging from lumber yards to department stores. It directly affects all phases of State, county, and municipal requirements in the fields of education, health, sanitation, transportation, police and fire protection, and its value represents the major source of tax revenues to these governments. And to the American homeowner it still represents the largest and most important investment he makes during his life. In 1954 the estimated dollar value of new residential construction—including cost of land—was $13.4 billion, an all-time high, and the first quarters of 1955 has exceeded the first quarter of 1954 by 34.8 percent. This represents new construction only and does not include the value of existing homes which have been sold.

What part does Government mortgage programs play in the construction of housing units? In 1954 the FHA and GI programs combined were used to assist in financing the construction of 49 percent of all new homes built—approximately 1 out of every 2 houses built. This astonishing percentage emphasizes the importance of these programs, not only to the housing industry but to the whole economy. In other words, the Government's mortgage insurance and guaranty programs in supporting one-half of all new housing construction is the most important single factor in the decisions made by builders and construction and mortgage lenders, which, in turn, directly affects our national economy through the multitude of related industries which produce, transport, store, and distribute the materials and products used in construction.

Since its inception in 1934, the FHA has insured housing loans amounting to $37,221,784,960. This total covers mortgage loans on 4,605,477 housing units, 3,933,494 of which were home mortgages and 671,983 were on units in multiple-unit rental projects. It also includes 18,360,709 property improvement loans amounting to $8,478,039,951.

At the present time approximately $20 billion of FHA mortgage loans are still outstanding, and the FHA is insuring or committing to insure new mortgage loans at the current rate of approximately $4 billion annually.

These statistics should serve to indicate the importance of this industry to our overall economy, the rate which Government mortgage programs play in the field of housing, and the absolute necessity of the Congress to constantly exercise its duty of continually keeping abreast of the operation and impact of these programs.

In view of the importance of the housing industry to the national economy, it appears desirable that a study be made of all phases of the housing industry to determine at what levels housing construction during the immediate future may be supported and continue to be a sustaining contributing factor to the national economy.

The principal cause for alarm by those who believe that the current rate of construction is an unhealthy one is primarily based upon the fact that the number of new net family formations during the period 1955–58 is estimated at approximately 800,000 annually, and that current mortgage credit terms should be contracted to bring starts more in line with economic demand for housing. Replacement of existing dilapidated structures is estimated to require an additional 100,000 to 200,000 new units annually during this period. Nevertheless 1955 housing construction will result in an estimated 1,400,000 new units at the current rate of construction. It is true that mortgage terms, that is the equity of downpayment requirements, rate of interest, and the term of the mortgage loan, have a great effect on the volume of new construction. These are the factors which have been attacked by those who express great apprehension over the volume of current construction. However, mortgage terms are not the only factors nor necessarily the basic factors in determining a healthy economic demand for new housing. Assuming a sufficient supply of mortgage funds to sustain the current level of 1,400,000 units other considerations entering into the overall economic facts of this volume of construction are the average price of newly constructed homes, the average mortgage loan, the relation of total mortgage debt to total consumer expendable income and other factors. For instance, the same volume of mortgage financing will support the varying levels of construction depending upon the prices of newly constructed houses. If the building industry is directing more and more construction in the moderate- and middle- income ranges more units will be constructed during any given period with the same volume of mortgage financing than if such construction is weighted heavier in the higher-price field. If such is the case the usual factors considered as supporting the underlying demand for new construction, that is net new-family formations and replacement of uninhabitable dwellings, can be increased to support a greater volume of construction by reaching into lower-priced homes and thus result in a greater market for housing. Since Government-assisted mortgage financing is the principal factor in financing construction these programs are of tremendous importance to the social and economic stability of the country and a study of the entire housing market at this time should be conducted to assure its economic soundness.

During World War II the Government constructed a great amount of both temporary and permanent housing units needed to assist the war effort. In the early postwar period the House Banking and Currency Committee conducted a study and investigation of the disposition of Government-owned war housing which culminated in the enactment of title VI of the so-called Lanham Act in 1950. Shortly thereafter the Korean war broke out and an administrative moratorium was placed upon the disposition of many of these units to conserve their use during the Korean conflict. There remained as of December 31, 1954, a total of 75,064 permanent dwelling units and

52,276 temporary housing units costing $614 million still in the hands of the Federal Government. It is evident that, if these units are ever to be disposed of, a vigorous effort must be made in that direction as soon as possible. The time has come for a reappraisal of this whole subject in order to redetermine the best and most efficient manner in which these units can be disposed of.

Considerable attention has been drawn lately to the status and adequacy of the FHA mortgage insurance funds. I believe that a possible harmful misconception of the FHA insurance program may result from these expressions and a true understanding of the theory and operation of the FHA mortgage insurance system should be made available to the Congress and the general public in order to properly assess the adequacy of the insurance reserves which are the first line of reliance in meeting FHA insurance obligations. There are several FHA insurance funds. The mutual mortgage insurance fund is the fund supporting the 1 to 4 family units insured under section 203, and the other funds support principally special mortgage programs such as section 207, 213, 220, 221 and title VI. The section 203 insuring program is by far the biggest FHA insuring activity. Fundamentally, the 1 to 4 family FHA mortgage insurance program is founded on these basic concepts.

First. It is a mutual mortgage-insurance system in which the user—home owner—pays a premium calculated on an actuarial basis to pay for the administrative costs of the system and the insurance risk.

Second. The reserves established by the premium income together with investment income thereon should be sufficient to meet the ultimate liabilities of the program and if more than sufficient the user is refunded that part of his premium payments not required for the purpose.

Third. Upon FHA acquisition of a mortgage property through assignment upon default or foreclosure there is not an immediate cash demand upon the FHA. In such event the FHA issues to the insured lender a debenture with a maturity of 20 years guaranteed as to principal and interest by the Federal Government paid out of the insurance fund or by the Federal Government if the fund is not sufficient for that purpose. The term of the debenture is designed to carry over any downward business cycle which we have yet experienced. During the term of the debenture the FHA should have ample opportunity to manage or otherwise dispose of the project without suffering substantial losses or further depreciating an already depreciated mortgage market. Our recent experience with the HOLC tends to support the fundamental soundness of this position. The average life of a FHA insured mortgage was at latest report less than 8 years. The important factors in the FHA exposure are not only the total volume of insurance outstanding but the total volume of real estate value which this insurance supports together with the average maturity of insured mortgages, insurance reserves, and the total amount of insured mortgages which are in a real risk position. It is axiomatic that the risk on a mortgage loan whether insured or conventional is greatest in the early years of its existence. As equity builds up, especially under our system of amortized mortgage payments, the risk of loss even in an adverse market is substantially lessened. I think it is important that the Congress, business and the public have a proper understanding of the FHA mortgage system and this can best be accomplished by a studious reappraisal of its operation and functions at this time.

A study of the housing market including all phases such as rate of construction, total mortgage financing, rate of default and foreclosures, adequacy of FHA insurance reserves, and the management and disposition of foreclosed properties can be most effective at this time because it can be accomplished during a healthy economic period with consequent objectiveness which would not be possible in a period of falling markets.

WHERRY ACT HOUSING

The Comptroller General of the United States filed a report in April 1955 he made on four Wherry Act housing projects located in Virginia. The report was made upon the request of Senator BYRD, the Chairman of the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures in a letter to the Comptroller dated January 26, 1955. Basically the report was requested to ascertain the right of local communities to tax Wherry projects stemming from the fact that the four projects studied had an allowance in their rent schedule—paid taxes under protest, received refunds in some cases based on court decisions holding property nonassessable.

The report shows that the FHA approved an allowance for taxes in the rent schedule, that the sponsors may either escape payment of taxes or obtain refunds for those paid. In one case the sponsor has refused to apply the refund to either repayment of principal, reserves return to tenants, or to reduce rentals. In one case a rental increase was obtained based upon cost of construction exceeding contemplated cost—which is contrary to FHA regulations.

The report states that title to the land of all four projects is held by Federal Government, and title to the improvements is either held by the sponsor, or leased to the sponsor if vested in the Government. The land is leased to the sponsor on a long term leasehold. The legality of local taxation of a sponsor's possessory interest is now before the United States Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit in an appeal from the decision in *Sheridanville, Ind.* v. *Borough of Wrightstown* (125 F. Supp. 743).

With respect to the tax question the Comptroller feels that in any case, taxes should only be assessed upon the basis of municipal services rendered in view of the fact that the installations provide many of the normal municipal services and others, such as utilities are contracted for with private companies. He further states the only satisfactory solution to the tax question is legislation.

WHERRY DATA

This housing is insured under FHA title VIII upon the basis of certification of the military department concerned, or the Atomic Energy Commission, based upon need for housing. The projects are constructed and operated as private rental housing. Rentals are controlled by FHA after consultation with military officials.

As of November 30, 1954, FHA had insured 255 mortgages amounting to $632,978,066 on 78,680 housing units. In addition, there were outstanding commitments for $37,498,600 on 13 projects comprising 4,658 housing units.

QUESTIONS RAISED BY REPORT

First. Complete review of the tax status of these projects. Number of States who either are, or have attempted, taxing the sponsor-mortgagor's possessory interest in the land and improvements whether title to the underlying land is vested in the United States. A legislative solution to this problem which will be equitable to all concerned.

Second. Steps can be taken to revise rent schedules where tax allowance is included, but no taxes are paid, or taxes have been paid and refunded. What disposition can be made of tax refunds.

Third. Future participation in Government insured mortgages programs of mortgagors who have received rental income which included tax allowance, and either has not paid taxes or has been refunded taxes paid, and has retained such income for its own benefit.

Fourth. The manner in which all FHA insured project mortgage rental schedules are determined, and manner, right to, and basis of revision.

REFINANCING SECTION 608 MORTGAGES

In view of the windfalls connected with the financing of many 608 projects and the tax treatment of the distribution of such windfalls as capital gains rather than ordinary income decided in the Gross Martin case, Congress should review the provisions of law applying to the refinancing of 608 mortgages. A few years ago prior to the windfall disclosures, a statutory provision was enacted which would permit the refinancing of 608 mortgages on a term basis extending up to 12 years beyond the unexpired term of the mortgage. The provisions generally applicable to refinancing insured mortgages limit the term to the then unexpired term of the mortgage.

The refinancing provision applicable to 608 mortgages appears in section 223 (a) (6). The reason for the need of extending the term in the case of 608 mortgages was based upon the fact that in the case of many of these mortgages a point would be reached where the rental income from the project after taxes would not be sufficient to meet the amortization payments because the depreciation allowance for tax purposes would decrease proportionately with the life of the mortgage resulting in lower net income after taxes while amortization payments remained constant. This situation could result in such mortgages going

into default—thus the reason for the refinancing provision.

In connection with depreciation generally, it would be feasible for the Congress to ascertain what effect the existing depreciation allowances have on the financing of the FHA project mortgages and the manner in which mortgage-loan amortization is computed.

TRANSFER OF GOVERNMENT HOUSING TO COLLEGES

In recent years several bills have been referred to the committee authorizing the transfer to colleges of Government-owned permanent housing for students of the college concerned. In view of the special circumstances connected with such housing such as the inadvisability of disposition to the general public where the premises are adjacent to college property, the limited funds available to many colleges for investing in property which puts them at a competitive disadvantage with other bidders for the property, the continued need for student housing accommodations especially for veterans and their families, a review of all projects being used for such purposes should be undertaken to enable the Congress to establish a policy applicable to the disposition of such housing.

Mr. Speaker, this resolution should be adopted.

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. McCORMACK). The question is on the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The resolution was agreed to; and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CONSERVATION, DEVELOPMENT AND UTILIZATION OF THE WATER RESOURCES OF ALASKA

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 251 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 3990) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to investigate and report to the Congress on projects for the conservation, development, and utilization of the water resources of Alaska. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill, and shall continue not to exceed one hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, the bill shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ALLEN], and at this time I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 251 makes in order the consideration of H. R. 3990, a bill, which, as I understand it, is designed to provide an authorization for a matter which previously has been taken care of in appropriation bills.

Apparently it became the desire of those concerned to accomplish this in the more usual fashion.

H. R. 3990 would authorize that there be appropriated not more than $250,000 in any 1 fiscal year for the purpose of making investigations of projects for the conservation, development, and utilization of water resources of Alaska, and to report thereon with appropriate recommendations from time to time to the President and to the Congress.

There was some opposition to this proposed legislation before the Committee on Rules.

However, this rule provides for 1 hour of general debate and permits amendments. Therefore, I urge the adoption of the rule.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, the able gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BOLLING] has explained the resolution and the provisions of the bill. I know of no one on this side of the aisle in opposition to it.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, there being no further requests for time, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 3990) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to investigate and report to the Congress on projects for the conservation, development, and utilization of the water resources of Alaska.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 3990, with Mr. HOLIFIELD in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the gentleman from California [Mr. ENGLE] is recognized for 30 minutes and the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. MILLER] for 30 minutes.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ENGLE. I yield.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. May I inquire whether the gentleman from California told the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. MILLER] that this bill was coming up at this time?

Mr. ENGLE. Yes. We sent notice to the committee about 20 minutes ago when I found out the bill would be on the floor, asking that the gentleman from Nebraska be notified, and he will be here in a moment.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. He is not opposed to this bill? He favors it, does he not?

Mr. ENGLE. Yes. He voted for it in the committee.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. I see no reason for not continuing with the consideration of the bill. I called and asked him to come over. So I suggest the gentleman go ahead.

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I propose to address myself to this bill for a few minutes. In that time I am sure that the ranking minority member, who has been notified that this bill is now on the floor, will be here.

First I should like to speak of the legislative history of this bill. Secondly, I will discuss the facts upon which the bill is based. Third, I shall speak on the provisions of the bill itself.

First with reference to the legislative history of this bill.

This bill came to the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs by an executive communication sent to the Speaker, the Honorable SAM RAYBURN, under date of February 9, 1955, and signed by Mr. Orme Lewis, Assistant Secretary of the Interior, in which he requested the introduction of this bill and provided a copy of the proposed bill with the request sent to the Speaker. This is commonly known as an executive request for legislation.

This measure was introduced by the gentleman from Alaska [Mr. BARTLETT]. It has been the practice, I know, with some committees of this House for the chairman of the committee to introduce bills which come to the committee as a result of executive communications. As far as I am concerned, however, where the bill relates exclusively and specially to the area represented by a sitting Member, I believe it is the prerogative of that Member, whether he sits on my side of the aisle or the other, to introduce such legislation.

As a consequence of that, from time to time this House will see bills introduced by members of our committee or Members of the House based upon executive communications.

Where the executive communication involves a fundamental question of policy and does not relate exclusively or particularly to the district of a sitting Member, then I regard it as a prerogative of the chairman of the committee to introduce that legislation.

I make this explanation so that no special significance will be attached to the fact that this bill, although based upon an executive communication, was introduced by the gentleman from Alaska [Mr. BARTLETT]. I am in favor of this bill.

With reference to the executive communication itself, Mr. Lewis in his letter points out that the Congress has for a number of years provided funds for the

conduct of "engineering and economic investigations, as a basis for legislation, and for reports thereon to Congress, relating to projects for the development and utilization of the water resources of Alaska."

As I previously stated, Mr. Chairman, this bill is a bill to authorize the Secretary to investigate and to report to the Congress on projects for the conservation, development, and utilization of the water resources of Alaska. What I am emphasizing here is that over a period of years this program has been going forward but on the basis of appropriations made by the Appropriations Committee. These funds have ranged in annual amounts from $100,000 to $250,000 and have been in addition to those made available, through appropriations to the Geological Survey, for collection of basic water data. The program which has been conducted under these annual appropriations has proved to be of such merit that it should be placed on a permanent basis.

In carrying out the directive of the appropriation acts, this Department has compiled a wealth of information on potential water-resource developments in Alaska. Much of this information, even though of a reconnaissance nature, was made available in the Reconnaissance Report on the Potential Development of Water Resources in Alaska, which was printed as House Document 197, 82d Congress. This report fully supports the need for permanent legislation such as is now proposed to assist this Department in aiding in the development of Alaska.

The data obtained from these investigations also served as the basis for a report to the Congress on the Eklutna power project which has recently gone into partial operation. This project will serve a very urgent need for power in the Anchorage area as is evidenced by the fact that the entire output of this plant has already been allotted. Also, in various stages of completion are reports on, among others, the Swan Lake project near Ketchikan, the Blue Lake project near Sitka, and Dorothy Lake project.

While one of the most urgent needs in Alaska is, as the priority given the preparation of these reports indicates, development of its hydroelectric power resources to assist in the industrial development of the Territory, our general reconnaissance report mentioned above makes it clear that this is by no means exclusive of those other aspects of water-development work—irrigation, flood control, and domestic water supply—which are familiar in the western part of the United States and are commonly included in multiple-purpose projects.

Mr. Chairman, this is a summary of the statements made by Mr. Orme Lewis in his request accompanying the draft of this bill, as submitted to the Speaker and transmitted to our committee. The Bureau of the Budget cleared this executive communication before it came up. So, Mr. Chairman, the measure before you today is an administration measure having the support of the Department of the Interior and the clearance of the Bureau of the Budget, and which was pursuant to the executive communication introduced by the delegate from Alaska [Mr. BARTLETT].

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ENGLE. I am very glad to yield to my friend, the gentleman from Iowa, a former member of our committee.

Mr. GROSS. This then is permanent legislation; is that correct?

Mr. ENGLE. This is permanent legislation. It is a permanent authorization to proceed to make these investigations provided that the Committee on Appropriations, in its wisdom, sees fit to allow the necessary funds. It does not make it mandatory. It does not require anybody to do these investigations. It authorizes investigations which would then be the basis for the Committee on Appropriations to appropriate the money and, I repeat what I said previously, and that is for the last 7 years the Committee on Appropriations has been making these appropriations and this is a continuation then in the nature of permanent legislation authorizing those appropriations. Each one of the preceding appropriations, as I am sure the gentleman knows, would have been subject to a point of order, if points had not been waived by a special rule because there is no authorizing legislation at the present time.

Mr. GROSS. So this has been going on for some 7 years or more; is that correct?

Mr. ENGLE. Yes; I believe it is 7 years that appropriations have been made annually, as Mr. Lewis states in his report, of $100,000 to $250,000 annually to make these studies and surveys.

Mr. GROSS. The letter from the Department says a wealth of information has already been accumulated with respect to the water resources in Alaska. How much more can be added to that? How much longer must this go on?

Mr. ENGLE. The Territory of Alaska is almost as big as one-fifth of the United States. It is bigger than the State of Texas, which my friends from Texas hate to admit, I know. So it can go on for a long time. What Mr. Lewis says is that the money which has been spent will not be effectively used unless these studies are continued and carried to their final conclusion, and he mentions a number of projects which are currently under study.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ENGLE. I yield.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Did I understand the gentleman to say that this was an administration measure?

Mr. ENGLE. It is an administration measure in the sense that it is here on the basis of a communication and request from the executive branch.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. ENGLE. I am emphasizing that for the reason that some criticism of this measure has come from the other side of the aisle. Now, Mr. Chairman, I would like to proceed for just a moment to say something further about this legislation.

We recently had a bill before this House to grant statehood to Alaska, along with Hawaii. One of the major arguments made against that legislation was that Alaska is insufficiently developed economically to warrant statehood at this time. Would it not be strange if we said to the people of Alaska, "You are not sufficiently advanced and matured economically for admission to statehood, but we will deprive you of the service generally afforded throughout the 48 States of this Union. We will deprive you of what every State of this Union has, all 17 Western States under the reclamation law, and thereby deprive you of the opportunity for the industrial development and power development and water development so necessary for you to acquire economic maturity necessary to become a State."

On the one hand, to refuse statehood because of the lack of economic development, and on the other hand to refuse to give to this Territory a position of parity on this type of investigation with that which is now received by all 17 of the Western States, it must be remembered that 98 percent of the area of Alaska is in Federal ownership—98 percent of it. Therefore, this little handful of money which is authorized under this bill for investigation of water development in Alaska, 98 percent conceivably could be used for the investigation of water resources on property belonging to the United States Government itself, and the remaining 2 percent of these operations on Alaska, geographically, which are in territorial status; that is, which belong to, and taxable by, the Territory of Alaska. Granted that most of the people live in that 2-percent area; granted also that large portions of the 98 percent might never be susceptible of any great amount of development; nevertheless, this is a bill which we should pass in fairness to the people of Alaska, in fairness to ourselves in carrying out these investigations that have already gone forward as far as they have.

I now yield to the gentleman from Idaho.

Mr. BUDGE. I was going to suggest to the able chairman of the committee that today is probably not the best day to consider this legislation. Members of the committee were led to believe that the legislation would not be before us until later in the week. I suggest to the chairman that he move that the Committee rise, and that consideration be continued until a later time.

Mr. ENGLE. The gentleman is in no different position than I am. I had the idea that this would come along later, but the leadership moved the matter ahead. Legislation which preceded it on the calendar was moved forward, and so here we are. I believe that we can dispose of this legislation just as well today as tomorrow. I notice the gentleman is here; and also the gentleman from Pennsylvania, Mr. SAYLOR, who also had some criticism of the bill.

Mr. BUDGE. I would reply to the gentleman, if he would yield, that all of us on this side are somewhat tardy in our arrival because we had not understood that the bill would be on the floor today. I would ask the gentleman if he would object to a motion that the Committee rise at this time and proceed

with the consideration of the matter tomorrow.

Mr. ENGLE. I would not want to make a decision like that without talking to the leadership. In fact, we are trying to get along with everybody.

Can the gentleman say what he would be able to say tomorrow what he cannot say today? Is there any intelligent reason which would make it better to consider the bill tomorrow than today?

Mr. BUDGE. I would reply to the gentleman, if he yields to me for that purpose, simply by saying that a number of Members who are interested in this legislation who are not present, and I have no means of knowing whether they could be present if a call of the House were ordered. Since the impression was definitely given that the legislation would come up later in the week and the schedule as given us for the week certainly does not seem to be pressing, I think it would be proper for the gentleman to move that the Committee do now rise.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 3 additional minutes that I may answer the gentleman.

The whip notice I received listed this bill and several others for Wednesday, Thursday, and Friday. The fastest way for the gentleman to find out whether they could be here this afternoon would be to make a point of no quorum. I am not suggesting that. Perhaps Members are not here because they may not be interested. But I cannot think of any reason why the bill cannot be proceeded with today. As soon as I understood the bill would be called up I immediately called the committee and notified the gentleman from Nebraska and other Members.

Mr. SISK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ENGLE. I yield.

Mr. SISK. I would just like to say for the benefit of the gentleman from Idaho that I only knew about 20 minutes ago that this bill was coming up, and certainly this was not something that just one side knew about. I knew it was on the calendar for this week, but I think there was no particular favoritism played with reference to one side or the other knowing about the bill coming up.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ENGLE. I yield to the gentleman from Alaska.

Mr. BARTLETT. And I would like to say I did not know about it either. I was preparing to go into another subcommittee at 2 o'clock; as a matter of fact, by the time I got here the rule had been adopted.

Mr. ENGLE. May I suggest in closing that I know of no reason that would be good tomorrow that would not be good today.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ENGLE. I yield.

Mr. SAYLOR. I do not think anybody ever expressed the fact that one side or the other knew about this. I think it came as much a surprise to Members on this side as on the other, and I am very frank to tell the chairman of the committee that as soon as he gets through making his speech I am going to move that the Committee rise.

Mr. ENGLE. That, of course, is the gentleman's privilege.

Mr. Chairman, as I said, this bill is here because the Interior Department with clearance by the Bureau of the Budget sent a request with a proposed bill to the Speaker. It was by him referred to our committee for study and introduction. Pursuant to that request it was introduced by the gentleman from Alaska [Mr. BARTLETT] and, after study, voted out by our committee, and is before you now.

It is based upon the proposition that for 7 years these investigations have been going forward on a year-to-year basis with appropriations annually by the Appropriations Committee ranging from $100,000 to $250,000 a year. This bill would be a permanent authorization. If the Appropriations Committee sees fit in the future to appropriate further funds to continue these investigations, it may. It does not require them to be made; it requires the building of no project, but it is permanent authorization on the books so the Appropriations Committee can act legally in making these appropriations.

PERTINENT POINTS ON H. R. 3990

First. This bill would authorize the Secretary of the Interior to investigate projects for the conservation, development, and utilization of water resources of Alaska and make appropriate recommendations and reports to the President and to the Congress.

Second. The bill does not authorize the construction of any project. Any Federal construction would have to be specifically authorized by the Congress.

Third. The information which would be made available under this bill is needed by the Secretary of the Interior to assist him in carrying out his responsibilities in the administration of the Territory.

Fourth. This legislation has no relation to the Federal reclamation program and does not put Alaska under the Federal reclamation program. In the past the Commissioner of Reclamation has been designated to carry on these studies and investigations. Because of the experience of the Bureau of Reclamation in this field and the qualifications of the Bureau personnel to accomplish this work, this responsibility assigned to the Commissioner of Reclamation is completely apart from his responsibility for administering the Federal reclamation program.

Fifth. This legislation does not provide that the investigations must be accomplished by the Bureau of Reclamation. The Secretary could designate the Office of Territories or set up a separate office.

Sixth. The studies are needed regardless of how later construction was accomplished. If the studies show favorable power of development, private industry would perhaps be interested in development.

Seventh. Whether development is by private enterprise or by the Federal Government, there could be no bigger boom to the economy of Alaska than the initiation of development of that Territory's power resources.

Eighth. Emphasis has been placed on the power possibilities of Alaska because it appears that power development is one of the important means of accelerating development of Alaska. There are also important possibilities of development of irrigation, drainage, and other water uses.

Ninth. Alaska contains unused resources such as undeveloped mineral deposits, fertile lands, forests, and potentialities for developed low-cost power, which are becoming scarce in the United States.

Tenth. The continuation of an affected rate of investigation will encourage industrial development, aid in the use of other Alaskan resources, and assist in permanent settlement of the Territory.

Eleventh. There is a great need for some additional assistance and encouragement for development in the Territory of Alaska.

PAST OPERATIONS

First. This bill would not establish a new activity in Alaska but would continue on a permanent basis the investigations and studies which have been carried on by the Secretary during the last 7 years on a year-to-year basis. The authority for these investigations has been the Interior Department annual appropriation acts.

Second. In the past, the Commissioner of Reclamation has been designated to carry on these studies and investigations and the annual appropriations have ranged from $100,000 to $250,000.

Third. As a result of the past 7 years of work, the Department has compiled a wealth of information on potential resources in the Territory. One extremely valuable document is entitled "Reconnaissance Report on the Potential Development of the Water Resources in Alaska" and has been printed as House Document No. 197, 82d Congress. This report points out the need for development of the water resources to assist the Secretary in carrying out his responsibility in administering the Territory. The Department has also completed a reconnaissance report on the Susitna River Basin which inventories the potentialities in this basin. Specific project reports, which are in various stages of completion, include the Swan Lake project, Blue Lake project, Dorothy Lake project, Laying project, Wickersham project, and the Yukon-Taiya project. The Yukon-Taiya project is a very attractive power development which has international significance as the storage sites are located in British Columbia. It is considered of utmost importance that the studies of this project be completed in order that the interests of the United States be properly reported.

Fourth. Although the investigations and studies would relate primarily to power development, there are some irrigation possibilities in Alaska and it is expected that irrigation will be needed as the economy of the Territory expands. One of the projects which is under study by the Department is primarily

for irrigation. It is the Matanuska Valley project for the irrigation of some 13,000 acres.

POTENTIAL WATER RESOURCE DEVELOPMENT

First. The inventory of Alaska's water resources to date indicates that 50 million kilowatt-hours of firm electric energy could be produced annually from the hydroelectric power sites on major streams only. Sixty- to seventy-thousand acres can be economically irrigated as the needs, due to expanding population, require additional agricultural production. The studies to date have, for the most part, been of a reconnaissance nature. What is needed now is more detailed investigation of specific projects. It is important that the investigations be continued at an affected rate in order to encourage industrial development, accelerate use, encourage industrial development, aid in the development of other natural resources and contribute toward permanent settlement.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SAYLOR].

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. SAYLOR) there were—ayes 11, noes 29.

So the motion was rejected.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count. [After counting.] Eighty-three Members are present, not a quorum. The Clerk will call the roll.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 77]

Baker	Gubser	Poage
Barden	Halleck	Powell
Betts	Heselton	Preston
Bolton, Oliver P.	Hoffman, Mich.	Prouty
Byrd	Horan	Radwan
Canfield	Hyde	Reed, Ill.
Cellar	Jackson	Reed, N. Y.
Chatham	James	Richards
Chelf	Jenkins	Riehlman
Chiperfield	Kearney	Rogers, Colo.
Clark	Kelly, N. Y.	Sadlak
Colmer	Kilburn	Sheehan
Davis, Tenn.	King, Pa.	Sheppard
Dawson, Ill.	Knutson	Siler
Delaney	McCarthy	Simpson, Pa.
Dingell	McCulloch	Spence
Dolliver	McMillan	Taylor
Donohue	Mack, Wash.	Thompson, Mich.
Donovan	Marshall	Williams, N. Y.
Dorn, N. Y.	Miller, N. Y.	Wilson, Ind.
Eberharter	Morrison	Withrow
Gamble	Mumma	Wolcott
Gathings	Perkins	Zablocki
Green, Pa.	Philbin	
	Pillion	

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. HOLIFIELD, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that the Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 3990) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to investigate and report to the Congress on projects for the conservation, development, and utilization of the water resources of Alaska, and finding itself without a quorum, he directed the roll to be called when 362 Members responded to their names, disclosing a quorum to be present, and he handed in the names of the absentees to be spread upon the Journal.

The Committee resumed its sitting.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. MILLER].

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, before the quorum call had been made, the chairman of the full committee, the gentleman from California [Mr. ENGLE] had made a very fine explanation of this measure. I am sorry a larger group was not present to hear the gentleman from California.

The bill before you is one to provide for permanent legislation to study the utilization of water resources in Alaska. We have been doing it for 7 years. It is nothing new. It has been carried on without authorization and law. The bill is here because on February 9, 1955, Mr. Lewis, Assistant Secretary of the Interior, sent a letter to Mr. RAYBURN, the Speaker of the House, asking that the legislation be referred to the proper committee and be given consideration by that committee.

It is an administration measure. It is nothing new. For 7 years we have been appropriating from $100,000 to $250,000 each year to study the water resources of the great Territory of Alaska. You who are interested in water and power should know they have sites in Alaska that dwarf Hells Canyon, Echo Park, TVA, Bonneville, and all of them put together. There is some feeling among our committee members that perhaps the Department of the Interior some day wants to build a TVA in Alaska. I do not think that is true. I think it is necessary that we do have research and investigation of our great water resources. Alaska is a great virgin Territory where some day I envision that industry may well be developed handling pulp for paper and minerals and other things that may come out of the Territory. This is nothing more than making the legislation permanent and authorizing by law the very things that have been done for 7 years.

There are some who think it will mean the establishment of another division, but the Secretary in his report states that he will use the individuals who have been up there, completing the Eklutna project. I have been a little suspicious at times not only of the Department of the Interior, but the Department of Agriculture and all departments of the Government trying to get a little bigger all the time, a little more authority, a little more power. I do not think they would do that in this case because they are carrying on the same program now and have been doing it without benefit of permanent legislation.

I think we need to study the basic water data not only in Alaska but also throughout the United States. This bill proposes to keep the work going in Alaska.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. KEATING. Did I understand the gentleman correctly that this has been carried on for approximately seven years?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. About seven years. From $100,000 to $250,000 has been spent out of the general investigative funds of the Department of the Interior; yes, this work has been carried on for 7 years.

Mr. KEATING. And that we are now authorizing and appropriating to the Department of the Interior funds for this purpose as general funds.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. As general funds.

Mr. KEATING. What is the reason for the change in procedure? Why is this present bill necesary?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. It could go on, but the department in its executive communication to the Speaker suggested that it ought to be permanent legislation.

There are some who contend that the Army engineers are doing the same work, likewise the Geological Survey; but the big job here, certainly, I think, is in the Department of the Interior dealing with the water resources. The pending legislation would make it possible to carry on that work without coming to Congress and the Appropriations Committee each year and getting authorization to carry it on.

Mr. KEATING. This bill authorizes not in excess of $250,000 a year to be spent for this purpose.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. That is right; and unexpended balances are left in the Treasury.

Mr. KEATING. Would it not be more likely to be concluded in the foreseeable future if we granted this authorization on a year-to-year basis rather than enacting this measure making it permanent?

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. ENGLE. The answer to that question is that such authorizing legislation is subject to a point of order unless points of order are waived by special rule. During the past 7 years this money has been appropriated in each instance through legislation on an appropriation bill, which was subject to a point of order had one been made or had points of order not been waived. Such would presumably be the case in the future unless this bill is passed. That is why the Bureau of the Budget suggests that the authorization be made permanent.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Let me say in conclusion that in my humble opinion the statement in the executive communication to the effect that it will not add new employees to the Department of the Interior is correct. I think in the light of the communication sent by the executive department to Speaker RAYBURN, that making this authorization permanent is in order. Congress granting it, likewise has the power to take it back at any time.

Mr. FENTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I yield.

Mr. FENTON. Is it not a fact that the Geological Survey, which is an agency of the Department of the Interior, is charged with all these various functions?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. No; Geological Survey is interested mostly in the development of mineral surveys. They are doing some work on water, but that is only a very small part of what is necessary to get the water survey that is needed.

The Corps of Engineers are also doing some survey work in Alaska just as they are in every State; also the Department of Agriculture. I do not think the Department of Agriculture is in Alaska yet, but it may be that some day they will be there.

Mr. FENTON. It is my impression that the Geological Survey is charged with this very same duty.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I yield.

Mr. FULTON. When this is a general blanket authority might this not be a precedent for other departments and agencies? For example, why not make the same blanket authorization for the Department of Engineers so they can make all the studies they want without coming to Congress?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. When authorized in appropriation bills from year to year the language is always subject to a point of order unless points of order are waived. This makes it permanent legislation so it will not be subject to a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, I yield 8 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SAYLOR].

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Chairman, I would like to tell the members of this committee something about what has happened in Alaska within the past 7 years. If you will read the letter from Orme Lewis, Assistant Secretary of the Interior, stating why this legislation should be passed, you will find it contains a statement that part of their force is already near Eklutna, Alaska, working on that project. I think the members of the committee who are asked to pass on this permanent legislation should know what we have been heading into and what they are pointing with pride as the basis for asking the Congress to appropriate each year a quarter of a million dollars.

The Bureau of Reclamation came before the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs of the House a few years ago with a proposition that they wanted to build a power project after they had made a complete survey with some of the funds you already appropriated near Eklutna, Alaska. They said that they could build this project for $14 million. The members of the committee were rather skeptical, having had a great many dealings with the Bureau of Reclamation, and they asked the Bureau to go back and check their figures. They did and came back and said they had made a slight error, slight only as far as the Bureau of Reclamation is concerned, because a 50 percent error is nothing to them. Six hundred percent is nearer their average. They said that now they could build it for $21 million. Our committee, after having asked them very carefully whether or not they could build that project, authorized it and put in the bill a provision that no more than $21,400,000 could be expended.

The very first contract that the Bureau of Reclamation let for half of the project was in excess of that amount. The only reason somebody was not sent to jail was because the Attorney General said he could not find any law to authorize putting anybody in jail because they let a contract for more money than the Congress authorized.

I can also tell the members of the committee that before the Bureau of Reclamation was through with that project, it did not cost $14 million, it did not cost $21 million; it cost $34 million, together with this startling fact: The Bureau did not own the water that they were going to use to generate the power.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SAYLOR. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. ASPINALL. Is it not true that the final cost of the project was $29 million rather than the $34 million that the gentleman is using?

Mr. SAYLOR. Thirty-four million dollars was the amount that was in the final bill. The final cost that they came out with was the $31 million.

Mr. ASPINALL. It is to the credit of the Bureau of Reclamation and the Department of the Interior that they spent only $29 million.

Mr. SAYLOR. Here is how they got out of that. We did not own the water that they were going to use to generate power; so they had to go up there and enter into a contract and give the city of Anchorage who owned all the water rights a reduced rate for 40 years on the power that they are getting so that they would be able to get out with less than they originally indicated.

Mr. DAWSON of Utah. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SAYLOR. I yield to the gentleman from Utah.

Mr. DAWSON of Utah. Is the gentleman against this bill now before us? It seems to me the reasons he has given would be all the more logical for passing this bill.

Mr. SAYLOR. The Army engineers are now up there doing this work, the Interior Department already has the Geological Survey up there doing this work. This is no more than a matter of duplication.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SAYLOR. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. FULTON. I likewise am against this bill on the basis it is a blanket authorization. I would like to ask the gentleman a question. This gives the authorization ahead of time, then the reports only come to the Congress and other Federal agencies after the investigation is made by the Department of the Interior?

Mr. SAYLOR. That is correct.

Mr. FULTON. They can investigate anything they want to?

Mr. SAYLOR. They can investigate anything they want to if you pass this bill. This is a blanket authority given to the Department of the Interior that no other department has ever had.

Mr. FULTON. This would be a bad precedent for other Government departments if we grant general continuing yearly authority to the Department of the Interior for this purpose. Is it not better for the Congress to take a "look see" when authority is asked to investigate as customary on rivers and harbors and matters of that kind?

Mr. SAYLOR. Absolutely.

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SAYLOR. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. ENGLE. It is a fact, is it not, that the Bureau of Reclamation now has the authority in the 17 Western States to make these general investigations under the same kind of authority as provided in this bill for that purpose?

Mr. SAYLOR. They have the right under the general law at the present time to make these surveys in the Western States, and they are now trying to get authority which they do not have, but they have not held up a record which anybody would like to look at with pride, and ask this Congress forever and 2 days thereafter, to authorize them to spend a quarter of a million dollars a year on these projects.

Mr. ENGLE. And is it not a fact, too, that any project which they do investigate must be specifically authorized by the Congress before it can be constructed?

Mr. SAYLOR. That is correct. I have heard that same old argument, and every time the Interior Department comes forward with a project they come up with a nice bill of goods, and somebody will be coming down here and asking this committee to authorize it, because they spent all of that money beforehand on investigations.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. SAYLOR. I yield.

Mr. FULTON. Is it not a fact that the figure of $250,000 a year is simply a round figure drawn out of a hat, because the Department does not know what these investigations are going to be? It is a round figure for $250,000 a year put in at the committee level only, and should not be instituted.

Mr. SAYLOR. There is no doubt about that, because when the Bureau sent their bill up here they had absolutely no amount in it. They wanted blanket authority to spend any amount they wanted, and the only reason we have the sum of $250,000 here is that the gentleman from Washington [Mr. WESTLAND] offered that as a committee amendment.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SAYLOR. I yield to the Delegate from Alaska.

Mr. BARTLETT. Is it not true that Anchorage, for its legal right, receives now only 16 million kilowatts out of a total annual production of 137 million kilowatt-hours?

Mr. SAYLOR. That may be, but they got all they were hoping for, and the Interior Department had to go up there

and buy the water from Anchorage, and the Delegate from Alaska knows that.

Mr. BARTLETT. The gentleman will not question the fact that Anchorage had a legal right to that water?

Mr. SAYLOR. Not at all. But you know and I know, that representatives of the Interior Department appeared before the committee and testified for that bill for Eklutna when they came there originally, and nobody ever told the Delegate from Alaska that the city of Anchorage owned that water, and nobody told the committee that the Bureau of Reclamation did not have the right to build that project in the first instance.

Mr. BARTLETT. Will not the gentleman admit that Anchorage and the REA out of Anchorage are receiving from Eklutna cheaper power than they ever had before?

Mr. SAYLOR. That may be, but that does not give any reason for voting for this bill.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. BUDGE].

Mr. BUDGE. Mr. Chairman, last week the House had before it a proposition to extend the activities of the Bureau of Reclamation throughout the 48 States of the United States. The House—and I think wisely—did not make that extension of the activities of the Bureau of Reclamation.

Mr. Chairman, I appear before you today in opposition to this legislation, because I feel that an historic agency such as the Bureau of Reclamation should not be extended at this time into fields beyond its present area jurisdiction and also into fields beyond its present activities. The Bureau of Reclamation has been and still is a truly western organization. It was set up for one purpose and one purpose only, to irrigate the arid lands of the 17 Western States.

Now we engage upon a new proposal, going into Alaska, where the Delegate from Alaska stated before the Committee on Rules there was to be no study of irrigation and that it was simply to build power projects. The Corps of Army Engineers has been in Alaska for a great many years. It receives substantial appropriations. I think the appropriations for construction this year will be in excess of $200 million. Then, of course, the Geological Survey that studies water resources has been in Alaska for a great many years. The Department of Agriculture this year has over $7 million of appropriations in Alaska. The subject of water in Alaska is being as thoroughly studied as it can be studied.

It has taken me a number of years, the 5 years I have been in Congress, to convince the Bureau of Reclamation that it should get back into the irrigation business where it has been historically ever since 1902. Now, it has reached the point where its operation and maintenance expenses for power purposes are more than double what they are for irrigation and reclamation purposes.

I am proud of the agency. As a westerner, I know that it has contributed a lot to the wealth of our West. I want to keep it an agency that operates in the arid States, so long as the need for that type of operation exists. After that the Bureau should be dissolved.

I sincerely hope that the House today will keep the Bureau within the limits within which it has operated both as to area and purpose for the last 53 years. If the development sought here is necessary, then the work should be done by the Corps of Army Engineers. I shall offer later in the day an amendment to permit this work to be done by the Corps of Army Engineers if the study is to be made.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUDGE. I yield.

Mr. EDMONDSON. I have just been examining the letter from Mr. Orme Lewis, Assistant Secretary of the Interior, which is included in the report, wherein he states that these purposes to be carried out by the Bureau of Reclamation are by no means exclusive of irrigation, flood control, and domestic water supply; that all of those things will also be functions of the Bureau of Reclamation and legitimate fields for activity in Alaska. So does not the gentleman think that his statement that all that they are interested in up there is power is a statement that fails to give full faith and credit to the statement of his own Assistant Secretary of the Interior on the subject?

Mr. BUDGE. I would say to the gentleman that I was simply quoting the words of the Delegate from Alaska [Mr. BARTLETT].

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield at that point?

Mr. BUDGE. I am glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. ASPINALL. The Delegate from Alaska did not reply as my friend from Idaho has indicated. The Delegate from Alaska stated that irrigation was not a primary objective in this study. That was the statement made before the Committee on Rules.

Mr. BUDGE. Such is most certainly not my recollection but I shall not quibble about that. If we are to extend the act to Alaska or to any other part of the United States, then it should be done by legislation which specifically does that. If the House wants to extend the Reclamation Act to Alaska and to all of the other 48 States, that is one thing. But to come here and simply ask that yet another agency be allowed to investigate in Alaska is a matter to which I cannot give my support.

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the Delegate from Alaska [Mr. BARTLETT].

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Chairman, I am happy to follow into the well my distinguished chairman, the gentleman from California [Mr. ENGLE], and the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. MILLER], in an effort to protect what is essentially an administration bill.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. BARTLETT. I am very happy to yield to my friend from Colorado.

Mr. ASPINALL. I wonder if my distinguished friend can tell the Committee just why it is that this authority is channeled through the Secretary of the Interior.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Chairman, the answer to that is simple. The Secretary of the Interior is the Cabinet officer chiefly responsible for Alaska and all other Territories. That is why the authority is sought for the Secretary in this bill. It is not sought for the Bureau of Reclamation. The Secretary of the Interior could delegate the work to the Office of Territories, if he desired. It happens that when this activity started in Alaska 7 years ago he sent people who were skilled in water matters there, and I would assume that he would continue to do that. He would not send anthropologists, who might be familiar with Indian work, to conduct this kind of work. But the Secretary as the Cabinet officer having primary Federal executive jurisdiction, will have the administrative authority and, indeed, the administrative responsibility.

I would like to tell the Committee how this work got underway. In the fiscal year 1949 a provision was inserted in the appropriation bill at the instance of the distinguished gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN] in the amount of $150,000 or thereabout to institute this work. Those appropriations have been carried forward ever since, rising to a maximum of $250,000 in the fiscal year 1953, and $100,000 for each of the last 2 years.

Of course, a point of order could have been made on some occasions against that appropriation, but everyone seemed to be for it then. No point of order was made because on both sides of the aisle it was agreed that the water power resources, including flood control and irrigation, ought to be investigated. The reason this authorization legislation is now before this Committee is that this year in the President's budget message it was suggested that no further appropriation ought to be made unless there were basic authorizing legislation.

This has no relation at all to the Federal reclamation program. It does not provide, as I noted heretofore, that these investigations are going to be made by the Bureau of Reclamation. The studies are needed, notwithstanding how and by whom construction may later be accomplished.

I want to emphasize this: There is no quarrel between public and private power in the Alaska field. There is no private capital willing to undertake construction of power facilities. It is a big job. The Department has published a volume which I call to your attention. As you note, it is a big document, House Document No. 197 of the 82d Congress. In it the statment is made that there is a potential in the hydroelectric field of 50 billion kilowatt-hours a year.

If some of these projects are constructed it would be our hope and our belief that more people would go to Alaska because there is the great untapped reservoir of cheap electric power in the United States of America. People would go there to engage in industry, in business, to mine, to farm. As more people went there, there would be increasing need for irrigation, and this is the point I want to emphasize in connection with the statement made by the gentleman from Idaho. When we have more people there, there will be more need for

irrigation. The Anchorage area, for example, has an average annual precipitation about identical with that of the country around Los Angeles; the Fairbanks area only half of that amount.

Mr. BUDGE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARTLETT. I yield to the gentleman from Idaho.

Mr. BUDGE. Why would the gentleman object to the Army engineers doing this work in the Territory, in view of the fact that they have been there for so many years and have such a large construction program going on in the Territory now?

Mr. BARTLETT. I would prefer not to for two reasons: One reason would be that if this bill is not passed it is a certainty that the work of the Interior Department in this field in Alaska would not be continued in the next fiscal year. There would not be time for the Corps of Engineers to take up the slack.

More importantly, however, I prefer it this way because the administration does. By that I mean some of these decisions certainly must be made by the Executive Department. This matter was discussed among the departments. It was coordinated at the Bureau of the Budget. The chairman of our committee [Mr. ENGLE] has already informed you that the Bureau of the Budget, after this board-meeting activity, has suggested that the Department of the Interior is the proper department to do this work.

Mr. ENGLE. I call attention to what Mr. Orme Lewis said, on page 3 of the report. He said:

> Our information indicates that there has been little or no duplication of effort between the work of this Department in Alaska and that of the Corps of Engineers. The corps has, for the most part, carried on river-basin surveys and river and harbor work. This Department has utilized data made available to it by the Corps of Engineers and has translated these studies plus additional data collected by its staff into project feasibility reports as a basis for recommending legislation.

On December 1, 1953, a letter from the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, Mr. Dodge, said, and I quote:

> It is believed to be necessary that basic authorizing legislation should be recommended and submitted to the Bureau of the Budget so that the views of other Federal agencies can be obtained and then submitted to the Congress in the usual manner for its consideration.

They went through all that. That was in 1953. The Bureau of the Budget has cleared this. This is the way they say it should be done as between these agencies. Of course, it is their business to take care of that kind of coordination.

Mr. BARTLETT. The gentleman is precisely right.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARTLETT. I yield.

Mr. HOSMER. If this is good for Alaska, is it likewise good for Hawaii; and if so, why is Hawaii not mentioned in the bill?

Mr. BARTLETT. I cannot answer that question for the gentleman. This is a specific bit of legislation for Alaska only. What the needs are in Hawaii relating to this, I do not know.

Mr. HOSMER. Would the same principle apply, if the need is found, or the same conditions are found in Hawaii?

Mr. BARTLETT. I should certainly think so—by all means.

Mr. HOSMER. And American Samoa and Guam and the Virgin Islands, too?

Mr. BARTLETT. I have the impression that the gentleman is asking a facetious question, but my answer will be very serious—yes; anywhere under the American flag where we can make a wise investment of public money to bring about an increase in business and an increase in industry and a betterment of the population. I think that is what we ought to do.

Mr. HOSMER. Including the 31 nonreclamation States as well?

Mr. BARTLETT. Those States, I am confident, can take care of themselves.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARTLETT. I yield.

Mr. FULTON. The question I had raised previously was on the amount of authorization of $250,000. When it is apparent that the amount previously appropriated has been $100,000 for each of the last 2 fiscal years, why is this present authorization increased from that amount almost 2½ times?

Mr. BARTLETT. I cannot give the gentleman a precise answer, but may I make a suggestion?

Mr. FULTON. If the gentleman can justify it in all fairness, I would like to have him do so.

Mr. BARTLETT. Yes, I can justify it in all fairness, because during the years this work has been under way since the fiscal year 1949, 8 projects have been investigated and reports on them have been made or are in process of being made. According to this reconnaissance report to which I referred a few minutes ago, there are 200 additional power sites in Alaska. Two hundred, mind you, in need of investigation, and I do not figure it is a mistake at all or a confession of weakness on my part to say I think an annual appropriation of $250,000 over a period of a good many years to complete that investigation is little enough although if the administration asks for only $100,000 in any one particular year, I suspect we will not get more than that.

Mr. FULTON. I want to congratulate the gentleman on his statement although I do disagree with him.

Mr. BARTLETT. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. SISK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARTLETT. I yield.

Mr. SISK. I just want to ask a question with reference to what the gentleman from Pennsylvania has said. Actually, this legislation does not necessarily authorize the appropriation of $250,000 but simply sets that as the maximum that can be spent in any one year. Is that not correct? Perhaps only $50,000 may be used or it might be $100,000 depending on what the Department needed. But the maximum amount that they can use is $250,000.

Mr. BARTLETT. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARTLETT. I yield.

Mr. MASON. My question is with reference to the method. Ordinarily, in appropriation bills, everything in those bills has been authorized by the proper committee of the Congress. Now they would change that entirely so far as this is concerned, and would make this an automatic permanent authorization over the years without any action of any commitee in the House but the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. BARTLETT. I know the gentleman's knowledge is much more extensive than mine about these matters, but my belief has been all the way through that we are, by means of this proposed bill, bringing this situation into harmony with the existing situation in other fields.

Mr. MASON. If any legislative committee of this body proposes and authorizes the expenditure and then it is approved by Congress, that legitimately and properly goes into appropriation bills, and no point of order can be made against it. But if it has not been approved by a committee of this House and has not been authorized, then of course a point of order can be made against it. Why can they not do this in the regular method that we have for authorizations and appropriations?

Mr. ENGLE. That is precisely what this bill does. The Bureau of Reclamation at present has authority to make general investigations, subject to the amount of money appropriated by the Committee on Appropriations. All this does is to say that they can do the same thing in Alaska but the limit is $250,000. This bill exactly parallels existing authority in the Bureau of Reclamation in the 17 Western States, for Alaska, but limits the amount that can be spent or appropriated to $250,000. Perhaps the members of the Committee on Appropriations will say, "We will give you only $150,000." They must justify the amount to be expended the same as the Army engineers must justify their estimates. It does just exactly what the gentleman is talking about.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 2 minutes.

I want to bring into focus the arguments being made on this bill. The Department of the Interior has been spending from $100,000 to $250,000 a year on just this type of work. This is simply legislation to authorize spending the money. Heretofore it has been done without any authorization.

Mr. MASON. And therefore points of order can be made against it in an appropriation bill, if it has not been authorized.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. But a point of order has never been raised.

Mr. MASON. But it could have been raised.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. The appropriation bill this afternoon waived all points of order. I think perhaps the bill that carried this appropriation had all points of order waived against it.

This is an administration bill. It is for the conservation and development of the water resources of Alaska. I recommend to my colleagues in the House that

they adopt this legislation. I think it is the proper way to proceed, instead of trying to put the money into an appropriation bill, then waiving points of order, and not proceeding under the proper procedure; that is not the proper way to legislate. The Appropriations Committee will determine the amount of money for this purpose.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I yield.

Mr. NICHOLSON. How many electric power dams have they built in Alaska now?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. There is only one now, the Eklutna Dam, which will soon be in operation. That was thoroughly investigated. The money was spent over many years. I think perhaps some overspending took place because they had not had sufficient investigation of the project before it started.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Will that take care of the people and the business in that Territory?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Oh, no. While this does not necessarily confine it to power dams, there are possibilities for power dams up there that would make Bonneville, TVA, and Echo Park look like dwarfs. It is estimated there are 50 billion kilowatt-hours that might be developed in Alaska. This bill is not for electric power.

Mr. Chairman, I yield the remainder of my time, 8 minutes, to the gentleman from California [Mr. ENGLE].

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 2 minutes that I may yield.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ENGLE. I yield.

Mr. FULTON. Why does this authorization, which is a blanket authorization, come in here for $250,000 when previously for each of the last 2 fiscal years the amount appropriated by the Committee on Appropriations was simply $100,000 a year?

Mr. ENGLE. Because the Secretary of the Interior in his letter to us said that appropriations had run from $100,000 to $250,000 a year. I think the gentleman from Alaska [Mr. BARTLETT] has the amount. In 1952 the appropriation was $243,000; in 1953 it was $250,000; in 1950 it was $200,000.

I emphasize the proposition that this is a ceiling on the authorized appropriations.

Mr. FULTON. But what was it for the last 2 years? Will the gentleman read those figures?

Mr. ENGLE. The gentleman asked me a question and I am trying to answer it.

I think what we took was the figure suggested by the Interior Department in its request to us for this legislation. We took the maximum figure that had ever been used in any one year. We could have taken another figure, we could have made it $200,000 or $175,000, but we felt that the Appropriations Committee was competent to handle the amount from year to year, so we just put in the limit suggested by Orme Lewis in his report.

Mr. FULTON. Is it not a fact that the appropriation for the current fiscal year is $100,000 for this very purpose?

Mr. ENGLE. I do not believe the appropriation in the current bill is anything.

Mr. FULTON. I do not mean for the coming year; I mean the year we are just going through.

Mr. ENGLE. For the past year it is $100,000. Then the Bureau of the Budget said they were not going to clear any more as a budget matter until we got this thing put into some kind of order so they could.

The gentleman says this is blanket legislation. It is no more blanket legislation than the Bureau of Reclamation has had all the time for the 17 Western States. It is difficult for me to believe that this great area of Alaska, trying to develop its industries and resources, needs any less than we give the smallest State in the Far West. We give this benefit to the Far West and do not limit it to $250,000 or any amount. The Bureau of Reclamation can use all the money the Appropriations Committee gives them, and they give them several million dollars a year, yet I believe the gentleman does not call that blanket authority.

Mr. FULTON. Will the gentleman yield further that I may clarify my position?

Mr. ENGLE. Certainly.

Mr. FULTON. Some of us on the floor are not against developing Alaska with full amounts of money, but we want the legislative committees of this House to go over each of these localized investigations, look at them, and then after the Appropriations Committee has another look at it to see that they are justified, go ahead; that is a matter of control, not of reducing the amount.

Mr. ENGLE. Let me remind the gentleman that we are the legislative committee involved in this instance, and we have said that we do not want to look at every little bitty item on every river every time the Interior Department comes in before the Appropriations Committee which we know is tight-fisted enough that they will look at it. These investigations have to be justified there, that committee has to study them and decide what they are permitted to do. We think that tight-fisted group is the proper one to decide whether or not to grant any money or what amount of money considered reasonable and right.

We think as an authorizing committee that this is a reasonable amount of authorization. It is not an excessive authorization.

Mr. FULTON. Does not the gentleman think there is reasonable doubt as to whether this Congress should extend this authorization, this blanket authorization, beyond the continental limits of the United States to Territories? Should not the legislative committees watch carefully where they are not close enough to see what is going on? The other Members of Congress cannot watch.

Mr. ENGLE. Let me say to the gentleman from Pennsylvania that in my humble judgment this is the way to handle the matter rather than have the issue come up each year.

Mr. BUDGE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ENGLE. I yield.

Mr. BUDGE. A lot of speculative reasoning has been heard here this afternoon as to why this bill is before us. I served on the Appropriations Committee in the preceding Congress. The reason this legislation is before us today is because the conferees from the other body opposed the duplication being superimposed upon Alaska where you have the Corps of Army Engineers doing this work and then you have the Bureau of Reclamation doing the same work; therefore, the department has now asked for specific authorization. That is the reason this legislation is before us at this time, and I hope that it does not pass.

Mr. ENGLE. Let me say to the gentleman that the agency of Government responsible for determining conflict of authority of executive agencies is the Bureau of the Budget. The Bureau of the Budget has cleared this legislation. The Bureau of the Budget has requested just exactly that kind of a review in a letter written in December 1953. That review has occurred. This is the decision of the administration downtown. This is what they requested. It is their responsibility to see that that overlapping and duplication does not occur. They said, this is the way to do it. We agreed with them and I cannot understand why the gentleman does not agree a little more with some of those folks downtown.

Mr. DAWSON of Utah. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ENGLE. I yield to the gentleman from Utah.

Mr. DAWSON of Utah. Some point has been made of the fact there is a $250,000 figure in this bill. You will notice in reading the bill that it originally called for such sums to be appropriated as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this act. The committee in discussing the matter felt there should be a ceiling on the amount that could be appropriated. So it was at the suggestion of the committee that the $250,000 limit was put in there because we did not want them to spend more than that amount. That does not mean that that amount is going to be spent. We wanted to hold the lid down.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ENGLE. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. FULTON. Why do not the members of this committee, the legislative committee, want to look into each of these authorizations as they come up before the Appropriations Committee gets it, so that when we do get it as we go along we average Members on the floor will know it has been scanned carefully by the legislative committee. That is the usual thing. I likewise feel that there is a real question here whether this should be extended beyond the continental limits of the United States.

Mr. ENGLE. The gentleman says that that is the usual thing. I dislike to disagree with him so pointedly, but it is not the usual way. The Army engineers are in Alaska today. They pro-

ceed under a general authority. The Bureau of Reclamation with reference to its general investigations throughout the Far West proceeds under a general authority, only subject to justification before the Appropriations Committee. That is precisely what we have in the 17 Western States for everybody else, even the smallest of them, Nevada. Why should we not give this to Alaska?

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ENGLE. I yield to the gentleman from Alaska.

Mr. BARTLETT. I would like to ask the gentleman if any administration witness came before the committee and informed the committee that if this bill were not enacted some other agency would take up the slack and do the job in place of the Secretary of the Interior?

Mr. ENGLE. No; they did not and, further than that, the Bureau of the Budget has in accordance with the letter in December 1953, gone all through this. That has been decided downtown.

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired. The Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purpose of encouraging and promoting the development of Alaska, the Secretary of the Interior (hereinafter referred to as the "Secretary") is authorized to make investigations of projects for the conservation, development, and utilization of the water resources of Alaska and to report thereon, with appropriate recommendations, from time to time, to the President and the Congress.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 9, after the words "President and", insert "to."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BUDGE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BUDGE: On page 1, line 4, after the comma, strike out the remainder of line 4 and all of line 5 to and including the word "Secretary" and insert in lieu thereof "the Corps of Army Engineers."

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. ENGLE. The point of order is that the amendment is not in order inasmuch as it seeks to insert an entirely different agency into this legislation which deals exclusively with the Department of the Interior. This legislation relates to one particular department of the Government, and the gentleman's amendment seeks to insert another in its place and stead and is therefore not germane and is subject to a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Idaho wish to reply to the gentleman from California?

Mr. BUDGE. I do, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman, it appears to me that the amendment is germane. It substitutes an existing Government agency for another existing Government agency. It carries out the stated purposes of the legislation simply by a substitution of the agency to do the things which are called for in the legislation. I consider it germane.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is ready to rule.

The gentleman's amendment substitutes a department of the Government which does not come under the jurisdiction of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and therefore the Chair must rule that it is out of order. The Chair sustains the point of order.

PROGRAM FOR THE REMAINDER OF THE WEEK

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, and I do this for the purpose of inquiring of the majority leader as to the program for tomorrow and the remainder of the week.

Mr. McCORMACK. I will be happy to. After the completion of this bill, tomorrow we will take up H. R. 5715, which is on the program for this week, and there is a rule reported out of the Committee on Rules today on a bill introduced by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH] which relates to the Salem-Church Reservoir, Rappahannock River Basin, which relates to the power pool elevation, whether it be 240 or 220 feet.

Mr. MARTIN. That is legislation that has already passed the House.

Mr. McCORMACK. It has heretofore. But, in any event, after H. R. 5715, H. R. 192, which I referred to, will come up tomorrow, and then we will go over until Monday.

Mr. MARTIN. I thank the gentleman.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 2. Prior to the transmission of any such report to the Congress, the Secretary shall transmit copies thereof for information and comment to the Governor of Alaska, or to such representative as may be named by him, and to the heads of interested Federal departments and agencies. The written views and recommendations of the aforementioned officials may be submitted to the Secretary within 90 days from the day of receipt of said proposed report. The Secretary may thereafter transmit to the Congress, with such comments and recommendations as he deems appropriate, his report, together with copies of the views and recommendations received from the aforementioned officials. The letter of transmittal and its attachments shall be printed as a House or Senate document.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 2, line 9, strike out "may" and insert "shall immediately."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 3. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this act.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 2, line 15, strike out all of section 3 and insert the following:

SEC. 3. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated not more than $250,000 in any one fiscal year: *Provided*, That any amount of any annual appropriation left unexpended at the end of any fiscal year shall be returned to the Treasury.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FULTON to the committee amendment: On page 2, line 19, strike out "$250,000" and insert "$100,000."

Mr. FULTON. I would like to explain briefly what this amendment does. The committee originally had before it a bill with no limitation of amount whatever. The section then read:

There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this act.

Then the committee introduced an amendment which put a limitation of $250,000 per year of authorization on this particular type of investigation work by the Interior Department. The bill came before the House today, and the committee has just introduced its amendment to make the limitation $250,000 per year. My bill would limit this authorization to $100,000 per year.

My amendment reduces the committee amount $250,000 to $100,000 a year. The reason for that is this. In the last fiscal year the amount appropriated for this purpose was $100,000. In the fiscal year previous to the last fiscal year the amount appropriated was likewise $100,000. There have been some curtailments of funds in each of our districts. I know that when we ask the Army engineers to look at any creek or river in our districts to see if there should be flood control work or navigation work done on it, we in this Congress must go before the specific legislative committee, the Public Works Committee, and the Subcommittee on Rivers and Harbors of that committee, for that authorization. I realize that there is a general authorization for this particular type of work to be done within certain Western States, and that is closely watched by Members of this Congress from individual smaller districts than a big area such as Alaska, which is one-fifth the size of the whole United States continental area. Here is an extension of a doctrine which goes beyond the continental limits of the United States and sets a precedent of advance authorization so that the legislative committee of this House is permanently bypassed.

The questions which this House faces are, first, shall we increase the amount for these projects of investigation in Alaska by 2½ times over the amount of money appropriated in the 2 prior fiscal years; and secondly, shall we extend this general blanket authority which the Department now has in 17 Western States beyond the continental limits of the United States?

Mr. MASON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FULTON. I yield.

Mr. MASON. Every time the Army Engineers have come into my district or into the gentleman's district or any other district to make a survey or an investigation, first there had to be an authorization by a legislative committee and then an appropriation made to cover it. That is done every year. Why should it not be done the same way in this case?

Mr. FULTON. The purpose is that the legislative committee may have the opportunity to look into the matter of

authorization and policy. We do not want those gentlemen to give up that function.

Mr. MASON. We have two checks, through the legislative committee and the Committee on Appropriations. Some of us who are not members of either one of those committees like to have two checks before we approve something.

Mr. FULTON. So I hope that the House will adopt the $100,000 figure as provided in my amendment to the committee amendment, which figure was the customary figure for the last 2 years. And in default of that I hope the House will defeat this measure.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FULTON. I yield.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. The Appropriations Committee will make the final decision whether the sum is to be $250,000 or less.

Mr. FULTON. That is right. But with legislative committee authorization, we get two screenings. The Members who have the legislative authority should look into these projects so that the rest of us may know what is going on.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Let me say to the gentleman that in the foreign aid bill which will come before the House we will be spending more money for this sort of work in Israel and in other countries, than we will be spending here.

Mr. FULTON. If the gentleman will show me any good project in Alaska, I shall be 100 percent for it. I voted for statehood for Alaska. I want Alaska to develop. But I do not want to give blanket continuing authority to any agency to this sort of investigation nor have you gentlemen permanently give up the authority of the legislative committee which you now have.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I hope the gentleman will move to cut the appropriations for foreign aid which bill will be before us shortly, and where they are proposing to spend more money for this kind of work in one country, Israel, than we are spending in our own country.

Mr. FULTON. As the gentleman knows, I am a member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs and I have on this floor introduced amendments to cut foreign aid where I thought it was wise to do that. Israel, a loyal ally, should not be singled out for attack, as she is doing a fine job, and her people are to be complimented for their wonderful progress, and loyalty to democratic ideals and the western world. But unless we, on the Committee on Foreign Affairs, go over each authorization and are able to say to the rest of the Members that we have studied them, and then the Committee on Appropriations does the same thing, I do not believe the House should approve such authorizations nor that Congress should pass them. Without that particular kind of study and scrutiny I do not think we should have any of this kind of legislation spending the United States taxpayers' hard earned tax money unless the particular legislative committee having policy jurisdiction has first scrutinized the particular proposals of the executive department and authorized them, because we have full confidence in the legislative committees, with the detailed examination for savings being made by the appropriate subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. May I say to the gentleman that there are 87 people assigned to the Republic of Israel from the Department of the Interior to study reclamation projects. They are spending far more there than is provided in this bill, for what I do not know.

Mr. FULTON. The Foreign Affairs Committee will make adequate study of the mutual security program, including the good State of Israel, and will make recommendations for authorization to this Congress as the legislative committee, prior to the action by the Appropriations committee on the appropriations bill. We should continue this same general procedure in this case.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, perhaps the committee which has studied, considered, and has had the responsibility for this bill made a mistake when it tried to advise this Congress what it thought would be a sufficient sum to authorize for the work they think is necessary to be done in Alaska.

Last year when we had before this committee the question of authorizing flood-control and small-watershed projects in the upper reaches of the rivers of the United States, we gave blanket authorization to the amount of expenditure for the work. The section was worded almost as the section now under debate is worded. The authorization in the watershed bill carries a blanket authorization of between five and eleven billion, and leaves it up to the Appropriation Committees of the different bodies of Congress and the Congress itself to make the determinations each year.

As I remember the discussion on the floor of the House, when that bill was before us in the 83d Congress, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SAYLOR] was the only one who took exception to the blanket authorization provision. Not another dissenting voice was heard on the floor of the House.

All we have sought to do here is not to tell the Congress that $250,000 annually is necessary, but, rather, to advise the House of Representatives that in our opinion that is the maximum which the Appropriations Committee should consider.

I listened intently to the remarks of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MASON], and I have to take exception to what he said for the simple reason that there is no appropriation to the Corps of Engineers for the current fiscal year to come into my district to make any specific studies. I have just recently requested them to go into the district and make an investigation on a particular flood situation and report back. They were able to respect my request because that is a part of their general authority, and the Congress of the United States has seen fit to appropriate money for such services. There is no study of such investigations before the investigations are made. The only time we come before the Congress of the United States for funds for the construction of projects, either for the Bureau of Reclamation, Department of the Interior, or for the Army engineers, is when they make a prior investigation and determine that a project is necessary and should be built. Then they must come before the committees having jurisdiction and first have them authorized. Following such authorization, the Appropriations Committee must see fit to appropriate the funds in such amounts annually as the welfare of the Nation will permit.

That is all we are asking for in this bill, simply to give to the Department of the Interior, not to the Bureau of Reclamation, which has jurisdiction over such Bureaus as the Bureau of Reclamation and the Bureau of Geological Survey, the right and the responsibility of conducting these studies.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ASPINALL. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. KEATING. I have asked the gentleman to yield in order to propound a parliamentary inquiry to the Chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. KEATING. I intend to support the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania, but I have a further amendment to the committee amendment following the figure as it appears in that bill, $250,000. Would it be appropriate to offer that after the committee has acted on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair would say that if it is to insert language after the figure it would be in order after the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania has been voted on.

Mr. KEATING. It is to change language after the figure but in the same section. I just wanted to be sure I was not precluded from offering it.

The CHAIRMAN. It would be in order after the amendment was disposed of, and the Chair will recognize the gentleman.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, I would ask my colleagues to vote against the amendment to the amendment which is before the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FULTON] to the committee amendment.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. FULTON) there were—ayes 24, noes 66.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. KEATING to the committee amendment: On page 2, line 19, after "$250,000" strike out "in any one fiscal year" and insert "in the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1955."

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, this is a somewhat more conservative amendment than the one offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania, and I hope it will appeal to the Members as deserving of a more favorable vote than the amend-

ment previously offered. It has occurred to me during this debate that we are acting a little bit in the dark. I am entirely in accord with the idea that we should have authorizing legislation before we make these appropriations. It obviously is not right to put in appropriation bills amounts which are not authorized, and I am very much opposed to the Committee on Appropriations legislating in any field. However, I regret to see us taking the step of authorizing for all time in the future an expenditure of $250,000, particularly in the light of the defeat of the previous amendment. We are here giving the very top authorization extending it indefinitely into the future. It seems to me it would be more prudent, at least until we know more about it, to move a little bit more slowly and the House has worked its will on the figure of $250,000, and decided to leave it in the bill. But it strikes me that until we know more about these projects and the need for them, and know more about the merit of the allegation that there is duplication here between the Department of the Interior and the Corps of Engineers, it would be wiser to limit this to a 1-year period and then have a look at it again next year.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEATING. I yield.

Mr. MASON. Then, your language really means in substance that we are authorizing for 1 year $250,000 for this purpose.

Mr. KEATING. A top limit of that amount.

Mr. MASON. Yes, well that is all I want to do. I do not care whether it is $100,000, $200,000, or $300,000, but I do care that the Congress through its regular legislative committees should pass on it each year.

Mr. KEATING. I agree with the gentleman. That is the very purpose of this amendment.

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEATING. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. MEADER. I would like to ask the gentleman how anyone in this House today could say how much in the way of investigation should be required in Alaska 5 years from today.

Mr. KEATING. I think that is a good point. Apparently a majority felt that way in providing for the top figure of $250,000 now. I supported the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FULTON], because $100,000 is the figure that was actually spent in the last 2 years. But it strikes me it is inadvisable to try to authorize such a large figure for many years in advance. As a matter of fact, it could well develop that it would have to be a larger figure as well as a smaller figure.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEATING. I yield.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Did I understand your amendment was just for fiscal 1955?

Mr. KEATING. That is right. It is limited to 1 year.

Mr. NICHOLSON. The fiscal year will be over on June 30.

Mr. KEATING. It is for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1955.

Mr. DAWSON of Utah. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEATING. I yield.

Mr. DAWSON of Utah. Is it not a fact that we are not legislating for 10 years from now. The $250,000 is merely a ceiling. We are simply saying that the appropriation shall not be in excess of $250,000. If we want to go above that we will have to come before this body to increase it.

Mr. KEATING. That would be necessary. I would hope we would be able to go below that figure. Of course, the gentleman might well say the Committee on Appropriations will take care of that, and I would hope that they would. However, there is a certain obligation on us in the initial authorizing legislation to arrive at a reasonable figure. As long as we have decided to keep the $250,000 figure in, we should limit it to 1 year.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEATING. I yield.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEATING] has expired.

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment is supposed to limit this bill to 1 year's operation. I am not sure that I heard the amendment correctly. Did the gentleman strike out the last two lines?

Mr. KEATING. No. It strikes me it would apply to the appropriation left unexpended this year and to any left unexpended at the end of this season.

Mr. ENGLE. The answer to this amendment is, of course, that we will have to be right back here next year with another bill and do this all over again. The administration will no doubt send up another request for another bill next year, and we will be back to do it all over again.

There has been in some of the arguments here this afternoon an assumption that there is something unique about this particular bill, that we are clothing the Secretary of Interior with some strange and extraordinary authority that does not exist in other agencies or in other parts of this country. The fact is that the Army engineers spend very close to $10 million a year on general investigations with nothing but the broadest sort of authority, only as limited and prescribed by the Appropriations Committee.

The general investigations conducted by the Bureau of Reclamation cost annually on the average $6 million. They are general investigations without any legislative committee pinpointing each particular stream or each particular project that should be studied. That is a part of our current method of operation.

This legislation gives precisely the same authority to the Bureau of Reclamation in Alaska but limits it to $250,000 a year. The bill that came up recommended by the administration carried no such limitation; your committee put that in.

Let me repeat, we are not adding any extra power that requires the limitation of this amendment. The amendment would limit the operation to 1 year. We might as well not pass this bill. We have put on, of course, the dollar limitation of $250,000; that is limitation enough.

In all probability we would have done just as well had we left Alaska, which is one-fifth the size of the whole United States, in the category with all the rest of the 17 Western States where there is no limitation except what the Appropriations Committee, in its wisdom and subject to the testimony it receives sees fit to place.

Mr. BUDGE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ENGLE. Yes; I shall be glad to yield.

Mr. BUDGE. I am rather surprised that the chairman would object to accepting this amendment in view of the fact it would simply permit the Congress to take another look next year, and the Department to take another look also.

If the gentleman will permit, I would like to ask him this question: Does the gentleman not feel that he is injecting the Bureau of Reclamation into a new field when for 53 years they have been irrigating the arid lands of the West, but now he would send them into the Territory of Alaska? Is that not a new proposal?

Mr. ENGLE. It is new to the extent that they are going into the 8th year or 10th year, or whatever it is, of investigations. The Department of the Interior is the agency of the Government that has jurisdiction of Alaska. Alaska is not under the Department of Defense where the Army engineers are; it is not in the Department of Commerce; it is in the Department of the Interior. The Department of the Interior has jurisdiction of the Bureau of Reclamation. Therefore the administration downtown, the executive agency, sent up here and asked us to authorize these investigations on a permanent basis.

I would like to say to those who want to put on all these limitations that it is just the same as though you asked the corps of Army engineers to come before a legislative committee and justify every item.

All we are doing is giving Alaska precisely what the 17 Western States have, and Alaska should have it without the limitation imposed by this amendment.

I hope the amendment will be voted down.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEATING].

The question was taken; on a division (demanded by Mr. KEATING) there were—ayes 40, noes 61.

So the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to return to section 1 of the bill. I have an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SAYLOR: On page 1, line 5, after "authorized", insert "through the exclusive use of the Geological Survey."

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of this amendment is following the Assistant Secretary's directive that this work is now being done by the Geological Survey to see to it that this money is used by the Geological Survey for basic research on water policy. It is to make sure that the Bureau of Reclamation does not get this money to continue itself in Alaska doing things which it has not done heretofore except by allowance of the Congress for 7 years. This is a fine example of what happens.

The Bureau of Reclamation is the greatest group of people I have ever bumped into in the United States Government that look to things for precedent. I can say to you that anything this Congress does, regardless of whether it is in a bill or anywhere else, the Bureau of Reclamation will seize on it and try to use it as a precedent for their bills.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SAYLOR. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Under what department is the Geological Survey?

Mr. SAYLOR. Under the Department of the Interior.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. This bill says nothing about the Reclamation Bureau. It says "under the authority of the Secretary of the Interior."

Mr. SAYLOR. That is correct and I am making sure that this fund which you apparently have decided is going to the Department of the Interior will be used by the branch of Government which the Congress of the United States has historically said has charge of the basic water policy and basic water research. That is what this amendment does. It is saying that the Bureau of Reclamation must look to the Geological Survey in Alaska just as they look to it in other States for the places they can get their basic information from.

If you do not think that the Department of the Interior and the Bureau of Reclamation are those who look for policy in any statement that the Congress makes, I would like to call your attention, and especially the attention of the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ASPINALL] because he is very familiar with this matter, to a project he had in his district which was known as the Collbran project. Because of extenuating circumstances the Bureau of Reclamation came forward with an entirely new formula for determining feasibility. The committee was impressed with the necessity of putting that project through and authorized the project, but in the report they specifically specified that the formula that was used for the Collbran project should not be taken as a precedent for any other project. I can say to the Members of the House that the Bureau of Reclamation ever since has come to the Congress and pointed out that all of these new projects that would not be feasible under the old standards are now brought up under the Collbran formula as a method of making them feasible. So my amendment will tie down the funds which are now appropriated for the Department of the Interior and use them for the exclusive purpose of the Geological Survey.

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SAYLOR].

Mr. Chairman, I sometimes think that my friend from Pennsylvania has developed such a spleen against the Bureau of Reclamation that he forgets there was a change a couple of years ago, that that organization is no longer a Democratic operated organization but that there is a Republican Secretary of the Interior.

I want to say that the gentleman's amendment would straitjacket the Secretary of the Interior. This bill does not say who shall do it, particularly; it allows that discretion in the Secretary of the Interior.

I call attention to what Mr. Orme Lewis said in his letter of February 9, 1955, in which this legislation, with clearance from the Bureau of the Budget, is requested.

He said:

These funds have ranged in annual amounts from $100,000 to $250,000 and have been in addition to those made available, through appropriations to the Geological Survey, for collection of basic water data.

The Secretary of the Interior uses whatever agency most appropriately fits for the purpose to be accomplished. In some instances, with reference to certain types of water data, he would use the Geological Survey. In other instances, where the Bureau of Reclamation, with its trained engineers, dealing in power and the irrigation field, could be more properly used, he would use them.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SAYLOR].

The amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the Chair, Mr. HOLIFIELD, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Commitee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 3990) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to investigate and report to the Congress on projects for the conservation, development, and utilization of the water resources of Alaska, pursuant to House Resolution 251, he reported the bill back to the House with sundry amendments adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en bloc.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

Mr. BUDGE. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. BUDGE. I am, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. BUDGE moves to recommit the bill H. R. 3990 to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The question was taken; and the Speaker announced that the nays appeared to have it.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 79, nays 278, not voting 77, as follows:

[Roll No. 78]

YEAS—79

Adair	Dowdy	McVey
Alexander	Fino	Magnuson
Alger	Flynt	Mason
Andersen, H. Carl	Ford	Matthews
Andresen, August H.	Fulton	Meader
Ashmore	George	Morano
Auchincloss	Gross	Nicholson
Avery	Gwinn	O'Hara, Minn.
Becker	Hand	Osmers
Bosch	Harrison, Nebr.	Ostertag
Bow	Harvey	Phillips
Brownson	Herlong	Rees, Kans.
Budge	Hoeven	Rogers, Fla.
Byrnes, Wis.	Hoffman, Ill.	St. George
Cederberg	Hope	Saylor
Chase	Hosmer	Schenck
Church	Jensen	Schwengel
Clevenger	Johansen	Short
Cole	Jonas	Taber
Corbett	Jones, N. C.	Talle
Coudert	Kean	Utt
Cretella	Kearns	Van Pelt
Cunningham	Keating	Velde
Curtis, Mo.	Knox	Vursell
Dies	Laird	Weaver
	Latham	Wharton
	LeCompte	Widnall

NAYS—278

Abbitt	Bowler	Dawson, Ill.
Abernethy	Boyle	Dawson, Utah
Addonizio	Bray	Deane
Albert	Brooks, Tex.	Dempsey
Allen, Calif.	Brown, Ga.	Denton
Allen, Ill.	Brown, Ohio	Derounian
Andrews	Broyhill	Devereux
Anfuso	Buchanan	Diggs
Ashley	Buckley	Dixon
Aspinall	Burleson	Dodd
Ayres	Burnside	Dollinger
Bailey	Bush	Dondero
Baldwin	Byrne, Pa.	Dorn, S. C.
Barden	Cannon	Doyle
Barrett	Carlyle	Durham
Bass, N. H.	Carnahan	Edmondson
Bass, Tenn.	Carrigg	Elliott
Bates	Chelf	Ellsworth
Baumhart	Chenoweth	Engle
Beamer	Christopher	Evins
Belcher	Chudoff	Fallon
Bennett, Fla.	Clark	Fascell
Bennett, Mich.	Cooley	Feighan
Bentley	Coon	Fenton
Berry	Cooper	Fernandez
Blatnik	Cramer	Fine
Blitch	Crumpacker	Fisher
Boland	Curtis, Mass.	Fjare
Bolling	Dague	Flood
Bolton, Frances P.	Davidson	Fogarty
Bonner	Davis, Ga.	Forand
	Davis, Wis.	Forrester

Fountain	Long	Rodino
Frelinghuysen	Lovre	Rogers, Colo.
Friedel	McConnell	Rogers, Mass.
Garmatz	McCormack	Rogers, Tex.
Gary	McDonough	Rooney
Gavin	McDowell	Roosevelt
Gentry	McGregor	Rutherford
Gordon	McIntire	Scherer
Granahan	Macdonald	Scott
Grant	Machrowicz	Scudder
Gray	Mack, Ill.	Seely-Brown
Green, Oreg.	Mack, Wash.	Selden
Griffiths	Madden	Shelley
Hagen	Mahon	Shuford
Hale	Mailliard	Sieminski
Haley	Martin	Sikes
Harden	Merrow	Simpson, Ill.
Hardy	Metcalf	Sisk
Harris	Miller, Calif.	Smith, Kans.
Harrison, Va.	Miller, Md.	Smith, Miss.
Hays, Ark.	Miller, Nebr.	Smith, Va.
Hays, Ohio	Mills	Spence
Hayworth	Minshall	Springer
Hébert	Mollohan	Staggers
Henderson	Morgan	Steed
Hess	Moss	Sullivan
Hiestand	Multer	Teague, Calif.
Hill	Murray, Ill.	Teague, Tex.
Hillings	Murray, Tenn.	Thomas
Holifield	Natcher	Thompson, La.
Holmes	Nelson	Thompson, N. J.
Holt	Norblad	Thompson, Tex.
Holtzman	Norrell	Thornberry
Huddleston	O'Brien, Ill.	Tollefson
Hull	O'Brien, N. Y.	Trimble
Hyde	O'Hara, Ill.	Tuck
Ikard	O'Konski	Tumulty
Jackson	O'Neill	Udall
Jarman	Patman	Vanik
Jennings	Patterson	Van Zandt
Johnson, Calif.	Pelly	Vinson
Johnson, Wis.	Pfost	Vorys
Jones, Ala.	Pilcher	Wainwright
Judd	Poff	Walter
Karsten	Polk	Watts
Kee	Powell	Westland
Kelley, Pa.	Price	Whitten
Keogh	Priest	Wickersham
Kilday	Quigley	Wier
Kilgore	Rabaut	Wigglesworth
King, Calif.	Rains	Williams, Miss.
Kirwan	Ray	Williams, N. J.
Klein	Reece, Tenn.	Willis
Kluczynski	Reuss	Wilson, Calif.
Krueger	Rhodes, Ariz.	Winstead
Landrum	Rhodes, Pa.	Wolverton
Lane	Riley	Wright
Lanham	Rivers	Yates
Lankford	Roberts	Young
Lesinski	Robeson, Va.	Younger
Lipscomb	Robsion, Ky.	Zelenko

NOT VOTING—77

Arends	Green, Pa.	Pillion
Baker	Gregory	Poage
Bell	Gubser	Preston
Betts	Halleck	Prouty
Boggs	Heselton	Radwan
Bolton, Oliver P.	Hinshaw	Reed, Ill.
Boykin	Hoffman, Mich.	Reed, N. Y.
Brooks, La.	Horan	Richards
Burdick	James	Riehlman
Byrd	Jenkins	Sadlak
Canfield	Jones, Mo.	Scrivner
Celler	Kearney	Sheehan
Chatham	Kelly, N. Y.	Sheppard
Chiperfield	Kilburn	Siler
Colmer	King, Pa.	Simpson, Pa.
Davis, Tenn.	Knutson	Smith, Wis.
Delaney	McCarthy	Taylor
Dingell	McCulloch	Thompson, Mich.
Dolliver	McMillan	Thomson, Wyo.
Donohue	Marshall	Williams, N. Y.
Donovan	Miller, N. Y.	Wilson, Ind.
Dorn, N. Y.	Morrison	Withrow
Eberharter	Moulder	Wolcott
Frazier	Mumma	Zablocki
Gamble	Passman	
Gathings	Perkins	
	Philbin	

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Taylor for, with Mr. Colmer against.

Mr. Reed of New York for, with Mr. Chatham against.

Mr. Riehlman for, with Mr. Morrison against.

Mr. Kearney for, with Mr. Sadlak against.

Mr. Miller of New York for, with Mr. Marshall against.

Mr. Reed of Illinois for, with Mr. Eberharter against.

Until further notice:

Mrs. Kelly of New York with Mr. Halleck.

Mr. Delaney with Mr. Arends.

Mr. Celler with Mr. Baker.

Mr. McMillan with Mr. James.

Mr. Byrd with Mr. Thomson of Wyoming.

Mr. Boggs with Mr. Gamble.

Mr. Green of Pennsylvania with Mr. Mumma.

Mr. Gregory with Mr. Scrivner.

Mr. Sheppard with Mr. Dolliver.

Mr. Moulder with Mr. Betts.

Mr. Preston with Mr. Chiperfield.

Mr. Frazier with Mr. McCulloch.

Mr. Donovan with Mr. Sheehan.

Mr. Donohue with Mr. Horan.

Mr. Dingell with Mr. Kilburn.

Mr. Jones of Missouri with Mr. Wolcott.

Mrs. Knutson with Mr. Simpson of Pennsylvania.

Mr. McCarthy with Mr. Gubser.

Mr. Boykin with Mr. Dorn of New York.

Mr. Zablocki with Mr. Canfield.

Mr. Passman with Mr. Williams of New York.

Mr. Perkins with Mr. Wilson of Indiana.

Mr. Philbin with Mr. Hoffman of Michigan.

Mr. Davis of Tennessee with Mr. Siler.

Mr. Richards with Mr. Smith of Wisconsin.

Mr. Bell with Mr. Heselton.

Mr. Gathings with Mr. Withrow.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill was passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND REMARKS

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may extend their remarks in the RECORD on the bill just passed by the House.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

Mr. ROOSEVELT asked and was given permission to address the House for 20 minutes on Monday next, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered.

Mr. BURNSIDE asked and was given permission to address the House for 30 minutes on tomorrow, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered.

Mr. JONES of North Carolina asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 hour on Tuesday next, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered.

Mr. BOYLE asked and was given permission to address the House for 5 minutes on tomorrow, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered.

Mr. SHORT asked and was given permission to address the House for 5 minutes today, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered.

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on tomorrow during general debate, the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce may have permission to sit.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

THE LATE PETE JARMAN

Mr. RAINS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. RAINS. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably absent from the House Chamber when my colleagues from Alabama, and other Members of the House of Representatives, paid their tribute of respect to the life and memory of our departed friend and colleague, Pete Jarman.

Even though I was among the friends who watched with sorrowing hearts as he was lowered to rest in a leafy bower in beautiful Arlington Cemetery, it is difficult for me now, to realize that Pete has departed the land of the living. Only a few days before Pete's untimely death my wife saw and talked with him here in the Capitol. That evening she told me of having seen and talked with Pete, and made the remark that he looked better than she had ever seen him, and that he seemed in robust health. It is one of the inscrutable mysteries and lamentable tragedies of human life that so often one who is at the zenith of his wisdom and mental powers is stricken down by death like a flower before the icy winds of winter. But, of death and its coming no man can tell.

Leaves have their time to fall,
And flowers to wither at the north wind's breath,
And stars to set; but all thou,
Thou has, all seasons for thine own, O death,
We know when moons shall wane,
When summer birds from far shall cross the sea,
When autumn's hue shall tinge the golden grain,
But who shall teach us when to look for thee.

And the part in us that does not die is our deeds, our accomplishments, our achievements.

Pete Jarman had a long and distinguished career of public service to his State and Nation. He was elected to public office by the people of the State of Alabama and his congressional district many times. I knew him first when he was secretary of the State of Alabama. His friendliness, his devotion to duty, his strong will and firm determination led him from that position in the State capitol to a seat in this august body in the 75th Congress. He served the people of the Sixth Congressional District of Alabama with approval and approbation for six terms, and at the end of his service here in the Congress with us, he received from the President

of the United States, the highest appointment which can come in the Foreign Service of our country, that of an Ambassador. From his colleagues in the State Department and in the Foreign Service, I have learned he was also eminently successful in his service as Ambassador of our Nation to the great sovereign Land Down Under. A minute reprobation of his accomplishments would require many pages in telling. Suffice to say here, he was a man of action, determination, and his life is an open book, filled with worthy attainments in the service of his State and country. Pete has departed this life, but no man can wholly die whose life is measured in such achievements and such accomplishments.

At the beginning of the Christian era, there lived a Latin poet by the name of Horace. He must have had in his thoughts a life and character like that of our departed friend, when he wrote the immortal classic, Odes from Horace, from which I quote:

I have raised a monument more lasting than bronze
Loftier than the royal peak of pyramids.
No biting storms can bring it down:
No impotent north wind
Nor the unnumbered series of the years,
Nor the swift course of time.
I shall not wholly die.

In a news story not too long before Pete's death, a contemporary writer said, that—

Jarman's secret of success is courage, charm, and know how. He is a winner. He goes along until the pinch comes, and then moves out in front.

Henry Van Dyke summed up Pete Jarman's philosophy in these beautiful words:

Let me live my life from year to year
With forward face and unreluctant soul,
Not hastening to nor turning from the goal;
Not mourning for the things that disappear
In the dim past, nor holding back in fear
From what the future veils; but a whole
And happy heart, that pays its toll
To youth and age, and travels on with cheer.
I shall grow old, but never lose life's zest
Because the road's last turn will be the best.

And now he has found that the last turn of the road is the best. For around that turn of the road he has entered the gates of the Celestial City, and is now reunited with the loved ones who have been waiting for him. I am sure that the guardian of the gates said to him: "Well done, good and faithful servant."

It is a truism running like a golden thread through the biography of many men in America, that behind every great man, every good and noble deed, is a good and noble woman. This was true in the life of Pete Jarman. In his successes, his attainments and his achievements, his faithful and charming wife, Beryl, was always beside him, helping and sharing. They were truly partners in their work and accomplishments. To her, great credit is due. To her my heartfelt sympathy in her time of sorrow.

Mr. Speaker, as we contemplate the passing from this world of our friends, our feeling is often one of depression and melancholy. But it should not be, since we are firm in our faith that there is immortality and life after death.

The greatly beloved Peter Marshall, known to all of us, a few years ago in the old New York Avenue Presbyterian Church here in Washington, closed a stirring Easter Sunday message with these words:

I tell you they have not died,
They live and breathe with you;
They walk now, here at your side,
They tell you things are true:
Why dream of poppied sod,
When you can feel their breath,
When flow'r and soul and God
Know there is no death.

I tell you they have not died,
Their hands clasp yours and mine:
They are now but glorified,
They have become divine,
They live, they know, they see,
They shout with every breath:
All is eternal life.
There is no death.

WHY DO NOT PRIVATE POWER COMPANIES BUILD THE UPPER COLORADO RIVER PROJECT?

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, on the Snake River, and in other places, the Interior Department is willing to let private power companies build hydroelectric power projects with their own money.

On the upper Colorado River the reverse is true. There the administration insists on building a series of great power dams with the taxpayers' money.

What is the reason that the Interior Department, presumably speaking for the administration, is following two policy roads at the same time?

The answer is simple:

The Snake River project at Hells Canyon is economically feasible. Any private power company would be willing to build it, because it would pay dividends to stockholders.

The proposed multibillion dollar upper Colorado River project is not economically feasible. No private power company would undertake it. The cost would be exorbitant. The power would have to be sold at rates in excess of what the market could pay. Stockholders would lose their shirts.

If the proposed power developments in the upper Colorado River project were practical and feasible, you could bet your bottom dollar that a private power company, or a group of companies, would want to build them.

Size and dollar cost are not deterrents to private power companies in the upper Colorado River project. The estimated construction cost of Echo Park Dam is $176 million. That is precisely what the Federal Power Commission estimates it would cost to build the Hells Canyon project proposed by the Idaho Power Co.

Four other dams in the upper Colorado project are estimated to cost from $16 to $82 million. Only the proposed Glen Canyon Dam would cost more, an estimated $421 million. But certainly with the immense southern California, Nevada, and Arizona market waiting for more power, this development could be financed by private companies. Glen Canyon Dam, as an independent unit, could be a feasible project. The upper basin States, however, want to use it as a cash register to pay off ridiculous irrigation projects, and, indeed, to defray the cost of the other dams in the project which cannot even pay for themselves.

The administration spokesmen have consistently advocated a partnership program in the development of power and water resources in the West. They are claiming that it has been a success and has been well received. As recently as May 11, this year, Secretary of the Interior McKay told the National Industrial Association that during the last two years "applications to the Federal Power Commission for permits to survey potential hydroelectric developments represented a larger total of kilowatts than was covered by the applications during the prior seven years."

The Secretary further said:

At the end of last year the volume of such permits outstanding was by far the greatest in the history of the Commission.

Where are the permits to build the power dams proposed in the upper Colorado River project?

There aren't any. If this project is ever built it will be built by the Bureau of Reclamation with taxpayers' money.

The private power companies have provided a neat explanation to Congress as to why they do not want to build the upper Colorado River project.

A statement signed by 10 upper basin power companies said:

Because of the relationship of the water-storage features of this project to the Colorado River compact, the vast areas encompassed, the magnitude and multiple purpose objectives incorporated—including non-reimbursable features—we believe the hold-over reservoirs and powerplants should be built by the Federal Government.

When the upper basin power companies speak of the Colorado River compact, they are saying in effect: These immense storage dams involve interpretations of the compact which could result in irreparable damage to the financial structure of such projects. These conflicting interpretations of the compact are now before the United States Supreme Court. We do not know what the Court will say. Nobody builds anything on a piece of ground in which title is in doubt.

Nobody, except the Interior Department, that is. The Interior Department and its Reclamation Bureau are perfectly willing to use the taxpayers' money to build the biggest reclamation and power projects ever conceived, knowing they would operate at tremendous losses.

The private companies, however, are willing to distribute the power produced by the Federal project. They told Congress as much in a statement delivered to the Senate Interior Committee.

In that statement the companies announced their willingness to enter into contracts whereby they would deliver the power and charge only a reasonable amount for transmission.

Their statement said that they believed the financial feasibility of the project depended upon the sale of the power to them, but, of course, the cost of the power must not exceed the cost of power from alternate sources.

It was a nice way for these private companies to say they did not care to build the project, because it would be a white elephant. But if the Government wants to squander the money of the taxpayers, they would be happy to take the power, if the price is right.

They know, also, that the price would not be right. It would have to be higher than the market. If the Government elected to sell the power below cost to the private utilities, then the taxpayers would have to pick up an additional bill of enormous size.

These private utilities know, also, that they can build steam plants to produce power cheaper than the upper Colorado project could produce it.

That is what they have been doing, building steam plants adjacent to the largest coal deposits in the country.

If the hydroelectric plants proposed in the upper Colorado project would be paying propositions, they would have been built long ago by the private utility companies.

The taxpayers of the Nation—most of them far removed from the sparsely settled upper basin of the Colorado—will be the goats if the project is built.

FEDERAL SOIL CONSERVATION PROGRAM

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. MOLLOHAN] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Mr. Speaker, one would think that by now the validity of the Federal soil conservation program—and as a corollary, the Soil Conservation Service—had been as clearly demonstrated and as firmly established as national defense, itself. From 1935, when it was first launched by a Democratic Congress, to the present administration, the Soil Conservation program had bipartisan support in Congress and the Soil Conservation Service was kept free of politics. The result was a magnificent contribution to the stability, the prosperity, and the future well-being of a strong America.

During the past 20 years, the SCS has helped to recover and restore to fertility more than 140 million acres of our farmland previously devastated and lost to the Nation through ignorance, selfishness, or greed.

Moreover, it has succeeded in paying real dollars-and-cents dividends in a ratio of $1 in the value of every improved acre for every 10 cents of meager investment which Congress has made in this essential program.

Proof of the popular support which the program has enjoyed in both parties can best be demonstrated by the comments of General Eisenhower, when, in his campaign speech in Omaha in 1952, he observed that the only trouble with the program of the Soil Conservation Service was that it was moving too slowly.

Since that time, however, it would seem—as the editorial in the Charleston Gazette so succinctly sets forth—the soil-conservation program and the Soil Conservation Service have not continued merely to move slowly. They have moved backwards. Nevertheless, the Secretary of Agriculture consistently flouts the will of Congress to play his political games to the detriment of the conservation program and the disruption of the Service.

Even while new dust bowls scatter our precious soil to the four winds, and precious water becomes a problem of increasing concern to thousands of communities, the Secretary persists in his stubborn efforts to break the once efficiently organized and effectively functioning Service into 48 piddling little units that cannot possibly serve the needs of the Nation. Mr. Benson, it would seem, has still to learn that neither flood control nor soil erosion respects State lines.

Mr. Speaker, in my opinion, the following editorial which appeared in one of West Virginia's great newspapers, the Charleston Gazette, on May 17, 1955, is both timely and persuasive:

ATTEMPT TO DISMEMBER SOIL SERVICE REAL THREAT TO CONSERVATION AND FUTURE ECONOMY OF NATION

Conservation stands at the crossroads. The Eisenhower administration preaches conservation to lull a trusting public into an apathy even more dangerous than that which is woefully inherent to the average citizen. In the meantime private mineral, lumber, and grazing interests gather support for carefully laid plans to ravage our national forests with at least the acquiescence of the administration. The United States engineers propose substantially to destroy at least one national monument. Morale in the Fish and Wildlife Service and the Forest Service is at a lower ebb than at any time since these organizations grew out of their formative periods.

Only vigorous opposition in Congress prevented the administration and the United States engineers from completely hamstringing the small watersheds bill, one of the most constructive and badly needed pieces of legislation passed by any recent Congress.

The selfish greed of the land-grant colleges and their agricultural extension services for greater power and ultimate control of the Nation's entire agricultural program have been fostered and encouraged by the administration. Congress alone can prevent the dismemberment of the Soil Conservation Service, the ultimate destruction of the soil conservation districts, and the eventual relegation of the vital program of soil and water conservation to just another routine extension service authority.

If there ever was a time when every conservationist worth his salt should be standing on his hind feet and fighting to preserve our national forests, parks, and monuments for all the people, it is now. As for the administration's plan to decentralize soil and water conservation and create 48 individualized programs—going in all directions at once, some perhaps reasonably effective, others conducted with lackadaisical disinterest—this threatens the very foundation of our future economy and jeopardizes the health and subsistence of coming generations.

Selfish interests, governmental and private, seem to be in stronger position than ever before to take over and practice the doctrine of "the public be damned." There are many real conservationists, belonging to both parties, in Congress who have consistently opposed the administration's conservation policies and will continue to do so. They need the encouragement and support of an aroused citizenry.

LET US NOT BE DELUDED BY COMMUNIST TECHNIQUES

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHORT] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, within the past few days the news has carried two items of great significance. One has to do with the release of only 4 of the 15 American flyers, illegally held by the Chinese Communists as prisoners of war—in violation of the solemn covenants which they entered into in the cease-fire agreement at Panmunjom.

The other item has to do with the 62 naval vessels which the Russian Communists are at long last returning to us. These and many other vessels were turned over to the Russian Communists during World War II as a part of lend-lease, with the firm promise that they would be returned to us at the end of hostilities. However, 10 years after World War II hostilities ceased, the Russians still retain 148 of our naval vessels.

These two events are significant because they forcefully call to our attention once again the fact that the Communists—whether they be Chinese, Russians, or any other variety—never live up to their agreements. Their signature on a treaty is worthless. They will perform only so much of their treaty as they think is in their own selfish interests and at such time as it pleases them to do so. I think that we should keep these facts well in mind with the approach to the so-called Meeting at the Summit.

I hope that we will not allow ourselves to be deluded as to the ultimate objective of international communism. That objective is world domination, and the United States of America is included in their plans.

Permit me, Mr. Speaker, to quote briefly from a book entitled "The Great Globe Itself," written by our former able Ambassador to the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, and later our Ambassador to France, the Honorable William C. Bullitt, who quotes from Lenin on pages 94 and 95 of this book, which every Member should read if he has not already done so. I am quoting from Lenin's Collected Works, volume 24, page 122, of the Russian edition, quoted with approval by Stalin in his book, Problems of Leninism:

> We are living not merely in a state, but in a system of states; and it is inconceivable that the Soviet Republic should continue for a long period side by side with imperialist states. Ultimately one or the other must conquer. Meanwhile a number of terrible clashes between the Soviet Republic and the bourgeois states is inevitable.

Again, Lenin wrote in 1920 in The Infantile Sickness of Leftism in Communism:

> It is necessary * * * to use any ruse, cunning, unlawful method, evasion, concealment o' truth.

Mr. Speaker, let no one be deceived by the artifice, chicanery, trickery, by the

subterfuge, and by the downright falsehoods and lies of the Communists, because that is their chief technique, and we should not become too gratified or too hopeful because they at long last are releasing only four of the prisoners of war which they have illegally held.

On page 96 of The Great Globe Itself, Ambassador Bullitt has this to say, and I hope it could be emblazoned across the skies and drilled into the mind and heart of every American when the former Ambassador states:

Peace to the Soviet Government is not peace as we understand peace but an armistice in which to prepare attack.

That is the heart of the whole matter. They spar for time. Like a groggy prizefighter, they hold on until the bell rings. And we stupidly relax our efforts and let them get their second wind.

Let us not forget that Lenin was the apostle of the technique of 3 steps forward and 1 in reverse. It would appear that at present the Communists are in the process of taking that one step in reverse because of internal problems. The 14 mad dogs in the Kremlin have plenty of headaches these days. All is not going smoothly and well inside Soviet Russia and her satellite countries. If ever this Nation needed to be firm, it is now. I have great faith in Eisenhower and Dulles. God give them wisdom, strength, and courage to stand their ground.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include as a part of my remarks an editorial on Broken Pledges which appeared in today's Washington Daily News.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

(The editorial is as follows:)

BROKEN PLEDGES

In welcoming back to freedom four American fliers, we are apt to forget that—

The men have been illegally held by Red China.

Their detention and that of 11 other fliers is a violation of the Korean truce agreement.

Red China should be denounced for holding them rather than thanked for releasing them.

Being a civilized Nation, our first interest is to get our fellow countrymen released. If part of the price of doing that is to restrain our natural emotions, then we are big enough and honorable enough to do so.

Two years ago this spring President Eisenhower challenged the Communist rulers to prove their peaceful professions by concluding an honorable armistice in Korea and agreeing to a Korean settlement which would unite that country by free elections.

"Any armistice in Korea that merely released aggressive armies to attack elsewhere would be a fraud," the President said.

The armistice was signed, but it has been a fraud in many ways. Red China's military might backed the Communist victory in Indochina. Red China stepped up attacks on Nationalist China. The Korean truce has been repeatedly violated. Red China consistently has blocked a final Korean settlement and jeered at the idea of free elections.

At Geneva a year ago the Communists persisted in the same attitudes which have frustrated United Nations efforts to unify Korea since 1947.

Maybe the time has come again, before we are too overwhelmed by talk about peace, to ask: "How about a Korean settlement?"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. LANE in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. DEANE, the remarks he will make in Committee of the Whole and to exclude extraneous matter in connection with the bill H. R. 6499.

Mr. QUIGLEY and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. CRUMPACKER and to include a letter.

Mr. LAIRD and to include a speech by the Honorable JOHN W. BYRNES, of Wisconsin.

Mr. RAY and to include an editorial.

Mr. MCDONOUGH in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. HOSMER and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. LECOMPTE on the life and services of Chief Judge Harold Stephens.

Mr. AYRES.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska.

Mr. RODINO (at the request of Mr. MULTER) and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. DOLLINGER and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. EVINS (at the request of Mr. BASS of Tennessee) and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. LAIRD and to to include an address by Mr. HOPE.

Mr. SHELLEY (at the request of Mr. BOLLING) in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. DODD.

Mr. FLOOD.

Mr. ABBITT and to include an address.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. BOW and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. GWINN in two instances.

Mr. PELLY in three instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. LESINSKI.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. POFF, for Thursday and Monday, June 2, and 6, on account of official business.

Mr. KRUEGER, for from June 2 to June 8, on account of official business.

Mr. JAMES (at the request of Mr. GAVIN), for an indefinite period, on account of illness.

Mr. GUBSER (at the request of Mr. MARTIN), for 10 days, on account of illness.

Mr. GATHINGS (at the request of Mr. MILLS), for today and tomorrow, on account of official business.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey, through June 6, on account of official business outside of the United States.

SENATE BILLS REFERRED

Bills of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 414. An act 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; to the Committee on Public Works.

S. 928. An act to provide research and technical assistance relating to air pollution control; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

S. 1093. An act to fix and regulate the salaries of schoolteachers, school officers, and other employees of the Board of Education of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

S. 1187. An act to amend section 5221 of the Revised Statutes relating to voluntary liquidation of national banks; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

S. 1188. An act to amend section 5240 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, relating to the examination of national banks; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

S. 1189. An act to permit national banks to make 20-year real-estate loans, 9-month residential construction loans, and 18-month commercial construction loans; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

S. 1250. An act to declare Pike Creek above the easterly side of the highway bridge at Sixth Avenue in the city of Kenosha a nonnavigable stream; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

S. 1289. An act to establish a domestic relations branch in the municipal court for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

S. 1300. An act to declare a certain portion of the waterway at Greenwich, Conn. (in which is located the Greenwich Harbor), a nonnavigable stream; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

S. 1318. An act 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; to the Committee on Public Works.

S. 1340. An act to authorize the conveyance by quitclaim deed of certain land to the Brownsville Navigation District of Cameron County, Tex.; to the Committee on Public Works.

S. 1469. An act to declare the portion of the waterway at Bridgeport, Conn., known as the West Branch of Cedar Creek, a nonnavigable stream; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

S. 1736. An act to amend section 5146 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, relating to the qualifications of directors of national banking associations; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

S. 2061. An act to increase the rates of basic compensation of officers and employees in the field service of the Post Office Department; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 625. An act to provide for the adjustment of tolls to be charged by the Way-

land 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.;

H. R. 3879. An act to amend section 2 of the act of March 2, 1945, pertaining to the Columbia River at Bonneville, Oreg.;

H. R. 4646. An act to amend section 4421 of the Revised Statutes, in order to remove the requirement as to verifying under oath certain certificates of inspection, and for other purposes;

H. R. 4817. An act relating to the payment of money orders;

H. R. 5223. An act to continue until the close of June 30, 1956, the suspension of duties and import taxes on metal scrap, and for other purposes; and

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

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, bills of the House of the following titles:

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

H. R. 3879. An act to amend section 2 of the act of March 2, 1945, pertaining to the Columbia River at Bonneville, Oreg.;

H. R. 4646. An act to amend section 4421 of the Revised Statutes, in order to remove the requirement as to verifying under oath certain certificates of inspection, and for other purposes;

H. R. 4817. An act relating to the payment of money orders;

H. R. 5223. An act to continue until the close of June 30, 1956, the suspension of duties and import taxes on metal scrap, and for other purposes; and

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

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 51 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, June 2, 1955, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

856. A letter from the Commissioner, Emergency Procurement Service, General Services Administration, transmitting a copy of a notice to be published in the Federal Register of a proposed disposition of approximately 30 million pounds of palm oil now held in the national stockpile, pursuant to section 3 (e) of the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act (60 Stat. 597; 50 U. S. C. 98b (e)); to the Committee on Armed Services.

857. A letter from the National Shipswriter, Navy Club of the United States of America, transmitting the annual report of the Navy Club of the United States of America as of April 30, 1955; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

858. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the audit of the Bureau of Mines and Defense Minerals Exploration Administration, Department of the Interior, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1954, pursuant to the Budget and Accounting Act, 1921 (31 U. S. C. 53), and the Accounting and Auditing Act of 1950 (31 U. S. C. 67); to the Committee on Government Operations.

859. A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting a report on records proposed for disposal and lists or schedules covering records proposed for disposal by certain Government agencies; to the Committee on House Administration.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. LONG: Joint Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers. House Report No. 688. Report on the disposition of certain papers of sundry executive departments. Ordered to be printed.

Mr. LONG: Joint Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers. House Report No. 689. Report on the disposition of certain papers of sundry executive departments. Ordered to be printed.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 3333. A bill to amend title 18 of the United States Code relating to the mailing and transportation of obscene matter; without amendment (Rept. No. 690). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. ENGLE: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H. R. 3587. A bill granting the consent of the Congress to the negotiation of a compact relating to the waters of the Klamath River by the States of Oregon and California; with amendment (Rept. No. 703). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BOLLING: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 259. Resolution for consideration of H. R. 6410, a bill to authorize the construction of a building for a Museum of History and Technology for the Smithsonian Institution, including the preparation of plans and specifications, and all other work incidental thereto; without amendment (Rept. No. 704). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. DELANEY: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 260. Resolution for consideration of H. R. 5923, a bill to authorize certain sums to be appropriated immediately for the completion of the construction of the Inter-American Highway; without amendment (Rept. No. 705). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. O'NEILL: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 261. Resolution for consideration of H. R. 192, a bill to amend Public Law 526 of the 79th Congress, section 10 of the Flood Control Act, July 24, 1946 (Rappahannock River); without amendment (Rept. No. 706). Referred to the House Calendar.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1245. A bill for the relief of Marianne Anita Zelinka; without amendment (Rept. No. 691). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FEIGHAN: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1275. A bill for the relief of Gennaro Savarese; without amendment (Rept. 692). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1463. A bill for the relief of Rudolfo M. Gomez (Capaz); without amendment (Rept. No. 693). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FEIGHAN: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1540. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Joan Craig Newell; without amendment (Rept. No. 694). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CHELF: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1541. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Maria Dicran Simon; without amendment (Rept. No. 695). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FEIGHAN: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1648. A bill for the relief of Sister Luigia Pellegrino, Sister Angelina Nicastro, and Sister Luigina Di Martino; without amendment (Rept. No. 696). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FEIGHAN: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1997. A bill for the relief of Linda Beryl San Filippo; without amendment (Rept. No. 697). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FEIGHAN: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 2073. A bill for the relief of Bengt Wikstam; with amendment (Rept. No. 698). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Miss THOMPSON of Michigan: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 2495. A bill for the relief of Antoni Rajkowski; without amendment (Rept. No. 699). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FEIGHAN: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 2721. A bill for the relief of Mihai Indig; with amendment (Rept. No. 700). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FEIGHAN: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 2756. A bill for the relief of Frank Scriver; without amendment (Rept. No. 701). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Miss THOMPSON of Michigan: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 6086. A bill for the relief of certain relatives of United States citizens or lawfully resident aliens; with amendment (Rept. No. 702). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BLATNIK:

H. R. 6582. 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.

By Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana:

H. R. 6583. A bill to amend the Uniform Code of Military Justice; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BUDGE:

H. R. 6584. A bill to enable the Secretary of Agriculture to extend financial assistance to desert-land entrymen to the same extent as such assistance is available to homestead entrymen; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. DAVIS of Georgia:

H. R. 6585. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to establish a code of law for the District of Columbia," approved March 3, 1901, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. McCORMACK:

H. R. 6586. A bill to amend section 7 of the War Claims Act of 1948, with respect to claims of certain religious organizations functioning in the Philippine Islands; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MAILLIARD:

H. R. 6587. A bill to amend the Classification Act of 1949 with respect to the exclusion of crafts, trades, and labor positions therefrom; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. RAY:

H. R. 6588. A bill to establish dates for celebrating certain public legal holidays; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. REED of Illinois:

H. R. 6589. A bill to amend the Refugee Relief Act of 1953, as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BENNETT of Florida:

H. R. 6590. A bill to prohibit the employment by the Government of the United States of persons who are disloyal or who believe in the right to strike against the Government of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. ALGER:

H. R. 6591. A bill relating to the transportation of personal motor vehicles for military or civilian personnel; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. ASHLEY:

H. R. 6592. A bill to require compliance with the National Labor Relations Act as a condition of receiving Government contracts; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. BUCKLEY:

H. R. 6593. A bill to authorize and direct the Architect of the Capitol to transfer to the District of Columbia jurisdiction over certain portions of the United States Capitol Grounds and other grounds belonging to the United States for use in connection with the widening of Independence and Constitution Avenues and the rechannelization of Union Station Plaza; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. CRETELLA:

H. R. 6594. A bill to liberalize the provisions of the Refugee Relief Act of 1953; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FORAND:

H. R. 6595. A bill to amend certain provisions of law relating to the estate tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 6596. A bill to amend the Universal Military Training and Service Act; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. HIESTAND:

H. R. 6597. A bill to provide research and technical assistance relating to air pollution control; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HYDE:

H. R. 6598. A bill to provide for the creation of an Office of Administrator for Legal Assignments for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. KEOGH:

H. R. 6599. A bill to provide that the tax on transportation of property shall not apply to amounts paid for ferry service; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KILDAY:

H. R. 6600. A bill to amend section 303 of the Career Compensation Act of 1949, to authorize travel and transportation allowances, and transportation of dependents and of baggage and household effects to the homes of their selection for certain members of the uniformed services, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 6601. A bill to provide for the suspension of certain benefits in the case of members of the Reserve components of the Army, Navy, Air Force and Marine Corps ordered to extended active duty in time of war or national emergency, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. LIPSCOMB:

H. R. 6602. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to the treatment of the payment and receipt of back alimony; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MACK of Washington:

H. R. 6603. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act authorizing Federal participation in the cost of protecting the shores of publicly owned property," approved August 13, 1946; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. MOSS:

H. R. 6604. A bill to increase the rates of basic compensation of officers and employees in the field service of the Post Office Department; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. O'HARA of Illinois:

H. R. 6605. A bill to provide for protection of the shores of the United States against erosion; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. BUDGE:

H. J. Res. 328. Joint resolution providing for the revision of the Status of Forces Agreement and certain other treaties and international agreements, or the withdrawal of the United States from such treaties and agreements, so that foreign countries will not have criminal jurisdiction over American Armed Forces personnel stationed within their boundaries; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MILLER of New York:

H. J. Res. 329. Joint resolution providing for the revision of the Status of Forces Agreement and certain other treaties and international agreements, or the withdrawal of the United States from such treaties and agreements, so that foreign countries will not have criminal jurisdiction over American Armed Forces personnel stationed within their boundaries; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. FULTON:

H. Con. Res. 150. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that the United States in its international relations should maintain its traditional policy in opposition to colonialism and Communist imperialism; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. DINGELL:

H. Res. 258. Resolution to commend Representative ADAM CLAYTON POWELL for the statesmanship displayed by him at the recent Afro-Asian Conference; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. HAYS of Ohio:

H. Res. 262. Resolution to authorize the Subcommittee on Printing to make studies and inquiries relative to unnecessary Government printing and paper work; to the Committee on Rules.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States, relative to Federal research of problems relating to chronic alcoholism; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ANFUSO:

H. R. 6606. A bill for the relief of Ignacz Englender and Mrs. Olga Englender; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CHUDOFF:

H. R. 6607. A bill for the relief of James A. Franklin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DODD:

H. R. 6608. A bill for the relief of Peter Monaco; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HALEY:

H. R. 6609. A bill for the relief of Dorothy May Ackermann; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HIESTAND:

H. R. 6610. A bill for the relief of the Strategical Demolition Torpedo Co., Inc.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KING of California:

H. R. 6611. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Margherita Angela Savio Artiano; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MILLER of New York:

H. R. 6612. A bill for the relief of John Virag; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'BRIEN of Illinois:

H. R. 6613. A bill for the relief of Yuji Doi and Mrs. Matsuyo Yamaoka Doi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PHILLIPS:

H. R. 6614. A bill for the relief of Annilari Parchment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RIVERS:

H. R. 6615. A bill for the relief of Catherine Demetre Stouka and daughter, Irene Lycourgas Skia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. VINSON:

H. R. 6616. A bill to permit a retired officer of the Navy to be employed in a command status in connection with Antarctic expeditions; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. WALTER (by request):

H. R. 6617. A bill for the relief of Boris Kowerda; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WINSTEAD:

H. R. 6618. A bill for the relief of Etha Dora Johnson; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

299. By Mr. HERLONG: Petition of Mrs. H. A. McDonald and others of Ocala, Fla., urging Congress to get alcoholic-beverage advertising off the air and out of the channels of interstate commerce and thus protect the rights of States to prevent advertising within their borders; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

300. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the secretary-treasurer, California Association of Airport Executives, Inc., Fullerton, Calif., relative to urging passage of the amendments to the Federal Airport Aid Act as proposed in Senate bill 1855; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

301. Also, petition of the State secretary, Grand Council of Virginia, Order Fraternal Americans, petitioning consideration of their resolution relative to destruction of the present immigration and naturalization laws, and condemning any effort to amend the McCarran-Walter Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Commencement Address by Hon. Edward Martin, of Pennsylvania, at the Eastern Baptist College, St. Davids, Pa.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. EDWARD MARTIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, June 1, 1955

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an address I delivered at last Saturday's commencement exercises at the Eastern Baptist College at St. Davids, Pa.

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

COMMENCEMENT ADDRESS OF HON. EDWARD MARTIN, OF PENNSYLVANIA, AT THE EASTERN BAPTIST COLLEGE, ST. DAVIDS, PA., May 28, 1955

I deeply appreciate the high honor of being invited to address you this morning.

Never in the history of our country has the place of our colleges been as important as it is today.

We cannot praise too highly the tremendous contribution of the small colleges of America toward the maintenance of the American way of life. If we are to continue as a land of liberty and opportunity the small colleges must be preserved and protected.

They must be supported on a financial basis adequate to sustain their historic part in developing leadership for our country.

They must be kept free from dependence upon government. They must be kept free from bureaucratic regimentation and control. They must have freedom in their cultural, spiritual, and academic policies.

The small colleges of America are the guardians of the religious tradition in education. They have produced leaders in business and industry, science, education, military affairs, government, and the church.

No dictator will rise among us so long as our small colleges teach young men and young women to lead clean, decent, God-fearing lives and to appreciate the real meaning of patriotic Americanism.

We live in a time of desperate challenge. Great problems confront us.

Your generation will be called upon to assume responsibilities of vast magnitude. You will be called upon to assume the burden of a world torn by two conflicting ideologies.

One preaches the Word of God, sustained and strengthened by faith in the divine teachings of the Holy Bible.

The other plots in darkness to enslave mankind under a cruel tyranny that denies God and would tear down all that we hold sacred.

One believes in freedom under God as the source of all human progress. That philosophy, to which we adhere, upholds the dignity and sanctity of the individual. The other would destroy all freedom and all religion except worship of the state. In the Communist philosophy the individual exists only to serve the purposes of the government.

Within the lifetime of all of us here today revolutionary changes have taken place.

The swift pace of modern scientific development has touched upon every aspect of human activity. The old concepts of time and space have been swept away. Research into the secrets of nature has made possible the destruction of civilization should the world become involved in total war.

I bring these grim facts to your attention only to emphasize my firm belief that the future of mankind depends upon a clear understanding of the eternal and unchanging truths that govern the destinies of men and nations.

Let us, therefore, consider some things about the American Government and the American way of life.

The Founding Fathers erected a great landmark in human progress when they proclaimed that the right to "life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness" are divine endowments, bestowed upon all mankind by the Creator of the universe. They built the foundation of our Republic on faith in God. They placed their reliance upon the ideals that have guided men of good will on the path of honor and righteousness since the dawn of Christianity.

Their plan embraced the fundamental proposition that governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed.

They knew, however, from their profound study of history, that great democracies of the past had failed because the moral fiber of the people had become undermined by greed and corruption—because the people demanded their rights but failed to appreciate their obligations.

They knew that tyranny and dictatorship had always overwhelmed free people who ignored the sound principle that government has nothing to give except that which it first takes from the people.

They feared that the people through their own votes would rob the Public Treasuries—that they would fail to recognize that no government can give security—that anything given by government is counterbalanced by some loss of freedom.

Therefore, in framing the Constitution, the Founding Fathers sought to protect the rights and personal liberty of every individual from oppression by government and by their own acts. They established a constitutional Republic under which the people govern through their duly elected representatives. They adopted a Bill of Rights, placing definite limitations on the power of the chosen representatives of the people.

These fundamentals of the American system of government are well known to you. I mention them only because I believe that the principles and precepts of the Founding Fathers should be told over and over again until every citizen, young and old, understands and appreciates what America means and the reasons for its greatness.

As graduates of a fine, Christian college you are qualified by background, education, and experience to take leadership in the big job of teaching Americans the reasons we have become such a powerful Nation.

We must teach the glories of the American way of life and what it has accomplished. We must arouse among our people a deeper recognition of personal responsibility for good government. We must teach our people to be self-reliant, tolerant, and unselfish.

Our people should be taught in the schoolroom, from the lecture platform, the pulpit, the legislative halls, and the courts the difference between our republican form of government and the Communist system of Soviet Russia.

We must emphasize that freedom of the individual, as ordained by God, is the firm foundation of our national strength.

Americans are guided by the sacred principles of their religious faith. In the Communist philosophy there is no God; therefore there is no morality, no truth, no honor, no justice.

In the United States we the people are the Government. In Soviet Russia the people are ruled by the iron hand of tyranny. They have no choice, no voice, and no vote. They have no rights, no privileges, no freedom.

Under our Republic, government is the servant of the people. Under the distorted concepts of godless communism, government is the absolute master of the people—the will of the dictator is all powerful.

Many reasons have been advanced to explain why the United States has become such a great and powerful country. If we make an analysis, we find that we have no more intelligence. We have no greater natural resources. We have less territory than many of the competing nations.

Then why is it that in 200 years we have carved out of a wilderness a nation that is the world leader in material, cultural, and spiritual attainment?

Why is it that with only about one-sixth of the world's population and territory, we produce one-third of the world's goods?

To my mind, it can all be summed up in the fact that we have freedom of the individual—that here the dignity of man is recognized because he was created in the image of God.

Recognizing those ideals, we have lived under a system of government which has left personal ability and productive capacity unshackled. It gives to each man the rewards of his ingenuity and hard work.

There is another side. A great thinker once was asked why North America has advanced so much more in material progress than South America. South America, as you know, has some of the richest natural resources ever uncovered in the world. They have hard-working people. The answer was that those who came to South America were in search of gold, while those who settled North America were searching for God.

We are so fortunate that our country was built on the everlasting premise that God is sovereign and that the law comes from God.

In all the history of our country, great men—dedicated men of the cloth—have preached the word of God and the way of Christ.

There have always been great preachers to stand in the pulpits and guide the spiritual lives of our people.

There have always been church leaders and educators of great moral courage to fight against evil conditions that bring corruption into private lives and public affairs. Those men knew that the moral standards of government cannot rise above the spiritual strength of the individual citizen.

They did not hesitate to take an active part in public affairs and to fight for clean, decent, honest government in order to protect the liberties of the people.

They taught that obedience to the laws of God and man is the foundation of good citizenship.

No matter what career you may choose as your life work, I suggest that you study the lives and achievements of the great teachers and preachers who dared to fight for the principles of government in which they believed. Their example of militant Christianity can guide us today in meeting our duties and responsibilities as Americans.

I ask you to remember that religious duty and civic duty are interwoven.

Without the sustaining power of religion the United States could never have become the greatest and most powerful Nation of all time.

Without religion the blessings of freedom which we now take for granted could never have been ours.

Through religion unity of purpose was achieved; the will to help one another was strengthened.

Without religion there can be no lasting peace.

We must develop a stronger and more willing spirit of public service, civic-mindedness and moral leadership. We all should take part in government.

You all know about the three R's in early education—reading 'riting, and 'rithmetic. There have now been added three more R's—reality, responsibility, and reverence.

Things in the world are real. Let each of us prepare to do something to make a better world. Let us accept our full share of responsibility in our communities, the State, the Nation, in civic affairs, and in the church. We must appreciate decency, courtesy, and reverence.

If we are to retain our individual freedom, all Americans must be alert. We must realize that it is our Government.

What endangers our Government?

It is bigness. Twenty-five years ago we had 600,000 employees in the Federal Government. Today, even after a reduction of 200,000, we have 2,300,000 on the Federal payroll. The cost of the Federal Government 25 years ago was $3 billion a year. It is now $67 billion. The national debt 25 years ago was $25 billions. It is now $280 billion.

In 15 years private and public debt in the United States has multiplied by three.

These are things which should have your attention because the solvency and stability of our Government has a direct relationship to freedom of religion and the progress of education.

But regardless of American shortcomings, we are the hope of the world. In our prayers let us thank God that we are Americans.

In closing let me recall the words of Woodrow Wilson who said, and I quote:

"Freedom and free institutions cannot long be maintained by any people who do not understand the nature of their government."

For a better understanding of the nature of the American Government, let us teach that the three great supports in the tripod upholding the American way of life are:

1. Faith in God, in ourselves and in our fellow men.
2. Faith in our constitutional form of Government.
3. Faith in our plan of economy.

You can serve our country by teaching Americans what our Government really is and what American freedom means to us and to the world.

Program of Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, June 1, 1955

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, last Saturday night, May 28, it was my privilege to deliver an address broadcast from station WGN, Chicago, as a part of a regular series of reports to people of the Midwest.

My subject was the program of the 84th Congress for its 1st session.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of this talk be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

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

CONGRESS' PROGRAM FOR 1955

(Address by Hon. ALEXANDER WILEY, of Wisconsin, over station WGN, Chicago, May 28, 1955)

I would like to talk to you tonight about the work of your United States Congress in Washington.

I am going to set forth the things which I think your Senators and Representatives should be doing in the months remaining in this first session of the 84th Congress.

I am going to spell out a detailed legislative program.

I will tell you the bills that I am personally for; how I intend to vote on them.

I will mention such important subjects as—

The problem of the city person and the farmer;

Problems of national defense; the matter of small business;

The problems of our young people and of our old people; the health of America, and many other issues.

I'M FOR IKE'S PROGRAM

Basically, I am for the legislative program of Dwight D. Eisenhower. It is a forward-looking, dynamic program.

It conforms to the best principles of the Republican Party—but it is big enough, broad enough—to win the enthusiastic support of millions of independent voters as well.

What America wants is an All-American program, not just a Republican program. And that is what Dwight D. Eisenhower offers.

America doesn't believe in extremism of the right of extremism of the left.

It doesn't believe in stand-pat reaction or in wild-eyed radicalism.

America wants stability; it wants continuity; but it wants a modern program for the future, it doesn't want narrow-minded partisanship.

In domestic affairs, America wants Eisenhower moderation. In international affairs, it wants Eisenhower leadership in the worldwide alliance against communism.

Now let's get down to cases on what Congress' program should include.

INVINCIBLE DEFENSE

Now, first and foremost, is the matter of adequate defense. The No. 1 challenge to the Congress is the survival—I repeat—the survival—of America in the face of the worldwide Communist peril.

That is why Congress should closely evaluate and strengthen the present and future adequacy of our Army, Navy, and Air Force. In this dangerous atomic age, we cannot be "second best."

The Soviet Union is making alarming progress in her atomic development, in her long-range bombers.

And, so, I am personally in favor of accelerating our most crucial military programs. I think that we must still further strengthen our United States strategic aviation, heavy, and medium jet bombers.

I think that we should speed up our effort for the development of intercontinental missiles, both guided missiles and so-called ballistic missiles.

I think that we should speed up our program for atomic development—for nuclear-powered ships, above the sea and below the sea.

I think we should speed up our research into atomic powered airplanes.

I don't believe in wasting a dime, but I do believe that every single cent which is necessary for the most modern American defense and offense should and will be paid. Why? Because, it is a matter of our own survival.

STANDBY CONTROL POWERS

That is why we've got to get civil-defense "on the road."

It is why we've got to pass standby control powers for any emergency which may arise. I don't believe in leaving plans unmade until the last minute—when it may prove too late.

JUVENILE DELINQUENCY

Now, secondly, on problems right here at home, I want to turn to the problem of young people and old people.

This session of Congress, in my judgment, should not close without passing juvenile delinquency control legislation. I personally have sponsored such bills. I think that it is essential that a comprehensive program be set up so as to end the situation which has arisen with an appalling number of youngsters getting into trouble.

As a matter of fact, a million of our children are getting into trouble with the law every year. A third of a million end up in the Nation's courts.

That doesn't mean, of course, that the youngsters of America aren't fundamentally sound and wholesome. On the contrary, 95 percent of our youngsters never get into trouble at all. But the 5 percent that do get into trouble, merit our careful attention.

So, we need strong coordinated action, by home, church and school, by Federal, State, and local governments to help protect our young people. As a member of the Senate Subcommittee on Juvenile Delinquency, I pledge my continued efforts toward those ends.

OLD-AGE SECURITY

Now, I want to turn to the other end of the age scale. I want to turn to the problems of our old folks.

Ten percent of our population is aged 65 years or older. Too many of our old people find themselves on the scrap heap, so to speak. They can't find jobs because of prejudice against old age. They have problems of inadequate recreation, of health; they have problems of housing.

That is why I am a cosponsor of legislation to set up a new commission on the problems of the aged.

I think old people are a great human resource which we can ill afford to squander.

I think that men's and women's older years can be their best years. I recall the words of the poet: "Grow old with me; the best is yet to be."

I think that there is no real limitation on man. Chronological age does not matter one bit compared to men's thinking and their spirit. As we are young at heart, we are young in mind and body, and I am for a square break for old folks.

That is why I've introduced bills to liberalize social security. It is why I've offered the Wiley bill to extend old-age pensions to attorneys at law.

It is why I'm in favor of giving higher incentive to older folks to continue to work in their later years, without losing their modest pensions.

RAISE MINIMUM WAGE

Now, let me turn to the problems of the laboring man.

I think that the minimum wage ought to be increased. Right now it is only 75 cents an hour.

There is an unfortunate tendency for industries to shift from the North to the South merely to get the benefit of cheaper wage rates in Dixie.

Now, I am for fair competition between sections and States. But I have seen industries pack up and leave my own State of Wisconsin and leave other Midwestern States, and I certainly don't want to see more of

them leave our Northern States because of unfair southern wage differentials.

I think workers in the South are entitled to decent wages. "The laborer is worthy of his hire."

And I think workers in Wisconsin, as well as in Illinois or in other States, are entitled to a decent minimum wage. You can't raise a family these days on $30 or so a week for a 40-hour week, and so I definitely believe that the minimum wage should be increased.

PROTECTING CONSUMERS

I've referred thus far to the problems of defense, of old people and young people and workers.

Now, what about the consumer? I am in favor of definite protection of the consumer.

That is why I will continue to fight against the effort which would destroy controls over natural gas. If these controls were destroyed, natural-gas rates—which are already high—would skyrocket. That must not happen. It will not happen, if consumers get busy and write to the Congress, urging fair protection and fair controls on gas rates.

JUSTICE FOR THE FARMER

Now, what about the farmer? There are several key points I want to mention as regards the farm program.

First of all, I believe that farm parity should be increased. I think that the farmer's income has been nosediving, and that the time has come—in the national interest—to halt that nosedive.

I think that the dairyman has been having a particularly serious problem making ends meet. And I see no reason why the dairyman should not get the same amount of parity return as do the producers of the so-called six basic crops.

After all, there is nothing more basic nor more essential than milk: nature's first food, nature's best food.

And I think that it is a shame that some of our dairy farmers have had to sell out, have had to auction off their livestock and close their farms.

The dairyman is entitled to a just price, as are other United States farmers.

Toward that end, I have introduced a bill to establisn in Madison, Wis., the capital of my State, a dairy research laboratory. I think that such a laboratory could prove a tremendous boon for the dairymen of our country, and for every American as well.

It could help improve America's health; it could help improve the stability of our dairy industry. And that is why I have introduced the bill for a dairy research laboratory, in hope my listeners will give it their support.

SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION

Now, what about the problem of the small-business man?

On June 30, the Small Business Administration will die unless it is renewed.

I am very definitely in favor of renewal of this agency's authority to exist. If anything, we need more small businesses in America, rather than fewer.

As you and I know, there is a tendency toward mergers in our country today. There is a tendency for more and more relatively large corporations to swallow up smaller ones.

In addition, right now, tax rates tend to discriminate against the small businessman. He can't raise sufficient capital. And if he earns a profit, he can't keep it, because Uncle Sam grabs it up.

I think that the Federal Small Business Administration can do and has done a vital job, to protect smaller enterprises, and that is why I am very definitely in favor of continuing it.

SEAWAY CHANNELS

Now, what about the problem of internal improvements in our country?

One of the most important such problems is the matter of the Great Lakes connecting channels. This is the legislation for $100 million to, in effect, complete the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Seaway.

By enacting this bill, by deepening the connecting channels, above Lake Erie, we will have a 2,400 mile long artery into the heartland of the North American Continent.

We will have a fourth great coast on the oceans. The Great Lakes—the heartland of America—will have 27-foot deep water access to the ports of the world.

That is why the deepening of the connecting channels—as proposed in the Wiley bill—must be authorized.

Moreover, once the proposed Cal-Sag Canal is completed, as I believe it should be, we are going to see an artery right down through the midpart of North America, so that shipping can move from the Great Lakes to the Mississippi down on the gulf coast. This, too, will strengthen America internally. I am definitely in favor, therefore, of completing the Calumet-Sag Waterway.

MISCELLANEOUS BILLS

Now, friends, in the few minutes remaining to me, I'll like to mention a few of the other subjects which I believe your Congress should advance.

Let me just refer to them briefly:

1. Roads—The Congress should, I believe, enact the President's broad-visioned program for highway improvement. We can't continue with horse and buggy roads which are already choked with traffic.

2. Second, anticommunism: We should strengthen our internal-security laws by closing certain loopholes which now exist and by putting more teeth into anti-Red statutes. That means, for example, passing the Wiley bill to increase the penalties against seditious conspiracy.

3. Third, crime: There are several key anti-crime bills which we of the Kefauver crime committee had recommended but which Congress has not enacted. These bills—against gambling, tax evasion by gangsters, interstate bookmaking, and the like should definitely be enacted without further delay.

4. Taxes: There should be further liberalizing of the tax laws. That's one reason why I've offered a bill to permit parents to deduct the heavy cost of educating their youngsters in college. And, too, there should be more tax deductions, for working mothers.

5. Now, fifth, reservists: Congress should definitely provide a fairer break for our reservists who have been treated very arbitrarily in the past by the Pentagon.

Many World War II veterans were called back into the colors for the Korean conflict even though other men, without any prior service were not called at all. Reservists are the backbone of our defense and must be treated fairly.

6. Education: Congress should make available oil revenues from the rich outer Continental Shelf for purposes of bolstering United States national defense and for purposes of school aid.

7. Health: Pending bills to provide a Federal program for expansion of United States medical schools, training and research centers, should definitely be enacted in the interest of better health for all.

Meanwhile, Congress should continue its various investigations:

Its probing of subversive forces.

Its investigations of monopoly.

Its investigations of the causes of juvenile delinquency.

Its investigations of Canadian stock swindlers, a probe of frauds and racketeers, conducted in the interest of the investing public, which I personally have been spearheading.

And other probes against graft and corruption should likewise continue.

CONCLUSION

Well, friends, I want you to know that I've enjoyed submitting this legislative program to you.

I hope that you've found it helpful.

It would be a pleasure to get your reaction to it; just write me what you think Congress should do prior to its scheduled adjournment.

This is ALEX WILEY signing off from Washington, D. C.

Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH W. GWINN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 1, 1955

Mr. GWINN. Mr. Speaker, Spiritual Mobilization, 1521 Wilshire Boulevard, Los Angeles 17, Calif., is, for the fifth consecutive year, urging an observance of Independence Day which calls attention to the spiritual foundations of the Government of the United States of America and to the inherent relationships between religious faith and freedom.

The Government of the United States of America was the first in history established on the recognition of the fact that man is free only as he seeks freedom according to divine laws. The signers of the Declaration of Independence acknowledged that the freedom they proclaimed was a gift from their Creator. The Declaration of Independence is a proclamation of conviction in the supreme worth of each man as a child of God. It heralded the birth of a Nation in which each man might claim his birthright of freedom under God. It proclaimed that there is no freedom but freedom under God. Thereafter people would have the right to be what they ought to be and to possess what they ought to possess.

"The freedom under God observance of Independence Day" was originated, under Spiritual Mobilization's sponsorship in 1951, through a 175th anniversary committee. The Honorable Herbert Hoover and Gen. Douglas MacArthur were among the committee's 89 distinguished members. Focusing attention on the religious significance of America's heritage, this annual nationwide effort enlists the support of clergymen, public officials, businessmen, clubs and organizations, publishers, and broadcasters. Governors and mayors throughout the country each year, issue official proclamations for a "Freedom under God observance of Independence Day."

Individuals are urged to take part in the "Freedom under God observance of Independence Day"—

By commemorating the birth of our country with personal dedication to the spiritual concepts set forth by our Founding Fathers;

By reading and pondering the Declaration of Independence in an effort to understand and value its profound meanings;

By recognizing that God is the source of freedom and that "men are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights";

By fortifying freedom with faith in God, faith in one's self, faith in other men;

By writing editors, columnists, commentators and public officials their opinions on happenings which infringe on individual liberty;

By personally taking the responsibility for meeting a community need or for helping another stand on his own feet;

By applying religious principles to every problem they face.

Spiritual mobilization assists individuals and groups in contributing to the "Freedom under God observance of Independence Day" by making available on request a variety of material and literature designed to inject the "Freedom under God" theme into the observance of Independence Day. It would be difficult to conceive of a more fitting and, in these critical times, a more significant day than July 4 on which each of us may once again rededicate ourselves to the purposes for which our forefathers pledged their lives, their fortunes, and their sacred honor.

We hope that everyone will act within their own sphere of influence to help carry out this "Freedom under God observance of Independence Day, 1955."

Independence Day of Armenia, May 28, 1918

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN LESINSKI, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 1, 1955

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, much of the tension in the world today arises from the fact that so many nations have been deprived of their freedom and independence. Under such conditions there can be no real or lasting peace. The United States by espousing the cause of self-determination for all nations both great and small has become a beacon of hope for those enslaved or subject to alien domination.

As the leader of the free, the United States, is striving to ease those international tensions that have their roots in the denial of liberty to so many millions in Europe and Asia and thus bring back genuine peace to our world.

Among those nations which today are deprived of their independence is Armenia. Armenia's political independence was lost late in the 14th century, and from then until 1918 the Armenians had not known what it meant to be free. For more than 500 years their historic homeland was overrun and parcelled out among its conquerors—Persians, Russians, and Ottoman Turks. During all that time they suffered many hardships and lost heavily in worldly goods; often they were subjected to wholesale massacres. Early in World War I their very existence as a people was threatened in a massacre unprecedented in modern history. One million Armenians lost their lives in that atrocious butchery. But the survivors of those horrors did not lose heart. Early in 1918 in a portion of their homeland then part of the old Russian Empire, they declared their national independence on May 28, 1918.

It is that day which is being celebrated today in all Armenian communities where there is freedom to celebrate national holidays. Armenian independence was supported by the United States and we gave our moral and financial assistance to the struggling government of that counry. We tried to help it in every way possible. At one time we were even asked to be a mandatory over Armenia but, not being as fully conscious of our world leadership as we are today, we declined it. Besides, the course of international events proved fatal to Armenian independence. Late in 1920 the new Republic of Armenia became an easy victim of aggressive Turkish nationalism and expanding Russian communism.

Since then Armenian independence has vanished, but the Armenian people and their sympathetic friends continue to celebrate that independence day in the hope that someday, and perhaps soon, they may regain their independence. I heartily join in this memorable celebration.

Peace Talks for United Nations Meeting

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN F. SHELLEY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 1, 1955

Mr. SHELLEY. Mr. Speaker, inasmuch as the 10th anniversary of the founding of the United Nations will be commemorated in June of this year by a special session of the general assembly in the district which I have the honor to represent in San Francisco, the birthplace of the U. N., I want to call the attention of the House to a meritorious suggestion recently advanced to further the purposes of that historic occasion. Dr. Persio C. Franco, a former diplomatic representative of the Dominican Republic now living in the United States, has suggested in a letter to the New York Times that all living recipients of the Nobel peace prize be invited to attend the commemorative sessions as a mark of our continuing devotion to the cause of world peace.

It seems to me personally that this idea has merit beyond the simple recognition of the personal attainments of these distinguished people. Should the United States officially accept and sponsor the proposal by Dr. Franco, the act would present further tangible evidence to the world of our unswerving purpose to bring peace to the world through peaceful means—the basic ideal to which the majority of United Nations are dedicated and for which it was founded. The Nobel peace prize has gained universal recognition as a symbol of man's efforts to attain that end despite seemingly endless setbacks. The outstanding citizens of many countries who have received the award have already contributed much to the cause of peace. Their presence at the coming U. N. sessions in San Francisco would certainly lend emphasis to the fact that we as a nation and the other member countries of the U. N. who honestly subscribe to its principles have not allowed the frustrations we have experienced to make us forget the goal we had in mind when President Roosevelt conceived and President Truman put into execution the plans for the establishment of the United Nations.

Mr. Speaker, I intend to urge Secretary of State Dulles and Ambassador Lodge to place the United States squarely behind this proposal. I can think of no better way to impress upon the world our wholehearted sincerity in clinging to the hope for a permanent peace among nations without recourse to the sword or nuclear weapons. I submit Dr. Franco's letter to the New York Times for printing with these remarks so that the Congress and the people of the United States may lend their voices in support of his well-conceived plan:

WASHINGTON, *May 24, 1955.*

To the EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES:

The paramount objective of the United Nations—the most important concern of all mankind—is the creation of peace among the peoples of the world. The men who have been awarded the Nobel peace prize have made exceptional contributions toward the attainment of that objective. Of them the following are still living:

Sir Norman Angell, British, born 1874, received the prize in 1933; Dr. Carlos Saavedra Lamas, Argentinian, born 1880, prize 1936; Viscount Cecil of Chelwood, British, born 1864, prize 1937; Cordell Hull, American, born 1871, prize 1945; Prof. Emily Green Balch, American, born 1867, prize 1946; Lord Boyd Orr of Brechin, British, born 1880, prize 1949; Ralph J. Bunche, American, born 1904, prize 1950; Albert Schweitzer, French, born 1875, prize 1952; Gen. George C. Marshall, American, born 1880, prize 1953.

I suggest that they be invited to attend and address the assembly to be held next June 20–26, at San Francisco in commemoration of the tenth anniversary of the founding of the United Nations; also Pearl Buck, American, and Gabriela Mistral, Chilean, who won the Nobel literature prizes for 1938 and 1945, respectively; and Emilio Bello Codesido, Chilean, who is the dean of Pan Americanists. He is the sole survivor among the delegates to the first and second international Conferences of American States, held in Washington and Mexico City in 1889 and 1901, respectively.

These eminent men and women could speak to the assembly in behalf of all peoples of the world, including those that are not officially represented in the United Nations.

PERSIO C. FRANCO.

A United Nations Police Force

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 1, 1955

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, in the fall of this year the United Nations General Assembly will consider whether to hold a conference for a review of the United Nations Charter. It is almost certain that such a conference will be

held. The Senate Foreign Relations Committee has been conducting extensive hearings to find out if the United States should propose any revisions of the charter at that time.

It seems to me that the question of a United Nations police force should loom large in any review of the charter. It is one of the major problems in organizing the nations of the world to provide for the security under which all could live in peace.

Under the charter, all members of the United Nations assumed the obligation to make armed forces available to the Security Council, in accordance with a special agreement or agreements. The agreements were to be negotiated between the Security Council and individual members or groups of members and to be subject to ratification. Negotiations were initiated in the United Nations soon after its establishment to determine what forces the Big Five Powers should make available, but a deadlock soon developed between the Soviet Union and the western countries as to the balance of forces to be provided by each major country. It soon became apparent that the Soviet Union had no intention of approving any agreements and would use its veto to block approval, and that further negotiations in the Security Council would be fruitless.

In 1950 at the height of the Korean war the United Nations General Assembly passed what has become commonly known as the "uniting for peace" resolution. In it the Assembly recommended that each member maintain within its armed forces elements so trained, organized, and equipped that they could be made available, in accordance with its constitutional processes, for service as United Nations units, upon recommendation of either the Council or the Assembly. This marked a step forward in providing that the Assembly should exercise concurrent jurisdiction with the Council in recommendations on the creation and use of armed forces, but progress along the path opened up by the resolution has been slow—indeed, almost negligible. It was to be expected that there would be no response from the Communist bloc to such a recommendation. Even among the free world nations, however, a demonstrated willingness to contribute forces to the United Nations for the maintenance of peace has been almost totally lacking.

The United States was called upon to furnish a grossly disproportionate share of the manpower and equipment toward the winning of the Korean war. Even taking into consideration the economic difficulties and military commitments elsewhere which kept many of the free nations from joining in the common effort, much more could and should have been done by the other members of the U. N. It is inequitable and unjust for many U. N. members to bask in the security provided by belonging to the United Nations and not to fulfill the responsibilities which membership imposes upon them. Moreover, if one member-state shirks its responsibility and is able to do so with impunity, then another may do the same thing and soon the whole system of collective security disintegrates.

Perhaps there should be an amendment to the charter which would provide that members would contribute a certain quota of their forces based on population for use by the United Nations. If this were not acceptable, maybe some system could be devised whereby members making decisions on war and peace in the United Nations could be limited to those which are willing to contribute forces for carrying out the decisions. This could have the effect of inducing some members to contribute which might not do so otherwise. Since the Communist countries would almost certainly refuse to join in a U. N. police force, this would bar them from sharing in the decision-making. In Korea, the Soviet Union aided the aggressors, and at the same time participated in the decision-making in the United Nations, involving the organization in paradoxes of principle and procedure which placed a severe strain on cooperative efforts to resist the aggression.

There are many knotty problems of policy and method which would be encountered in a serious attempt to establish a United Nations police force. Would a two-thirds vote in the Assembly be an effective procedure for deciding to use the police force? Should there be a definition of aggression in the Charter so that it would be unmistakably clear when it was lawful to use such a force? These are examples of the questions which would have to be answered. However, one thing is clear: until overwhelming power is put behind just law there will be no lasting peace. And in the atomic age peace has become sheer necessity for the survival of mankind.

Although regional arrangements, such as the North Atlantic Pact, are effective within their limited range, it is important to go further and devise an international framework within which all nations of good will could be allowed, and would be expected, to do their share in sustaining the forces of international law and order.

Memorial Day Address

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 1, 1955

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following Memorial Day address given by our colleague, the Honorable JAMES M. QUIGLEY, of Pennsylvania, on Monday, May 30, 1955, at Camp Hill and New Oxford, Pa.:

We are gathered here today on this sacred ground to remember our dead and to pay special tribute to those men and boys who were born and grew up in this area and who then went forth to offer their lives so that we and our country might live. It is proper that we should do this—for this is the purpose of Memorial Day. This is the reason for the holiday.

Unfortunately, this day will come and go, and have little or no significance for many Americans. The meaning of Memorial Day will be lost in the roar of racing automobiles, the cheering at the doubleheaders, in the excitement of the season's first picnic. Too many Americans will be so wrapped up in their pursuit of happiness that they will not remember even for a moment that good, brave men met death that we might continue to live in America with the reasonable hope of meeting up with happiness somewhere along the way.

Fortunately, however, there are many good Americans who will remember. Throughout the length and breadth of this land—in small towns and big cities—men and women will gather today, as we are gathered here. In simple but dramatic ceremonies, our honored dead will be remembered. And the honor thus bestowed upon our war dead should serve to remind all of us of why they died, and to help us to be more firmly resolved that they did not die in vain. For Memorial Day will indeed become a shallow thing when it fails to remind all of us of our duties as citizens. Duties which are always with us. Duties which may be more colorful and romantic in time of war but are nonetheless vital and unavoidable in time of peace. This is indeed the true value of Memorial Day that, remembering those who sacrificed even life itself, for the American ideal, the living may take courage and strength in their defense and development of that ideal.

America can be proud that it was the first Nation of the world to set aside a day on which to pay tribute to those who died in defense of their country. It is not fitting, however, that we should remember only those who died and at the same time to forget those who are still suffering from wounds received in service, particularly the paraplegics, the amputees, and the mentally ill. These men and their families have paid and are paying even a higher price than those who met death on the battlefield.

It is true that in indirect ways—such as the sale of poppies these, our living dead, are remembered on this day. It is also true that throughut the year our veterans' organizations and their auxiliaries do a grand job of easing the burden of our hospitalized veterans. But, sad to note, by and large this Nation as a whole does a pretty thorough job of forgetting those veterans who were unable to march home from the wars. This forgetfulness is not to our credit as a people.

I trust that we will live to see this defect in our Nation's character corrected. It has been my hope for sometime that the day will come when this Nation will have a day set apart to memorialize and pay tribute to our disabled war veterans. I visualize that on this day, dedicated to the disabled, good men and good women, led by their former comrades in arms and fellow veterans, will flock to the various veterans hospitals to visit and to cheer and to pay tribute to those to whom we owe so much and remember so seldom.

I express this hope fully conscious that in many respects this country can't stand another holiday. Our holiday accident rate for example is indeed a crime and a disgrace. I make the suggestion for this special day for the disabled even though I share the feeling that we in America already have too many special days and special weeks for a vast variety of purposes, good, bad, and indifferent. Nevertheless I urge the establishment of just this 1 more day, for just this 1 more purpose because I believe that by and through such a day we can, in a small way, fulfill our duty to those less fortunate and at the same time focus public attention on the great work of rehabilitation that remains to be done in this field.

I do not presume to suggest when such a day should be observed. Initially my thinking was that it should be the anniversary of V–J Day, because while the Civil

War gave us Memorial Day and World War I Armistice Day, now almost 10 years since its end, no special day of remembrance has been effectively set aside to commemorate World War II. However, I am no longer certain that V-J is the ideal day. This change in my thinking is caused in part by the fact that just a year ago tomorrow the President signed into law an act of Congress which caused Armistice Day as this country has known it since the end of World War I to go out of existence and to be commemorated henceforth as Veterans' Day. This presidential and congressional action was in a sense a recognition that Memorial Day and Armistice Day tended to duplicate one another. I suppose it was this recognition of duplication and a desire to avoid triplification more than anything else which prevented the successful establishment of a special day to commemorate World War II.

In any event, on the basis of the action of Congress this Nation will now officially remember its war dead, of all wars and of every battlefield on 1 day out of the year. That day is today, Memorial Day. Likewise from now on this Nation will officially remember its veterans, of all wars and every battlefield, 1 day out of the year and that day will be November 11. In the light of this development I seriously suggest that from now on November 11—Veterans' Day—would be the ideal day to give special honor and special remembrance to those veterans who have sacrificed in an especially hard way for the defense of our country.

If such a day is to become a reality, it will need more than my dreaming. But all it really needs, is a few people who believe that it is a dream worth dreaming and with a willingness to do something about it. After all, Memorial Day was the result of the efforts of a few women and we as a nation are grateful to a Philadelphia Sunday-school teacher for giving us Mother's Day. There is no reason why we could not this morning light the spark that could spread throughout the entire country, the burning desire to do more for our disabled. From the town of Camp Hill starting at this moment, there could go forth an ideal, a spirit which could eventually add much of character and beauty to our national life.

Such a project would indeed be worth our efforts. Few of us, in our lifetimes will have an opportunity to participate in an effort more worthwhile. I humbly but honestly submit this my dream, for your consideration and action. A Memorial Day for our living dead would bring forth a public acknowledgment of our unpayable debt to those in the beyond who fought and died that this ceremony here today is not just so many hollow words, but a hallowed tribute to them and to all who fought and sacrificed in the defense of our great Nation.

It is within our power to make this a Memorial Day that will never be forgotten.

Holiday Highway Accident Toll Mounts—Speeding Automobiles Called Misguided Missiles

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 1, 1955

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, as usual, the aftermath of the Memorial Day holiday tells a sickening story of death and destruction on the highways of the Nation. Latest reports, which may be revised upward, indicate that some 360 persons were killed on the road in automobiles during the weekend just past when the Nation observed Memorial Day.

We call this holocaust which plagues our Nation with each national holiday season, a series of accidents. It would seem to me, Mr. Speaker, that there is very little "accident" connected with the driver who sends his car down the highway at terrific speeds or a driver who ignores traffic regulations drawn up for his safety or who drives while intoxicated. These drivers are not involved in accidents; they are involved in almost certain destruction. The accident victims are those whom these murderous drivers encounter or who are so unfortunate as to be passengers in these missiles—these misguided missiles of death.

A recent compilation of highway casualty statistics has been supplied by an esteemed friend and is a reliable and accurate report which, Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. These statistics may startle, but they should be read.

The tables are as follows:

Actions of drivers resulting in deaths and injuries—1954

	Persons killed	Percent	Persons injured	Percent
Exceeding speed limit	12,380	45.7	659,000	43.1
On wrong side of road	4,970	18.3	131,480	8.6
Did not have right-of-way	3,060	11.3	351,670	23.0
Cutting in	100	.4	45,880	3.0
Passing on curve or hill	140	.5	3,060	.2
Passing on wrong side	320	1.2	32,100	2.1
Failed to signal and improper signaling	410	1.5	58,100	3.8
Car ran away—no driver	30	.1	3,060	.2
Drove off roadway	1,980	7.3	79,510	5.2
Reckless driving	3,440	12.7	142,200	9.3
Miscellaneous	270	1.0	22,940	1.5
Total	27,100	100.0	1,529,000	100.0

Age of drivers in accidents—1954

	Drivers in fatal accidents	Percent	Drivers in nonfatal accidents	Percent
Under 18 years	1,440	3.4	53,310	2.6
18-24 years	8,800	20.7	348,570	17.0
25-64 years	29,920	70.4	1,584,960	77.3
65 and over	2,340	5.5	63,560	3.1
Total	42,500	100.0	2,050,400	100.0

Operating experience of drivers in accidents—1954

	Drivers in fatal accidents	Percent	Drivers in nonfatal accidents	Percent
Less than 3 months	550	1.3	28,710	1.4
3 to 6 months	260	.6	16,400	.8
6 to 12 months	550	1.3	34,860	1.7
1 year or more	41,140	96.8	1,970,430	96.1
Total	42,500	100.0	2,050,400	100.0

Types of motor vehicles involved in fatal and nonfatal accidents—1954

	Vehicles in fatal accidents	Percent	Vehicles in nonfatal accidents	Percent
Passenger car	33,400	78.3	1,767,700	84.4
Commercial vehicle	7,290	17.1	215,750	10.3
Taxi	210	.5	58,650	2.8
Bus	470	1.1	33,500	1.6
Motorcycle	770	1.8	12,600	.6
All others	510	1.2	6,300	.3
Total	42,650	100.0	2,094,500	100.0

Condition of vehicles involved in fatal and nonfatal accidents—1954

	Vehicles in fatal accidents	Percent	Vehicles in nonfatal accidents	Percent
In apparently good condition	40,640	95.3	2,025,300	96.7
Brake defective	510	1.2	33,500	1.6
Steering defective	130	.3	6,300	.3
1 or 2 lights out	260	.6	4,200	.2
Taillight out or obscured	40	.1	2,100	.1
Other defects in equipment	600	1.4	16,800	.8
Puncture or blowout	470	1.1	6,300	.3
Total	42,650	100.0	2,094,500	100.0

Weather conditions prevailing in accidents—1954

	Fatal accidents	Percent	Non-fatal accidents	Percent
Clear	25,930	84.2	1,021,360	80.0
Fog	370	1.2	12,770	1.0
Rain	3,640	11.8	183,840	14.4
Snow	860	2.8	58,730	4.6
Total	30,800	100.0	1,276,700	100.0

Days of occurrence of accidents—1954

	Persons killed	Percent	Persons injured	Percent
Sunday	6,530	18.4	313,600	16.0
Monday	4,370	12.3	260,680	13.3
Tuesday	3,660	10.3	231,280	11.8
Wednesday	3,940	11.1	237,160	12.1
Thursday	4,080	11.5	245,000	12.5
Friday	5,470	15.4	307,720	15.7
Saturday	7,450	21.0	364,560	18.6
Total	35,500	100.0	1,960,000	100.0

Hours of occurrence of accidents—1954

	Persons killed	Percent	Persons injured	Percent
12 to 1 a. m.	2,060	5.8	58,800	3.0
1 to 6 a. m.	6,390	18.0	176,400	9.0
6 to 7 a. m.	780	2.2	31,360	1.6
7 to 8 a. m.	600	1.7	64,680	3.3
8 to 9 a. m.	710	2.0	72,520	3.7
9 to 10 a. m.	780	2.2	62,720	3.2
10 to 11 a. m.	960	2.7	73,620	3.8
11 to 12 a. m.	1,100	3.1	90,160	4.6
12 to 1 p. m.	920	2.6	90,160	4.6
1 to 2 p. m.	1,170	3.3	95,280	4.9
2 to 3 p. m.	1,710	4.8	110,620	5.6
3 to 4 p. m.	1,850	5.2	141,120	7.2
4 to 5 p. m.	1,880	5.3	174,440	8.9
5 to 6 p. m.	2,130	6.0	165,400	8.4
6 to 7 p. m.	2,020	5.7	121,520	6.2
7 to 8 p. m.	2,420	6.8	111,720	5.7
8 to 9 p. m.	2,200	6.2	94,080	4.8
9 to 10 p. m.	1,950	5.5	82,320	4.2
10 to 11 p. m.	1,810	5.1	72,520	3.7
11 to 12 p. m.	2,060	5.8	70,560	3.6
Total	35,500	100.0	1,960,000	100.0

Direction of travel of cars involved in accidents—1954

	Persons killed	Percent	Persons injured	Percent
Going straight	27,760	78.2	1,305,360	66.6
Turning right	570	1.6	33,320	1.7
Turning left	1,770	5.0	99,960	5.1
Backing	390	1.1	33,320	1.7
Skidding	2,240	6.3	70,560	3.6
Car parked or standing still	1,170	3.3	117,600	6.0
Slowing or stopping	430	1.2	239,120	12.2
Miscellaneous	1,170	3.3	60,760	3.1
Total	35,500	100.0	1,960,000	100.0

Almost 40 percent of the deaths occur on weekends.

Saturday was the most dangerous day of the week.

Crossing between intersections was the greatest cause of pedestrian casualties.

Drivers under 25 were involved in more than their proportionate share of accidents.

Three out of five deaths occur during the hours of darkness.

Ninety-five percent of the vehicles involved were in good mechanical condition.

Minimum Wage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 1, 1955

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I wish to include herein my statement before the House Committee on Education and Labor favoring increase of the minimum wage to $1.25:

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, the present minimum wage of 75 cents an hour is a law without a friend, because every sincere American is ashamed of it.

Those who do take advantage of it to avoid paying labor its just compensation don't qualify as citizens, or as human beings.

They are very close to being Communists, because they treat their workers as slaves.

It is a pity that we cannot bring them into court and sentence them to make restitution for this virtual nonpayment of wages, or, better yet, give them a 1-year term at the hard labor of trying to exist on $30 a week.

As long as the law freezes the wages of certain workers at starvation levels, the reputation of the United States will suffer from scorn and abuse, against which there is no defense.

Economic justice, equality of opportunity, at $30 a week?

I am positive that, if every Member of Congress could acquire the rugged field experience of trying to keep body and soul together on $30 a week, legislation to increase the minimum wage to $1.25 per hour would be passed immediately, and without a dissenting voice.

And a heavy burden of guilt would be lifted from our conscience.

Seventeen years have passed since the Fair Labor Standards Act (and we wince at that misnomer) was passed, 17 years of tremendous economic progress, 17 years during which the minimum wage, against opposition that it is almost impossible to imagine in this age of economic enlightenment, barely managed to get up to 75 cents per hour. In 1950, 5 years ago.

The great majority of employers pay their employees well. They are a credit to themselves and the Nation.

The few who pay substandard wages are being subsidized in fact, by the reputable enterprises who must make up the deficit.

Honorable business concerns must not only pay their own share in providing social and community services, but are forced to pick up the tab for the exploiters of labor. This is a rank injustice, which can only be corrected by raising the minimum wage, and thus providing some protection for both workers and responsible firms.

Any canvass of labor-surplus areas will reveal how vagrant industries search for these localities, and then start up operations with the sole intent of paying the lowest wages possible. Under the guise of providing employment, they force standards down, and depress the communities they profess to help.

They use the slave-labor minimum-wage law to cannibalize business.

They are an insult and a menace to everything that we value in our system of free and progressive enterprise.

The minimum budget necessary for a single American to support himself is $2,500 a year.

This is at the rate of $1.25 minimum hourly rate.

An average worker, with a family to support, would require more.

Anything less than this has a deteriorating effect upon the health, morale, and productivity of individuals and communities.

Compared with the steady increase in our gross national product, it is a contradiction leading to extremes and tensions that we must avoid if we are to keep our economy healthy and our people strong and confident.

An employer or a corporation claiming inability to pay workers more than $1.25 an hour has no right to hire human beings.

They can and should be made to pay a decent wage or suffer the consequences.

I am opposed to the decision that the hearings on this important legislation will not cover extension of the law to additional employers. This is a loophole that enables some irresponsible employers to escape from their obligations.

In conclusion, I heartily endorse the proposal to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act in a manner to raise the legal minimum wage from 75 cents to $1.25 per hour.

I believe that this increase should take effect just as soon as possible, and during this session of Congress because the laws of this Nation should promote the public welfare, and must never be misused as a shield to protect scavengers.

Real Nice Holiday, Yes?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN H. RAY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 1, 1955

Mr. RAY. Mr. Speaker, under the permission granted to extend my remarks, I include in this statement a copy of a timely and vigorous editorial. It interested me and I hope all Members of the House will find it worthy of serious consideration. The editorial makes two points: First, that our so-called national holidays, other than those with religious significance, be celebrated on Mondays; and, second, that we simplify and improve the calendar along the lines of the world calendar printed with the editorial.

The second point is dealt with in the bill, H. R. 3588, introduced by the Delegate from Hawaii [Mrs. FARRINGTON] and referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs. It proposes a slightly different form of world calendar from that printed in the editorial but the difference is not substantial.

One approach to the first problem presented in the editorial appears in House Concurrent Resolution 55, introduced by the Member from New Jersey [Mr. HAND] and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary. Since I desire to present to the committee a quite different treatment of the holiday-on-Monday problem, I have today introduced H. R. 6588, which reads as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, to all intents and purposes and in the same manner that they are now made public holidays by law, each of the holidays hereinafter named shall be celebrated on the day shown in the following list: New Year's Day, on the first Monday in January; Washington's Birthday, on the third Monday in February; Memorial Day, on the last Monday in May; Fourth of July, on the first Monday in July; Labor Day, on the first Monday in September; Armistice Day, on the second Monday in November; Thanksgiving Day, on the last Monday in November.

SEC. 2. This act shall take effect on January 1, 1956.

I hope all Members will give prompt and serious study to all of these bills and express their views to the appropriate committees.

The editorial follows:

REAL NICE HOLIDAY, YES?

We're assuming, of course, that things went smoothly for you throughout these past 3 days. No road accidents—no untimely squalls at your vacation spot—nobody forgot the can opener—and no seventh son of a seventh son of a sea cook talked you into just one more nibble at his special 8-to-1 martinis. Oh, brother.

So now how about us increasingly vacation-minded citizens sitting down and trying to figure out how we can achieve more of these refreshing 3-day breaks in the year's routine?

In this year of 1955, actually, we're not faring badly holidaywise.

Labor Day, of course, always falls on a Monday and thereby is the automatic windup of a triple-decker weekend.

The Fourth of July also will land on a Monday. And Armistice Day, by arriving on a Friday this year, will provide a 3-day-off spell for some of us.

But, as our present calendar operates, those 1955 breaks are just that—accidental. Next year, for instance, Fourth of July will come on a Wednesday. Try and squeeze a big holiday out of those 24 hours.

So what do we do? Well, more and more thoughtful citizens are pointing out that Congress can remedy this situation if it would, and quite simply. The setting of national holidays is one of our lawmakers' stated though seldom exercised chores.

CONGRESS CAN DO IT

Congress could do us all a handsome favor by decreeing that all United States holidays (excepting those with deep religious significance) shall hereafter and henceforth fall on Mondays. If you, too, would like to enjoy more of these Saturday-Sunday-Monday vacations per annum, why not write your Representative to that effect? Chances are he may feel the same way about it, and will welcome your support.

That's the fastest way to achieve some extra holidaying. But it still doesn't solve the whole problem of irregular and messed-up dates. That headache is basic, and its base is the obsolete, modified Gregorian calendar with which our Western world has been struggling since 1582.

Actually, today's date troubles go all the way back to Julius Caesar (100–44 B. C.). His astronomers tried their best, and so did Pope Gregory XIII's 16th century scientists, and some 1,760 adjusters. Theirs is the calendar we're using right now.

This time-measurer is not only a producer of erratic holidays, but doesn't jibe at all with modern business periods and bookkeeping methods. Its months are irregular and its yearly quarters are even more so.

On the other hand, a scientifically streamlined time chart on the order of the proposed World Calendar, printed below, would eliminate many of our year-measuring woes permanently.

BUSINESS BENEFITS

This modern calculator would begin every year and every quarter-year on a Sunday. Each quarter would have the same number of days—91. Each month would contain 26 weekdays, plus Sundays. Once set, a holiday would stay in its proper place—none of this casual flap-landing on any one of the week's 7 days.

Congress, if it will be so kindly, can provide us with more fine holidays like the one just past, and in quick order. In due time, we hope, the U. N. or some more effectual international body will start the wheels moving toward a much needed, brandnew calendar for our modern business world.

The proposed world calendar

FIRST QUARTER

January							February							March						
S	M	T	W	T	F	S	S	M	T	W	T	F	S	S	M	T	W	T	F	S
1	2	3	4	5	6	7				1	2	3	4						1	2
8	9	10	11	12	13	14	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
15	16	17	18	19	20	21	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	10	11	12	13	14	15	16
22	23	24	25	26	27	28	19	20	21	22	23	24	25	17	18	19	20	21	22	23
29	30	31					26	27	28	29	30			24	25	26	27	28	29	30

SECOND QUARTER

April							May							June						
S	M	T	W	T	F	S	S	M	T	W	T	F	S	S	M	T	W	T	F	S
1	2	3	4	5	6	7				1	2	3	4						1	2
8	9	10	11	12	13	14	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
15	16	17	18	19	20	21	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	10	11	12	13	14	15	16
22	23	24	25	26	27	28	19	20	21	22	23	24	25	17	18	19	20	21	22	23
29	30	31					26	27	28	29	30			24	25	26	27	28	29	30
																				**W

THIRD QUARTER

July							August							September						
S	M	T	W	T	F	S	S	M	T	W	T	F	S	S	M	T	W	T	F	S
1	2	3	4	5	6	7				1	2	3	4						1	2
8	9	10	11	12	13	14	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
15	16	17	18	19	20	21	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	10	11	12	13	14	15	16
22	23	24	25	26	27	28	19	20	21	22	23	24	25	17	18	19	20	21	22	23
29	30	31					26	27	28	29	30			24	25	26	27	28	29	30

FOURTH QUARTER

October							November							December						
S	M	T	W	T	F	S	S	M	T	W	T	F	S	S	M	T	W	T	F	S
1	2	3	4	5	6	7				1	2	3	4						1	2
8	9	10	11	12	13	14	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
15	16	17	18	19	20	21	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	10	11	12	13	14	15	16
22	23	24	25	26	27	28	19	20	21	22	23	24	25	17	18	19	20	21	22	23
29	30	31					26	27	28	29	30			24	25	26	27	28	29	30
																				*W

*The year-end world holiday, W or Dec. 31 (365th day), follows Dec. 30 every year.

**The leap-year world holiday, W or June 31 (an extra day), follows June 30 in leap years.

Retirement Benefits for Panama Canal Pilots

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN F. SHELLEY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 1, 1955

Mr. SHELLEY. Mr. Speaker, I have recently introduced H. R. 3946, a bill which has been referred to the Post Office and Civil Service Committee. In my opinion the passage of this bill by the Congress is essential if we are to do justice to a group of maritime employees of our Government. I refer to the Panama Canal pilots who safely navigate all vessels through the Panama Canal. These men have an outstanding record of experience, safety, and skill. Nowhere in the world today is there a body of water which requires all of the skills of the navigator for such an extended passage as the Panama Canal. Nowhere is there a more complicated system of locks. And nowhere has the safety record for passage of all types of vessels, including our mammoth air carriers, been excelled.

The group of men who have complete and full responsibility for the movement and navigation of vessels in Panama Canal waters are all employed as pilots by the Panama Canal Company. These employees are subject to the retirement provisions of the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930. The bill I have introduced would permit present and future employees who serve as pilots in the Panama Canal to derive the same benefits under that act as are presently granted to certain investigative personnel. In other words, an employee of the Panama Canal Company, would be eligible to retire after rendering 20 years of service if he has reached the age of 50 and if at the time of making application for retirement he is employed as a Panama Canal pilot.

There are many reasons why I attach importance to this proposal and I shall enumerate a few of them:

First. The average starting age for a qualified Panama Canal pilot is 36. This is because of the long years of experience in navigation, including a period as master of an oceangoing vessel, that is required for these jobs. Because of this high entrance age and the hazards of his duties it is now almost impossible for these people to reach the present retirement age without first becoming disabled.

Second. A Panama Canal pilot must navigate vessels of heavy tonnage through particularly precarious and narrow waters for passages that extend up to 20 continuous hours and which are often at night, all of which subjects him to long periods of excessive strain and tension.

Third. The duties of these pilots require that they work under the extensive glare and heat of a strong tropical sun. The reflection from the water and direct glare and heat of this tropical sun causes severe sunburn sores to develop around the mouth and lips. The incidence of skin cancer among these pilots is very high.

Fourth. Eminent medical authorities have commented on other hazards of life in the tropics. The whole oxidation process of persons from temperate zones slows up, resulting in a condition of chronic fatigue, headaches, and faulty elimination of toxins from the body. Life there is a constant race between heat production and heat dissipation which produces the effects first mentioned because of an increase in unburned wastes of the body-toxins.

Because of lack of muscle tone in the tropics there is organic deterioration and consequently shorter life. This is supported by insurance company statistics on life expectancy in the tropics and by the increased rates which they charge Americans on the Canal Zone.

This station in the tropics is also unfavorable for tuberculosis and there is a high incidence of rheumatic conditions and chronic nephritis. In addition due to the tropical climate there are innumerable parasitic fungi and almost all of these pilots are suffering or have suffered from disagreeable and sometimes dangerous skin conditions.

Fifth. The incidence of skin cancer, tuberculosis and other diseases represents a great hazard for these American pilots. Moreover, the strain and tension of their duties which must be performed for long hours both night and day in excessive heat and humidity adds to the perils of their jobs. The fact that they are engaged in hazardous and perilous duties is evidenced by actual statistics. From this small group of approximately 80 men, and not including men who left for personal reasons before age 50, there have been 26, or 32 percent, who have left their jobs since 1949. Thirteen of these 26 retired for physical disability; 4 died; 4 retired with reduced annuities before reaching age 62; and only 5 of the 26 were able to reach the retirement age of 62 without physical disability. Thus it can be seen that of those pilots who have given up their jobs at 50 or above, 80 percent were unable to reach the full retirement age provided by present law.

I believe these statistics and the reasons I have set forth here justify legislation to protect this group of fine public servants who are giving of their health and their very lives to serve their Government in this strategic tropical area.

Mr. Speaker, I might also add that the Marine Director of the Panama Canal Company some time ago expressed the view that legislation to effectuate the purposes of my bill would not meet any objection from the company.

I hope that this bill will be favorably considered so that this small but vital segment of our maritime staff can attain fair retirement to which they are so justly entitled.

Freedom for Lithuania

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. DODD

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 1, 1955

Mr. DODD. Mr. Speaker, it is fitting that on the occasion of the 37th anniversary of the declaration of independence by the people of Lithuania, numerous Members of the Congress of the United States expressed their sincere expressions of encouragement and support to the American citizens of Lithuanian descent, and joined them in the fervent hope that the day may not be too far distant when this brave little country will once again enjoy true liberty and freedom.

A number of Members spoke on the floor of the Senate and in the House of Representatives.

Other Members addressed mass meetings in various cities where observances of this significant anniversary were held.

Other Members of Congress voiced their sentiments in statements to the Lithuanian American Council, a nation-

wide organization of Americans of Lithuanian descent, or to its press agency, the Lithuanian American Information Center in New York City.

We were particularly proud in having had in the Senate and in the House on the days of the observance of Lithuanian independence, two eminent Lithuanian American religious leaders, both members of the Lithuanian American Council, to offer the invocations—the Very Reverend Monsignor John Balkunas, of Maspeth, Long Island, N. Y.; and the Very Reverend Francis M. Juras, of Lawrence, Mass.

In addition to this observance in the Congress of the United States, the governors of 12 States and many mayors of cities urged other millions of Americans to join in observing this significant anniversary.

With confidence that the people of Lithuania will soon regain their natural rights to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness, Mr. Speaker, I have prepared the following statement on the observance of Lithuania's Independence Day and her right to freedom. Under unanimous consent, I ask that the statement be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The statement follows:

LITHUANIA: VICTIM OF U. S. S. R. AGGRESSION

On June 15, 1940, just 15 years ago, Lithuania, a peaceful and freedom-loving nation was overrun by barbaric Soviet Russian hordes and through terror and fraud, reduced to a slave state of the vast Communist empire.

This sad anniversary is a warning to all free peoples of the evils of the pernicious world Communist conspiracy. It should inspire us with a determination to guard zealously our own liberties and should serve as a reminder of our obligations toward unfortunate and defenseless peoples, victims of Soviet aggression.

THE SOVIET MILITARY PREPAREDNESS FOR AGGRESSION

The notorious secret agreement, between the German Third Reich and the U. S. S. R., following the defeat and partition of Poland, actually sealed the fate of Lithuania.

When on September 1, 1939, Hitlerite Germany attacked Poland, Soviet Russia began massing her armed forces along the Polish frontiers and in front of the Baltic States. Lithuania had no common borderline with Russia at the time.

With the deterioration of relations between Germany and Poland, the Government of Lithuania, in January 1939, proclaimed its decision to preserve absolute neutrality and strictly adhered to such a decision.

When the German armies, after 2 weeks of continual advance, occupied a substantial part of Polish territory, the Soviet Union on September 17 suddenly invaded Poland from the opposite side.

Poland fell before the two aggressors who divided the spoils between them.

As a result of this deal, Lithuania found herself on the southeastern border of the Russian-occupied territory.

The Soviets were carrying out a premeditated plan of aggression which was later confirmed in secret agreements with Hitler's government.

It was in compliance with that plan that the Soviets soon demanded the admission of Russian army garrisons into Lithuania.

Under Soviet Government pressure, a Lithuanian delegation summoned to Moscow, on October 10, 1939, signed the so-called pact of mutual assistance, in accordance with which a month later, 20,000 Soviet troops entered Lithuanian territory and occupied 4 separate bases there.

After the establishment of the Soviet army garrisons in Lithuanian. Latvia, and Estonia, the Soviets moved a part of their armed forces from the Baltic States and placed them along the Finnish frontier in preparation of the assault on Finland, which began in November 1939 and lasted 3 months.

It is interesting to recall that, according to Soviet propaganda, the excuse for the aggression against Finland was the alleged intention of Finland under the influence of western capitalists—the United States and England—to invade the Soviet Union.

THE SOVIET QUEST FOR A PRETEXT TO INVADE LITHUANIA

Concluding the peace treaty with Finland, Russia again began to concentrate her armies along the Lithuanian frontier and, in March 1940, she had from 12 to 15 divisions there.

Two months later the Soviet timetable of conquests called for preparation to swallow the three Baltic Republics.

The Soviet Government first spread false accusations against the Lithuanian Government and, in May 1940, sent General Loktionov, Deputy Commissar of War of the Soviet Union, to Lithuania to direct the Soviet campaign of provocations.

Immediately upon his arrival in Kaunas he presented a note to the Minister of Defense and the Minister of Foreign Affairs, accusing the Lithuanian authorities of kidnapping Soviet soldiers from established military bases.

The Lithuanian Government immediately appointed a special commission to investigate the charges, and invited the Soviet Government to appoint representatives to participate in the investigation and to produce the allegedly kidnapped soldiers for questioning. The Soviet Government refused to cooperate but, instead, kept repeating the trumped-up charges.

The Lithuanian commission, after thoroughly investigating all evidence, found these charges to be absolutely groundless. It was established that one soldier, attempting to desert the Soviet Army, had hidden in the home of his fiancee, but later returned to his base.

In 1954, a number of witnesses now in this country, presented detailed accounts of these alleged disappearances of Russian soldiers to the congressional committee investigating the Soviet aggression against the Baltic States. The real intention of the Soviet Government was apparent: to seize Lithuania by first inventing fictitious motives for doing so; to sway world opinion to her side. When the Lithuanian Government tried to clear away the misunderstandings between the two governments, Moscow paid no attention whatever.

The Government of Lithuania sent its Prime Minister, A. Merkys, and the Minister of Foreign Affairs, J. Urbsys, to Moscow to try to settle the matter directly. The Kremlin disregarded completely all explanations and efforts.

Finally on June 14, 1940, the Soviet Commissar for Foreign Affairs, V. Molotov, presented to the Lithuanian Government the Soviet ultimatum in which the following demands were set forth:

(A) To bring to trial the Minister of the Interior, K. Skucas, and the Director of the Department of Security, A. Povilaitis.

(B) To form a new government in Lithuania, satisfactory to the Soviets.

(C) To assure free entry into Lithuania of unlimited numbers of Soviet Russian armed forces.

The deadline for the reply of the Lithuanian Government was set at 10 a. m. of June 15; thus, scarcely 10 or 11 hours was allowed to consider the ultimatum.

MILITARY OCCUPATION OF THE COUNTRY

On June 15, 1940, at 2 in the afternoon, the Minister of Foreign Affairs, J. Urbsys, sent a telegram from Moscow explaining that the Chairman of the Council of People's Commissars and Foreign Commissar of the Soviet Union, V. Molotov, had presented a detailed plan as to how the Soviet army units, with the purpose of occupying Lithuania, would proceed.

Among other things, the Soviets demanded that the Lithuanian authorities should instruct the Lithuanian armed forces and people not to interfere in any way with the movements of the Soviet army in order to avoid possible misunderstandings and conflicts. The Soviet Government also stated that General Pavlov of the Soviet army will meet with Lithuania's General Vitkauskas, June 15 at 8 p. m. in the railway station of Gudagoj, to arrange for the orderly operations of the Soviet army.

As the Lithuanian delegation prepared to meet with General Pavlov, Red army troops were already on Lithuanian territory speeding in the direction of larger cities and communication centers. The previously established Soviet garrisons in Lithuania, also moved out to occupy certain localities. In full combat formations, the invaders arrogantly disregarded completely the Lithuanian Government authorities and the native inhabitants. About 12 complete divisions, from two hundred to two hundred and fifty thousand soldiers, swamped Lithuania whose peacetime armed forces comprised only about 28,000 soldiers.

The President and the Minister of Defense of Lithuania left the country. Mr. A. Merkys, as Acting Prime Minister, remained to head the government.

In its negotiations with Moscow, the government of Lithuania acted at all times in conformance with the obligations under the treaties with Soviet Russia. Thus, this sudden and surprising Soviet ultimatum came as a shock to the Lithuanian people. It was utterly impossible to organize in so short a time any substantial resistance against the masses of Russian armed forces already on Lithuanian soil.

A number of eye-witnesses before the congressional committee of the 83d Congress told of the behavior of the Soviets in Lithuania. The following facts were established without a doubt from documents and interrogated witnesses:

1. In complete disregard of the sovereign rights of Lithuania and even in violation of agreements which they themselves had forced on Lithuania, the Soviets employed unlimited numbers of armed forces for the occupation of Lithuania.

2. The Soviet military attaché, Major Korotkich, was placed on the General Staff of the Lithuanian Army to carry out purges in the higher ranks of Lithuanian officers on the first day of the occupation. He ordered the disarmament of the Lithuanian National Guard (Sauliu Sajunga) and the dismissal of a number of officers. The Chief of the Second Department of the General Staff, Colonel Dulksnys, was arrested and on July 18 deported to Soviet Russia.

3. The entire Lithuanian Army was immediately put under the control of the occupation authorities. As soon as the Soviets arrived on June 15, an order grounded all Lithuanian airplanes. The hangars were closed the following day and placed under guard of Soviet armored detachments.

4. Military quarters had to be vacated to billet Soviet Army personnel. Soviet demands were harsh and instant. Lithuanian military units were often ordered to leave their quarters almost immediately and in many instances personal belongings were hastily left behind, and nights were spent in the open.

5. Military installations of the Lithuanian army (radio and telegraph transmitters, telephone switchboards, railway depots, etc.) were seized for the Soviet Army without any notification to Lithuanian authorities.

6. Immediately upon the occupation of the country, the Lithuanian frontiers with

Germany were placed under rigid control, in an attempt to seal Lithuania off from the rest of the world.

7. Strong-armed guards were placed at the state bank and government office buildings. The Ministry of the Interior agencies were placed under strict control.

8. Lithuanian Army newspapers and other literature, published during Lithuania's independence were suppressed and banned from military libraries. In their stead appeared Communist propaganda literature besmirching the government and the institutions of independent Lithuania in an effort to antagonize the Lithuanian soldiers against their officers.

9. The Soviet military authorities soon forced the Lithuanian Government to extradite all Polish officers and men who had been interned in Lithuania after the defeat of Poland.

This same pattern of occupation was followed by the Soviets in their aggression against Latvia and Estonia.

PREPARATIONS TO ABOLISH LITHUANIA'S INDEPENDENCE

Many Soviet civilian officials, predominantly specially trained members of the Communist Party Soviet Secret Police (NKVD) charged with the final incorporation of Lithuania into the U. S. S. R. accompanied the Soviet occupation forces. One of their main objectives was to conceal the real intentions of Soviet Russia. In numerous statements in the press and in public speeches they reiterated that the Soviet Union had no intention of destroying the independent status of Lithuania, and that the presence of Russian forces in Lithuania had in no way constituted a peril to Lithuania's freedom. However, they worked feverishly to bring about the annexation of Lithuania into the Soviet Union.

Meanwhile, the special emissary, Vice Commissar for Foreign Affairs V. G. Dekanozov (liquidated following Beria's execution in 1954), came by plane to Kaunas and set up headquarters in the office of the Soviet Legation, and assisted by the Soviet envoy, Pozdniakov, began to rule the country. Orders now came from Dekanozov.

His first task was the formation of a new government, obedient to Moscow. He dictated the names of new ministers to the Acting Prime Minister, A. Merkys. Justas Paleckis, who had previous contacts with the Soviet Union, was to become the President of the Republic. To allay the fears of the native inhabitants, several prominent Lithuanian patriots were purposely included in the list of new ministers.

June 18, 1940, Paleckis delivered a message to the Lithuanian nation:

"The new government will continue to maintain normal relations with all countries. The first task of the government will be the establishment of sincere and friendly relations with the Soviet Union with which Lithuania has a close alliance based on the mutual assistance pact."

The new government was controlled by the Kremlin bosses, whose orders were carried out by their chief emissary, Dekanozov, and the Red army. Step by step, everything that had been achieved during her days of independence was turned to ruins in Lithuania. Practically all organizations, political, social, cultural, and economic, were suspended. Great numbers of employees of the various government agencies and economic enterprises were jobless overnight.

It was to be expected that the Communist emissaries would lift the ban on the Communist Party which during Lithuania's independence days was illegal. An order of the Minister of the Interior on June 25, 1949, placed the Communist Party of Lithuania on the official register of societies and associations.

Pursuing the plan of Lithuania's subjugation still further, the Kremlin agents made Paleckis's government proclaim on July 6, 1940, an electoral law to govern the elections to the so-called People's Diet to be held on July 14.

An order of the Director of the State Security Department, dated July 7, dissolved all non-Communist parties and most of their leaders and active members were arrested. The Communist Party remained the only recognized party, which to mislead the people, assumed the name of "the Union of Working People of Lithuania." The "Union" alone was given the right to nominate candidates for the elections.

Seventy-nine members were to be elected to the "People's Diet." The same number of candidates were nominated and, as the nomination was reserved for the Communist Party and its affiliated organizations only, predominantly Communists and their sympathizers, persons without any reputation or any standing at all, were put on the list. Some well-known Lithuanians became candidates against their will as their names were included without their knowledge or consent. This was done to mislead the voters.

The fictitious "Union of Working People" proclaimed to the Lithuanian nation its political platform which, among other promises, contained the following:

"On this historical day, July 14, we must go to the polls in united and closed ranks and elect the worthy candidates able to express the real will and aspirations of the people and to strengthen the true friendship with the great Union of the Soviet Socialist Republics, which is the one and only guarantee for the prosperity and free development of our country."

The "Union" further declared that it stands—

"For the friendship and the strong and indestructible alliance of the Lithuanian Republic and the Soviet Union.

"For the cancellation of bank debts of poor people and small holders.

"For all possible assistance by the government to the landless peasants and smallholders and for the allotment of sufficient land for them.

"For freedom of speech, press, and associations for the defense of interests of the working people."

The platform denounced as false the rumors anticipating the enforcement of the Soviet system in Lithuania:

"Enemies of the Lithuanian people and their stooges, supporters of the old regime, are circulating provocative rumors about terror against those who are faithful to their religion, about the closing of churches, about the alleged forced organization of collective farms, etc. These rumors are thoroughly unfounded and willfully fabricated."

Among the numerous slogans concluding the text of the platform the following are most significant:

"Long live free Lithuania."

"Long live the brotherly friendship and strong alliance with the great and invincible Union of the Soviet Socialist Republics."

These promises were meant to fool the people and entice them to the polls. During the short "election campaign" no mention was made regarding the intention to destroy the sovereignty of Lithuania and its incorporation into the Soviet Union. Numerous speakers, including members of the new government repeatedly referred to a "free Lithuania," "friendly relations," or "alliance with the Soviet Union."

The elections took place on July 14, 1940, under the close supervision of the Kremlin emissaries and the Red army. The Lithuanian people resisted passively by abstaining from voting or, if they went to the polls, they replaced the ballot with a blank piece of paper.

The duty to vote was especially emphasized. The voters were watched in polling places, and since each voter had to present his identification papers to be stamped, an abstention could not pass unnoticed. Those who had no stamps on their passports risked severe consequences later on.

Absenteeism on the day of elections was so evident that the Communist Party decided to take additional measures. President Paleckis, by a decree, extended the voting another day, at the same time warning the people of their duty to vote. The results were poor. Moscow announced that, according to figures published by the Supreme Electoral Commission, 95.51 percent of the voters presented themselves at the polls. But, it appears from confidential statements made by the Minister of the Interior, M. Gedvila, that only 16 or 18 percent of the ballots deposited were valid.

The new "Diet" elected under such circumstances, convened on July 21. The only business on the agenda was the passing of a resolution requesting that Lithuania should be admitted into the Soviet Union. That the entire show was directed by Moscow, is also proven by the fact that similar decisions, on the same day and exactly in the form described, were made by the "People's Diet" in the other two Baltic States, Latvia and Estonia.

The manner in which the 'Diet' was elected and the measures undertaken by the Kremlin to accomplish the annexation of Lithuania were bared before the Congressional Committee on Communist Aggression by many witnesses of different professions and places of residence in Lithuania. Their testimony revealed the tricks of deception the Communists employed.

When the Soviet-German war broke out and the Communists were driven out of Lithuania, a number of members of the "People's Diet" and the government made public a joint statement disclosing the true facts concerning the distortion of the will of the Lithuanian nation.

Their statement is quoted here:

"Meeting at Kaunas, on August 30, 1942, we, members of the former Lithuanian Government and the "People's Diet," state publicly:

"1. In violation, by use of force, of the solemn obligations given to the Republic of Lithuania to respect, in all circumstances, her 'sovereignty and also integrity and territorial inviolability' (paragraph 2 of the Treaty of Nonaggression of September 28, 1926, between the Republic of Lithuania and the U. S. S. R.), the Government of the Soviet Union, on June 15, 1940, occupied Lithuania by its armed forces.

"2. The Lithuanian Government which was created according to the provisions of the Moscow ultimatum and which had obtained assurances that the independence of Lithuania will be respected, later, under pressure from Moscow, was reorganized, without any knowledge or consent of the Acting Prime Minister, Prof. V. Kreve-Mickevicius, by securing its majority for the Communists, headed by M. Gedvila, for the purpose of making it a tool in Moscow's hands.

"3. The Moscow Government ordered the Lithuanian Government, thus reorganized to carry out elections to the 'People's Diet' in order that it should later on, request the incorporation of Lithuania into the Soviet Union.

"4. The 'People's Diet' could not and did not proclaim the will of the Lithuanian people because:

"(a) The composition of the 'People's Diet' was made up in advance by the Communist Party, directed by Moscow's representative, V. G. Dekanozov, and by the Soviet Minister to Lithuania, N. G. Pozdniakov. Only the Union of Working People of Lithuania was allowed to select candidates who were nominated by the Communist Party. The number of candidates was exactly the same as the number of members elected to the 'People's Diet.'

"(b) As the composition of the 'Diet' was made up in advance, it declared, in order

to enhance the effect, that 95.51 percent of all the electorate had voted, while actually, as confirmed by the Supreme Election Commission and by the statement made by the former People's Commissar, M. Gedvila, and by the President of the U. S. S. R. Supreme Soviet, J. Paleckis, at secret meetings, only 16 to 18 percent of valid voting cards were submitted at the polls.

"(c) A number of members of the 'Diet,' who were not members of the Communist Party, were compelled by threats to become members of the 'Diet' and to vote for incorporation into the Soviet Union.

"(d) When the voting on the incorporation into the Soviet Union took place the votes of the members were not counted; all strangers present at the meeting voted together with them.

"5. Not a single member of the 'People's Diet' could express a protest against the use of force as, under the circumstances, such protest would have involved danger to his life. Moscow's representatives and the members of the Soviet Legation openly threatened all those members of the 'Diet' and their families who would have dared to announce their intention not to vote for incorporation into the Soviet Union.

"6. We, former members of the 'People's Diet,' raise a public protest against the methods of violence and of falsifications which were directed by the Bolshevik Government against the Republic of Lithuania and the Lithuanian nation during the elections to the 'Diet' as well as during its session. Neither we nor the other members of the 'Diet' could express and did not express the will of the Lithuanian nation for incorporation in the Soviet Union.

"7. The 'People's Diet' itself stated in its declaration of July 21, 1940, 'Now the people, helped by the mighty Red army, did away with the yoke of Smetona's oppressors and established in their own country the Soviet Government. If the people have been able to establish in their own country the only just order, the Soviet order, it is all due to the Soviet Union.' In this way the 'People's Diet' itself admitted the Red army's influence in its decisions and the decisions of other government authorities.

"Signed by former Members of the People's Diet: Dr. A. Garmus, L. Dovydenas, H. Kacinskas, R. Juknevicius, V. Birzietis, P. Mickus, Mrs. S. Vainekiene, Miss P. Milanciute, the former Acting Prime Minister and Minister of Foreign Affairs of the People's Government, Prof. V. Kreve-Mickevicius, the former Commissar for Social Care and Forest Industry of the L. S. S. R., Jurgis Glusauskas.

"KAUNAS, *August 30, 1942.*"

The procedure of elections to the "People's Diet" was described, among many other witnesses, in a deposition by the former People's Commissar, J. Glusauskas, who escaped from bolshevism and is now residing in Australia, he stated:

"On July 14, 1940, I was appointed to watch the voting to the 'People's Diet' in the district of Mariampole. At that time I was the chief of police of the city of Kaunas and its district. The task assigned to me was to render help wherever necessary.

"When I arrived in Mariampole, I found everything ready for the election. I learned that the supervisor of the election there was a high official of the Soviet secret police (NKVD), a Russian, who had at his disposal a number of Russian soldiers and some army trucks. Therefore, all that was left for me to do was to observe what was going on.

"Several hours before the closing of the polls, it was announced that only 5 or 10 percent of those eligible to vote had cast their ballots. The NKVD officer was greatly concerned over such a situation. Finally, the following instructions were given: 1. All chairmen of electoral districts were ordered to record higher percentages of votes than actually were cast. As a result of this order, in an hour, all reports showed a 40 to 60 percent vote, and when the polls were about to close the percentage suddenly leaped to 99. 2. The NKVD personnel had instructions to tour villages and bring in voters by force. But because only a few trucks were available, this measure did not prove successful. Also, there was very little time left for voting.

"I consider the elections to the 'People's Diet' were a deception for the following reasons:

"1. Actually only 5 to 15 percent of electors voted, and therefore did not represent the will of the Lithuanian people.

"2. Candidates for the 'People's Diet' were nominated by the central committee of the Communist Party without their knowledge or consent. The list of candidates was presented by the Working People's Union which was the Communist Party itself. There were exactly as many candidates as members of the 'Diet' to be elected. There was no choice but to vote for those nominated by the Communist Party.

"3. No lists of electors had been prepared so that it was impossible to determine the percentage of the votes cast. This circumstance offered a good opportunity to falsify the results of the elections.

"4. It was publicly made known that persons failing to appear at the polls will be regarded as 'enemies of the people.' Everybody knew that such a branding meant deportation to the forced labor camps in Siberia or other remote places in Russia.

"Conclusion: All decisions of the 'People's Diet' are null and void as the 'Diet' itself could not and did not represent the will of the Lithuanian people.

J. GLUSAUSKAS.

"ADELAIDE, *November 15, 1953.*"

The Communist information agencies reported that the table of the election returns was prepared "in conformity with the data on population of Lithuania compiled by the Central Bureau of Statistics of Lithuania."

The former director of this bureau, Domas Micuta, now in the United States, submitted a statement which says: "The elections were directed by Pozdniakov through the Supreme Electoral Commission. The Central Bureau of Statistics of Lithuania never had anything to do with this commission and did not participate in the preparation of the table of election returns or its publication."

Adolfas Klimas, now residing in the United States, member of the staff for computing the election returns, stated the following in his deposition: "I was employed, as many other former employees of the old Lithuanian Diet were, to work on the technical staff of the so-called 'People's Diet.' I was to prepare for publication stenographic transcripts of the sessions of the 'People's Diet,' to supervise their publication and distribution, to translate into the Russian language and to prepare Lithuanian translations of various Russian orders, instructions, etc., which were sent from Moscow.

"On July 14 and 15, the election days to the 'People's Diet,' I was assigned, together with a number of other employees, to receive telephone reports of election returns coming from various electoral districts. Seventy-nine members of the 'Diet' were to be elected in 8 electoral regions. There was only one list of candidates, all nominated by the Communist Party. The election commissions did not pay any attention whether the votes cast were valid or not. They took for granted that everyone appearing at the polls was in favor of the candidates listed on the ballot.

"While taking the election reports over the telephone, I, as well as my colleagues, recorded several instances when the vote in a particular locality exceeded 100 percent. I learned that soldiers of the Soviet army had the right to take part in the elections and voted together with Lithuanian citizens. However, we were instructed to keep the percentages in such cases somewhat below 100 percent when computing the election returns.

"I often received from Andrius Bulota, an attorney in the office of the 'Diet,' all sorts of orders and resolutions sent from Moscow, and my job was to translate them into Lithuanian. Then A. Bulota would read the translations, make corrections to adjust them to the specific conditions in Lithuania. As a rule, such orders and resolutions passed the 'People's Diet' without any discussion. Though there were some non-Communist members in the 'Diet' not one of them dared to question the propositions; they remained silent."

The falsification of election returns was witnessed by the Chief of Information and Statistics Department of the Supreme Soviet of Lithuania, Pranas Valiulis, now in Western Germany, who stated:

"The election commissions did all they could to increase the percentages of the ballots cast trying to please the omnipotent Communist Party and the People's Government, as well as the Moscow masters. Alterations in the election results could be made easily by simply marking the ballots for those who failed to appear at the polls. To make up for the shortage in the ballot box, as many ballots as were necessary could be stuffed in. Members of the election commissions were all persons devoted to the Communist Party. When the votes were counted nobody, except members of the official commissions were present, which means that there was no control at all of the commission's work. The fact that falsifications in computation of the returns were made was confirmed to me by the assistant attorney general, Vytautas Balciunas."

Thus, it is evident that this so-called "election" had in no way expressed the will of the people of Lithuania. Moreover, even if the election had been conducted in a way prescribed by the laws of the country or in accordance with the principles of democratic procedure, this so-called "People's Diet" would not have any power whatsoever to make decisions affecting the sovereignty and independence of the Republic of Lithuania because no proposition of this kind was submitted to the voters. For the same reason, this so-called "election" cannot be considered a plebiscite on the question of Lithuania's incorporation into the Soviet Union.

Moscow's resolution forced upon the so-called "People's Diet" to request Lithuania's admittance to the "family of nations of the Soviet Union" was an act of violence and coercion against the Lithuanian nation.

SOVIETIZATION OF LITHUANIA

And yet, the delegation of 19 persons appointed by the "People's Diet" was taken to Moscow to petition the Soviet Government to incorporate Lithuania into the Soviet Union.

On August 3, 1940, the Supreme Soviet of U. S. S. R. decided to "receive favorably the petition of the Lithuanian Diet and to admit the Soviet Socialist Republic of Lithuania into the Union."

Then, step by step, the Soviet system was introduced in Lithuania. Land, industry, business enterprises, and private property were nationalized, people's rights subverted, the standard of living reduced. Lithuania was entirely shut off from western civilization and culture. Arrests and deportations gradually took on such dimensions that there was no doubt but that Lithuania was doomed by the Kremlin masters to total physical destruction.

The attitude of the United States Government in regard to the present status of Lithuania is universally known. The United States has never sanctioned the forced incorporation of Lithuania and the other two

Baltic nations, Latvia and Estonia, into the Soviet Union, and continues to recognize them as sovereign states. Many other free democracies also regard the Baltic nations as temporarily deprived of their independence by an act of aggression which has neither legal nor moral justification.

On this occasion, and as we approach a Four Power Conference, let us all remember these historical facts. The conscience of the free world will not be clear until Lithuania, Estonia, and Latvia are free.

Why Not?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS M. PELLY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 1, 1955

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, the Pacific Northwest is the natural airline terminus for world trade and travel routes. Of great interest to me, as a Representative from the city of Seattle and Kitsap County, is the application of Pan American Airways for a certificate to fly from Seattle to Europe over the polar route.

Already such service is available to Los Angeles through a service inaugurated a year ago by Scandinavian Airlines System. That this polar route offers unlimited possibilities for swift and safe operation is indicated in a statement by the president of Scandinavian Airlines System, welcoming Pan American into the field and assuring them that the traffic potential is so encouraging as to justify two carriers over this route.

Pan American's application asks for CAB authority to operate from Seattle, Portland, San Francisco, and Los Angeles to London and other European capitals via the top of the world. It is important that the United States continue to build a strong civil air transport system in the interest of both national defense and an expanding commercial economy. I hope the Civil Aeronautics Board acts promptly to put Pan American in competition with our enterprising and resourceful Scandinavian friends.

The Seattle Post-Intelligencer of May 24 carried a thoughtful and illuminating editorial on the Pan American application. Under unanimous consent, I include this editorial with my remarks:

WHY NOT?

Seattle has a chance to have a direct connection to Europe over the Polar Route—and we are for it.

We see no good reason why a route from the west coast to Europe, and now exclusively in the hands of foreign flag carriers, should not have a little United States competition.

Furthermore, the present Arctic flights from the coast do not include Seattle. The Scandinavian Airlines System presently operates between Los Angeles via the Polar Route, and a British airline operate between San Francisco and London and beyond. Also, there will soon be Canadian service between Vancouver, British Columbia, and Amsterdam.

Now Pan American Airways has asked the CAB for permission to fly from four coast cities—Seattle, Portland, San Francisco, and Los Angeles—to London and European points via the top of the world.

Pan American says it is all set to go in experience, equipment, and stations manned and operating in Iceland, England, and other north countries in Europe.

It now wants to put Seattle on the route. It sounds good to us because, as we've said here before and often, we want Seattle to have everything it can reasonably claim in the way of air transportation.

The Administration Highway Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM H. AYRES

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 1, 1955

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Speaker, the highway problem now occupies the thoughts of many people in and out of Government. As I have given considerable thought to this and related problems I want to begin by saying that neither the Gore bill nor the Cabinet Policy Committee report, in my opinion, will become law. The peace and prosperity the country is enjoying under President Eisenhower's leadership is not going to be disrupted by petty politics no matter who practices such. He will be just as quick to criticise his own Cabinet's action if he thinks it wrong as he will be to speak out against those who are playing petty politics.

The most recent example of his steadfast integrity occurred in connection with the postal-pay veto when many were urging him to give ground for the sake of political expediency. Ike's reply was that he had gone as far as he could go in good conscience and he would not yield 30 cents for political purposes. Whether he was right or wrong he did not budge an inch, or rather he did not budge six-tenths of 1 percent. In the history of this administration one thing stands out clearly: President Eisenhower's leadership is of concern to both parties. His policies have been so universally accepted by the electorate that the Republicans are fearful he might not seek reelection and the Democrats are shaking in their boots lest he does. Now I say, Mr. Speaker, let every Republican and thinking Democrat get behind our President particularly when we are talking about something as vital and essentially nonpolitical as our highways. My constituents are becoming increasingly concerned about the confusion that has resulted from the efforts of the administration to create the new and better highways the Nation needs. I share their concern, primarily because what has always been essentially a nonpolitical subject has, in recent months, become increasingly political. Politics, while necessary and desirable in our national life, has no place in the solution of grave economic problems relating to our national transportation system. Needless to add, no amount of politics as usual will build a single inch of new highway.

Today, we have the spectacle of politics in the highway program not only in Congress, and in the executive branch, but also in the transportation industry itself where, it is evident from the report of the President's Cabinet Policy Committee, forms of transportation that compete with interstate motor carriers are seeking to legalize selective rate cutting and otherwise tamper with our highway transportation. If, while we try to solve the problems of meeting our increasing national demands for highway transport, we allow the trucking industry to go down under the weight of the attacks on it, we will surely be indulging in foolishness. We also have the spectacle of opposition for opposition's sake here in Congress. It seems that every time the administration comes forward with a piece of constructive thinking, the postal raise, minimum wages, farm policies, to name just a few in addition to the highway program, opposition is raised and a new measure is proposed, often without any motive behind it other than sheer opposition.

Our Nation has far outgrown its highway system. We now have over 58 million vehicles on our highways. What we desperately need is less talk about this "plan" or some other "report" and more action to get the four-lane highways we must have within the next 10 years or so. We certainly could do with less politics in and out of competing forms of transportation. The trucking industry itself has not met the challenges to it with any great degree of acumen. Competition between various forms of trucking such as contract and for-hire carriers, as well as the apparent lack of interest in the other fellow's problem, has created an atmosphere in which the truck industry itself is responsible, in a great measure, for its present plight. When we consider those who are concerned with truck ownership, production or maintenance, the total truck employment figure is gigantic indeed. Unfortunately, when we attempt to abscribe to this mass group any real concern for the general welfare of the motor-carrier industry, we are faced with divergent viewpoints and wasted effort. In other words, the industry concerned with its own salvation has found it impossible, by reason of internal stress and politics, to tell a coherent story to the public. If this industry were not of a major concern to our general domestic welfare, then I suppose we could say, "who cares about the future of the trucking industry?" Unfortunately, this industry is so closely tied to the public welfare that no one can say "put your own house in order before you come to Congress."

I recently had the pleasurable experience of visiting in California, and a respected member of the trucking industry with many years of experience put this problem to me in substantially this fashion: There is a relatively limited number of responsible people in the trucking industry to whom Congress can look for leadership in the solution of their problems in the State and Federal jurisdictions in which they operate. Unfortunately, special groups tend to obtain special favors for themselves from legislators. These groups are not interested

in the problems of their neighbors who are in the same business of hauling the Nation's commerce. They are inclined to take the attitude: "Well, we got ours, so who cares about the others?" As a friend of the trucking industry, I want to tell it publicly to get its house in order. I want to say the same thing to the Nation's rail carriers. The Nation's rail carriers ought to awaken to the needs of motor transport. Instead of trying to stifle motor transport competition, they ought to be asking Congress to do something about legislation to build new four-lane highways. Safety requires we do something. Last year, 36,000 people were killed on the open roads. National defense needs are such that if a major emergency were to befall any one of our cities tomorrow, the chances of its civilian population surviving in any great measure would be far less than 5 or 10 years from now with super highways available for evacuation.

Over and beyond the confusion and politics which seem to have taken over our highway program, we have a situation in some of the States which has placed an intolerable burden upon interstate commerce. I refer to so-called third-structure tax laws which have destroyed reciprocity as to highway commerce between some of the most important producing and distributing centers in the Nation. Here again, through confusion and the dissipation of funds for road construction, we have the serious threat that highway commerce will not be able to survive all the various operations that are being performed on it. I say let us stop the bickering and get the highways built. We can do it by issuing special bonds which will insure completion of a program in 10 years. Increased revenue from increasing traffic would go far toward retiring such bonds in record time. While we are waiting for the bonds to mature, the Federal gasoline tax would carry the burden. This would be eminently sensible, for it is clear that the proceeds from the Federal gasoline tax have been dissipated in many ways not related to highway improvement. Under such a proposal, the States could devote their funds to the building of roads which are outside the scope of the Federal program. Thus we would have a State and a Federal road system growing to proper proportions side by side.

The trucking industry of this Nation, I am assured, is fully cognizant of the needs and the benefits of all our citizens to be derived from highways which would meet the demands of our growing traffic. All it needs is to be treated fairly. It asks no special privileges, nor would I or anyone else I know grant any. In treating such a vital industry fairly, we must understand that attempts to give railroads a competitive advantage over trucking by changing our national transportation policy and virtually nullifying rate regulation in favor of rail carriers may result in a situation where the cure is worse than the disease. When we get the roads we need, will there be a strong, dynamic trucking industry around to haul the goods we use? Let us use good sense and have done with confusion. In my judgment, Congress should pass the administration highway bill promptly, reject the recommendations of the Cabinet Committee, and tell the States they cannot third-structure interstate trucking out of existence. When this is done, we will have accomplished our national highway objectives.

Americans Fight for Freedom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES M. QUIGLEY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 1, 1955

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Speaker, for the past 88 years Memorial Day services have been conducted at the National Cemetery at Gettysburg. It has become one of the most solemn and traditional observances of the day.

There were two things about this year's ceremonies which were highlights to me. One was the voluntary presence in this essentially northern observation of the band of the Mount Vernon High School from Alexandria, Va. The other were the pertinent remarks of the principal speaker, the Honorable Harold E. Stassen. Under leave to revise and extend my remarks, I include the speech given by Mr. Stassen:

MEMORIAL DAY ADDRESS DELIVERED BY HAROLD E. STASSEN AT THE GETTYSBURG NATIONAL CEMETERY, MAY 30, 1955, AT 3:15 P. M.

Mr. President, Mrs. Eisenhower, Congressman QUIGLEY, my fellow citizens assembled for this 88th memorial service at Gettysburg, I am certain that every citizen joining in this vast assembly would wish me to express on their behalf a deep appreciation to the President and Mrs. Eisenhower for their presence and for the fact that their home address at Gettysburg has led to their attendance today at this memorial service initiated by President Lincoln. Today is an occasison that will long be remembered in Gettysburg.

Nearly 100 years ago President Abraham Lincoln, in words now an immortal part of our American heritage, helped to dedicate this final resting place for those who gave their lives during the first cruel days of July 1863. Even as Lincoln spoke, our Nation was racked by a civil war; and the outcome of that tragic conflict was still uncertain.

Today we know the ultimate victory. We know the brave men who paid the final price of freedom at this spot did not die in vain. Their cause survives. The principles they fought for have endured and prospered mightily. This Nation, under God, has not perished from the earth. This Nation, under God, has prospered and held freedom.

It is fitting that each year a special time, Memorial Day, be set apart for us, the living, to pluck the mystic chords of memory lest we forget the meaning of the distant drums. Only a few survive who hearkened to the battle bugles call in Lincoln's time, less than a platoon left who know the deeds of yesterday at first hand. For most of us the agonizing struggles of the Civil War are but pages in a history book.

Since those grim days other Americans, in other wars, in other lands, have fought—and many died—that liberty might live. The names of far-off battlefields twist our tongues—alien places undreamed of by those who lie in this hallowed earth. Yet, no matter what the changes—in time, or place, or weapons—the fundamental cause for which America has fought remains the same: Freedom.

So all may know that if need be we will fight again in freedom's cause, we bear today a great and heavy load of arms. Our partners overseas do the same. We have watched, too often in the recent past, a tyrant's armies move, first attacking weaker nations close at hand and then, emboldened by aggression's seeming triumph eventually attacking us.

We have learned this lesson: A world not safe for little nations is not secure for big ones. Until the immoral law of force gives way to the force of moral law, those who love and cherish liberty must have power to deter its deadly foes.

Liberty is not guarded by arms alone; it survives and flourishes through the spirit—the dedicated lives of those who know that liberty is worth its price. Should that price be patriot's blood and women's tears, let knowledge of this fact be more than sorrow. Man was born to be free; and will forever strive forward to fill this destiny.

Therefore, with courage and with sober hope, under the inspiring leadership of the now President, let us take up our great unfinished work. Upon the principles of liberty and justice for all, we can, with patience and with perseverance, build up a decent trust among all nations. Thereby this Nation under God, working in faith and valor with our partners across the seas, may erect the noblest monument that could be raised to those we honor here this day: A living monument of peace and freedom.

Los Angeles County 1953 Agriculture Production Exceeds Any State in the Union—Valued at More Than $1,400,000,000

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GORDON L. McDONOUGH

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 1, 1955

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, southern California has become one of the most important agricultural centers in the United States, according to the latest figures released by the Agricultural Committee of the Los Angeles Chamber of Commerce, and is in the unique position of shipping, as a section of a State, more produce during the year 1953 than any other entire State in the United States with the exception of the whole State of California.

Los Angeles County alone, according to Mr. F. R. Wilcox, chairman of the Agricultural Committee, reached a total value for agricultural production for 1954 of $1,427,000,000, an amount almost $2 million greater than 1953.

The phenomenal growth of population, business, and industry in Los Angeles County and in all of southern California is well known, but to most people, it is not regarded as an agricultural area. Yet it has now become one of the leading agricultural communities in the whole world, and its tremendous produce added to that of the rest of the State has brought a record of 1 carlot of fresh fruits or vegetables rolling from the 58

counties of the State every 1½ minutes during 1953, the last year for which these figures were available.

The following is the press report on the agricultural record of Los Angeles County and southern California:

COUNTY'S FARM PRODUCTION IN 1954 NEAR RECORD

Agricultural production in Los Angeles County in 1954 reached the second highest peak in history, exceeded only by the record year of 1952.

F. R. Wilcox, chairman of the Los Angeles Chamber of Commerce Agricultural Committee, said yesterday the total value for 1954 was $1,427,000,000, or almost $2 million greater than 1953.

"The county, in addition to its great business, industrial, and population growth, thus continues to be one of the leading agricultural communities in the world," Wilcox said.

He said latest available figures, those of 1953, show that southern California shipped more produce that year than any State except California itself. One carlot of fresh fruits or vegetables rolled from the 58 counties of the State every 1½ minutes during 1953.

The Dairy Industry Faces the Facts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MELVIN R. LAIRD

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 1, 1955

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include a speech by my colleague, the Honorable JOHN W. BYRNES, of Wisconsin, in this morning's CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Congressman BYRNES spoke at the Alice in Dairyland celebration at the dairy festival in Kewaunee, Wis., on May 28, 1955. Congressman BYRNES' speech shows a clear insight into the problems facing the dairy industry:

THE DAIRY INDUSTRY FACES THE FACTS

It has given us a real lift to get back here today and take part in this most magnificent program. The people of Kewaunee, and all of those who have worked so hard to make this dairy festival such a success, are to be congratulated.

I know you are all anxiously awaiting the climax of this celebration—the crowning of our regional Alice in Dairyland. I am, too. I know you will agree with me when I say that anyone of the beautiful young ladies we have seen tonight would make a splendid representaitve of our State's principal industry. I wish them all luck. Win or lose, we can be proud of them all.

In the meantime, while we await the decision of the judges, I hope you will be able to listen to me without too much impatience. I want to say a few words tonight about the future of the dairy industry. It is a subject which should be of prime interest to every resident of the State of Wisconsin. I'm sure it is of interest to you; otherwise you would not be here tonight participating in this program.

Sometimes, however, there are many of us who forget how closely the prosperity of our State and its people is allied with the fortunes of the dairy industry. We tend to take for granted the marvelously complex economic system we have built up around the dairy cow. Sixty-five percent of our farm cash income comes from the sale of milk, cattle, and calves. This income—close to $800 million—represents between 15 and 20 percent of our State's income from all sources. But that is only half the story. Thousands of other people, besides the dairy farmer himself, are engaged in work directly dependent upon the vast flow of milk from Wisconsin's diary cows—in manufacturing dairy products from milk, in distributing them, in transporting them and in merchandising them. Thousands of others are engaged in providing supplies, equipment, and services, not only for the dairy farmer but for the dairy processor and manufacturer. Still thousands more supply products and services to those employed directly in the dairy industry. In all its ramifications, the dairy industry is undoubtedly the largest single industry in our State. There is not one of us in this auditorium tonight who does not have a personal stake in its prosperity.

Yet, we all know, many of us too well, that the dairy industry is going through a most difficult period. In essence, it is the same problem which faced the industry in 1949—when the post-World War II adjustment to peacetime conditions began. In 1949, dairy surpluses piled up and milk prices went down. Recovery took place only when the shooting in Korea began and a wartime economy took over. We want no more of that kind of solution for this or any other problem. We certainly are not going to rely on wartime shortages and post-war inflation to solve the problem for us. Today, we seek to readjust the dairy industry to peacetime conditions and to put it on a firm basis for the years ahead.

Abraham Lincoln once advised us, if we wanted to decide which way we're going, to look back where we'd been. What was the situation which confronted the dairy industry just a little more than a year ago?

Milk production was booming toward new highs. The Government was in the dairy business with both feet. Surplus dairy products were piling up in Government warehouses at tremendous rates. Consumption of dairy products was not keeping up. In fact, it was trending dangerously downward, particularly in the case of butter. Net income of dairy farmers had declined by more than $200 million, in spite of the fact that dairy supports were at 90 percent, the highest level permitted under the law. The dairy industry was critically sick.

Drastic measures were then taken by the Government. The Secretary of Agriculture reduced milk supports to 75 percent, as he felt the law required him to do under the circumstances. Many of us, while recognizing the need for a lower support level, felt that the step was too drastic, too sudden, too severe. Regardless of our feelings then, I believe it is time for us to ask ourselves honestly if this shock treatment was not perhaps what the patient needed. Certainly, this action has set in motion a significant reaction which has put new life into a very sick industry.

It's true that the patient has suffered much in the past year. Dairy income was down again, about 4 percent, but not so much as in the previous year when 90-percent supports prevailed and not nearly so great as the prophets of doom at the bedside had predicted. But the other clinical evidence was all good. Milk production has leveled off. In fact, it is down, the first 3 months of this year, over the corresponding period of a year ago. Government purchases of dairy products have fallen sharply. Consumption of dairy products, particularly butter, is up. Surpluses previously acquired have moved into the channels of consumption—into people's stomachs rather than spoiling in warehouses.

I certainly do not want to mislead anyone. The patient is still ailing, but all signs indicate that the invalid, instead of going down hill, is convalescing rapidly. There will be crises ahead, no doubt, but there is every hope that he will recover in the near future—if the patient and his friends continue to face the facts about his own condition.

What are those facts?

The first and most basic one, I believe, is that the industry will be sick just as long as production of milk and its products outpaces consumption, regardless of the level of Government support. It is axiomatic that milk surpluses, no matter who stores them, act as a depressing influence upon the farmer's price for milk.

If we face this major fact—that our problem is bringing production and consumption into balance, then we must go on and face other facts which are part and parcel of a sound program for the future.

These facts, in my opinion, are:

First, Government alone cannot bring permanent prosperity to the dairy industry. It can only help. It can also harm. Our program should stress helpful rather than harmful actions by our Government.

Second, the problem of surplus production, paradoxically, must be met partially by increased production on the farm through greater efficiency. This means higher volume at lower costs.

Third, the great hope, and the soundest solution, lies in the field of increasing per capita consumption of milk and its products. This responsibility lies principally with the dairy industry itself.

Let me speak first of the role of government.

There are those who want the Government, in effect, to take over the dairy industry. They call loudly for rigid, high supports for dairy products. They do this in the face of the evidence that high supports have failed miserably in the past to solve the dairy problem, and, in fact, aggravate it by encouraging higher production and discouraging consumption. These people have changed their tune somewhat in the past few months. They are still calling for a return to high supports, but they now tell us it cannot be done unless the Government controls milk production. I will discuss in a moment what that would mean, but for now, I want merely to point out the existence of this school of thought—that thinks the Government should be entirely responsible for the dairy industry.

I say to you that we cannot build a sound dairy industry for the future if that industry is dependent upon the Government for its income and its markets. The Government cannot solve the basic problem—bringing consumption in line with production. It can only take crude and costly steps, which are generally self-defeating, to remove surplus production from the market.

This does not mean that the Government has no role in helping to bring about a permanently sound dairy industry.

Government, I believe, should, as it is now doing, provide realistic supports for the milk producer to prevent drastic fluctuations in price and production. Such supports are vitally necessary for stability within the industry.

Government should, as it is now doing, take aggressive steps in the field of research for new and better dairy products and better marketing methods.

Government should, as it is now doing, encourage and promote the consumption of dairy products, both within and without the Government. Great strides have been made in increasing milk consumption in our veterans' hospitals and in the Armed Forces, while the school-milk program is growing by leaps and bounds.

Government should, as it is now doing, provide technical assistance to farmers, helping them to produce more economically, to rid themselves of dairy diseases, such as in the accelerated brucellosis eradication program, and to assist them to become better all-round producers.

Government should—and real aggressive action is needed in this field which has been neglected—help to eliminate the barriers to increased milk consumption; artificial barriers which have sprung up through marketing orders, sanitary regulations, and milk price regulation in various States and localities.

These are all proper and helpful fields for Government action. But, please note that none of them contemplate turning over the dairy industry to complete control from some desk in Washington—as the advocates of high supports and milk production controls propose. They are geared instead toward attacking the dairy problem at its source—by encouraging more efficient production by efficient producers and by increasing per capita consumption of dairy products.

The possibilities of harm through Government action are just as great as the potential for good. I need mention only one at this point. It is a sad commentary that some who purport to speak for the dairy farmer are supporting legislation which would put feed crops at mandatory, high support levels while keeping dairy products on a flexible basis. I see no good in such legislation for the dairy farmer. It is a move to increase his cost of production at a time when one of his great needs is to reduce that cost. A dollar paid out for higher feed has the same number of cents as a dollar received for milk.

Let us talk a bit about production. I have already mentioned that the advocates of milk production controls have come out of hiding and are now openly proposing that the Government tell each and every dairy farmer how much milk he shall produce in return for high Government-supported prices.

I think that the Wisconsin dairy farmer, if he faces the facts, will overwhelmingly reject such a proposal. It is a proposal for nothing more nor less than a Government-run monopoly. It is a proposal which would strike hard at the efficient milk producers of our Nation because it would freeze them in old production patterns, limiting their sales not by what they can efficiently produce but by what the Government tells them they can sell. I need not tell you that the most efficient milk producers in the country are the Wisconsin dairy farmers.

The Wisconsin dairy farmer knows the importance of volume. He constantly strives to increase production at reduced cost. A production drop, he knows, costs as much as a drop in price. Let me put it another way. He knows that a reduction in his volume of milk reduces his income just as much as a drop in the price of milk. Every advance he makes in dairying efficiency—the upgrading of his herd, improvements in feeding and milking, better handling and transporting of his milk—is designed for volume production. Production controls would end the march toward efficient production. What farmer would strive for more volume when the Government would prevent him from selling his extra milk, or penalize him for doing so?

May I point out another fact to the Wisconsin farmer? Any system of production controls would necessarily have to exempt the backyard producer—the one- and two-cow farmer—or the administrative job of handling the controls would be impossible. To us in Wisconsin, it probably seems incredible, but the fact is that almost half the farms in the Nation producing milk fall in this category. That means that the full burden of production controls would fall upon the large and efficient producers. It would fall particularly hard upon the farmers in our State where dairy herds of 20 or more account for 53 percent of the cows in our State and where we pride ourselves on efficient production of milk.

No, I say the answer to the dairy problem does not lie in production controls. Rather, one part of the answer lies in the opposite direction. It lies not in limiting efficiency, but in promoting it. The dairy farmer cannot be helped by persuading him to accomplish less with his labor. A test at Michigan State showed that milk production costs could be cut by 45 percent through the use of all available techniques, such as better-producing cows and improved practices, without increasing farm help or farm acreage. Any dairy farmer who achieves only part of this efficiency increase automatically improves his economic position considerably.

That is why I said earlier that the partial answer to the problem of too much production is, paradoxically, increased production by individual producers. For, part of the reason for too much production is too many farmers engaged in milk production, in other parts of the country, who have no economic justification for being in the business of producing milk. They have been able to operate inefficiently and get by because of artificially high prices for milk, either through Government supports, marketing orders, or local regulations. As we produce more efficiently in Wisconsin and as we break down these artificial barriers to the flow of milk into other States, we in Wisconsin can expect to capture the markets now held by inefficient producers. These other areas can then return to crops for which their farms are more suited. This is happening to a slight extent already. Wisconsin milk production is down only slightly for the first 3 months of this year, but production nationwide is down almost 2 percent.

May I point to a final fact which faces the dairy industry—the fact that our brightest future lies in increasing the consumption of dairy products. This is a fact which we have been late to recognize. I have no doubt, however, that the industry is now well aware of the need to go out and sell its products. This festival is a significant contribution to that sales campaign.

Great progress has been made already. We are increasing the consumption of dairy products through giant advertising and merchandising plans sponsored by the dairy farmers themselves. My kids are singing "Davy Crockett, King of the Wild Frontier," because Davy Crockett is selling milk, butter, and cheese on the television. Our own Alice in Dairyland is promoting the sale of dairy products. You good people here are doing more than your share. The industry itself has come alive. We can expect more and better results as this gigantic promotion program takes hold of the American people, as it has begun to do already.

We begin with a tremendous advantage. We have an ideal product to sell. It is nature's finest food. It is inexpensive. It tastes good. That is a combination that can't be beaten. The American people need to be made aware that milk and its products are the source of over 100 different nutrients—vitamins, minerals, fats, sugars, and high-quality proteins. They need to be reminded that the 15 percent of their food dollar which they spend on dairy products brings them 25 percent of their food. They need to have brought to their attention the thousand and one different ways in which dairy products can be used to better the taste of their diets. That is the road to increased per capita consumption.

These jobs—and the job of better distribution of dairy products—are the responsibility of the industry and the dairy farmer, assisted by Government. It is a job which must be done.

I am supremely confident of the future of the dairy industry—so important to all of us in Wisconsin—if the industry continues to face up to the facts.

An understanding of the basic problem, a recognition of the proper role of Government, increased production efficiency and increased per capita consumption—these are the needs. These are the facts we face.

We have made great progress from the serious situation which confronted us only a year ago. We have a long way to go. But I believe strongly that we are moving toward the time, as the Secretary of Agriculture put it recently, when the support price will no longer be the ceiling price, as has been the case too long. Our goal, he said, is to have the farm price of milk move up in the market rather than on the statute book.

I am convinced we can reach that goal—if we continue to face the facts.

Memorial Day, Lawrence, Mass.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 1, 1955

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following address I delivered on the Memorial Day observance on Campagnone Memorial Common, Lawrence, Mass., with exercises in memory of those who served as soldiers, sailors, and marines in defense of the Union, during the War of the Rebellion, followed by the traditional military parade to Bellevue and Immaculate Conception Cemeteries, where the dead of all other wars were honored. The exercises were jointly sponsored by American Legion Posts, Nos. 15 and 275, this year.

With each passing year, we approach Memorial Day with greater reverence.

The boy who stood near one of those trees in 1938, 1925, or 1907, holding on to his father's hand as he watched the uniformed veterans on Memorial Day, may be in the gallant company of the heroic dead whose sacrifices we honor in 1955.

As each generation, in turn, grows up to defend the freedoms of our Nation.

To die, if need be, winning time for us to help create a civilization that shall be worthy of all God's children.

On Memorial Day we put aside for a moment the routine tasks that make our lives seem so small in meaning and in purpose.

We think of the boy next door, who had no wealth, or fame, or position to protect, but who went forth in the splendor of his manhood to give up his whole being that we might be spared for another chance.

What inspired him with such faith and courage?

Through home, and church, and school, he learned that the finest people are those who free themselves from the imprisonment of self.

Who are not afraid to spend their energies, their minds, and their hearts, to make life just a little better than it was before.

To our soldier dead, the bright, clean flag that they followed into battle, represented all the brave men who had gone before them; it spoke of their mothers and fathers who had provided opportunities for them in this new world; and it promised all the greatness yet to be, if Americans become fully awake to the responsibilities of freedom.

Living each day, not only for material gain, but to extend our horizons in all directions, searching for the peace based on understanding and fellowship.

Every man has his shortcomings, whether he knows them or not.

And the same applies to groups, to cities, States, and the Nation itself.

We are aware of much that is cheap and shoddy in our way of life; of action for action's sake with no constructive end in view.

In our dealings with other nations, we sometimes rush in with economic aid and military equipment, thinking that these two items will solve the whole problem, instead of trying to understand the character and the culture of the nations that we are trying to befriend.

Our impulsiveness leads us to expect quick results.

This is a factor that we must also bear in mind during forthcoming negotiations with the Russian Communists, that could result in some lessening of international tensions.

Whatever may be their long-range objectives, we can be sure that their present behavior is prompted by necessity rather than a genuine desire for peace.

Things are not going too well within the Communist Empire.

This, plus the fact that the free world is steadily building its economic and military strength, as it applies the lessons of teamwork, is responsible for the sudden change in tactics on the part of the Kremlin.

Some Americans may jump to the false conclusion that the Communists have suddenly reformed, forgetting the mousetrap plays that the Soviets employ to tempt nations into moves that will weaken and defeat them.

Armed Forces Day, which was observed on May 21, stressed the theme of power for peace.

It is that power which has made some impression on the Communists.

It is a realistic force that they plan to undermine by the olive-branch technique, until such time as they can lull the free world into the careless mood where stealthy subversion may enslave us from within.

While we are duty bound to examine every Soviet proposal that might, just might lead to a settlement of outstanding problems, we should look beyond the bait and guard ourselves against boobytraps.

At no time can we ever relax our vigilance.

The menace in our time is communism.

In the future it may come in another form; through our own worship of materialism or indifference to problems right here at home.

Having freedom is one thing; what we do with it is another.

A spoiled child, wanting to have its way in all matters, believes that it is enjoying a special freedom. But that child grows up alone because it fails to show consideration for the rights of others.

Just as no free people can live in isolation.

We remember George Washington, who shared the suffering of his men during that bitter winter at Valley Forge.

Abraham Lincoln, worried by a divided nation, the inhuman lot of the slaves, and the tragedy of brother fighting against brother that burdened his heart with anguish.

Woodrow Wilson, leading the crusade to save democracy and to win the right of self-determination for all peoples.

Franklin D. Roosevelt, lifting the Nation and the world from despair by his confident leadership and his faith in the future.

Behind these Presidents, supporting and inspiring them, were the millions of unknown Americans whose sacrifices we honor today.

In every city and hamlet throughout the Nation we shall decorate their graves on this Memorial Day and in every year to come as long as man shall live. Not only in the cemeteries that carpet the western hills of our city, but in the bivouacs of the dead from Concord to Korea; in the islands of the far Pacific; and along the hedgerows of France, that tenderly embrace the mortal remains of young Americans who fought and died in freedom's name.

Today we commune with them.

Praying that we may live up to the high standards they have set before us.

Heartened by the alert and every-ready pilots of our Strategic Air Command; by the soldiers and sailors who make tyrants hesitate to embroil the world in war.

Hopeful, as we look at our schools where youngsters are learning those imperishable truths that will nourish the future.

From university to scientific laboratory, from factory to market place, and in every activity, the eager American is pioneering, pressing forward to conquer poverty, disease, ignorance, and intolerance.

Not for himself alone, but that all men shall benefit from progress. With the dedication of a Dr. Salk, who freely offered his discovery to liberate parents and children in all lands from the fear and suffering of a dread affliction.

Soldiers for peace as well as for war.

Winning victories for mankind.

In sadness, mellowed by pride, we mourn for our soldier dead because they gave up the great gift of life, to defend us.

Wondering if we can ever justify their faith in us.

Missing their unwavering courage that we need to overcome the dangers that challenge us the living.

But wait, we do not have to reach back and recapture the past.

Our heroic dead are not separated from us, in the ever-lengthening distance between 1950, 1918, 1898, 1864, 1775.

They are the invisible host of brave men who, having done their duty, encourage us to do ours, being closer to us than we realize.

Freedom is not a passing experiment.

Courage is never dated.

On this Memorial Day we are aware of a precious heritage that lives and breathes in us.

Thankful to God for having blessed our country with men who were unafraid to open the way on which we must follow through.

Indebted to the valiant Americans who have not really gone and will never be forgotten.

Because they walk with us in spirit and forever.

Protecting the Educational Opportunities of Our Young Men

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS M. PELLY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 1, 1955

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, I have received a protest from the Washington State Bar Association which I think merits the attention of the Members of the House.

Recently in the Committee of the Whole House when we were discussing the Reserve manpower bill it was obvious Congress desires in peacetime if possible to protect the educational opportunities of our young men. Now I have a case in point which shows how rigid and arbitrary our military can be.

Three graduating law students of the University of Washington who are attached to the District of Columbia National Guard as Reserve officers applied for induction delay so they could take their bar examinations. They were ordered to report June 15 and the examinations are to be given July 18, 19, and 20. Their request was rejected and they were told either to report as ordered or to resign and be drafted.

I certainly think the future careers of our young men should be considered. To me the Washington State Bar Association is right, and I have urged the District National Air Guard to reconsider its decision. My colleague from the State of Washington [Mr. MACK], in whose district one of the young men lives, has joined me in protesting and urging that a 60-day delay be given these three students in reporting for military service. We have pointed out that the Government already has an investment in their training which should be protected, but more important they should be permitted to take their bar exams now rather than after they complete their military service. Otherwise their future careers may well be jeopardized.

Increase Minimum Wage to $1.25

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ISIDORE DOLLINGER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 1, 1955

Mr. DOLLINGER. Mr. Speaker, legislation to increase the minimum hourly wage now holds the spotlight. This vitally important question is being considered by the Committee on Education and Labor. Millions of underpaid workers are looking hopefully to Congress for relief and for a decent living wage.

As early as 1949 I introduced a bill to establish a $1 minimum hourly wage; in 1953 I introduced a bill providing for $1.25, and reintroduced it in 1955. The fact that a minimum wage of at least $1 per hour was needed to meet living costs in 1949 points up the futility and worthlessness of the President's proposal that the minimum wage be increased to only 90 cents, for living costs have steadily increased.

The workingmen of our prosperous country should be given a minimum wage of at least $1.25 per hour in order that they can maintain a decent standard of living.

I appeared before the committee today and made my plea in behalf of our low-income workers, and am inserting in the RECORD a copy of my statement:

Mr. Chairman and members of the Committee on Education and Labor, on January 5, 1955, I reintroduced my bill to establish a $1.25 minimum hourly wage, and for other purposes.

I am pleased to have this opportunity to speak in behalf of the underpaid workers of our country, for they need our help.

The President of the United States has recommended a 90-cent minimum wage. This is grossly inadequate. Decent living standards cannot be maintained on less than $1.25 per hour.

Living costs have increased 14 percent since January 1950—but for the lowest in-

come group, which suffers the greatest price rise, living costs have increased by at least 18 percent. During this time that the 75-cent level has remained, productivity has increased at least 20 percent. The gap between what a man is paid and a man produces widens and the glaring injustice of the 75-cent minimum wage is apparent.

The low-wage earner has been staggering under an overwhelming burden of high taxes and ever rising living costs and no relief by way of increased earnings has been given him. Low-income families have been suffering privations; they cannot afford adequate medical care or many of the necessities that we have come to take for granted as part of the American way of life. During the past 2 years, under the Republican administration, the rich have become richer while the poor man's lot has become more and more intolerable—low-income families have had to battle for a meager existence.

Although corporation and stockholder profits are up, labor is called upon to pay most of the tax bill. Corporations and those in high-income brackets were provided loopholes in the tax law under this administration, but the wage earner has not been granted an increase in personal income-tax exemption. On the other hand, hidden taxes have increased and in most States people are now called upon to pay sales taxes. Thus the tax burden is being shifted more and more to the shoulders of the low- and middle-income families.

We must come to the rescue of the laboring people of the country. The wage earner should be adequately paid for his labors and efforts; this is only his just share of the profits reaped as a result of his labors.

An adequate minimum wage would mean a boost to the health, morale, and general economic welfare of millions of workers and their families; it would bolster the purchasing power of the low-income groups where the need for higher living standards is the greatest. This, in turn, will increase the demand for goods and services throughout the Nation and benefit all.

I urge your committee to take a realistic view and to recognize the plight of the workingman. Justice demands that you set a minimum wage of $1.25 per hour. I trust that you will favorably report legislation providing for that sum. Anything less would be wholly inadequate, futile, and a betrayal of the workingmen who must rely upon us for protection.

The Late Chief Judge Harold M. Stephens

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL M. LeCOMPTE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 1, 1955

Mr. LeCOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, yesterday as I attended the last rites pronounced over my friend, Chief Judge Harold M. Stephens, I constantly thought of the great contribution this unselfish man had made to the welfare of his country through his devotion to fair and constructive interpretation of law. He was an eminent and successful practicing lawyer, but he was willing to devote the greater part of his life to the judiciary, and he became one of the very great jurists of this age.

For 20 years he served on the bench of the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Judicial Circuit, and since 1948 he has been Chief Judge. During his service he inaugurated many innovations, notably the Federal Register. This service alone is of sufficient importance to distinguish him. Many Executive orders have practically the force and effect of legislative enactments, but without the Federal Register it might be difficult to locate and analyze some administrative orders.

Judge Stephens was devoted to the law at all times, but had a fine sympathetic feeling toward all parties involved. He gave unstintingly of his time to every case that came before him.

In his private life he was a most lovable man, devoted to his friends and his faithful wife and companion of a lifetime. We will not soon see his like again.

Citizenship Day 1955

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK T. BOW

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 1, 1955

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, President Eisenhower has issued a proclamation calling upon all citizens to recognize September 17, the anniversary of the signing of the Constitution, as Citizenship Day.

Under joint resolution adopted in 1952, the Congress has set aside this day as one of recognition of all citizens who have come of age and all who have been naturalized within the year preceding.

I join the President in urging suitable recognition of our new citizens and of the anniversary of the Constitution.

I feel, however, that the anniversary of our American Constitution, one of the greatest written documents of all times, deserves greater recognition than is provided under the resolution and the proclamation of the President. I feel that it should be a legal holiday devoted to the Constitution. For this purpose, I have introduced House Joint Resolution 95, which is now waiting consideration of the Committee on the Judiciary, and which I hope may soon have the approval of that committee.

Under leave to extend, I include the President's proclamation and the text of House Joint Resolution 95:

PROCLAMATION 3098

CITIZENSHIP DAY, 1955

By the President of the United States of America, a proclamation

Whereas by joint resolution approved February 29, 1952 (66 Stat. 9), the Congress of the United States has designated the 17th day of September of each year as Citizenship Day in commemoration of the signing of the Constitution of the United States on September 17, 1787, and in recognition of all our citizens who have come of age and all who have been naturalized during the year; and

Whereas in this time of world uncertainty and unrest it is most appropriate that every one of our citizens, whether native-born or foreign-born, give special thought to the priceless blessings secured to us by our Constitution; and

Whereas the aforesaid resolution authorizes the President to issue annually a proclamation calling for the observance of Citizenship Day with appropriate ceremonies:

Now, therefore, I, Dwight D. Eisenhower, President of the United States of America, call upon the appropriate officials of the Government to display the flag of the United States on all Government buildings on Saturday, September 17, 1955, and urge the people of the Nation to display the flag on that day at their homes and other suitable places.

I also urge Federal, State, and local officials, as well as religious, civic, patriotic, educational, and other organizations, to arrange for appropriate ceremonies on Citizenship Day, in schools and churches and other appropriate places, to the end that all of us may gain a deeper appreciation of our rights and responsibilities as citizens of the United States.

And I also call upon all our citizens to renew and reaffirm their allegiance on that day to the principles and ideals embodied in the Constitution—the foundation of our strength and the symbol of freedom and justice for all.

In witness whereof, I have hereunto set my hand and caused the seal of the United States of America to be affixed.

Done at the city of Washington this 1st day of June in the year of our Lord 1955, and of the independence of the United States of America the 179th.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

By the President:

[SEAL] JOHN FOSTER DULLES,
Secretary of State.

[F. R. Doc. 55-4560; Filed, June 3, 1955; 1:38 p. m.]

House Joint Resolution 95

Joint resolution to make Constitution Day a legal holiday

Resolved, etc., That the 17th day of September in each year, being the day celebrated and known as Constitution Day, is hereby made a legal holiday to all intents and purposes and in the same manner as the 1st day of January, the 22d day of February, the 30th day of May, the 4th day of July, the first Monday of September, the 11th day of November, the fourth Thursday of November, and Christmas Day.

Letter From Georgia Women's Democratic Club Favoring 4-Year Terms for Representatives

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES C. DAVIS

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 1, 1955

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I am in receipt of a letter from Mrs. David S. Hogg, legislative chairman of the Georgia Women's Democratic Club, Atlanta, Ga., advising me that on May 26 that organization adopted a resolution advocating that the term of office of Members of the United States House of Representatives be changed from 2 years, the present length of a term, to a term of 4 years.

The Georgia Women's Democratic Club is affiliated with the National Democratic Party, and concerns itself with questions of national as well as local importance. I have been advised that this organization has for some time given

study and consideration to the question of the length of the term for Members of the United States House of Representatives, and the resolution adopted on May 26 is the result of that study.

I take pleasure in giving to my colleagues in the House this information regarding the action of the Georgia Women's Democratic Club.

Federal-Aid Highway Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS M. PELLY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 1, 1955

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, I have just read H. R. 7072, the new Federal Aid Highway bill, written and introduced by the Democratic members of the House Public Works Committee. I have no differences with many, in fact most, of the basic provisions of this new bill, H. R. 7072. However, I am most emphatically opposed to the financing provision of this bill. The President's program calls for financing the expanded program by means of a bond issue to be paid off from the increased revenue occurring from the gasoline tax which is expanding year after year. On the other hand the proponents of this new bill have set up a tax structure for the financing of their proposed bill that is in my judgment completely unrealistic and grossly unfair. The discriminatory tax placed burdens out of all proportion on certain segments of industry. Briefly they propose to raise the present 2 cents a gallon Federal gas tax to 3 cents, a 50-percent increase, and the present 2 cents a gallon tax on diesel fuel to 6 cents, a 200-percent increase. This tax is obviously grossly unfair to the users of our airways and the operators of gasoline- and diesel-powered small craft, as well as the users of diesel fuel for heating purposes, not to mention the general public already struggling with a tax burden out of all proportion to earned income.

Aside from these fuel taxes, H. R. 7072 comes up with a startling new proposal, the levying of a special tax on truck tires in sizes 8.50 by 18 and larger. I am informed that this size tire weighs approximately 100 pounds or more. The tax is to be 50 cents a pound on tires and tubes. Then, too, for the purposes of this act, every time the owner of a tire has occasion to have it retreaded or recapped, he pays an additional 20 cents per pound tax on the overall weight of this same tire.

This is an exorbitant tax. Heavy truck tires presently sell for approximately $1 a pound, to which there is added a 10-percent Federal excise tax. Under the new proposal the sponsors of this bill would add 50 cents per pound. Thus on a 100-pound tire now selling at $100 there would be the present $10 excise tax, plus the proposed new 50-cents-per-pound tax, making the cost of the tire $100 plus $10 plus $50, or $160, and with an additional tax of $20 every time the tire is recapped. In addition, all of the money derived from the new tire tax is to be earmarked for use on the Interstate Highway System, which in the case of my State of Washington would involve Highway 99, running north and south from Vancouver to Blaine, Wash., and Highway 10, running east and west from Seattle to Spokane, Wash. Logging is one of the chief industries in the State of Washington, yet owing to the location of the camps in relation to the mills, logging trucks seldom use the interstate highways. Nevertheless, logging-truck owners would be compelled to pay this exorbitant $50 or more tax on every tire purchased under this bill. The average logging truck has a complement of 16 tires, so that for every set of tires purchased an additional tax of $800 or more would be assessed, this in addition to the already substantial excise tax.

Referring once again to the staggering increase proposed in the gasoline and diesel-fuel tax, in the case of the former 50 percent and of the latter 200 percent, consider the plight of the airlines, the owner of private airplanes and small craft, the farmer operating tractors and stationery power-driven farm equipment. All these individuals would pay their tax without ever using the highways for which the tax was levied.

In my opinion this constitutes a perfect example of a discriminatory tax bordering on confiscation, and should most definitely be deleted from any legislation brought before the distinguished Members of this House. I strongly urge the financing of this program be based on the sound business practices suggested in the administration's recommendation.

American Motion-Picture Industry Promotes International Goodwill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GORDON L. McDONOUGH

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 1, 1955

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, the motion-picture industry of the United States has been and is doing much to further international goodwill and understanding between the United States and the other nations of the world.

Not only have motion pictures carried the message of our American way of life to every corner of the globe, but the motion-picture companies have sent units to all parts of the world in their film-making efforts.

The men and women who have traveled to far lands have acted as individual goodwill representatives of the United States, and have, in their relationships with peoples of other nationalities and backgrounds, impressed upon them the effectiveness of American methods and the ability of the American people to work in harmony with the people of other nations to accomplish a united purpose.

Foremost among those who have paved the way for the path of good international relations is the motion-picture director, Mark Robson. Mr. Robson 3 years ago took a company of American film workers into the remote areas of Samoa to make the motion picture Return to Paradise. He instructed his coworkers to enter into the civic life of the capital city. Spending 4 months with the Samoans, Robson and his company were model emissaries for this country—so much so that they were given a ceremonial farewell feast by the natives of six villages.

Last year, Robson extended his operations to Japan, where he filmed much of the motion picture The Bridges at Toko-Ri. To the Japanese, he brought a true view of the Americans at work. He integrated his production crews with those of Tokyo studios, and Americans worked alongside Japanese in perfect harmony. He exchanged professional views in public meetings with the Japanese film creators, and made a number of personal appearances in Tokyo theaters to praise the efficiency of the Nipponese studio workers. Robson's visit resulted in an added respect for American methods and conduct.

Later in the year, the director completed a motion picture that was made in England and Germany. In the latter country, where our public relations often are in the critical stage, he performed in the best diplomatic tradition by utilizing West Germany's motion-picture facilities to the fullest extent and always considering that nation's film experts on a par with our own.

In another case, Producer-Director John Huston endeared himself recently to the natives of the Canary Islands by staging special public sports events for the people while he was making the film Moby Dick in that part of the world. He created enormous goodwill also in the Azores, where he filmed another portion of his motion picture. In India last month, Mr. Huston provided the same effective international relations through his appearances at official functions and his superb press relations.

By the time the year ends, it is estimated that 40 feature motion pictures will have been made by American companies on foreign soil. If past experience is a criterion, the people who participate in these productions may be numbered among America's best missionaries of goodwill.

Bananas on Pike's Peak?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 1, 1955

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, the Congress might as well appropriate

public money to grow bananas on Pike's Peak as to approve the central Utah irrigation project.

The central Utah project is a part of the proposed multi-billion-dollar upper Colorado River project.

The cost to the Nation's taxpayers of the central Utah project would be $4,700 an acre.

The project would produce agricultural products now supported by the taxpayers and in great surplus in this country. Among these are grains, dairy products, and wool.

Limiting the Powers of Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH W. GWINN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 1, 1955

Mr. GWINN. Mr. Speaker, the other day a proposal in Congress to reduce personal taxes by a meager $20 a head was called fiscal irresponsibility. That was true because of worse fiscal irresponsibility by Congress for more than 20 years right up to this minute. It has been making appropriations for grants-in-aid, loans, subsidies, and gifts. It has authorized spending, borrowing, and running deficits that make the proposed reduction in taxes impossible—irresponsible. During the fiscal year 1956 the Federal Government expects to spend about 20 percent of its budget on domestic programs with so-called economic and social objectives. Included in these programs are aids to agriculture, aids to business, aids to tenants and homeowners, aids to labor and other programs providing general economic or social benefits. The total for these programs according to the Tax Foundation is $12¼ billion. It takes at least 1,400,000 Federal employees to operate our extraneous, unconstitutional functions of government. They cost in salaries and other overhead more than $6 billion. Nine hundred thousand employees could perform all the legitimate constitutional nonmilitary functions of government—and do a better job.

Americans are quick to express their displeasure of and opposition to the Communist concept of state ownership of land and resources. They would consider any comparison between our country and Russia as odious and tantamount to treason. But a look at the facts will show that such a comparison is possible and that the only difference is one of method and degree. It is common knowledge that in the last 15 years this inflation, which is directly attributable to reckless and irresponsible fiscal practices of the Federal Government, has decreased by 50 percent the value of our dollar assets, bank deposits, Government bonds, insurance policies, and social-security claims. Since the Federal Government has the power to so devalue the worth of our money, it can be said that the Government has confiscated one-half of every dollar earned and owned by every American. In the early days of the New Deal the Federal Government confiscated every ounce of gold that was being used or to be used as the medium of exchange. Future ownership of gold was declared a crime, and payment of obligations in gold was forbidden. Taxes, hidden and direct, require a third of our individual income. More than half of the net income of corporations is taken. The Federal Government owns about 25 percent of the land area of the United States. In addition are all the Government housing projects and some 2,500 business properties estimated at about $50 billion. Add to this the electrical-power projects that will soon produce a fourth of our power. Add to this irrigation projects of $2⅓ billion. Then there is the Government insurance business, impossible to estimate, insuring farmers against crop failures, workers against unemployment, orphans, widows, and old people against want. Along with innumerable other controls and regulations, the Federal Government exercises such compulsions as to fix wages according to the judgment of that Government. Farmers are instructed from Washington what crops are to be planted and what the extent of the harvest shall be. In recent times the Government has determined the rent a landlord should charge and the profits a business could make. This was accomplished by specific controls in addition to the taxing power which deprives the owner of his rights to property and his disposition of the same. Through the borrowing power the United States Government has mortgaged every man, woman, and child in the Nation to the extent of over $1,700, or a total of $285 billion, and entered into other contingent obligations estimated at $244 billion, many of which are not on the books and not yet determinable.

Thus, what the Federal Government does not own outright, which is communism, it regulates and controls, which is socialism, American variety. So far as the individual is concerned, there is little difference between taking ownership of property and taking control of it. What value does property have to a man if he cannot manage it or enjoy the fruits of it or dispose of it as he sees fit?

The conclusion is inescapable, that the Government, through its outright taking, taxing, regulatory and controlling powers, has confiscated and transferred to itself at least one-half of the value of all private property in the United States. This is obviously a conservative estimate. When income is taken by Government up to 91 percent as at present, that means individual responsibility to manage ourselves and our property is suspended.

Something has to be done about it. Or we shall have unlimited governmental irresponsibility in the management of our affairs permanently fastened upon us.

Indeed, is it not a fact that any people who tolerate mere men exercising unlimited powers over them have become themselves temporarily irresponsible? No sensible organization of men turns loose its officers to do anything they like and spend whatever they please. Their powers are always specified and limited in scope and spending to carry out the stated purposes of the organization. Congress is in that ridiculous position of being unlimited in functions and spending power.

Do we need another decade—even another day—to demonstrate that Congress is incapable of correcting its own helplessness without the people's help?

Much of our trouble stems from the Marxian system of taxation established by Congress. With its heavy progressive income tax and its confiscatory death tax, this system is fast driving us into complete socialism.

As a means of eliminating this evil, Senator EVERETT M. DIRKSEN and Congressman CHAUNCEY W. REED have introduced in the Senate and House an amendment to the Constitution limiting the power of Congress to tax incomes, inheritances, and gifts—Senate Joint Resolution 23 and House Joint Resolution 182.

Congressman REED, when he introduced the amendment in the House on January 31, 1955, summarized its provisions as follows:

> First. As to income taxes: The amendment limits income taxes on both individuals and corporations to a maximum rate of 25 percent, but permits Congress by a vote of three-fourths of the Members of each House to exceed that rate provided the top rate does not exceed the bottom rate by more than 15 percentage points. For example, if the bottom rate were 20 percent, the top rate could not exceed 35 percent. If the top rate does not exceed 25 percent, however, there is no restriction at all on the bottom rate. It could, for instance, be 1 percent or one-half of 1 percent. Subject to the foregoing limitations, the rates on corporate incomes may vary from those on individual incomes.
>
> Second. Death and gift taxes: The amendment gives to the States the exclusive power to impose death and gift taxes.

The Reed-Dirksen proposal recognizes some basic first principles that the Marxian tax system we now have does not. First, there is a point of diminishing returns in the collection of taxes. Low rates may produce more revenue than high rates. Second, the great bulk of income taxes in a progressive rate system is collected from the lowest tax brackets; and, third, that as between separate governmental taxing units, the one closest to the people can perform most efficiently and economically.

The first principle is best illustrated by the use of Henry Ford as an example. In 40 years Mr. Ford's fortune increased from $1,000 to $1 billion. If the Ford Motor Co. had been subjected to a 50-percent income tax during that 40-year period it could never have come into existence. We have proved to the world that mass-produced, low-per-unit-cost products yield more profits and pay more taxes than high-per-unit costs and high rates of taxes.

To illustrate: During the 1920's the high World War I tax rates were drastically lowered. The following table shows that although maximum rates

were lowered and personal exemptions increased the revenue yield was greater:

Year	Total internal-revenue collections	Maximum rate (percent)	Personal exemptions
1925	$2,584,140,000	40	$2,500
1926	2,836,000,000	24	3,000
1927	2,865,863,000	24	3,500
1929	2,939,054,000	20	3,500
1930	3,040,146,000	20	3,500

The reason for this is obvious. The great bulk of revenue comes from the first and lowest bracket of the income taxpayers. About 85 percent of all taxes collected comes from the lowest bracket, viz. the 20-percent bracket. Only 3 percent, or about $2 billion, is provided by rates in excess of 34 percent.

It is obvious from the foregoing that if the Government continues to require large revenues, the lowest income producers will be required to provide by far the greatest share of taxes.

Real relief can be effected only by drastically reducing expenditures or by reducing the higher bracket tax rates so as to increase incentive and investment in productive enterprise. As Congressman REED points out, this would increase the national income which constitutes the tax base and thereby increase the revenue.

A very important effect of the amendment is the restoration to the States of the fiscal ability to meet the needs of their people. The States have lost that power to a great extent and consequently have either been forced to rely on the various grants-in-aid programs, or have surrendered to the Federal Government the responsibility for the performance of services that are primarily of State and local concern. This shift of power and responsibility is in clear violation of our constitutional concept that the unit of government closest to the people can most capably serve them. The Constitution provides for a neat division of powers, reserving to the States the bulk of sovereignty and granting only explicit and very limited powers to the Central Government.

This balance has been upset by the reckless and unsound use of the unlimited taxing power granted to the Federal Government by the 16th amendment and the Court interpretations of it. By preempting the tax sources the Central Government has been successful in arrogating to itself virtual control over the lives, property, and liberties of the American people. The States exist too much by sufferance and function too often as agents for the distribution of the Federal largesse. The extent of the shift of sovereignty is indicated by the fact that 20 years ago the States and localities collected 75 percent of all tax revenues in the Nation, while today the Federal Government collects 75 percent. The pen is indeed mighter than the sword, but the power of the purse is invincible.

The Reed-Dirksen proposal reverses this trend toward centralizing government power by restoring to the States some of the sources of tax revenues. The amendment returns to the States the exclusive power to levy death and gift taxes. These taxes constitute a small item in the Federal tax picture—about 1 percent—but represent a considerable revenue to the States. The right to control the transfer and devolution of property is one of the historical attributes of sovereignty, and clearly belongs to the States. Secondly, the amendment's limitation on confiscatory rates in the higher income-tax brackets guarantees to the States that the wealth created within their boundaries will remain there to create more wealth and consequently produce more and greater tax revenues for the States.

The amendment is a compromise, recognizing that in emergency situations the Federal Government must have great fiscal powers. But it also assures the American people of fiscal and, consequently, political sanity in normal times. That is the least we can do for the Nation's 66 million taxpayers.

The following is an address delivered on the floor of the Senate, January 21, 1955, by Senator EVERETT M. DIRKSEN, of Illinois, introducing Senate Joint Resolution 23, the Reed-Dirksen amendment:

THE PROPOSED CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT LIMITING CONGRESSIONAL POWER TO TAX INCOMES, INHERITANCES, AND GIFTS

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, in January 1953 the Honorable CHAUNCEY W. REED, of Illinois, introduced in the House, and I introduced in the Senate a joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States limiting the power of Congress to tax incomes, inheritances, and gifts—House Joint Resolution 103 and Senate Joint Resolution 23.

This amendment would limit income taxes to a maximum rate of 25 percent, but would permit Congress by a vote of three-fourths of the Members of each House to exceed that rate at any time without limit. Where the top rate exceeded 25 percent, however, it could be no more than 15 percentage points above the bottom rate. For example, if the bottom rate were 15 percent, the top rate could not exceed 30 percent. If the bottom rate were 20 percent, the top rate could not exceed 35 percent. If the top rate did not exceed 25 percent, however, there would be no restriction at all on the bottom rate. It could, for example, be 1 percent, or one-half of 1 percent.

This amendment would also deprive Congress of the power to impose death and gift taxes and would leave these means of raising revenue exclusively to the States, where they belong, and where competition among the States would tend to keep the rates within reasonable bounds.

Representative REED and I are introducing this joint resolution again this year.

The proposed amendment has met with wide approval. Important national organizations have endorsed it, including the American Bar Association, the American Legion, the National Association of Manufacturers, the Western Tax Council, the Committee for Constitutional Government, the Life Insurance Policyholders Protective Association, the National Economic Council, and the National Small Business Men's Association.

I cannot emphasize too strongly the importance of this amendment. Its objective is to save our American incentive system, commonly spoken of as the private-enterprise system, on which our very form of government depends.

Our present system of taxation, with its heavy progressive income and inheritance taxes, will eventually destroy this system and result in the substitution of some form of socialism.

Karl Marx, in his Communist manifesto of 100 years ago, fully recognized the importance of these taxes as a means of destroying the private-enterprise system by including in the 10 planks in his platform the following:

First. A heavy progressive or graduated income tax.

Second. Abolition of all right of inheritance.

For the past two decades the Federal Government has been following the course prescribed by Marx by imposing a heavy progressive or graduated income tax, and while not abolishing the right of inheritance the Federal Government has been increasing the rates of the death tax until the top rate is now 77 percent.

The progression in income-tax rates from the beginning rate of 20 percent on incomes of $2,000 and under to 91 percent on incomes of more than $200,000 is progression of a most extreme character. It not only confiscates the larger incomes, but it bears most heavily on the middle incomes, the group at which Marx particularly aimed in his advocacy of heavy graduated income taxes.

Reason and the experience of other nations, and most recently that of England, demonstrate beyond all question that unless our policy of taxation is changed the system of society under which this country has prospered and grown great will come to an end and some form of socialism or communism will supplant it.

How, one may ask, will the proposed amendment keep the rates down? The answer is this: The amendment would make it in the interest of every taxpayer, first, to keep the top rate down to 25 percent—as compared with the present rate of 91 percent; and, second, to keep the bottom rate no higher than 10 percent—as compared with the present rate of 20 percent. It is expected that the beginning rate will ultimately be much less than 10 percent.

The proposed amendment is just as important for the small-tax payer as for the large. This united self-interest of all taxpayers is relied on as a force that would keep the tax rates within reasonable bounds. There are 66 million individual income-tax payers in the United States. Most of them vote.

It should be noted that the proposed amendment merely limits the degree of tax-rate progression. It does not prescribe the top rate that Congress may impose. Hence, it cannot be argued that the amendment impairs the Government's power to raise needed revenue during either war or peace.

The proposed amendment will reduce the burden of taxation on those with the smaller incomes. A fact not generally realized is that the great bulk of the revenue from the individual income tax comes not from the taxpayers with large incomes, but from those with small incomes. That is so simply because the small incomes, in the aggregate, constitute the bulk of the national income. For example, only 3 percent—about $2 billion—of the total estimated Federal revenue of about $60 billion for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1955, is produced by the individual income-tax rates above 34 percent, which is 14 percentage points above the present beginning rate of 20 percent.

Contrast these figures with the effect of an increase of only $100 in the present $600 personal exemption and credit for dependents. Such an increase would result in a reduction of 7 million in the number of income-tax payers and a revenue loss of $2.5 billion. This is one-half billion dollars more than the total revenue received from the individual income-tax rates above 34 percent.

Accordingly, if we are to have enormous expenditures and correspondingly large reve-

nue, the great bulk of the revenue must come from persons of small and moderate means.

The only possible way to give relief to the small-tax payers is either (1) by reducing the need for revenue through cutting expenditures, or (2) by increasing revenue through a drastic reduction of the present confiscatory higher bracket rates so as to increase incentive and investment in productive enterprise. This would increase the national income, which constitutes the tax base, and thereby increase the revenue.

Any immediate loss in revenue through the elimination of the higher individual rates would undoubtedly be only temporary. Eventually, the lower rates would produce greater revenue than the higher rates now in force.

That the present confiscatory rates of the individual-income tax are not approved by a large majority of the American people is shown by Gallup polls. The vote of those having an opinion was 2 to 1 in favor of a 25-percent top limit in the September 1951 poll, and 3 to 1 in the July 1952 poll.

As I have already stated, the proposed amendment also deprives Congress of the power to impose death and gift taxes and leaves these means of raising revenue exclusively to the States, where they belong, and where competition among the States would tend to keep the rates within reasonable bounds. Under existing laws the tax on the estates of decedents runs to a high of 77 percent, and the tax on gifts to 57.75 percent. These rates are manifestly confiscatory, and they have very harmful economic effects. They not only seriously impair the incentive to work, save, and invest in productive enterprise, but they are extremely destructive of capital and, in the long run, will destroy the accumulations of capital that are so necessary for industrial activity and expansion, with the resulting beneficial effects on our economy.

Moreover, the heavy taxation of large estates compels the rich to seek comparatively safe liquid investments in order to provide for the heavy taxes that will be imposed upon their estates at death, thus further reducing the capital available for risky business ventures.

The harm done to the economy by the present high rates of death and gift taxes is out of all proportion to the revenue produced, and cannot be justified by any argument based on fiscal needs. Even with the very high rates now in force, the revenue from these taxes is comparatively trivial. In 1953 it was $891 million from the two sources. This was a little over 1 percent of the total budget of $74 billion—enough to pay the Government's expenses for about 4 days. The gift tax is merely auxiliary to the estate tax, and both should be dealt with alike.

Of particular concern is the destructive effect of the heavy estate taxes on small business. The conclusions of the Select Committee on Small Business of the United States Senate in its report published in June 1953, was that "estate taxes often lead to the disappearance of small- or medium-sized independent businesses or their merger with the dominant segment of an industry."

Let me add that this statement represents not only my own views but those of Representative REED, who joins me in making the statement.

The following is an address delivered on the floor of the House, January 31, 1955, by Congressman CHAUNCEY W. REED, of Illinois, introducing House Joint Resolution 182, Reed-Dirksen amendment:

LIMITING THE POWER OF CONGRESS TO TAX INCOMES, INHERITANCES, AND GIFTS

Mr. REED of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, 2 years ago in the 1st session of the 83d Congress, the Honorable EVERETT W. DIRKSEN, Senator from Illinois, and I introduced in the House and Senate a joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States limiting the power of Congress to tax incomes, inheritances, and gifts—House Joint Resolution 103 and Senate Joint Resolution 23. Senator DIRKSEN and I are introducing the same resolution again this year.

The principal provisions of the amendment may be summarized as follows:

First. Income taxes:

The amendment limits income taxes on both individuals and corporations to a maximum rate of 25 percent, but permits Congress by a vote of three-fourths of the Members of each House to exceed that rate, provided the top rate does not exceed the bottom rate by more than 15 percentage points. For example, if the bottom rate were 20 percent, the top rate could not exceed 35 percent. If the top rate does not exceed 25 percent, however, there is no restriction at all on the bottom rate. It could, for instance be 1 percent or one-half of one percent.

Subject to the foregoing limitations, the rates on corporate income may vary from those on individual incomes.

Second. Death and gift taxes:

The amendment also gives to the States the exclusive power to impose death and gift taxes.

It should be observed that the amendment merely limits the degree of tax rate progression. It does not prescribe the top rate that Congress may impose. Hence, it cannot be argued that the amendment impairs the Government's power to raise needed revenue during either peace or war, except, of course, with respect to the revenue derived from the estate and gift taxes, which is only about 1½ percent of the total. In other words, the amendment does not limit the amount of revenue that may be raised, but limits merely the manner in which it may be raised.

Its purpose and effect are merely to eliminate in large measure from our system of taxation its socialistic features; namely, first, the heavy progressive feature of the income tax; and, second, the confiscatory death tax, which will eventually dry up the sources of private capital and lead to the establishment of socialism with the accompanying loss of the people's liberty.

In a statement to the Temporary Economic Committee prior to World War II, Adolph Berle, Jr., Assistant Secretary of State, made the following significant prophecy:

"The Government will have to enter into direct financing of activities now supposed to be private, and a continuance of that direct financing must be (mean) inevitably that the Government will ultimately control and own those activities. * * * Over a period of years the Government will gradually come to own most of the productive plants of the United States."

I am convinced that Mr. Berle's prophecy will come true unless action to prevent it is taken before it is too late.

Legislation by Congress is obviously insufficient; for the work of a good Congress may be easily undone by that of a radical Congress.

The need of reform would seem to be obvious and I know of no way of giving permanence to such reform except through a constitutional amendment.

The ultimate objective of the amendment is a top individual income tax rate of 25 percent and a beginning rate of much less than 10 percent.

In determining whether such an objective is realistic it will be helpful to consider the possible tax effect of a budget of more reasonable proportions than the present one. The budget estimate of expenditures for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1955, is $63.504 billion. According to the Federal Budget in Brief Government expenditures for the comparatively recent fiscal years of 1948 to 1951, inclusive, were as follows:

	Expenditures in billions
1951 (which included a full year of the Korean war)	$44.058
1950	39.606
1949	39.507
1948	33.068

Prior to 1942, which was a war year, the largest expenditure of the Federal Government in any year was $18.4 billion in 1918, which was also a war year.

Let us suppose now the following changes in the budget receipts as estimated for the fiscal year 1955:

1. A reduction in the individual income tax rates to 10 percent on incomes up to $10,000 and 25 percent on the amounts in excess of $10,000, and

2. Elimination of estate and gift taxes.

These changes would reduce the budget receipts to $47 billion, which is $3 billion greater than the budget expenditures for the fiscal year 1951 which included a full year of the Korean war. It is $7.5 billion greater than the budget expenditures for the fiscal years 1950 and 1949.

A beginning rate of 5 percent, instead of 10 percent, on individual incomes would reduce the receipts to $41.5 billion. This is $2 billion above the 1950 and 1949 expenditures, to say nothing of the $33 billion expenditures in 1948.

It would, of course, take some years to secure the adoption of the amendment, since it must be approved by two-thirds of both Houses of Congress and ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the States.

About 85 percent of the estimated revenue from the individual income tax, which produces over half of the total revenue of the Federal Government, is produced by the first bracket rate of 20 percent when applied to the entire amount of taxable income in all brackets. Only 3 percent—about $2 billion—is provided by the rates in excess of 34 percent.

Accordingly, if we are to have enormous expenditures and correspondingly large revenue, the great bulk of the revenue must come from persons of small and moderate means. The only possible way to give relief to such persons is either, first, by reducing the need for revenue through cutting expenditures; or, second, by increasing revenue through a drastic reduction of the present confiscatory higher bracket rates so as to increase incentive and investment in productive enterprise. This would increase the national income which constitutes the tax base and thereby increase the revenue.

Any immediate loss in revenue through the elimination of the higher individual rates would undoubtedly be only temporary. Eventually the lower rates would produce greater revenue than the higher rates now in force.

Another important effect of the amendment which has not been sufficiently stressed would be to restore to the States the power to be financially independent and to free themselves from Federal domination. The Federal Government should not be permitted to hog the revenue and hand back part of it to the States on conditions.

It should be remembered that with minor exceptions every dollar spent by the Federal Government comes from the same sources of revenue that are available to the States. The States should raise the revenue and spend it themselves. Responsibility for the raising of revenue is one of the best checks upon extravagant and unwise expenditures. It's too easy to spend money raised by someone else.

Moreover, the States and municipalities are better fitted than the Federal Government to perform the services which are primarily of State or local concern and they

would do so at much less cost. Performance of these services by the Federal Government has meant the maintenance at great cost of a vast horde of bureaucrats on the Federal payroll, many of whom could readily be dispensed with.

To summarize, the proposed amendment—

First. Largely eliminates from our Federal system of taxation its socialistic features and thereby puts an end to the use of the taxing power as means of forcing us into socialism;

Second. Does not impair the power of the Federal Government to raise revenue;

Third. Does not shift the burden of taxation from the rich to the poor;

Fourth. Aims at reducing eventually the taxes of everyone so that the top rate will not exceed 25 percent and the bottom rate will not exceed 10 percent, with the prospect that it will be much less;

Fifth. With lower rates will increase the national wealth and over the years the Federal revenue;

Sixth. Will restore to the States the power to be financially independent and to free themselves from Federal domination.

In the final analysis, the problem resolves itself into the simple issue of whether we are to have in this country a system of society based upon, first, private enterprise and our constitutional form of government, or, second, socialism. Both reason and the experience of other countries lead to the conclusion that our present system of confiscatory income and death taxes, if long continued, will ultimately result in the establishment of socialism in place of our present system.

The changes in the impact of Federal taxes on the great bulk of the taxpayers involved in the proposed amendment are, as I pointed out, comparatively minor. Their beneficial effect, however, would be far-reaching and decisive.

The changes in the income-tax provisions proposed in connection with and partially effected by the 1954 Revenue Code, such as reductions in the tax on dividends and increases in certain deductions and exemptions, are costly in revenue and will have only minor effect on the economy. The major evil to be corrected is the one at which the proposed amendment is aimed.

I cannot emphasize too strongly that this amendment is vastly different from the amendment which has been going through the State legislatures, an amendment which limits the power of Congress to impose income, death, and gift taxes to a maximum rate of 25 percent with no right to suspend the limitation except in time of war. That amendment is altogether too rigid and would seriously impair the Government's power to raise needed revenue from the income tax in time of peace.

The text of the resolution introduced by Congressman REED is as follows:

House Joint Resolution 182

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled (two thirds of each House concurring therein), That the following article is hereby proposed as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States which shall be valid to all intents and purposes as part of the Constitution when ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States:

"ARTICLE—

"SECTION 1. The sixteenth article of amendment to the Constitution of the United States is hereby repealed.

"SEC. 2. The Congress shall have power to lay and collect taxes on incomes, from whatever source derived, without apportionment among the several States, and without regard to any census or enumeration. The maximum top rate (a term which shall mean the aggregate of all top rates) of all taxes, duties, and excises which the Congress may lay or collect on, with respect to, or measured by, income shall not exceed 25 percent: *Provided, however,* That the Congress by a vote of three-fourths of all the Members of each House may fix such a maximum top rate in excess of 25 percent, for periods either successive or otherwise, not exceeding one year each, if such rate so fixed does not exceed the lowest rate (a term which shall mean the aggregate of all lowest rates) by more than 15 percentage points. Subject to the foregoing limitations, the rates of tax applicable to the incomes of individuals may be different from the rates applicable to the incomes of corporations, which term shall include also associations, joint stock companies, and insurance companies. The determination of income subject to tax shall be by uniform rules of general application which shall not vary with the size of the income.

"SEC. 3. The Congress shall have no power to lay or collect any tax, duty, or exercise with respect to the devolution or transfer of property, or any interest therein, upon or in contemplation of or intended to take effect in possession or enjoyment at or after death, or by way of gift.

"SEC. 4. Sections 1 and 2 shall take effect at midnight on the 31st day of December following the ratification of this article. Nothing contained in this article shall affect the power of the United States after said date to collect any tax on, with respect to, or measured by, income for any period ending on or prior to said 31st day of December laid in accordance with the terms of any law then in effect.

"SEC. 5. Section 3 shall take effect at midnight of the day of ratification of this article. Nothing contained in this article shall affect the power of the United States after said date to collect any tax with respect to any devolution or transfer occurring prior to the taking effect of section 3, laid in accordance with the terms of any law then in effect."

Government: It's Better Than You Think

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MELVIN R. LAIRD

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 1, 1955

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, this morning I was privileged to attend the annual award ceremony of the United States Department of Agriculture, which was held at the Sylvan Theater on the Washington Monument Grounds at 10:30 a. m.

A very worthwhile and inspiring address was made by our colleague, Hon. CLIFFORD R. HOPE, of Kansas. Congressman HOPE has served on the House Agriculture Committee longer than any other Member and it was indeed fitting that he be chosen to address this annual award ceremony.

I ask unanimous consent that the address be made a part of the RECORD today:

GOVERNMENT: IT'S BETTER THAN YOU THINK

The annual presentation of the Department of Agriculture awards to those who have made an outstanding contribution to Government is an ideal occasion on which to talk about Government, about how good our Government really is. On the basis of my experience, I long ago concluded that Government is better—far better—than most realize, and I believe it is unfortunate that people generally are not aware of this fact. I am certain the cause of good government would be better served if we found more opportunities—like this one—to emphasize the good, the decent, the constructive aspects of Government.

It is all too seldom that one hears a good word for the Government or for those who work for it. I'm speaking now of Government as a whole, the executive and administrative agencies of which you are a part, the judiciary and the Congress. All are essential parts of the governmental structure set up by our forefathers. They are equal and coordinate, and one cannot be attacked and seriously weakened without affecting the entire structure.

It is not strange that we hear so few good words for Government when nearly every magazine, paper, or book one picks up or broadcast one hears trumpets the latest wrongdoing of Government. Certainly if anyone ever speaks or writes well of Government or politics he rarely makes the headlines or the front page. The Congress, the departments, and agencies can turn in a creditable performance day after day, week in and week out, with never a kind word or a pat on the back for a job well done. Yet let there be one slip, and the roof falls in.

To listen to some, you could well believe that Congress is completely under the control of sinister rightist pressure groups and their well-paid hirelings. From others you could assume that Congress is influenced only by leftist forces who deliberately seek to wreck the country by wild spending schemes and unsound economic and social reforms. That Congress might have a mind and will of its own escapes attention.

From the comments and criticism which we hear of Federal agencies, one could well get the idea that Government personnel is made up of men and women who work for Government only because they are incapable of finding a job outside of Government. I believe the greatest injustice paid to any group of workers in the country is the Nation's failure to appreciate and think well of the efforts of those who work—and work hard—for Government.

I believe that our political and governmental institutions are good and I believe this irrespective of the scandals that can be uncovered or the articles that can be written and the speeches given to the contrary. I base my conclusion on 28 years of experience in the Congress and in working with Federal agencies.

But too many people accept the idea that 1 scandal, 1 piece of wrongdoing in Government is constructive proof that all is bad. The rotten apple is assumed to have spoiled the entire barrel. Too many believe that inefficiency and corruption in politics and Government is like an iceberg—that the largest part of it is submerged and lurks beneath the water unseen.

I do not believe the analogy is relevant. Instead it seems to me that disclosures of wrongdoing is proof that the processes of Government are working well, that Government cleanses itself. Very little that is corrupt goes undetected. For this reason I believe that the disclosure of wrongdoing should give us greater not lesser faith in the goodness of our governmental institutions.

For proof that Government is better than generally believed one can look to the great bulk of work involving knotty, intricate, complex problems that gets done by Government in a routine way without fuss or fanfare. As we all know, most work of Government gets done well and only a small fraction of the total causes headlines.

While some seem to believe that the Federal service is staffed with lazy and incompetent personnel those of us who know Government see differently. We know the Government worker as a person who believes in

what he is doing, who works hard to do the best job of which he is capable, who is a good citizen, and who contributes fully to the community in which he lives. My conclusion that Government is better than generally realized is based to a great extent on my personal acquaintance with hundreds of Government workers who are dedicated to their jobs and who are a credit to our Government.

I believe that anyone who has an opportunity to see the Federal Government in action will form a favorable opinion of it and its employees. Let me give you an example. Mr. James C. Worthy came to Washington early in the Eisenhower administration to take a position as administrative assistant to the Secretary of Commerce. He left an important position with one of the largest business enterprises in America. Last January when, after rendering eminent service to the Government, he resigned to return to his old company, he made this statement in the course of an address entitled "The Federal Service, Its Problems and Its Future," and I quote, "I shall always be thankful for the friends I have made here, in high positions and low; friends who have made my task easier and my life richer. I have come to have a tremendous respect, not only for the appointive officials of this administration, but for the members of the career service. I hope that as I go back to private life I will be able to help correct some of the mistaken impressions which prevail in certain quarters about the kind of people who work for Government. I can say in all sincerity that for hard work and patient devotion it would be hard to find their equal in any line of endeavor."

It is a tragedy that more people do not realize how good our Government is. I say it is a tragedy, because it keeps us from realizing the extent to which the American dream is coming true. Nearly two centuries ago the Founding Fathers established here a Government dedicated to freedom and to the belief in God and the dignity of man. It was their thought that here under freedom and self-government man would achieve his highest being, his highest standard of living, peace and contentment. An essential aspect of the dream was that man would always search for the truth and his basic tools would be freedom of speech and thought. As mankind today looks ahead into the unknown future, its greatest source of courage and hope should be the realization that it has made unparalleled progress toward making this dream come true. American self-government and freedom has been an outstanding success. Self-government has been, in fact, one of our greatest achievements, and we are making more rapid progress than the pessimists want us to believe. I believe it is important to recognize this progress, to recognize how well we have done and to turn deaf ears to the cynics.

And one of the important things we cannot overlook is that this Government, set up 175 years ago for 13 small colonies along the Atlantic seaboard with about 3 million inhabitants, is functioning well today for the mightiest Nation the world has ever known, with 165 million people and with a myriad of problems which could never have been foreseen by the Founding Fathers.

Although I believe government and politics is much better than the critics ever suggest, I must make it clear that I am not opposed to criticism—that is, constructive criticism of things that are wrong and that need correcting. Criticism has been a most essential factor in the progress we have made in government and politics. Instead of less criticism, we need more, providing it is of the right kind.

In our scheme of things the purpose of criticism is to correct and improve—to eliminate the improper so that the good can endure and develop. The purpose of criticism, like free speech, of which it is a part, is to help us as a self-governing free people to find that which we can believe in—that which we can regard as true.

Criticism, whether it is of art, of science, or of politics, should serve in the search for truth. Its end is not criticism for the sake of criticism, but truth. To a disturbing extent, however, criticism in this country is losing touch with this purpose. Today criticism too frequently is based on blind obstructionism, out-and-out appeal to emotional prejudice, irrational name calling, and a desire to destroy someone's character just because he happens to disagree, even though it can be out of intelligent disagreement the truth might emerge.

For another thing we have become overly opinionated—too sure what we believe now is the eternal, everlasting truth. The overly opinionated only search for facts and arguments to prove that they are right. So we use the right to criticize to prove that we are right and not as a conscientious means to search out the truth. Said another way, I believe there is a growing tendency to place too much emphasis on proving that we are right rather than in finding what is right.

I think the growing tendency for criticism to generate into irresponsible bombast and smear keeps us from fully realizing all the good there is in our culture and in our Government and political life. Once in a while we should be able to help those who are doing all they can to improve government and its processes with a word of encouragement—a word to the effect that they are making progress and that their work is worthwhile.

For years now serious-minded people have concerned themselves with the Federal Government as an employer. I believe this objective would be helped by placing greater emphasis on the good in government; on the fact that government is good—is better than we think. People—all people—have a basic inner need for believing their work is important and their effort is appreciated.

On this point let me quote again from Mr. Worthy's able and significant address. He said, and I quote, "The Government worker will exert himself to the utmost, if necessary under severe difficulties, if he feels that those in authority recognize the importance of what he is doing and are giving him the support he needs. But if the value of his work is questioned—or worse, if he is attacked directly or by implication as an unnecessary burden on the public payroll—he is deprived of the chief incentive he has for diligent, conscientious effort."

What is a better way to raise the morale of government, improve the government service, than to place ever greater emphasis upon the great things government is doing?

You who work for the Government have every reason to be proud of your work and the country has every reason to be proud of you. The giving of these annual awards certainly is a symbol representing the good in government and for this hour at least we can all be certain beyond any shadow of doubt that government is good, is better than most think.

What I have been saying applies to Federal Government service generally. I want to devote the rest of my time to saying something about the men and women who work in the Department of Agriculture. During my more than 28 years in Washington I have been thrown in closer touch with them both here and in the field than with any other group of Government employees and I have come to have for them a feeling not only of respect but admiration.

I presume that there is no department of Government which is any broader in the scope of its activities or which touches the daily life of the people as closely as the Department of Agriculture.

I am sure there is a general feeling on the part of the public that the Department of Agriculture is primarily an agency to help farmers find a solution for their problems, and so it is. But very few realize how much the increased efficiency in agriculture which has been brought about through the Department's activities is reflected in benefits to the public.

The standard of living of any country depends upon what proportion of its population is needed to produce the necessities of life—food and clothing particularly. In the most backward nations it still requires 80 or 85 percent of the people to produce these bare necessities. Here in America the industry of agriculture has become so efficient that only about 13 percent of our people now live on farms and some of these are engaged in agriculture only part time.

This means that all the rest of our people except those engaged in the transportation and distribution of agricultural commodities are free to produce, transport, and distribute the goods and supplies which add to the amenities of life and enable us to maintain what we call the American standard of living. It has given us all the luxuries and conveniences of modern life like good roads, automobiles, air transportation, radio, television, air conditioning, our far-flung educational system, and our churches with their wide religious and welfare activities.

Let me point out also that in spite of the small number now engaged in agriculture the people of America as a whole are better fed, and better clothed than those of any other nation past or present. More than that such great advances have been made in the preservation, precooking, and improved packaging of food products that I am informed that American housewives spend about one-third as much time in the preparation of foods in the home as was the case only a few years ago.

All of these things to which I have made reference are not due entirely to the work of the Department of Agriculture. They are due in part to the fact that we have farmers who are able and willing and intelligent enough to take advantage of the great discoveries which have been made in agricultural research. They are due in part to merchanization, they are partly due to the progressive work of agricultual distributors and food processors. But all of these activities tie in with the work of the Department of Agriculture and were it not for its activities and the leadership which it has furnished, much of what has been done would not have been accomplished. So it is no exaggeration to say that although the Department of Agriculture was set up primarily to deal with the problems of farmers that the general public and the nonfarming population have received greater benefits than farmers from its work and activities.

Yours is a Department of great traditions of which you may well be proud. In the earlier days of its history its scientific and research activties constituted a greater proportion of the Department's work than now. Changes in the structure of agriculture itself, particularly in the fields of marketing and finance have enlarged the activities of the Department beyond the fields of research and education so that they now include such subjects as credit, price stabilization, crop insurance, regulatory matters, and others which are important in these times. All of which means that the Department has been kept up to date as a service institution.

No one can study the early history of this Department without getting a thrill from the work of men like Harvey W. Wiley, Peter Collier, L. O. Howard, Theobald Smith, Charles Warden Stiles, Marion Dorait, William Orton, Seaman A. Knapp, and Gifford Pinchot, to mention only a few of many.

And in passing it should be said that the research work done by some of these men while primarily for the benefit of agriculture

brought about some of our greatest advances in general science as well as in the field of medicine. Thus again illustrating the benefits which the public in general has received from the Department of Agriculture.

Yes, there were giants in the early days of the Department and there are giants now in all of its varied fields of activity. Some of them are here today to receive this recognition of the great service which they as public servants have rendered on behalf of a better America and a better world. There are others here who have received well merited recognition on previous occasions of this kind and there are others whose outstanding work will bring them here as recipients of these awards in the future.

These awards recognize the achievements of men and women who have rendered outstanding and extraordinary public service. They will serve as an inspiration and an incentive to everyone in the Department for continued efficient and faithful work in the field in which he is engaged. They will bring to light in future years the work of others whose devotion to duty should receive recognition and last but not least, they furnish assurance and call attention to the fact that there is no more honest, loyal, hard working and dedicated group in our Nation than the career employees of the Federal Government.

Address by Hon. John C. Watts, of Virginia, at Democratic Dinner on May 27, 1955

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WATKINS M. ABBITT

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 1, 1955

Mr. ABBITT. Mr. Speaker, it was my pleasure to attend a Democratic dinner in my Congressional District—Fourth District of Virginia—last Friday night, May 27. The guest speaker was the Honorable JOHN C. WATTS, Member of the House of Representatives from Kentucky. Mr. WATTS is one of the outstanding Members of the House, an able legislator, a wise counselor, and a man I am honored to call my friend.

Mr. WATTS brought a real message to the group assembled and, under leave to extend my remarks, I am including herein the speech delivered by Congressman WATTS:

Mr. Toastmaster, Congressman ABBITT, and fellow Democrats, a democratic meeting is an occasion of joy in itself and a pleasure for me to attend. I deem it a high privilege that you have afforded me the opportunity to visit and participate in your Jackson-Jefferson Day dinner. I can think of no finer place to pay honor and homage to those two great Democrats than in the Fourth District of Virginia, that has never failed to go Democratic except possibly at a time when Democrats were not permitted to vote immediately following the Civil War.

This section of Virginia is very much like the section of Kentucky that I have the honor of representing in that the people are alike; they generally think alike; and their economy is principally agricultural or businesses related or dependent on agriculture. I assure you that I feel very much at home and welcome in your midst. As a matter of fact, most Kentuckians do and should feel at home in Virginia, for most of us in Kentucky can trace our ancestry back to those hearty pioneers from Virginia who settled in Kentucky. I often wonder if Kentucky would ever have been settled if Cumberland Gap had not existed or been discovered. The ties of friendship and relationship between the peoples of your State and my State are very close and may be said to be as close, although not similar, as the ties between the two colored boys who discovered each other on the field of battle in Korea.

I cannot miss this opportunity to pay a sincere compliment to your splendid Representative, WATT ABBITT, and for that matter to the entire Democratic delegation from Virginia. They are as fine a group of hard-working, intelligent, honest, conscientious Representatives as any State has ever had.

I do not know for sure what first attracted me to your Representative and my friend, WATT ABBITT. It might have been his engaging personality; his willingness to help a freshman Member of Congress; his keen appraisal of legislation; his devotion to you—the people he represents; or it might have been the fact that his first name is practically the same as my last name. But irrespective of why I was first attracted to him, I want you to know that the longer I know him the better I like and appreciate not only his friendship but his ability as a competent legislator. I am sure you all know and appreciate his true worth, but I can't help telling you how fortunate you have been in your selection of a Representative. He works and fights effectively for the welfare of his people. He is in the forefront on legislation that affects tobacco and peanuts. Recently, when the House had before it H. R. 12, and the candy manufacturers undertook and almost succeeded in having peanuts declared a nonbasic commodity, it was the effective efforts of WATT ABBITT that did as much if not more to save the peanut program than any other one person. He lined up city boys, country boys, or anyone else that would listen to him and, mind you, it took an almost solid vote of the Democratic Party to save this program. You could count on your fingers the support that peanuts received from the Republicans. If Congressman ABBITT ever casts a vote that you do not quite understand, or you think you would not have cast if you were in his place, just remember that there are many things that must be taken into consideration before a Member casts his vote. Oftentimes all of the circumstances are not always known to the public generally.

We are gathered here tonight to commemorate two great Democrats—Thomas Jefferson, of Virginia, who is the founder of our party, and Andrew Jackson, who indelibly stamped it with many of its principles. The South is and has always been the backbone of the Democratic Party and, in turn, the Democratic Party has always been the home, the hope, and the sanctuary of the South. It was not until the Roosevelt era that the peoples of the North fully realized and appreciated the great principles and lofty ideals of the Democratic Party.

As we head into the important 1956 presidential election, we again see the attempts being made by certain individuals to drive a wedge between Democrats in the South and Democrats in the North.

It is true that not all Democrats are agreed on all of the issues within our party. In that respect, our political-party system differs from the British. In Britain, most issues are fought out between the two major parties. But here in the United States we debate issues within parties as well as between parties. And I think that is healthy.

Since the Democratic defeat in 1952, our party has clearly revealed that there is a far wider area of agreement between Democrats in the North and South than there is in disagreement. And even in the areas of disagreement, we have seen, since the elections last November, a closing of this gap over former party differences.

For this, we can give much credit to the able leadership of two great southern statesmen—Senator LYNDON JOHNSON, now majority leader in the Senate, and our beloved SAM RAYBURN, Speaker in the House of Representatives.

But despite this strengthened unity, we will continue to hear from those who would like to see our party split—egging us on from the sidelines.

Our Republican friends might do well to recall the words of Abraham Lincoln, who was visited by a delegation after he received the Republican nomination for President. The delegation spokesman said: "Mr. Lincoln, we don't think you need to do any campaigning. All you have to do is stand back and let the Democrats fight among themselves. They'll destroy one another, and then you'll get elected easily."

Mr. Lincoln replied: "The trouble with your argument is that Democrats are like cats. They may sound like they're fighting, but when they get through all you have is more Democrats."

But this time we Democrat's don't even sound like we are scrapping. Democrats from every section of the country have responded to the able leadership in the Senate and in the House, and we have created a new unity based on our common belief in the Democratic philosophy and in our belief in the program and policies we have enacted and support.

Since 1952, the Democratic Party has been building for the future on the solid rock of the Democratic South. Southern statesmen are leaders in the Congress, and leaders of the important committees in the House and Senate.

In the Senate the following committees are headed by southerners: Agriculture and Forestry, ALLEN J. ELLENDER, Louisiana; Appropriations, CARL HAYDEN, Arizona; Armed Services, RICHARD B. RUSSELL, Georgia; Banking and Currency, J. W. FULBRIGHT, Arkansas; Finance, HARRY F. BYRD, Virginia; Foreign Relations, WALTER F. GEORGE, Georgia; Government Operations, JOHN L. MCCLELLAN, Arkansas; Labor and Public Welfare, LISTER HILL, Alabama; Post Office and Civil Service, OLIN D. JOHNSTON, South Carolina.

And in the House southern Democrats are equally imposing: Agriculture, HAROLD D. COOLEY, North Carolina; Armed Services, CARL VINSON, Georgia; Banking and Currency, BRENT SPENCE, Kentucky; District of Columbia, JOHN L. MCMILLAN, South Carolina; Education and Labor, GRAHAM A. BARDEN, North Carolina; Foreign Affairs, JAMES P. RICHARDS, South Carolina; Interstate and Foreign Commerce, PERCY PRIEST, Tennessee; Merchant Marine and Fisheries, HERBERT C. BONNER, North Carolina; Post Office and Civil Service, TOM MURRAY, Tennessee; Rules, HOWARD SMITH, Virginia; Veterans' Affairs, OLIN E. TEAGUE, Texas; Ways and Means, JERE COOPER, Tennessee.

Yet the Republicans would have us believe that our party is the party of irresponsibility; that we are Socialists and even border on the pink. If these great southern Democrats who head our committees are irresponsible or are Socialists, then in all seriousness I say that Webster better change the definition of those words. The Republicans had better stop worrying about creeping socialism in the Democratic Party and start worrying about galloping Hooverism in their own party.

The Democratic Party has gained in strength everywhere since 1952, but it has gained most in the Southern States. If the Presidential election were held today, there is no doubt that the South would be solid once again, for the true home of the South is in the Democratic Party.

We are fortunate indeed that our party is big enough to accept and welcome more than one point of view.

Now, we have often heard the South described as conservative. But I think that

word has been grossly misinterpreted by a good many people. I do not mind the South being called "conservative"—for we southerners try to conserve for the people what we sincerely believe belongs to the people.

For example, we are trying to conserve the great benefits of the Tennessee Valley Authority, which we paid for out of the people's money. We fought to preserve for the benefit of our people the results of atomic research paid for by the taxpayers, while the Republicans fought to turn it over to a chosen few. We have fought to preserve from exploitation our natural resources to the detriment of our people.

We also believe in conserving our freedom through adequate manpower, an adequate Air Force, and adequate defenses of all kinds in the face of the ever-growing Communist threat.

We question the wisdom of cuts in defense, especially when we learn that the administration has changed military plans 9 times in the last 9 months; when we read that the President himself changed his mind on defense manpower cuts twice in 3 weeks; when Defense Secretary Wilson and Secretary of State Dulles publicly contradict each other on the reasons for the cutbacks; and when Army Secretary Stevens and Army Chief of Staff Ridgway disagree on the effects of the manpower cuts.

We also fought to conserve for the farmer his right to earn a living without fear of mortgage foreclosure—and we fought for a decent tax break for the majority of the people, while the Republican administration calmly gave the tax bonanza to big business and corporations.

The Republicans keep on saying that they want to cut out unnecessary Government spending.

Who doesn't want to cut out unnecessary spending? It's like defining that word conservative. We would like to know just what is unnecessary spending.

It seems that there is rather general agreement among all Americans that there is need for a new highway program. But one of the odd aspects of the Eisenhower highway proposal is the provision which would obligate the United States Treasury for $20 billion in bonds to be issued by a new Government corporation, without counting this outlay as part of the national debt. It is my information that the Eisenhower method of financing his road program would cost $2.7 billion more in interest than it would to finance the program by the same method that other governmental expenditures are financed. The Republicans may call this cutting out unnecessary Government spending, but I doubt if anyone will agree with them.

Virginia's own Senator HARRY BYRD, who can hardly be called a spendthrift, had this to say about the Eisenhower highway program:

"Such procedures violate financing principles, defy budgetary control and evade Federal debt law.

"When the Government contracts a bona fide debt, but arbitrarily removes it from classification as public indebtedness, it creates fiscal confusion and disorder, and destroys confidence in Government credit.

"You cannot avoid financial responsibility by legerdemain, and you cannot evade debt by definition."

It is perhaps a good political maxim that a party cannot live by its past alone. It must make good every day, and in every administration. And that's just what the Democrats are doing.

Democrats have given the President timely support in many contests he has had with dissidents in his own party. On the other hand, Democratic criticism, which has been aimed at policies, and not at personalities, or motives, has served to alert the President to the dangers to his own administration.

An example of this took place shortly after the Republicans took office in 1953 when they instituted the hard-money policy of higher interest rates. Democrats in Congress warned that such a policy would surely slow down our economy and even perhaps contribute to a recession. Some months later the administration reversed its policy, and even had to admit that the Democratic criticism was justified.

Similarly, when the administration abandoned the Democratic policy of maintaining a broad defense productions base, substituting a few large producers where many smaller ones had existed before, another southerner, Senator ESTES KEFAUVER, called the public's attention to the dangers of the administration's new policy, and some corrective measures were taken.

Faced with the hard test of events and an alert Democratic Congress, we have brought home the truth to the people, and the administration has time and again shifted from dangerous courses it was following in the field of foreign affairs.

We have, on the whole, made a remarkable record for Democratic responsibility, through unity within our own party. But there is, in all this, no room for Democratic self-congratulation.

There is room only for increased determination to give our country the very best we have. And certainly the South has shown that it is more than able and willing to do so.

Thanks To Irrigation, We're Eating Well

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. L. MILLER

OF NEBRASKA

Wednesday, June 1, 1955

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, today I want to talk about a subject that is not discussed very often in the Halls of Congress. In fact, it is quite disturbing since it is a vital part of our daily lives and receives so little attention from all of us.

That subject is nutrition—the science that deals with food at work. As you may know, I am a medical doctor and will speak today, not as a Member of Congress, but as your family physician.

My guess is you could not tell me what you have had to eat the past week. With many of the weighty problems we have to discuss, I wouldn't be too surprised if less than half of my colleagues remembered what they had for lunch.

How many of us maintain a balanced diet? Before we can answer this question, we must first determine what a balanced diet is. Naturally each of us, under varying conditions, might require a different diet but nutritionists have agreed that certain basic foods should be included each day.

These are:

First. Leafy green and yellow vegetables—at least one serving, if not more;

Second. Citrus fruits, tomatoes, raw cabbage—at least one serving, if not more;

Third. Potatoes and other vegetables and fruits—two or more servings;

Fourth. Fluid milk or its protein and mineral equivalent in processed forms such as cheese and ice cream—3 or 4 cups for children and 2 or more cups for adults;

Fifth. Meat, poultry, fish, eggs, dried peas, beans—at least one or two servings.

Sixth. Bread, flour, cereals, whole grain, enriched or restored—some every day; and

Seventh. Butter, fortified margarine—some every day.

We must have at least the minimum requirements of these foods if we are to be in the best of health and vitality. If we eat the right foods, it does more than keep us alive, it can even help us to stay young longer. An individual well fed from babyhood has a more likely chance to enjoy a long life.

Getting back to the basic seven foods, the question arises as to why should we eat those foods.

We know of more than 40 different chemical substances that the body is known to require from food. It is not necessary to know all of the body's needs for you can be reasonably sure of getting all of them if your daily meals contain certain key nutrients.

These nutrients are protein, calcium, iron, iodine, vitamins in general, vitamin A, vitamin B family, vitamin C, vitamin D, and body fuels.

First, let us examine the recommended dietary allowances. The National Academy of Sciences, also known as the National Research Council, has supplied me with their figures. They have been studying this specific problem since 1940.

Now, let us examine each requirement and determine which of our many foods are rich in their respective nutrient.

The National Research Council recommends 65 grams of protein for the average man between the ages of 25 to 65; for women it is slightly less except during pregnancy and lactation, when it is considerably more. Protein requirements of children between the ages of 10 and 20 vary from 70 to 100 grams.

Protein is a complex and varied substance. It is the main substance in all of the body's muscles and organs, skin, hair, and other tissues. Protein in different foods is made up of varying combinations of at least 22 simpler materials known as amino acids.

You get top-rating proteins in foods from animal sources—meat, poultry, fish, eggs, milk, and cheese. As was pointed out in the basic seven some of these foods are needed each day. Other good sources of proteins are soybeans, nuts, and dry beans and peas.

The best food to supply the recommended allowances for calcium is, of course, milk. However, the quantities of calcium are so minute that you can hardly get enough without using a good deal of milk in some form.

Also rich in calcium are some of the leafy green vegetables—preferably turnip tops, mustard greens, and kale.

It is also important that we receive a good supply of iron in our daily diet. Iron is one of the essential materials for red blood cells and without it the blood could not carry oxygen from the lungs to each body cell.

The food richest in iron is liver. However, here we have the element of taste. Unfortunately too many turn up their noses when you mention liver and surveys show that a large majority of people eat little or no liver at all.

Therefore, we must look to other sources for our iron requirements. Here again leafy green vegetables are rich in iron content. Some of the other foods that add iron are egg yolks, meat in general, peas and beans of all kinds, dried fruits, molasses, bread, and other cereal foods made from whole grain or enriched flour.

THE SIGHT VITAMIN

The sight vitamin, or vitamin A, is especially important for normal vision and helps to keep the skin and linings of the nose, mouth, and inner organs in good condition.

Good sources of vitamin A are liver, egg yolks, butter, whole milk, and cream. You can also get a substantial amount of vitamin A from carotenes, which are yellow-orange substances that the body converts. Green, yellow, and some red vegetables are excellent sources of carotene.

The Bureau of Human Nutrition and Home Economics of the Department of Agriculture recommends that we eat heartily of foods that provide vitamin A since it can be stored in the body and may be drawn upon if in any emergency this vitamin is wanting in the diet.

The next three substances which are recommended by the National Research Council are thiamine, riboflavin, and niacin—all members of the vitamin B family.

When this vitamin was first discovered it was thought to be just one, but later when it was found to be quite complex it was broken down into about a dozen different ones—each with a particular duty and importance.

A lack of these substances causes beriberi and pellagra. The latter of these dietary deficiency diseases once was quite common in the South and in many instances death resulted. Now, reported deaths from pellagra have declined markedly in the United States. The disease is still quite common in many overpopulated areas.

What we have in the United States are borderline cases. If you know a chronic grouch, a shiftless person, a housewife with vague complaints, or a nervous man, chances are they may be showing effects of insufficient B vitamins.

Getting enough of these helps with steady nerves, normal appetite, good digestion, good morale and healthy skin.

Unfortunately too few foods contain a real wealth of the B vitamins, so it is necessary for your diet to contain many foods which contribute some in order to build an adequate supply.

As a doctor, I feel it is quite interesting to note that recently we have identified folic acid and vitamin B–12. These two substances are now being used medically with some success in treating two hard-to-cure diseases—pernicious anemia and sprue.

Since very few foods are rich in the B-vitamin group, at least 26 States have made it mandatory for flour to be enriched with this group. It is estimated that diets of city families are now 12 percent higher in iron, 16 percent higher in thiamine, 3 percent more in riboflavin, and 13 percent higher in niacin than they would have been without the enrichment of bread and flour.

THE TISSUE BUILDER

Ironically, the first vitamin separated from food was one of which very few actually get the recommended daily allowance. It is ascorbic acid—more commonly known as vitamin C.

You cannot keep tissues throughout the body in good condition without vitamin C. When your diet is low in this vitamin, gums are tender and bleed easily, joints swell and hurt and muscles weaken. In advanced stages it is called scurvy.

In this country scurvy is very rare, but many people do not get enough vitamin C for their best state of health. Since it cannot be stored in any appreciable quantity, you need some food rich in vitamin C daily.

All of the citrus fruits are plentiful sources of vitamin C. Other good sources of vitamin C includes tomatoes and tomato juice, fresh or canned; fresh strawberries and cantaloups; also raw green foods such as cabbage, green peppers and green lettuce.

Much of the vitamin content of these foods is lost when it is prepared for the table by cooking and, therefore, it is best to eat them with the minimum of preparation.

THE SUNSHINE VITAMIN

Vitamin D picked up the "sunshine" nickname because the sun's rays, striking the skin, have power to change certain substances in the skin into vitamin D.

An individual should get some of this vitamin regularly and especially during childhood since it works with minerals to form straight, strong bones, and sound teeth.

Since most of us make good use of sunshine to fill our vitamin D requirements, the recommended daily dietary allowance for it appears to be a little low. However, the sun's reaction on the skin more than makes up the difference.

It must be remembered that it does take direct sunlight and the sun loses its effectiveness if it is cut off by clouds, smoke, fog, dust, or ordinary window glass.

A few foods such as egg yolk, butter, salmon, tuna, and sardines help out with vitamin D and it is added to some milk.

WE'RE EATING WELL

Fortunately we are able to produce enough of all of the crops needed to insure a balanced and varied diet. The National Research Council's figures would be sheer folly if we could not produce the food to meet its requirements.

Today half the world is hungry and the vast majority of the other half does not enjoy a proper diet.

If everyone ate the same diet as the average person does in the Far East the world is presently producing enough to feed several billion more mouths.

If everyone had the same standard of diet as the average European, the world is producing enough to feed everyone if the food were properly distributed.

But if everyone enjoyed the high-level diet that we in the United States do the world would have to produce enough more to feed an additional several hundred million.

Perhaps this is the reason for so much unrest in the world today. All one needs to do is look at where all of our trouble spots are—Korea, China, Indochina, areas in the Near East—and our intelligence reports tell of unrest behind the Iron Curtain.

These are the same areas where the people do not have enough to eat. A hungry person wants food in his belly—he does not want your prayers or promises.

Periods of starvation have not been confined to the Biblical times. As recent as just prior to World War II thousands died of starvation in China, India, and Burma.

Our national diet today can best be described as the kind people choose when the supply of food is ample and they have the money to buy it.

Each of us now eats more of the dairy products—except butter—eggs, poultry, vegetables, and fruit, but fewer potatoes and grain products than people did at the beginning of the century.

The sharpest increase in per capita consumption of food comes in fruits and vegetables. In the past few decades the use of citrus fruits has tripled, that of carrots has quadrupled, and that of lettuce has nearly doubled.

EAT MORE BEEF

I represent the Fourth Congressional District of Nebraska, and I am quite proud of the fact that this district has more cattle than any one of the other 435 congressional districts in the United States.

Not only am I proud because of the number but also because of the tremendous contribution this meat makes to the American diet. The American people have always been meat eaters. Meat has been the principal item of diet for the human race from the beginning of time.

As a physician, I can tell you that the human body is especially adapted to the consumption and digestion of meat and animal products. There is no food which nature has endowed so lavishly with the necessary proteins, vitamins, minerals, and fats.

In fact, meat is the masterpiece of nature's laboratory. It contains 22 amino acids, 10 of which the body needs to keep healthy. People who are big meat eaters are large in stature and have great energy. The Hindus, Chinese, Japanese, and the inhabitants of Okinawa, who eat little meat, are small in stature.

For many years I operated a hospital in Kimball, and at that time there was a feeling among medical men that patients should be given fish and chicken instead of red meat. Recent experiments have shown that red meat is not harmful but can contribute to the patient's recovery by supplying many of the vitamins, minerals, and acids so necessary to tissue repaid and health.

Perhaps some of you are wondering what irrigation and reclamation has to do with producing more red meat. I can only refer you to a statement made by Dr. B. T. Shaw, who is the Administrator of the Agricultural Research Service of

the Department of Agriculture. In testimony before the House Appropriations Committee he said:

In 1949 the Nation was consuming about 16 billion pounds of red meat, and by 1954 consumption of red meat increased to about 25 billion pounds.

He goes on to point out that, if the per capita consumption of meat continues at the rate of 1954, it will require 7 million more head of cattle, 3 million more sheep, and about 10 million more hogs to supply the increased meat that would be needed by 1962.

To provide pasture and feed for these additional animals it would require another 35 million acres of land. This land is not available, but irrigated pastures could do much to alleviate this coming situation. You can pasture several times more animals on an irrigated acre than you can on a dryland pasture.

According to the Department of Agriculture, the consumption of beef has nearly doubled since 1930.

PRODUCTION INCREASES

In addition to the importance of these crops to our diet, increased production also has been a determining factor in the increase in consumption.

We would not have been able to experience this increase in per capita consumption had it not been for irrigation.

For example, about three-fifths of our fruits and tree nuts, one-half of our commercial vegetables and one-third of the potato crop are grown on irrigated land.

Irrigation has enabled growers to take advantage of the favorable soil and climate in our Western States to make the growing of fruits and vegetables one of the leading industries of the West.

To show what percent of the commercial fruits and vegetables that are produced in the irrigated West, I have asked the Department of Agriculture to give me the pertinent figures.

Here are the figures they have supplied me:

Almonds	100
Apricots	100
Asparagus	62
Avocadoes	72
Strawberries	50
Broccoli	79
Cantaloups	80
Carrots	75
Cauliflower	61
Celery	54
Sweet cherries	85
Lemons	100
Dates	100
Figs	100
Grapes	95
Lettuce	91
Honeydews	100
Filberts	100
Walnuts	100
Olives	100
Onions	56
Peaches	58
Pears	88
Peas	42
Plums	87
Prunes	100
Rice	52
Spinach	57
Tomatoes	51

Many of the crops are produced in the late fall, winter, and early and middle spring. As recently as 20 to 25 years ago these crops were not available in the winter months.

Certainly, new methods of processing, better transportation and the introduction of frozen foods has helped considerably to provide us with these specialty and seasonal crops the year around. However, without irrigation to grow these crops in the first place they would not be available.

We can be quite thankful to irrigation and reclamation for making it possible for us to have the necessary crops to give us a nutritious and balanced diet.

We in the United States eat better than anyone else in the world. Because of this we are a strong Nation.

Our youth excel in practically every international sport. They have strong, well-developed bodies which make possible the new records in athletics which they achieve.

Their bodies are strong and well developed because they enjoy a balanced diet—a diet containing plenty of fresh fruits and vegetables, milk, and meat.

There are some who complain about the cost of Federal reclamation projects. In the past 50 years, approximately $2.6 billion has been allocated to irrigation. It has been estimated that these irrigation projects have returned to the Treasury more than $4 billion in new taxes. These Federal projects have repaid about $600 million of the original cost and are returning an average of $60 million a year to the Treasury.

Water is the lifeblood of the arid West. Water, placed on good soil at the proper time, can bring a feeling of security, of confidence, and new wealth to the community.

If we are to eat well in the future, we will need to produce more crops. The population of our country increases about 3½ million each year. They will need food. Little of the food produced on irrigated lands adds to our present supply of surplus foods. We should be thankful that we have a surplus.

Because of irrigation, we are eating well. We will continue to eat well if we wisely develop the feasible irrigation projects in our land.

SENATE

THURSDAY, JUNE 2, 1955

(Legislative day of Monday, May 2, 1955)

The Senate met at 10 o'clock a. m., on the expiration of the recess.

Rabbi Benjamin Schultz, executive director, American Jewish League Against Communism, Inc., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, in these days we turn for strength to Thee. Assailed by slogans and shibboleths, we ask for power to discern. Lead us to convictions based on solicitude for America, its defense, and its survival. Inspire us to be guided by our true convictions and not by unworthy pressures.

Keep our leaders from the temptation of momentary political advantage, real or imagined. There is no compromise with the right. That opportunism which averts its face from human pain, from injustice, from cruelty, cannot be the chosen course of any nation knowing God. Preserve us from godless cynicism in the dress of diplomacy.

They cry peace, peace, but there is no peace. No peace for us while men cry out under the whip of the oppressor. No calm for mankind while one-third of earth cowers in terror.

Make us alive, dear God, to the truth: That life today is war—war everywhere between good and evil, war in hope of the good triumphant. It is war without arms; subtle, spiritual, emotional war. Give us clarity of perception to understand our foe, as he unfortunately studies and understands us.

Enable us to see not the easy way, but the right one. Help us to realize that facile appeasement, like some cosmic drug, may relieve a tension, but poison a world.

We pray for true peace, a peace of health, a peace of justice, a peace of God. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Wednesday, June 1, 1955, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

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

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, and withdrawing the nomination of Mrs. Lulie M. Frick, to be postmaster at Atlas, Mich., which nominating messages were referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

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

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSIONS

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the Antitrust and Monopoly Legislation Subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary was authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the Internal Security Subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary, considering Communist infiltration of defense plants, was authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

ORDER FOR TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there may be a morning hour for the presentation of petitions and memorials,