not forget, that some of those who now hail the recent developments are precisely those who sought for years to stop them.

It is not unprecedented to see men make a virtue of necessity. Today, the necessity for virtue has been created by a stalwart thwarting of efforts to subvert our charter. If we want to see that virtue continue, I suggest that it may be prudent to continue what has produced it.

Steadfastness to principle and sacrifice for principle are the proven price of the good that we have won. It would be reckless to expect further good at any lesser price. To achieve peace with justice, peace with sovereignty for nations great and small, peace with respect for human beings without regard to class, will require sustaining the effort, the sacrifice, the solidarity which has brought us where we are today. Much has been accomplished, but more, much more, remains.

There exists the problem of German unification. For 10 years, part of Germany has been severed from the rest. That unnatural division of a great people constitutes a grave injustice. It is an evil which cannot be indefinitely prolonged without breeding more evil to plague the world.

In Eastern Europe are nations, many with long and proud record of national existence, which are in servitude. They were liberated from one despotism only to be subjected to another, in violation of solemn international undertakings.

In Asia, there is a Chinese Communist regime which became an aggressor in Korea, for which it stands condemned by the United Nations. It promoted aggression in Indochina, and has used force and the threat of force to support its ambitions in the Taiwan area. Recent developments, including the influence of the Bandung Conference, suggest that the immediate threat of war may have receded. Let us pray that this is so. But the situation in Asia remains one that cannot be regarded with equanimity.

Also, we cannot forget the existence of that apparatus known as international communism. It constitutes a world-wide conspiracy to bring into power a form of government which never in any country, at any time, was freely chosen by the people, and which destroys the reality of independence. At Caracas last year the Organization of American States found that the activities of international communism constituted alien intervention in the internal affairs of nations, and were a threat to international peace and security. This threat should end.

Finally, there is the urgent problem of limiting the crushing burden of armaments. For many years the United States and its friends have sought to find ways to carry out the mandate of the charter to reduce the diversion for armaments of the world's human and economic resources. Nearly a decade ago, the United States made a proposal to internationalize atomic energy. This, if accepted, would have prevented the present competitive production of these weapons of awesome destructive power.

This unprecedented proposal was made at a time when the United States was sole possessor of this weapon. It was rejected.

This proposal was subsequently followed up by new proposals for the control and regulation of armaments and the establishment of an international organ to supervise an honest disarmament program. These proposals too were spurned. But the Soviet Union recently indicated that it might be prepared seriously to consider the initiative which had been taken months before by other members of the United Nations Disarmament Subcommittee. Let us hope that these indications can be translated into concrete action making possible limitations of armament which are, in fact, dependable and not a fraud.

These are some of the problems that confront us as we face the future. They are problems which cannot be met if we shut our eyes to them, or if we are weak, confused, or divided. They are problems that can be met if we are faithful to the principles of our charter, if we work collectively to achieve their application, and if we are prepared to labor and sacrifice for the future as we have in the past.

The United States asks no nation to do what it is not prepared to do itself. Any nation that bases its actions and attitudes in international affairs on the principles of the charter will receive the wholehearted cooperation of the United States.

Admittedly, the problems we face are not easy to solve, and they will not be quickly solved. There is room for many honest differences of opinion. But the existence of hard, unsolved problems need not itself be a source of danger and hostility if the nations will bring to the common task the spirit of our charter.

There is one extremely simple method of bringing an end to what is called the "cold war"—observe the Charter of the United Nations; refrain from the use of force or the threat of force in international relations and from the support and direction of subversion against the institutions of other countries.

To bring the cold war to an end, seven points are not needed; this one is sufficient.

It is in that spirit that we go to Geneva, and we hope to find that spirit shared.

If so, we can find there new procedures, or at least develop a new impetus, which will help to solve some of these vast and stubborn problems that still confront us.

We shall not, at Geneva, assume to act as a world directorate with the right to determine the destinies of others. Good solutions do not come from such a mood. We shall seek to find procedures such that all nations directly concerned can fully assert whatever rights and views they have.

In other words, we shall try to carry into the Geneva Conference the spirit which has been generated by this commemorative gathering of 60 nations. The sentiments which have been here expressed can inspire new strength, new determination, and a new spirit of fidelity to the principles of the United Nations founders.

In conclusion, I can do no better than to cite the pledge made here last Monday by the President of the United States:

"We, with the rest of the world, know that a nation's vision of peace cannot be attained through any race in armaments. The munitions of peace are justice, honesty, mutual understanding, and respect for others.

"So believing and so motivated, the United States will leave no stone unturned to work for peace. We shall reject no method however novel, that holds out any hope however faint, for a just and lasting peace."

SENATE

TUESDAY, JUNE 28, 1955

(Legislative day of Monday, June 27, 1955)

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

Rabbi David de Sola Pool, rabbi of the Spanish and Portuguese Synagogue in New York, N. Y., which was founded in 1654, offered the following prayer:

God of the spirit of all living, may Thy blessing rest on this assembly dedicated to serve our great land in keeping with the ideals with which Thou didst inspire its Founding Fathers.

Strengthen these Thy servants with wisdom from Thee in their ever-extending responsibilities. Through their vision and high purpose may the light of freedom and fellowship for all that was kindled in this Republic bring hope and courage to a world that shall be united in human brotherhood and good will beyond national frontiers.

Help and strengthen the Members of this powerful Government body to further Thy teachings of justice, compassion, and neighbor love, so that soon may dawn the day foretold by Thy prophet when nation shall not lift up sword against nation, neither shall they learn war any more, and all men, as children of Thee, the universal Father, shall dwell in peace on this earth as brothers. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, June 27, 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.

FINAL REPORT OF COMMISSION ON INTERGOVERNMENTAL RELATIONS — MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT (H. DOC. NO. 198)

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States, which was read, and with the accompanying report, referred to the Committee on Government Operations.

(For President's message, see House proceedings for today.)

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, its reading clerk, announced that the House had passed, without amendment, the following bills of the Senate:

S. 1582. An act to amend Public Law 727, 83d Congress, so as to extend the period for the making of emergency loans for agricultural purposes; and

S. 1755. An act to amend the act of April 6, 1949, as amended, and the act of August 31, 1954, so as to provide that the rate of interest on certain loans made under such acts shall not exceed 3 percent per annum.

The message also announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6295) to amend section 3 of the Travel Expense Act of 1949, as amended, to provide an increased maximum per diem allowance for subsistence and travel expenses, and for other purposes; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. DAWSON of Illinois, Mr.

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

FASCELL, and Mr. YOUNGER were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

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

H. R. 5853. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to regulate the practice of veterinary medicine in the District of Columbia," approved February 1, 1907;

H. R. 5892. An act to authorize officers and members of the Metropolitan Police force and of the Fire Department of the District of Columbia voluntarily to perform certain services on their time off from regularly scheduled tours of duty and to receive compensation therefor, and for other purposes;

H. R. 6259. An act to amend section 8 of the act entitled "An act to establish a District of Columbia Armory Board and for other purposes," approved June 4, 1948;

H. R. 6574. An act to amend section 2 of title IV of the act entitled "An act to provide additional revenue for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes," approved August 17, 1937 (50 Stat. 680), as amended;

H. R. 6585. An act 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;

H. R. 6795. An act to authorize appropriations for the Atomic Energy Commission for acquisition or condemnation of real property or any facilities, or for plant or facility acquisition, construction, or expansion, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 6829. An act to authorize certain construction at military, naval, and Air Force installations, and for other purposes.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the Vice President:

H. R. 880. An act for the relief of Paul Y. Loong;

H. R. 935. An act for the relief of Mrs. Marion Josephine Monnell;

H. R. 943. An act for the relief of Luzie Biondo (Luzie M. Schmidt);

H. R. 973. An act for the relief of Mrs. Elizabeth Dowds;

H. R. 977. An act for the relief of Mrs. Ellen Hillier;

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

H. R. 995. An act for the relief of Frieda Quiring and Tina Quiring;

H. R. 997. An act for the relief of Irmgard Emilie Krepps;

H. R. 998. An act for the relief of Meiko Shikibu;

H. R. 1028. An act for the relief of Melina Bonton;

H. R. 1047. An act for the relief of Armenouhi Assadour Artinian;

H. R. 1083. An act for the relief of Robert Shen-yen Hou-ming Lieu;

H. R. 1157. An act for the relief of Milad S. Isaac;

H. R. 1158. An act for the relief of Emanuel Frangeskos;

H. R. 1205. An act for the relief of Cynthia Jacob;

H. R. 1299. An act for the relief of Miss Toshiko Hozaka and her child, Roger;

H. R. 1300. An act for the relief of Luther Rose;

H. R. 1337. An act for the relief of Victorine May Donaldson; and

H. R. 2973. An act to provide for the conveyance of all right, title, and interest of the United States in a certain tract of land in Macon County, Ga., to the Georgia State Board of Education.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED

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

H. R. 5853. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to regulate the practice of veterinary medicine in the District of Columbia," approved February 1, 1907;

H. R. 5892. An act to authorize officers and members of the Metropolitan Police force and of the Fire Department of the District of Columbia voluntarily to perform certain services on their time off from regularly scheduled tours of duty and to receive compensation therefor, and for other purposes;

H. R. 6259. An act to amend section 8 of the act entitled "An act to establish a District of Columbia Armory Board and for other purposes," approved June 4, 1948;

H. R. 6574. An act to amend section 2 of title IV of the act entitled "An act to provide additional revenue for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes," approved August 17, 1937 (50 Stat. 680), as amended; and

H. R. 6585. An act 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.

H. R. 6829. An act to authorize certain construction at military, naval, and Air Force installations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

ORDER FOR TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

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

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

EXECUTIVE SESSION

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

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

EXECUTIVE REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

The following favorable report of a nomination was submitted:

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

John C. Baker, of Ohio, to be the representative of the United States on the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations, vice Preston Hotchkis, resigned.

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

HOME LOAN BANK BOARD

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of William J. Hallahan, of Maryland, to be a member of the Home Loan Bank Board.

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

IN THE ARMY

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Gen. Matthew Bunker Ridgway to be placed on the retired list in the grade indicated under the provisions of subsection 504 (d) of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947.

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

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

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

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

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

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

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I have a brief statement to make. Yesterday a number of extra bills were placed on the calendar. I understand the reports are available. I have communicated with the minority leader, and it is hoped that the Calendar Committees can be prepared on those bills, and that the Senate may be able to take action on them sometime during the week. I should like the Senate to be on notice that we may be prepared to have a call of the calendar again, and that we may move to proceed to the consideration of measures not passed on the calendar.

Also, Mr. President, four agreements were reported from the Foreign Relations Committee, relating to the Geneva Convention of August 12, 1949, which executive agreements were reported by the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD]. I understand that the reports will be available soon. There will be a rollcall on each agreement. I should like the Senate to be on notice that perhaps we can proceed to those agreements later in the day or tomorrow.

Mr. President, I should also like to call the attention of the Senate again to the unfinished business, Calendar No. 559, S. 1713, to amend the act of July 31, 1947, and the mining laws to provide for multiple use of the surface of the same tracts of the public lands, and for other purposes. It is hoped that we may be able to dispose of that bill early today.

Then it is planned to proceed to Calendar No. 542, S. 2220, the atomic energy construction bill.

It is then planned to proceed to consider Calendar No. 511, S. 1041, allowing certain State employees to be brought under the Federal retirement system;

Calendar No. 521, S. 1292, to readjust postal classification on educational and cultural materials;

Calendar No. 579, S. 63, to provide for the appointment of the heads of regional and district offices of the Post Office Department by the President by and with

the advice and consent of the Senate; and

Calendar No. 580, S. 1849, to provide for the grant of career conditional and career appointments in the competitive civil service to indefinite employees who previously qualified for competitive appointment.

I am prepared to ask the Senate to proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 627, S. 609, providing rewards for information concerning the illegal entry into the United States or the illegal manufacture of nuclear material or atomic weapons, if the Senate is able to dispose of the other bills.

In the event Calendar No. 689, S. 1077, to provide for settlement of claims for damages resulting from the disaster which occurred at Texas City, Tex., on April 16 and 17, 1947, is not passed on the calendar, I shall later move that the Senate proceed to its consideration.

I also wish to call the attention of the Senate to the fact that there are numerous conference reports which may be brought to the Senate including the report on the draft bill, and reports on various appropriation bills. Of course, the reports are privileged, and when they arrive I expect to ask the Senate to proceed to their prompt consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Morning business is in order.

DISCUSSION AT THE FORTHCOMING GENEVA CONFERENCE OF STATUS OF NATIONS UNDER COMMUNIST CONTROL—RESOLUTION

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a resolution adopted by the Lithuanian Americans of the city of Kenosha, Wis., favoring a discussion by the forthcoming Geneva Conference of the status of nations under Communist control.

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

Whereas in 1940 Soviet Russia, in vicious conspiracy with Hitlerite Germany and in brutal violation of all the treaties and obligations solemnly underwritten by her, invaded Lithuania with armed forces and against the will of the people annexed Lithuania to the Soviet Union; and

Whereas communism has demonstrated to the world its essential evil in a repetitious, ghastly pattern: the millions of Russian and non-Russian people perished from starvation and destroyed during the ruthless political purges staged by the Kremlin; the 10,000 Polish officers slain like cattle at Katyn; the shooting of manacled American prisoners of war in Korea; the mass deportations and killings that have terrorized and depopulated Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia, the first victims of the brutal and unprovoked Soviet Russian aggression; and

Whereas, until now, the horrifying and stupendous Communist evil has managed in condemning to slave-labor camps 15 million souls and in throttling the freedom of 800 million people living in nationwide prisons: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the United States delegation to the Geneva Big Four Conference bring up the question of the liberation of all Soviet enslaved countries, including Lithuania, the principal aim of such a policy being to reject entering into any agreement with Soviet Russia at the price of sanctioning all past, present, or future injustices inflicted upon many peoples in the last decade; and now be it finally

Resolved, That the Lithuanian Americans of Kenosha, Wis., once again reaffirming their loyalty to the principles of American democracy, pledge their wholehearted support of the administration and Congress of the United States of America in their efforts to bring about a lasting peace, freedom, and justice in the world.

PATRICK B. McGINNIS—RESOLUTION OF NEW HAMPSHIRE LEGISLATURE

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, the New Hampshire Legislature on Thursday, June 9, 1955, adopted a resolution extending appreciation to Patrick B. McGinnis, president of the Boston & Maine Railroad, for an address delivered before both houses of the legislature. A copy of this resolution has been sent to each member of the New Hampshire congressional delegation, including my colleague, the junior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. COTTON], myself, Representative CHESTER MERROW, and Representative PERKINS BASS, with the request that the resolution be made a part of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. On behalf of my colleagues as senior member of the delegation, I ask unanimous consent that the text of this resolution be made a part of the RECORD, and appropriately referred.

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

Whereas at the invitation of the house of representatives, Patrick B. McGinnis was cordially invited to address the members of the New Hampshire Legislature as to potential plans and ideas for the operation of the Boston & Maine Railroad; and

Whereas Patrick B. McGinnis has this date graciously accepted the invitation tendered, and delivered a speech of interest and encouragement to the entire State: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we, the members of this legislature, extend our thanks to Mr. McGinnis for his splendid address, and further that we be recorded as expressing the sincere wish that Mr. McGinnis be enabled to place his plans and ideas in action as president of the Boston & Maine Railroad; and be it further

Resolved, That the speaker of the house and president of the senate deliver a copy of this resolution to Mr. McGinnis.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. MORSE, from the Committee on the District of Columbia:

S. 667. A bill to exempt meetings of associations of professional hairdressers or cosmetologists from certain provisions of the acts of June 7, 1938 (52 Stat. 611), and July 1, 1902 (32 Stat. 622), as amended; with amendments (Rept. No. 685).

By Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, from the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service:

S. 1792. A bill to amend section 10 of the Federal Employees Group Life Insurance Act of 1954, authorizing the assumption of the insurance obligations of any nonprofit association of Federal employees with its members, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 686).

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

S. 464. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to issue patents for certain lands in Florida bordering upon Indian River; with an amendment (Rept. No. 687).

BILLS INTRODUCED

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

By Mr. KILGORE:

S. 2345. A bill for the relief of Lilu Yuen Chuang; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SALTONSTALL (for himself, Mr. BRICKER, and Mr. DOUGLAS):

S. 2346. A bill to establish a permanent committee for the Oliver Wendell Holmes Devise, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

By Mr. ERVIN:

S. 2347. A bill for the relief of Dixie Novelty Co.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BARRETT (for himself and Mr. O'MAHONEY):

S. 2348. A bill to establish certain requirements with respect to the notice of sale of certain isolated tracts of public land, and to limit the application of preference rights granted to owners of contiguous land in such sales; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MARTIN of Iowa:

S. 2349. A bill for the relief of Miss Pilar A. Garcia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROBERTSON:

S. 2350. A bill to define bank holding companies, control their future expansion, and require divestment of their nonbanking interests; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. ROBERTSON (for himself and Mr. BYRD):

S. 2351. A bill to authorize the conveyance of certain war housing projects to the city of Norfolk, Va.; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. BUTLER:

S. 2352. A bill for the relief of Maj. Luther C. Cox; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KUCHEL:

S. 2353. A bill for the relief of Mabel Dorothy Hoffman (or Clarke); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'MAHONEY:

S. 2354. A bill for the relief of Jean Goedicke; and

S. 2355. A bill for the relief of Katina R. Landrum; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CHAVEZ:

S. 2356. A bill for the relief of Julian William Pozenel; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McCARTHY:

S. 2357. A bill for the relief of Nenita Santos and Elizabeth Santos; and

S. 2358. A bill for the relief of Renate Karolina Horky; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WATKINS:

S. 2359. A bill to provide for the designation by the President of chief judges of the judicial circuits of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

CONVEYANCE OF CERTAIN PUBLIC LANDS TO CITY OF HENDERSON, NEV.—AMENDMENT

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment intended to be proposed by me to the bill (S. 2267) to direct the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain public lands in the State

of Nevada to the city of Henderson, Nev., and ask that it be printed and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and also printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

The amendment intended to be proposed by Mr. MALONE to the bill S. 2267, to direct the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain public lands in the State of Nevada to the city of Henderson, Nev., was received, referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, ordered to be printed, and to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

On page 2, at the end of line 7, insert the following: "east half of section 20; west half of section 21."

READJUSTMENT OF POSTAL CLASSIFICATION ON EDUCATIONAL AND CULTURAL MATERIALS—AMENDMENTS

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina submitted amendments, intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 1292) to readjust postal classification on educational and cultural materials, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

APPROPRIATIONS FOR ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION, ETC.—AMENDMENTS

Mr. McCARTHY submitted amendments, intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 6766) making appropriations for the Atomic Energy Commission, the Tennessee Valley Authority, certain agencies of the Department of the Interior, and civil functions administered by the Department of the Army, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, and for other purposes, which were referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

GIUSEPPE MINARDI—RETURN AND REENROLLMENT OF S. 195

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, I submit, for appropriate action, a concurrent resolution requesting the President of the United States to return to the Senate the enrolled bill (S. 195) for the relief of Giuseppe Minardi. The bill as it passed the Congress states that Minardi lost his United States citizenship under the provisions of section 404 (a) of the Nationality Act of 1940, whereas, in fact, the loss occurred by virtue of the second paragraph of section 2 of the act of March 2, 1907. The mistake was the result of a typographical error, and what was stated in the bill was not accurate. It is therefore necessary that the bill be returned so that the proper section of law under which Minardi lost his citizenship may be indicated. The concurrent resolution does not affect the bill in any other way.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of the concurrent resolution.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The concurrent resolution will be read for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 45), as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the President of the United States be, and he is hereby, requested to return to the Senate the enrolled bill (S. 195) for the relief of Giuseppe Minardi; that if and when returned the action of the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the Acting President of the Senate pro tempore in signing the said bill be, and the same is hereby, rescinded; and that the Secretary of the Senate be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to enroll the said bill with the following change, namely: On line 4 of the Senate engrossed bill, strike out "section 404 (a) of the Nationality Act of 1940" and insert in lieu thereof "the second paragraph of section 2 of the act of March 2, 1907."

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the concurrent resolution?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the concurrent resolution.

Mr. KILGORE. The wrong information was furnished by the immigration authorities. It was only after the bill was passed that the correct information was received.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the concurrent resolution.

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 45) was agreed to.

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

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

By Mr. JACKSON:

Letter written by him to the Secretary of Defense on June 27, 1955, regarding the progress the Soviet Union is making in the field of airpower.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, if no Senators desire to transact further morning business, 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.

EXTENSION FOR TEMPORARY PERIODS OF CERTAIN HOUSING PROGRAMS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, the distinguished chairman of the Banking and Currency Committee, the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] wishes to have the Senate consider Senate Joint Resolution No. 85. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate Joint Resolution 85.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The joint resolution will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 85) to extend for temporary periods certain housing programs, the Small Business Act of 1953, and the Defense Production Act of 1950.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Texas.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the joint resolution.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, this is a resolution which will require action by the House. I have already discussed it with the able minority leader. He has notified me he has no objection to its consideration or its passage.

I yield to the Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, this is a unanimous report from the Banking and Currency Committee. The joint resolution merely extends the 3 existing laws for 30 days, with no change whatsoever in any of the 3.

The VICE PRESIDENT. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the joint resolution.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 85) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That the National Housing Act, as amended, is hereby amended—

(1) by striking "July 1, 1955" in section 2 (a) and inserting "August 1, 1955"; and

(2) by striking "June 30, 1955" in section 803 (a) and inserting "July 31, 1955."

SEC. 2. The second sentence of section 104 of the Defense Housing and Community Facilities and Services Act of 1951, as amended, is hereby amended by striking "July 1, 1955" both times it appears therein and inserting "August 1, 1955."

SEC. 3. The United States Housing Act of 1937, as amended, is hereby amended by striking the words "fiscal year 1955" in subsection 10 (i) thereof and substituting the following therefor: "period from June 30, 1954, to August 1, 1955."

SEC. 4. Subsection (a) of section 221 of the Small Business Act of 1953 is amended by striking "June 30, 1955" and inserting "July 31, 1955."

SEC. 5. The first sentence of subsection (a) of section 717 of the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, is hereby amended by striking "June 30, 1955" and inserting "July 31, 1955."

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Texas will state it.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Is the Senate still in the morning hour?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the Senate will resume the transaction of routine business, in the morning hour.

SIXTH TRIENNIAL CONGRESS OF AMERICANS OF UKRAINIAN DESCENT—ADDRESS BY GOVERNOR HARRIMAN AND NEWSPAPER COMMENT

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, over the past Memorial Day weekend the sixth Triennial Congress of Americans of Ukrainian Descent was held, under the auspices of the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America, at the Commodore

Hotel, in New York City. As many of the Members of the Senate know, this committee, led by its national chairman, Dr. Lev. E. Dobriansky, who also is a professor of Soviet economics at Georgetown University, represents the views and sentiments of about 1½ million Americans of Ukrainian descent, for whom the just cause of liberation and independence of Ukraine and the other non-Russian nations in the Soviet Union is in the vital interest of our own Nation.

The success of the congress was highlighted by the address of the Governor of the State of New York, the Honorable Averell Harriman. It was delivered on Saturday evening, May 28, at the banquet dinner of the congress, during which the Honorable Stephen J. Jarema, prominent Democrat in New York City, served as toastmaster; and the Honorable Perle Mesta, the Honorable Michael A. Feighan, of Ohio, the Honorable Charles L. Kersten, of Wisconsin, and the Honorable Edward M. O'Connor also spoke.

Mr. President, because of the striking pertinence of Governor Harriman's remarks regarding the scheduled conference at the summit, aircraft production output, the refugee problem, and the general plight of Ukrainians, I ask unanimous consent that his address, along with some of the editorials and press reports, be printed at this point in the RECORD, as part of my remarks.

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

ADDRESS BY GOV. AVERELL HARRIMAN AT THE UKRAINIAN CONGRESS COMMITTEE DINNER AT THE COMMODORE HOTEL, NEW YORK CITY, MAY 28, 1955

It is a pleasure to meet with the members of the Ukrainian Congress Committee. I feel a personal bond with the Ukrainian people.

I regard myself fortunate in that I have had the opportunity and the privilege of visiting the Ukraine.

During World War II, I arranged with the Soviet Government for the establishment of United States Air Force bases there for use in the shuttle bombing of the Nazi military establishments. In my visits to Poltava at that time, I was greatly warmed by the friendliness of the people of the Ukraine. They became so friendly with our airmen that the iron hand of the secret police clamped down in an effort to prevent this natural friendship.

I have been greatly impressed with the national culture of the Ukrainians—their literature, their art, their music. I shall never forget the beautiful songs I heard in the Ukraine. But what I admire most about the Ukrainians is the purity and persistence of their aspiration for freedom—an aspiration which has endured through centuries of oppression.

It has survived the division of the Ukrainian nation. It has survived the cruel attempts of conquerors to stamp out the Ukrainian language. It has survived the extermination of Ukrainian leaders and scholars. It has survived the autocracy of the Mongols and the Czars. And it will survive the godless tyranny of the Kremlin.

We know, as surely as we are here tonight, that the enslaved nations of Eastern Europe will again one day be free. The oppressed people behind the Iron Curtain will again one day worship God in their own way, will reestablish their democratic institutions, will restore to their people the priceless liberties that are the God-given rights of human beings everywhere.

When and how this will come about, we do not know. But we know it will come about, because—as the history of Ukrainia tells us—the love of liberty cannot be extinguished. In the long run it is a force more powerful than any tyranny.

I want to congratulate you of the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America for the work you are doing to keep alive in this new haven the culture of your ancestors. In doing so you add richness and strength to American life. And I applaud your splendid efforts in finding homes and employment for displaced persons and escapees from the Ukraine.

I realize that this work unfortunately has been brought almost to a halt by the inexcusable administration in Washington of the Refugee Relief Act of 1953.

In that act, the Congress authorized the admission into this country of 209,000 persons over a 3-year period. As of 2 weeks ago, with more than half of the life of the act expired, only 21,000 persons have arrived on this country's shores under the act—and of these only 3,300 are refugees or escapees from behind the Iron Curtain. This is a mockery of the high promise of the act, which intended that we should do our share in providing homes for those who are fortunate enough to have escaped from the horror of Communist slavery.

Yesterday, the President sent to the Congress some recommended amendments to the law. It took almost 2 years of fumbling that reached the proportions of a national scandal before these amendments were proposed. That inaction is shocking enough. But what is even more shocking is that no changes are now proposed in the administration of the act.

We saw how a prominent member of the Administration's own party—Edward Corsi—went to Washington with the sincere purpose of putting impetus and humanity into the administration of the act. We saw how his efforts were thwarted at every turn, and when he persisted how he himself was arbitrarily fired from the program. I think it is safe to say that any changes in the law—however admirably drafted—will be a sham unless there are also changes in administration that will put the program into friendly instead of hostile hands. None of us who believe in offering haven to those who are fleeing Communist persecution can feel satisfied until that is accomplished.

I am sure you are all wondering today, as I am, what the latest turning in Soviet policy toward the West portends.

In recent weeks Soviet leaders have made a number of dramatic moves. They have agreed to a treaty of peace for Austria which leaves that country independent, they have made gestures toward Western positions on arms limitation and control, and they have made suggestions for a united Germany. These have superficial appeal to a fear-ridden world, but they need to be examined closely.

Now, the very fact that the Soviets have budged at all is highly important and to a degree encouraging. But we have no evidence that the ultimate Soviet aim to bring this entire planet under Communist domination has changed. The Kremlin has, it would appear, modified its tactics.

Now, I think most of us agree that our leaders have no acceptable alternative to talking and negotiating with the Soviets, either now or at any other time when there may be some chance of lessening the danger of war. But, as they negotiate, I earnestly hope that the American people—indeed, I hope all our allies—will not be beguiled by general concepts such as "neutrality," "disarmament," and "banning the atomic bomb." I hope there will not be, now, at the first sign of encouragement, another great pendulum swing of American opinion such as we have seen several times in recent years.

You recall how bitterly Americans felt toward the Soviets at the time of the Finnish war and the Nazi-Soviet pact in 1939. And then American opinion swung to another extreme—one of enthusiasm and comradeship—during the war against Hitler. I remember well the hostility with which I was received by many eminent journalists in 1945 when I said at the United Nations Conference in San Francisco that our aims and those of the Soviets were irreconcilable. Some wrote that I should be recalled as ambassador because I was too unfriendly toward our "gallant allies." But in the years thereafter the Soviet policies and actions provoked America to an extreme anti-Soviet feeling again. And now, already, there are some who would like to believe again that an era of peace and security is dawning. I pray that the American people will not let our high hopes and our love of peace interfere with an unemotional, shrewd, and hard-headed examination of every proposal which the Soviet Union makes.

The Soviet Union has recently made some proposals to give the impression it is the leading exponent of disarmament. What has really happened is that the Soviet Union has suddenly abandoned certain positions it has stubbornly held through endless negotiations, and now says it will accept absolute limitations on the size of armed forces and the principle of international inspection—things we have been urging for years.

We should, of course, be prepared to go just as far toward agreement on disarmament as it is safe to go. The rights of inspection teams will undoubtedly be a matter of official discussion and negotiation. But I want to suggest that our Government should raise with Soviet leaders the question of lifting the Iron Curtain to allow foreigners to enter freely, roam about and find out what is going on, and report out freely. This is absolutely necessary, it seems to me, if we are ever to agree upon and have confidence in any far-reaching measures of arms limitation and control.

In the meantime, it would be unforgivable if—pending absolute foolproof arrangements for mutual arms limitation and control—we or our allies let down our military guard.

There have been disquieting recent reports that the Soviets may have caught up with us in the development of intercontinental heavy bombers. And, day before yesterday, the Air Force announced it had decided to speed up production of our own newest heavy bomber, the B-52. This is a shocking admission that we have been holding back in our own bomber production—that we have been doing less than we could have been doing to maintain air supremacy—and this at a time of danger when we all know the Soviets have been proceeding full speed ahead.

Now I want to make clear that I have never believed and do not believe now that war is inevitable. In fact, if we maintain preeminence in the revolutionary new weapons and our ability to deliver them, there are grounds for long-run hope.

All things change in time—even in the Soviet Union. I think it is not unreasonable to hope that if we continue to build up the strength and unity of free nations, internal and external pressures may bring about a modification of basic Soviet behavior.

It will be increasingly difficult for the Kremlin to keep the varied peoples of the Soviet Union and the satellite nations in subjugation. As history proves, words and ideas can in time bring down the mightiest of empires. And to peoples living under foreign domination no words have greater force than those uttered a generation ago by that great American President, Woodrow Wilson:

"We believe these fundamental things:

"First, that every people have a right to choose the sovereignty under which they

shall live; second, that the small states of the world have a right to enjoy the same respect for their sovereignty and for their territorial integrity that great and powerful nations expect and insist upon."

These principles have the same validity today as the day that Wilson spoke them.

If we hold to our principles, if we are steadfast and patient and wise in our diplomacy, if we use a portion of our resources to help build and maintain the foundations of freedom throughout the world, I have no doubt that, with God's help, we shall be able to lead the world through the present terrible danger to a brighter day of security and peace.

[From New York Herald Tribune of May 30, 1955]

MR. HARRIMAN ON RUSSIA

Governor Harriman had some wise words to speak on the subject of Russia in a speech on Saturday before the Congress of Americans of Ukrainian Descent. The Governor, who was the American Ambassador to Russia from 1943 to 1946, understood well the forces at work in that country, and his advice, as evidenced in the recently issued Yalta papers, was remarkably sound. He is entitled to speak now on this subject, and his remarks deserve a careful hearing.

Mr. Harriman warned against one more swing of the pendulum in the American attitude toward the Soviets. This country has been by turns adamantly hostile and naively trustful. Now, with talk of negotiation in the air and a conference at the summit planned for this summer, there is danger that the sentimental or unduly optimistic tone will once more prevail. But, "We have no evidence," the Governor asserted, "that the ultimate Soviet aim to bring this entire planet under Communist domination has changed."

To negotiate, to seek settlements, to aim for peace; all this is essential. The administration is proceeding along this line. Yet the Governor adds an admonition, "I earnestly hope that the American people—indeed, I hope our Allies—will not be beguiled by general concepts such as neutrality, disarmament, and banishing the atom bomb." This appeal to the Allies, made with subtlety that befits a former diplomat, can be useful in mitigating pressures on the administration and is a fine example of bipartisanship in action.

The American people will not, we believe, be fooled. They will certainly not be if they take a long look and keep a steady mind.

[From the New York Times of May 29, 1955]

HARRIMAN SCORES LAXITY ON PLANES—SPEEDUP OF B-52 PRODUCTION TERMED "ADMISSION" NATION HELD BACK BOMBER OUTPUT

The Air Force's announcement on Thursday of a B-52 production speedup was a "shocking admission that we have been holding back in bomber production when the Soviets have been proceeding full speed ahead," Governor Harriman declared last night.

Speaking at a dinner of the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America at the Commodore Hotel, the Governor said the west must not be misled by recent outwardly peaceful Russian gestures.

"The very fact that the Soviets have budged at all is highly important and to a degree, encouraging," he said. "But we have no evidence that the ultimate Soviet aim to bring this entire planet under Communist domination has changed."

Governor Harriman said the United States and its allies should not be beguiled by what he called Moscow's modification of tactics.

"Our Government should raise with Soviet leaders the question of lifting the Iron Curtain to allow foreigners to enter freely, roam about, and find out what is going on, and report out freely," he declared.

Such a change in Russian policy is necessary, the Governor said, to make any pact on arms limitation and control effective. He said it would be unforgivable if the West let down its military guard short of foolproof control arrangements.

Governor Harriman said the hopeful way lay in a continued buildup of the strength and unity of free nations. Internal and external pressures then may bring about a modification of basic Soviet behavior, he said, adding:

"As history proves, words and ideas can in time bring down the mightiest of empires."

The Governor also scored "the inexcusable administration in Washington" of the Refugee Relief Act of 1953.

"In that act," he noted, "Congress authorized the admission of 209,000 persons over a 3-year period. As of 2 weeks ago, with more than half of the life of the act expired, only 21,000 persons have arrived under the act, and of these only 3,300 are refugees or escapees from behind the Iron Curtain.

"This is a mockery of the high promise of the act, which intended that we should do our share in providing homes for those who are fortunate enough to have escaped from the horror of Communist slavery.

"Yesterday, the President sent to Congress some recommended amendments to the law. It took almost 2 years of fumbling that reached the proportions of a national scandal before these amendments were proposed."

Worse than that "inaction," he declared, "is that no changes are now proposed in the administration of the act."

The Governor cited the arbitrary firing of Edward Corsi when Mr. Corsi "sought to put impetus and humanity into the administration of the act."

"Any changes in the law," Governor Harriman insisted, "will be a sham unless there are also changes in administration that will put the program into friendly instead of hostile hands."

Other speakers included Representative Michael A. Feighan, Democrat, of Ohio; former Representative Charles J. Kersten, of Wisconsin; and Perle Mesta, former Minister of Luxembourg.

[From the Long Island Press of May 29, 1955]

AVE SLAPS AT IKE IN REFUGEE RHUBARB

Governor Harriman hit last night at what he called "the inexcusable administration in Washington of the Refugee Relief Act of 1953."

The Democrat told the Ukrainian Congress Committee in a prepared address:

"Yesterday the President sent to the Congress some recommended amendments to the law. It took almost 2 years of fumbling that reached the proportions of a national scandal before these amendments were proposed.

"That inaction is shocking enough. But what is even more shocking is that no changes are now proposed in the administration of the act."

Harriman said, "Any changes in the law, however admirably drafted, will be a sham unless there are also changes in the administration that will put the program into friendly instead of hostile hands."

The Governor said the act authorized admission of 209,000 persons over a 3-year period but that up to 2 weeks ago, with more than half of the life of the act expired, only 21,000 persons have arrived. Of these, he said, "only 3,300 are refugees or escapees from behind the Iron Curtain." He said this is a mockery of the high promise of the act.

[From the Buffalo Evening News of May 31, 1955]

UKRAINIAN GROUP URGES LIBERATION

NEW YORK, May 31.—The Congress of Americans of Ukrainian Descent, Monday urged a policy of peaceful liberation for captive nations in the Soviet Union.

The group, closing its sixth triennial congress, also asked the United States Congress to ratify the United Nations genocide convention. The convention, outlawing mass extermination of entire human groups, was adopted 2 years ago, but has not yet been ratified by Congress.

Lev E. Dobrianski, of Washington, D. C., was elected chairman, chief executive, and chairman of the board of directors of the Congress.

[From the Buffalo Courier-Express of May 29, 1955]

HARRIMAN WARNS OF SOVIET AIMS

NEW YORK, May 28.—Gov. Averell Harriman, of New York, tonight warned the West to be wary of recent Soviet peace gestures.

Addressing the Sixth Congress of Americans of Ukrainian Descent at a dinner at the Commodore Hotel, Harriman cited signing of the Austrian peace treaty. Russian overtures on arms limitations and control, and suggestions for a united Germany, but described them as having superficial appeal and urged that they be examined closely.

"The very fact the Soviets have budged at all is highly important and to a degree encouraging," he told 88 delegates to the congress from all parts of the United States. "But we have no evidence that the ultimate Soviet aim to bring this entire planet under Communist domination has changed."

The congress, composed of native-born Americans and immigrants from the Ukraine, seeks to coordinate and intensify Ukrainian-American participation in peace efforts, to support the Ukrainian people in their struggle for freedom.

Harriman, who was Ambassador to Russia in 1941, said Soviet disarmament proposals calling for absolute limitation on the size of armed forces and the principle of international inspection are things we have been urging for years.

"Our Government should raise with Soviet leaders," he continued, "the question of lifting the Iron Curtain to allow foreigners to enter freely, roam about, and find out what is going on and report out freely."

BOMBER DELAY CRITICIZED

Harriman said the Air Force announcement last Thursday that it would speed up production of B-52 heavy bombers was a shocking admission that we have been holding back our own bomber production while the Soviets have been proceeding full speed ahead.

The Governor also criticized the inexcusable administration in Washington of the 1953 Refugee Relief Act.

Recalling that Congress authorized the admission of 209,000 persons over a 3-year period, Harriman said that "as of 2 weeks ago, with more than half of the life of the act expired, only 21,000 persons have arrived under the act, and of these only 3,300 are refugees or escapees from behind the Iron Curtain."

"This is a mockery of the high promise of the act, which intended that we should do our share in providing homes for those who are fortunate enough to have escaped from the horror of Communist slavery," he said.

Harriman congratulated the Ukrainian Congress for its work in keeping alive the culture of ancestors. Recalling his visits to the Ukraine during World War II, Harriman said what he learned to admire most about the Ukrainians is the purity and persistence of their aspiration for freedom—an aspiration which has endured rough centuries of oppression.

Harriman said that aspiration has survived division of the nation, the cruel attempts of conquerors to stamp out the language and the extermination of leaders and scholars, and declared it will survive the godless tyranny of the Kremlin.

Another speaker, Mrs. Perle Mesta, former Ambassador to Luxembourg, told of impressions she gathered of the Ukraine and its people while on a visit to Russia.

[From the Detroit News of May 29, 1955]

UKRAINIANS HEAR PLEAS FOR LIBERTY

(By James K. Anderson)

NEW YORK, May 28.—The triennial Congress of Americans of Ukrainian Descent, meeting at the Commodore Hotel, today registered 1,000 delegates from Ukrainian organizations in all parts of the country.

After speeches dealing with Ukrainian liberation from the Soviet Union and Ukrainian participation in American political and civic life, honorary doctorate from the Ukrainian Free University in Munich will be conferred tomorrow on Representative FEIGHAN, Democrat, of Ohio, and former Representative Kersten, who headed the House Committee on Soviet Aggression.

HEAR GOVERNOR HARRIMAN

At the congress' banquet tonight the delegates heard New York's Gov. Averell Harriman; Mrs. Perle Mesta, former Minister to Luxembourg, who traveled extensively through the Ukraine during a trip to the Soviet Union; and Edward M. O'Connor, former United States Commissioner on Displaced Persons.

Detroit and Hamtramck sent a large delegation to the congress, led by Dr. Michael Duzyj, president of the Detroit branch of the Ukrainian congress committee; Theodore Michaelezuk, vice president; Frank H. Huzil, secretary; William Dowhan, president of the Ukrainian Federation of Michigan; and Peter Rohatynsky, president of the Ukrainian congress committee in Hamtramck.

At the opening sessions today, Dr. Lev E. Dobriansky, congress president, and Dr. Dymtro Halychyn, vice president, urged the delegates to work on behalf of Ukrainian liberation.

[From the New York Herald Tribune of May May 29, 1955]

HARRIMAN SEES DANGER OF NEW SWING TO REDS

Governor Harriman warned yesterday against "another great pendulum swing of American opinion" in regards to Russia and expressed hope that love for peace will not prevent the American people from subjecting all Soviet peace moves to unemotional and hard-headed analysis.

Referring to recent Soviet peace overtures, notably the signing of an Austrian peace treaty, Governor Harriman said in a speech prepared for delivery at the sixth Congress of Americans of Ukrainian Descent at the Commodore that "now, already, there are some who would like to believe again that an era of peace and security is dawning."

"I pray that the American people will not let our high hopes and love of peace interfere with an unemotional, shrewd and hard-headed examination of every proposal which the Soviet Union makes," the Governor, who was American Ambassador to Russia from 1943 to 1946, declared.

URGES CLOSE STUDY

Governor Harriman said that the signing of the Austrian treaty and recent Soviet "gestures" toward Western positions on arms limitation and control are moves which must be studied closely by the West. But he added that up to now "we have no evidence that the ultimate Soviet aim to bring this entire planet under Communist domination has changed."

"Now I think most of us agree that our leaders have no acceptable alternative to talking and negotiating with the Soviets, either now or at any other time when there may be some chance of lessening the danger of war," the Governor said.

"But, as they negotiate, I earnestly hope that the American people—indeed, I hope our Allies—will not be beguiled by general concepts such as 'neutrality,' 'disarmament,' and 'banning the atomic bomb.' I hope there will not be now, at the first sign of encouragement, another great pendulum swing of American opinion such as we have seen several times in recent years."

SWING IN OPINION NOTED

Governor Harriman noted that American public opinion changed from bitterness toward Russia, during the Finnish War and the Nazi-Soviet Pact of 1939 to a sentiment of "enthusiasm and comradeship" during World War II, and then again back to anti-Soviet feeling because of Russia's policies during the postwar years.

In his speech, Governor Harriman also criticized the administration's handling of the Refugee Relief Act of 1953, asserting that the changes in the law proposed by President Eisenhower came only after "almost 2 years of fumbling." He declared that the nature of the law would not change unless its administration were put into friendly instead of hostile hands.

The Americans of Ukrainian Descent claim to represent 1,500,000 Americans of Ukrainian ancestry living throughout the United States. The group will hold sessions throughout today and close its congress tomorrow after voting on a series of resolutions, motions, and suggestions.

[From the Buffalo Courier-Express of May 31, 1955]

PEACEFUL LIBERATION OF CAPTIVE LANDS URGED

NEW YORK, May 30.—The United States was urged today to adopt a policy of peaceful liberation of the captive nations in the Soviet Union in the spirit of a universalized declaration of independence.

In a resolution adopted by the Sixth Congress of Americans of Ukrainian Descent at the Commodore Hotel, 600 delegates said the Ukrainian Congress would "redouble its efforts in the advancement of a steadily implemented policy of peaceful liberation which alone perceives the illusion of peaceful or competitive coexistence where iron curtains exist to divide nations and peoples."

In other actions, the Ukrainians resolved to support the efforts of 45 million Ukrainian people to regain political freedom and national independence from Soviet Russia and voted to persuade the Western nations that a Ukrainian underground opposes rule by Moscow and strives for a world free of the menace of Communist aggression.

The following officers were elected:

Lev. E. Dobriansky, Washington, D. C., chairman; Dmytro Halychyn, Jersey City, N. J., president; Michael Piznak, New York, treasurer; Antin Batiuk, Scranton, Pa., first vice president; Stephen Sprynsky, Philadelphia, second vice president; John Charumbura, Philadelphia, third vice president; Helen Lototska, Philadelphia, fourth vice president; Joseph Lesawyer, New York, fifth vice president; Stephen J. Jerema, New York, executive director; Ibnat Bilynsky, Philadelphia, secretary; John Roberts, New York, general counsel.

The UCCA is composed of native born Americans and immigrants from the Ukraine and seeks to coordinate and intensify Ukrainians American participation in efforts to achieve peace and to support the Ukrainian people in their struggle for freedom.

FIFTY THOUSANDTH CROSSING OF ATLANTIC OCEAN BY PAN AMERICAN AIRWAYS

Mr. FREAR. Mr. President, I should like to pay tribute to a historic milestone which the outstanding American organization, Pan American Airways, is observing today.

Mr. President, it seems as only yesterday that the entire world marveled at the unforgettable and epochmaking flight of Colonel Lindbergh, who first spanned the ocean barrier to Europe, alone. Now we observe the 50,000th crossing of the same ocean by Pan American Airways in what has become a routine operation. Time and distance have surrendered to modern aircraft, and today almost any spot on the earth is only hours away.

Mr. President, Pan American Airways has been a trailblazing pioneer in international air travel. It has helped to bring knowledge of America to peoples and nations thousands of miles away. Thus, in a real sense, this company fulfills the role of an ambassador.

I am happy to commend the officials of Pan American, its operating personnel, and all others associated with the company on the attainment of such an outstanding and safe record of flights across the Atlantic Ocean.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, at 5 o'clock this afternoon Pan American World Airways will make its 50,000th crossing of the Atlantic Ocean. I ask unanimous consent that there be made a part of the RECORD at this point some remarks I have prepared with reference to this mark in aviation history.

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

STATEMENT BY SENATOR CAPEHART

At 5 o'clock this afternoon a distinctive mark will be made in aviation history by one of the pioneers of United States commercial flying.

At that time a Pan American World Airways DC-7B plane will take off from New York to make Pan American's 50,000th crossing of the Atlantic Ocean.

Since that first Atlantic flight was made by Pan American on June 24, 1939, those 50,000 flights across the Atlantic have carried 2,021,483 passengers a total distance of 200 million miles.

Those same planes carried more than 24½ million pounds of mail, the equivalent of more than one-half billion letters.

In addition, more than 35 million pounds of cargo were carried on those 50,000 flights.

It is a privilege to have this opportunity to bring official notice to the United States Senate of this glowing example of accomplishment possible under the American free-enterprise system.

I have had the pleasant experience to observe in many foreign countries served by Pan American the good will established there by Pan American representatives toward the United States.

The operations of Pan American and the conduct of its personnel in foreign lands have won for us many friend; friends for our country and friends for our system of government.

In many instances Pan American, as well as other United States-flag airlines, compete with Government-owned and Government-operated airlines.

The record of Pan American and the other United States-flag lines proves the capabilities of United States free enterprise to meet that competition.

It is good that this Senate takes cognizance of the advancement of United States business both at home and abroad.

It is equally good that the Senate takes cognizance of development of trade of all sorts with other countries.

I am a firm believer that trade among countries is the pathway to eternal peace in the world because, as I have said many times, trade makes jobs and jobs make trade, and when people are working they are not interested in fighting.

Happy landings, Pan American, for all the years to come.

ADDRESS DELIVERED BY THE PRESIDENT AT SKOWHEGAN, MAINE

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. President, yesterday afternoon, President Dwight D. Eisenhower delivered at the fairgrounds at Skowhegan, Maine, some informal remarks which I believe illustrate once again his innate friendliness and good will toward his fellow men. The President summed up his own basic aspirations and those of all the American people when he stated:

We want peace in the world. We want prosperity at home, a prosperity that is widely shared, with everybody happy in his job. We have come to realize these two aspirations are related. We cannot have prosperity without peace. And there can be no peace unless we are prosperous.

We are the world's leader—economically, productively; and because we are this, we must also take the lead in many other ways, morally and politically, in leading the free world to bind itself together in a common appreciation of these basic values: The dignity of man, his right to be free, his right to exercise all of his privileges of worship and of thought and of speech, of action and of earning—in fact, to exercise every personal privilege, as long as he does not violate similar rights of others.

Mr. President, no one can honestly doubt the sincerity of our desire for peace and prosperity while our Nation is led by a man such as President Eisenhower.

As one who in 1948 first urged the nomination of Dwight Eisenhower, as one who was privileged to lead the campaign for convention delegates in his behalf in Maine in 1952, and as one who has been privileged to have the highest record of effective voting support of the Eisenhower program in the United States Senate, I have never once had occasion to waver in my great respect for this man, whom the American people have called to bear the heavy burdens of the highest office in this great Nation.

It is my hope, as I am sure it is the hope of millions of other Americans, that next year Dwight Eisenhower will again answer the call of duty, and will stand for reelection. This is my hope because I am convinced that Dwight Eisenhower is the best qualified person to guide the destinies of our Nation in these difficult times and to help us and all mankind achieve the basic aspirations to which he referred at Skowhegan, yesterday—peace and prosperity.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the President's remarks at Skowhegan, as they appeared in the New York Times this morning, be printed at this point in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

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

TEXT OF THE PRESIDENT'S REMARKS AT SKOWHEGAN, MAINE

Governor Muskie, Senator Smith, Senator Payne, Members of Maine's congressional delegation here present and my fellow Americans, no man can receive greater acclaim than to be received in friendly fashion by a gathering of real Americans. So from the bottom of my heart, I thank you—the Governor for his official welcome, Senator SMITH for all that she has so extravagantly said about my accomplishments, and each of you for the courtesy you have paid me by coming out here today that I might say hello.

There are no thanks due me for coming to this section of the United States, for long have I felt that my education was sadly lacking, in that I did not have an intimate acquaintanceship with this region. I have satisfied a long-felt desire to come here.

And, incidentally, I should like to point out one thing: The Office that I hold being what it is, I did not come alone. Now, there must be millions of Americans as ignorant as I was of the beauties of this region. And think of all the newspaper people, photographers and others that now should be educating those people. And possibly they will come and get the same first-hand knowledge that I had.

Now, if this does not happen, either the power of the press is not what we thought it was, or these newspaper people that travel with me haven't the proper sensibilities to appreciate beauty when they see it.

COMPLIMENTS TO "MIDGES"

I am grateful for the warmth of the welcome I have received all along the line, from young and old, from men and women, from workers and people who seem to be on vacation. And I might say, the most touching welcome that I received was from what the guides call "midges," and I call plain black flies. I am certain that during all these years when I did not come, they have been waiting on me, because they swarmed around me with their cannibalistic tendencies, and I am sure they will probably starve until I get back here.

My friends, as much as I have found here different, in the way of your scenery and your glorious lakes and streams and woodlands and piles of timber along the road which I have never seen, I find the basic beliefs, in our basic aspirations, in our hopes for the future and for our children, we are one.

We want peace in the world. We want prosperity at home, a prosperity that is widely shared, with everybody happy in his job. We have come to realize these two aspirations are related. We cannot have prosperity without peace. And there can be no peace unless we are prosperous.

We are the world's leader—economically, productively; and because we are this, we must also take the lead in many other ways, morally and politically in leading the free world to bind itself together in a common appreciation of these basic values; the dignity of man, his right to be free, his right to exercise all of his privileges of worship, and of thought and of speech, of action and of earning. In fact, to exercise every personal privilege as long as he does not violate similar rights of others.

ASKS FOR SACRIFICES

Now, if we are going to be bound together in these things we must realize that we can't do that, we can't attain them all without sacrifice. As your forefathers came into this region and built their homes, their cabins and began to conquer the wilderness, they had to sacrifice something, they had to sacrifice the safety of the lands from which they came, they had to part from loved ones, they had to make sacrifices to give to us what we have today.

If the world is going to be bound together in a system of mutual advancement—international security—with all of us sharing in that security and in that trade, here and there we must make sacrifices.

Let us make them courageously, as our forefathers did, so that we may enjoy real and secure and permanent peace, and not merely an uneasy cessation of the firing of the guns.

We want permanent peace based upon confidence, based upon justice and decency, wherever the American Government is represented. That is what we are struggling for—in every chancellery, in every capital of the world, those who are our friends and those who may be hostile to us.

We are coverting nobody's property. We want to assume power and rule over no one else. We want to live a life that gives to each of us the utmost opportunity for spiritual, intellectual and material and economic development, for ourselves and for our children.

I find in my few days that I have been privileged to travel across this northern tier of the New England States those sentiments are as widely shared and deeply felt as they are anywhere in the United States.

Indeed, may I say to you that because of this, though I come among you as a stranger, I have felt no more at home in any other town or city that I have visited in this country.

And so my real word of thanks is this: That you have let me feel that you do stand with one another shoulder to shoulder, and shoulder to shoulder with all of the other localities and States and regions of the United States—that all of us, together, may march along to that fuller life, strong, secure, but tolerant and ready to help the other fellow as we expect him to do his part in this great venture.

THANKS TO ALL

Now, before I leave, I would like to say thanks in a little bit more intimate way. Everywhere across this State today I have encountered smiles and shouts and "Hi Ikes" and waves of the hand—as I have met them here on this fairground. I can't reach each of you personally with a shake of the hand. I cannot even speak to all of the citizens I saw today. But if to you, and through you, I could let each of you know how sincerely I do appreciate the warmth of your friendliness, how earnestly I want to come back—as your governor said, no matter what my job may be—then indeed I shall be content.

And now one final word. In every audience such as this, there are literally hundreds of people who have served in the armed services during the period I was there—men and women. Some of them have served actively in the same theater, on the same battleground as I have.

To them I just want to say this one thing: During all those years that you were abroad, while your loved ones were suffering their fears for you, and you were encountering the dangers that finally won the war, we were upheld by a belief that we were fighting for freedom, for the rights of men as individuals, and for peace.

I believe that those aspirations, slowly and torturously it is true, but still steadily, are marching on toward achievement. And I believe that is the thought that all of us can take with us to our beds each night and thank our God that it is true.

CHARLES E. DANIEL, OF SOUTH CAROLINA

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the body of the RECORD, as a part of my remarks, an editorial entitled "One More Honor," published on June 22, 1955, in The State, a Columbia, S. C., newspaper. The editorial refers to the Distinguished Public Service Award of the American Legion, recently conferred upon former United

States Senator Charles E. Daniel, my immediate predecessor.

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

ONE MORE HONOR

It is gratifying to many South Carolinians and must be particularly so to Citadel men, that Charles E. Daniel, of Greenville, is coming into such notable prominence.

He has built himself a considerable empire in the construction field, gaining a national reputation in this line. He displayed a spirit of public service, including a gift of real magnitude, with a brother, to his alma mater, in the form of a carillon, and was appointed interim Senator by Governor Byrnes following the death of Burnet Maybank. He was signally honored some months ago by an extensive writeup in Fortune magazine.

And now he has received the American Legion plaque for distinguished public service to the State.

We extend congratulations to Senator Daniel on this new honor.

MULTIPLE USE OF SURFACE OF PUBLIC LANDS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate resume the consideration of Calendar No. 559, Senate bill 1713.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Texas.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1713) to amend the act of July 31, 1947 (61 Stat. 681), and the mining laws to provide for multiple use of the surface of the same tracts of the public lands, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT OF 1872 MINING ACT OPENING WEDGE TO DESTROY SMALL MINES—OBJECTIVE: LEASING PUBLIC LANDS FOR MINING PURPOSES

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, Senate bill 1713 has been accepted by many State mining organizations throughout the country under the threat that if they do not accept this amendment to the 1872 Mining Act, they will get something worse. It would establish a precedent for the leasing of all minerals and materials on public lands recommended by Government departments for 22 years, so that bureau heads in Washington may control all prospecting. So far they have not been able to bring it about to put their point over. What they want to do is to control, through a definite leasing system, all the prospectors and all the exploration work done on public lands.

EVERYTHING BUT THE BLUE SKY

The bill would establish a leasing system for sand, stone, gravel, pumice, pumicite, cinders, and clay, and vegetative materials, including, but not limited to, yucca, manzanita, mesquite, cactus, and timber or other forest products. This list includes everything but the blue sky, and would drive the ordinary prospector into his grave.

Forest reserves, parks, and other withdrawals take adequate care of the timber and scenic areas.

NO PRECEDENT FOR PENDING LEGISLATION

The argument is made that the precedent was set for this legislation through Public Law 250, passed by the 83d Congress, chapter 405, first session, under S. 1397.

That act merely coordinated the work on mining claims and ground leases for the development of different types of minerals, including petroleum, on regularly located mineral claims, and provided that the development for petroleum could be adapted to mining claims. If the mining-claim location were first made, then the oil-and-gas lease could not interfere with the mining and development of the minerals on the claim.

It also provided that a mineral claim could be located on the petroleum and gas lease, with the same provision, that the development of minerals should not interfere with a prior locator or lessor to develop the petroleum and gas on the particular land.

The act was a coordination of the development of different types of minerals, including petroleum.

It had nothing whatever to do with the leasing of the vegetation or the harvesting of the timber on a mining claim.

S. 1713 BUREAUCRATIC CONTROL BILL

A new precedent is being established under this bill, looking toward a leasing system under which Government departments and bureau heads would ultimately control all leasing operations.

The senior Senator from Nevada filed minority views on June 22, 1955, in which he pointed out, as set out in the minority views, that—

The purpose of the amendment to the 1872 mining law set forth in S. 1713 is, according to its sponsors, to prevent:

"1. Clearly invalid mining locations, unsupported by any semblance of discovery, and

"2. Mining locations having mineral disclosures which might satisfy the basic requirement of discovery, but which were in fact made for a purpose other than mining.

"3. To make it easier for the Federal bureaus to bring up for review claims and claimants which in their judgment includes land more valuable for another purpose."

That is the statement of the principal witness, Mr. Raymond B. Holbrook, an attorney employed by the United States Smelting, Refining & Mining Co. for 17 years, and who is the chairman of the public lands committee of the American Mining Congress. Mr. Holbrook was the nearest approach to a mining man who appeared for the bill.

TEN WITNESSES—GOVERNMENT BUREAU HEADS ALL BUT ONE

About 10 witnesses appeared at the hearings, which were held in Washington, D. C., only, where no ordinary prospector of mining could possibly come for the purpose of appearing before a committee. Only one man appeared before the committee who had ever had any mining experience. He appeared in opposition to the bill.

He is Robert S. Palmer, executive secretary of the Colorado Mining Association at Denver.

The witnesses who appeared before the committee consisted almost entirely of bureau officials and others who were hired to put this particular bill over, and to establish the precedent which I have already described.

Reading further from the minority views:

The first purpose, preventing invalid mining claims, is amply covered by the present mining law as interpreted over the years by the Supreme Court of the United States. Both the public and the prospector are fully protected, with recourse to the courts.

PROSPECTORS DEPRIVED OF RIGHTS

The second and third—

Purpose of S. 1713, the proposed amendment to the 1872 mining law—that 75-year-old law which laid down the principle with respect to what a prospector's rights are and which has been interpreted and supported by the Supreme Court—

are clearly an imposition on the rights of the prospector since they open the door for the first time in more than 80 years for a Government bureau employee to allege that the land is more valuable for another purpose than mining and bring the case before his own bureau where the only appeal is to a higher employee or official in that same bureau.

Reading further from the minority views:

CONGRESS COULD DESTROY INCENTIVE

Since it is even conceivable that evidence might show that the value for other purposes might temporarily be greater than the immediate value of a small mining property, it is inconceivable that the Congress would allow a bureau official, in no way connected with mining, such as the Forest Service or the Bureau of Land Management, and having no firsthand knowledge of the industry, to be the complainant, judge, and jury.

The history of mining is clear that you must have prospects before you have small mines and you must have small mines before you can have big mines—and that it often requires many years before the larger bodies of ore can be developed, even after they are known to exist.

FIRST LOCATOR SELDOM PROFITS

History also shows that the property may change hands many times through the first locators "going broke" and either relinquishing the claim to another locator or selling out for what they can get because of their inability to continue working the property, or because of lack of "assessment" work simply losing to another locator. Rarely does the first locator profit from the discovery.

There used to be a byword in the ranching business—that it was the third or fourth homesteader of a homestead that made it stick. The mining business is even tougher.

GOVERNMENT BUREAUS

The principal witness, Mr. Holbrook, further testified that—

I quote from Mr. Holbrook's testimony because he was the leading witness for the precedent-making proposal to break down the 75-year-old law, and the Supreme Court decisions, under which a prospector knows what his rights are.

I am reading from Mr. Holbrook's testimony, as set forth in the minority views:

We have had the pleasure of working with the Forest Service and the Bureau of Land Management and understand their position is that these problems could not be entirely met by effective administration of existing laws for the following reasons:

1. The available remedies are slow, expensive, and not conclusive, and

2. There is great difficulty in establishing the invalidity of a location, supported by discovery, on the basis that the location was made for a purpose other than mining.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will be in order.

MINORITY VIEWS FURTHER OUTLINED

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, reading further from the minority views:

The weight of evidence of the witnesses called—all but one holding some Government position—was that the Government bureaus should be given the clear power to determine the validity of a mining location within their own department.

This power in the hands of the bureau officials would destroy the prospector and reverse the Supreme Court decisions for more than 80 years.

They would also have the authority to determine whether or not the land is more valuable for another purpose than mining.

OBJECTIVE—LEASING SYSTEM

It is clear that the Government bureaus are still moving toward a leasing system which they have continually advocated for two decades.

DESTROY LAW INTENT AND COURT DECISION

The prospector can be moved under the 1872 law if he has not complied with it, which is the intent and the extent of the original law.

The Supreme Court decisions, for more than 80 years, have clarified and established the law.

It has been established that if the prospector has complied with the law in setting up his monuments—in filing with the county recorder—and has done the required "assessment" work that a Government department cannot move him or interfere with his work by alleging that "a reasonably prudent man would not expend his money and his effort in the hopes of developing a mine" (Holbrook, p. 91, May 18, 1955).

MINE DEVELOPMENT IMPERILED

I repeat that statement:

A reasonably prudent man would not expend his money and his effort in the hopes of developing a mine.

I read further from the minority views:

The amended act opens the door for continual interference by Government officials.

It limits the locators' inherent rights prior to patent—since when patent issues there is no change in the fee-simple ownership—and the timber, forage, and all other assets go to the patentee. It does not make sense to allow the Government to deplete his claim in accordance with their judgment before patent.

There may have been abuses under the law—but when investigated it will generally be found that the Government has not met its responsibilities under existing law and that the law itself or court decisions provide the remedy.

PROSPECTOR ON THE DEFENSIVE

As it now stands the Government must initiate any proceedings to prove the location invalid—which is exactly what was intended and must be maintained—under the proposed law the prospector will be on the defensive and will be continually harried and tormented by inexperienced and irresponsible bureau officals.

HEARINGS IN MINING AREAS

It is abundantly clear that hearings should be held in the mining areas of this Nation before any action is taken, since no real miners were heard and the mining associations of the several States were clearly intimidated through threats of more severe legislation unless they accepted the proposed legislation as written.

NEVADA MINING SPOKESMAN STATES HIS VIEWS

Mr. President, I have before me a communication from the executive secretary of the Nevada Mining Association, Inc., Reno, Nev., to whom I wrote for advice. In his letter he says:

DEAR GEORGE: Thank you for your letter of May 26. I have noted carefully all that you say therein.

As far as S. 1713 is concerned, please refer to my letter of May 14, 1955. Inasmuch as our members have voted under our prescribed voting system and the fact that all but four of our members voted in favor of the bill, it would ill behoove me to take any stand in contradiction to the expressed wishes of a large majority of the members of the association.

I have always said that if the present mining laws were enforced, there would be no need for new laws and if the present law is not enforced, I doubt if any new law will be.

However, the theory, as expressed by mining men throughout the West, is that unless they accept this law, something much more inimical to the industry will be enacted into law. Whether this is well founded or not, I do not know, but it is a factual condition and there is nothing I can do about it.

With kindest personal regards,

Very sincerely,

LOUIS D. GORDON.

NEW TACTIC EMPLOYED IN PRESSING BILL

Mr. President, the American Mining Congress is carrying on a campaign to secure the enactment of this bill. I am not critical of the American Mining Congress, if that is what they think should be done, but intimidating State associations throughout the Nation in the mining areas into thinking they must take this bill or something worse is not exactly the way business has been done in the public land-mining areas for the past 80 years.

Reading further from the minority views:

The present simple location system for acquiring prospecting ground for mining is the last stand for the man of small capital.

It requires no money—just a sack of beans and some coffee and many of them have been known to dispense with the coffee until they can show enough to acquire a "grubstake" from someone who is willing to gamble with them.

They can build a rock mound or stick up a stake and lodge the location notice on it—then set up the corners within 30 days and start the location work.

The ground is then his own as long as he does the required annual assessment work and files proof of it in the county recorder's office of his county.

It is not necessary to have a surveyor or an accurate placing of the corners of his property. If he inadvertently takes in too much territory then, when there is a conflict, which there will most certainly be when and if he makes a strike, he can only hold the 1,500 by 600 feet of the regulation mining claim.

MINING CLAIMS "FENCED IN"

Mr. President, if the prospector or miner does not take in the total amount, that is, the distance of 1,500 feet by 600 feet, and someone else locates next to him, he cannot enlarge his claim.

Reading further from the minority views:

Mining is a gamble—it is also a disease, which once acquired means that they will "hit" a mine or die broke. Where a very limited few develop a mine, thousands die broke, but it is the incentive of "striking it rich" that keeps them in the hills where the ore is to be found.

Probably 90 percent of the digging done by prospectors is on ground where no prudent man would dig—and this Nation can thank God that they have continued to dig on such ground, because most of the prospects developing into mines are discovered by these miners confirmed in the faith.

MOST MINES FOUND WHERE PROSPECTS DIM

Mr. President, no one knows better than does the junior Senator from Michigan [Mr. MCNAMARA] that that statement is true, namely, that 90 percent of the digging is done by prospectors on ground where no prudent man would dig, but that is where 98 percent of mining properties are eventually found.

I continue reading from the minority views:

The testimony by Government witness, and witnesses inexperienced in the actual prospecting operation, was to the effect that many mining claims are located on ground where no prudent man would dig—prospectors are not prudent men.

There was only one mining man at the hearing who testified and his testimony was emphatically against the bill unless modified—and he recommended that hearings be held in the mining areas before it was reported to the Senate floor. The witness was Mr. Robert S. Palmer, secretary-treasurer of the Colorado Mining Association, which is one of the largest and most important of such associations in this Nation.

Several witnesses have testified that a precedent for this proposed legislation was set in the passage of Public Law No. 250, 83d Congress, amending the 1872 Mining Act.

There could have been no precedent set in the previous legislation for this type of bill since it only dealt with coordinating the use of the same mining claims for different minerals—petroleum, uranium, and other minerals. The amended act provided that you could mine uranium on an oil claim but the petroleum producer had the priority and you could not interfere with him, and that you could develop and produce oil on a uranium claim but that you could not interfere with the operation of the prior locator.

It positively had nothing to do with timber or forage or sagebrush. It had absolutely nothing in common with S. 1713, which does set a precedent for leasing ground for materials.

Certainly hearings should be held in the mining areas. Let the miners have a chance to help work it out.

Quoting further from the minority views:

I believe that if this is done a satisfactory piece of legislation can be worked out that will benefit all concerned, and that will not curb the prospector, and that will not discourage independent investors and "grubstakers" interested in locating, developing, and producing minerals.

If the legislation is to be voted on today as set up without hearings in the mining areas of the country, then its application should certainly be confined to the forest reserve areas where most of the testimony before the committee applied.

INVESTIGATION OF FOREST SERVICE, LAND BUREAU URGED

Mr. President, I have here a letter from J. P. Hall, president of the Western Mining Council, Inc., dated June 11, 1955, which reads as follows:

DEAR SENATOR: Thanks for your help on the Dawson bill (H. R. 5561) and Anderson measure (S. 1713). At both our Redding, June 2, and Weaverville, June 3, meetings we concluded our best hope was to have you urge upon the Senate the move of a western investigation of what we consider the present illegal practices of the agents of

the Bureau of Land Management and the Forest Service relative to valid mining claims.

To back up this move a number of outstanding cases were cited. The Gerlinger case in Shasta County has just been heard by the court. The Bureau sold outright four claims belonging to Gerlinger Brothers, of Redding, the purchaser attempting to eject Gerlinger Brothers when they were doing their assessment work. The court found the claims to be valid but held valid the Bureau's deal of allowing a grazing patent on the claims. In other words, the court acted as if the Anderson bill is already law.

Our Trinity County Chapter cited the Pearl Wood case, which has been reviewed by Secretary McKay's office. The Forest Service sold Mrs. Wood's timber and in order to make the sale good proceeded to prove her claims invalid, even though her gravel has run (according to operating witnesses at the hearing) from $2 to $4 per yard. The Forest Service engineers tested the worst parts of the claims and when it was finally put to McKay's office, his attorney, Clarence Davis, came out with the ruling that the claims would have to show $1.50 to $2 to constitute a "discovery." The witnesses who showed gold taken from the claims were discredited with the statement: "How do we know you took that gold off Mrs. Wood's claim?"

In the same kind of treatment Mrs. Anna Vernon, Cle Elum, Wash., has $12 gold ore on the dump and high-grade assays as high as $1,500.

I have a letter from Mr. McKay's office that she would have to have ore running from $20 to $30 a ton to constitute discovery.

HOW SMALL MINES DEVELOP

Digressing from the letter, that is exactly the point I wish to make. Many a prospector has dug on claims and has passed them on to his successors, and they have been developed, but where only a trace of gold or a trace of some other mineral has been discovered.

But it is a valid discovery, the Supreme Court has said, and that is how a small mine develops. Thousands of prospectors may search, and very few of their claims may become producers and very few of the producers become mines of consequence.

No prudent person would dig where the ordinary prospector digs. Of course not.

BILL DOOMS SMALL PROSPECTOR

So the bill will finish the job on the prospector, the fellow who works without capital, or who goes to a friend for a grubstake; to someone who will gamble with him.

The practice of chasing prospectors off the claims is already going on, but there is a minimum of it because of Supreme Court decisions of 80 years' standing which set forth the rights of prospectors and miners.

This is positively the first bill ever to reach the Senate floor which sets the precedent, an act which will allow the inexperienced personnel of the Bureau of Land Management and the Forest Service to exercise control.

BUREAU BOSSES GREEN HANDS IN MINING FIELD

Ninety percent of them are inexperienced in the very field which they are supposed to know—the public range. They are absolutely inexperienced and green hands in the mining business.

They put the prospector on the defensive.

They allege that no prudent man would dig on that ground. Certainly no prudent man would dig on it. There are few if any prudent prospectors. That is the reason why we are in the mining business, because due to the 1872 Mining Act and the Supreme Court decisions the prospectors could control their ground.

PROTECTION DESTROYED IN 1934

Twenty-two years ago—1934—an act was passed which took away practically all the protection afforded the American workingmen, investors, and prospectors who made their stand in the hills, and put the 50-cent-a-day laborers in Burma in direct competition with the $12-or-$15-a-day American workmen. That is to say, the foreign workers had a $10-to-$13-per-day advantage.

There is a bill in the Committee on Finance which would lower the income tax on foreign-earned income by 14 percent. I am glad I am a member of that committee. Under the terms of the bill now before the committee, there would not only be the advantage of cheap labor in Burma and other foreign countries, but the investor could come back with his profits and pay 14 percent less income tax than if he had earned it in the United States.

PENDING BILL "LAST STRAW" FOR PROSPECTORS

There is not sufficient time today to describe all of the approaches to destroy this Nation; but when the foreigners seeking to divide our markets come in the door, and we shut the door, they come in the windows. When we shut the windows, they come up through the cellar door.

Now the last straw for a mining prospector is the proposal to allow a man who has never seen a mine to go to a prospector and tell him, "We are going to rent this ground to another person because no prudent man would dig on what you call your discovery."

PRESENT LAW AMPLE TO HALT ANY ILLEGALITY

I am not objecting to stopping an illegal entry. I am advised that the law allows plenty of leeway to stop a man who might try to locate an illegal claim on a forest reserve.

All that is necessary is to follow it through with the law as it now is. The Government can take a man off a claim under present law, if he does not have a valid discovery, but under the decision of the Supreme Court, invalidated through that act, you cannot take him off because a Bureau of Land Management official says that "no prudent man would dig there."

It has been said that someone set up a bar on a mining claim. He established a location and puts a bar on it. It It is the easiest thing in the world to prove such a thing and to dislodge such a person.

Some say they locate the claim for the timber. It is necessary to do $500 worth of development work on a mining project before it can go to patent, and it is necessary to convince a mineral surveyor, who is under $5,000 bond to the Federal Government, that the work has been done on a valid discovery. I was a licensed mineral surveyor for 25 or 30 years in Nevada and California. A mineral surveyor is under oath, and he must forfeit his bond, if when his ruling is investigated he is found to have sworn to an illegal or untrue statement.

NO NEW LAW NEEDED IF PRESENT LAW ENFORCED

So I return to the letter. It has been well said in the letter from Louis D. Gordon, secretary of the Nevada Mining Association, that if the present laws are enforced, "It is my opinion we do not need new ones."

If it is timber about which the Government is worried, why use the timber as the entering wedge to run mining prospectors off the public lands? In my State of Nevada, the public owns 87 percent of the lands. Why do they own it? Because there has been no law passed by Congress under which the land can be taken up and developed except the 1872 mining law. Water is not available for farming much of the land, but it can be located and developed under a mining claim.

When the prospector believes he has a discovery, and believes it strongly enough so that he will stay there and dig on the claim, eventually, with the hardihood of prospectors, he may establish a successful claim.

But I content that the Government has mortally injured many prospectors by the free-trade acts which Congress sought to pass almost without debate, except on the part of the senior Senator from Nevada.

HOW COLLEGE GRADS NOW RULE THE RANGE

The prospector is still in business, and he still continues to dig where no prudent man would dig; and so long as he continues digging, the Supreme Court has, in most cases, upheld him.

But now it is sought to amend the law, so that a college graduate from Yale or somewhere else, who has never seen a mine, who has never seen a piece of ore bigger than a sample, will be permitted to regulate the range on a mining claim. Many of the college graduates have never seen a cow, much less a mine. They have no knowledge of the range or of this particular subject. Yet they are mortally injuring the livestock men of this country under the same act now in the Bureau of Land Management, which was the Taylor Grazing Act of 1933.

Now they can tell a prospector, "You don't have a discovery, because it does not assay $20 a ton; and no prudent man would dig there." And they apparently make it stick.

BUREAU PROBE SHOULD PRECEDE LAW CHANGE

I read further from Mr. Hall's letter. He has reviewed specific cases, and then says:

These are just a few of the reasons why the illegal practices of the Bureau of Land Management and the Forest Service should be completely investigated before any attempt is made to fortify their position with such measures as the Dawson and Anderson bills.

Claimholders are not opposed to a just division of the timber on their claims but will oppose the Forest Service telling them

how, when, and where to cut their just portions. We are for your suggestion of western hearings of this situation before any new bills become law.

TIMBER AMENDMENT VAGUE

Mr. President, there was offered and accepted to the bill an amendment providing that if all the timber is cut while the land is still being prospected, while it is still in the location stage, and then the prospector or a successor discovers a mine, the Government will furnish the timber that is needed.

Mr. President, what would that entail? How much timber are they going to furnish? Are they going to go out and measure the stumpage?

MINING COUNCIL OPPOSITION DEFINED

I also have a telegram from Mr. J. P. Hall, president of the Western Mining Council, Inc., at Santa Cruz, Calif., dated the 7th of this month. It is addressed to Hon. GEORGE W. MALONE, United States Senate, Washington, D. C., and reads:

Western Mining Council, Inc., meeting in regular monthly session in Redding June 2 went on record as not opposed to equitable division of timber on plains and national forests but opposing other provisions of multiple use we urge hearings on bills in western areas before passage of S. 1713.

Mr. President, I have a letter from Mr. Harold M. Morse, of Morse, Graves & Compton, attorneys, Las Vegas, Nev., which reads:

Hon. GEORGE W. MALONE,
United States Senator,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MALONE: This will confirm our telegram in answer to your telegram of June 7.

LEGISLATION SPEEDED TO FLOOR WITHOUT AREA HEARINGS, INVESTIGATION

I was trying to find out how all this came about without the prospectors and the attorneys for the prospectors even knowing that the measure was headed for the Senate floor, and without hearings being held outside of Washington, D. C. Who would pay to come 3,000 miles to Washington? At least no prospector has the money to finance such a trip.

The way measures go through the Senate now, all that is necessary is to get them to the Senate floor, and they go through without any adequate investigation. Apparently everybody is embarrassed in opposing any measure, regardless of what it may do to the economy of the country.

The letter from Mr. Morse reads:

This will confirm our telegram in answer to your telegram of June 7.

I carefully read your letter of May 27. You are absolutely correct in stating in your said letter that the Federal Supreme Court has passed on all phases of an 1872 mining act as amended, and the act itself and the decisions of the Federal Supreme Court amply protect the Government and anyone else from any misuse of a mining claim, either before or after patent. I will send you a decision or two shortly to the effect that where a party located a mining claim in a national forest, which was open, however, for mineral entry, and then used the surface of the claim to conduct a saloon, the Department of the Interior was justified in voiding the patent even after it had been issued, on the grounds of fraud.

The remedies exist, Mr. President.

BILL BOON TO "TINHORN CZARS"

I read further from the letter:

It is interesting to note from your letter that the 8 or 10 witnesses heard by the committee were all Government officials. Even a blind man can read the great boon it would be to the Bureau of Land Management to have this bill passed. We would have more tinhorn czars running around than have existed since Stalin—and I mean this sincerely. Why in the name of God Congress would delegate to the Secretary of the Interior and through him to the Bureau of Land Management, to use discretion in granting surface rights and use thereof, etc., I will never know. They should by the same token surrender their oaths of office to themselves—but I guess I get too angry every time Congress does delegate their power and authority to some agency. They should begin to realize they are going to delegate themselves out of office entirely.

SENATE SHRUGGING OFF POWERS TO EXECUTIVE

Mr. President, over the last few years the Senate of the United States has done just about that. It has just about legislated itself out of existence, as far as effectiveness is concerned. Every proposal which comes to the Senate floor to delegate authority to the President of the United States is passed almost without question.

I have stood on the Senate floor for 9 years and watched that done, and it was done for 12 years prior to that time.

CONSTITUTIONAL RESPONSIBILITIES SET ASIDE

Act after act was enacted which delegated the constitutional responsibility of the legislative branch of Government to the executive branch. Then the executive delegates it to a person in a bureau of whom no one has ever heard and of whom no one will ever hear, but that person makes the decisions.

I suppose it is easier to do it that way, because to make one's own decisions here on the Senate floor might be criticized. One of these days Congress is going to be criticized for delegating its constitutional authority to the executive branch of the Government.

CONSTITUTIONALITY OF TRADE ACT UNDER TEST IN COURTS

There is now in court a case concerning the constitutionality of the 1934 Trade Agreements Act, the Geneva General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade, which is a Tinker-to-Evans-to-Chance setup.

The Constitution of the United States charges the legislative branch of our Government with the responsibility of regulating the national economy, foreign trade through setting the duties, imposts, and excises, which we call tariffs. What does Congress, the legislative branch do? It transfers that responsibility to the executive branch, and the executive branch transfers it to Geneva, 3,000 miles away, to GATT—the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade—where representatives of 34 nations sit down to divide the markets of this Nation among them. There was no game until we decided to go into it for 3 more years through the House bill—H. R. 1. There would have been no game if we had not extended the 1934 Trade Agreements Act. But when we sat down in the game at Geneva we were putting in the pot our markets, so the game goes on with 34 nations—33 boosters in the sucker poker game—and us. Every other nation protects its own industry. We are the only people not for our country.

TRADE AGREEMENTS A DODGE TO AVOID TREATY ACTION IN SENATE

Mr. President, the communication from which I have just read is only one such communication. I have received dozens of them. Why did the Bricker amendment provoke a great controversy over the Nation, when almost two-thirds of the Senators voted for it? When that many Senators vote for such an amendment, the situation must be serious.

The people of the Nation are tired of Congress delegating its constitutional responsibility to the Executive. That is why that happened.

They are tired of having this Nation make trade treaties with foreign nations, calling them trade agreements, not treaties, to avoid coming before the Senate of the United States for a two-thirds vote.

These trade agreements are treaties, Mr. President. In the Federal district court in Washington the only woman Federal district judge has that question under consideration. I am of the opinion that she is a real American.

I refer again to the letter from Mr. Harold Morse:

To show you that other people are begining to think about the racket that is now being operated by a mess of crooks selling surface rights to Government land, I am enclosing the following:

A letter which appeared in the Los Angeles Times of Sunday, June 5, 1955, from a person who apparently was stung and was advising others not to get stung likewise.

An advertisement which appeared in the Los Angeles Times on Sunday morning, May 15, 1955.

An editorial which appeared in the Los Angeles Times on Saturday morning, April 30.

Of course, at times it is a very conservative newspaper and perhaps you had read the editorial but in any event it answers in part that portion of your letter to me in which you stated you sometimes wondered if anyone appreciated your efforts along certain lines mentioned in your letter. I would say offhand that the editorial in the Times commends your personal efforts very highly, and I might add that if the late Harry Dexter White were now alive he would be red hot and riding full herd in support of the so-called multiple use of surface rights, being Senate file 1713.

I again respectfully urge you not only to write a minority report but to take the floor of the Senate, not only as a Senator but as a mining engineer, to see if you can't convince that body to leave our present mining laws alone as we certainly don't need any more State socialism or any more czars in the Bureau of Land Management—but I guess I'd better quit.

Sincerely yours,

HAROLD M. MORSE.

So even an attorney gets discouraged at times, Mr. President.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks, the dispatches referred to in the letter.

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

[From the Los Angeles Times of June 5, 1955]

CAUTION URGED ON LAND DEALS

This letter is written in the hope that it will spread a word of caution to people contemplating or already making application for lease and sale of United States Government 5-acre tracts near booming Las Vegas.

There is much misrepresentation and misunderstanding regarding the facts on the requirements of the Bureau of Land Management, United States Department of the Interior, to acquire title. As a consequence, there will be a lot of unhappy people after the 3-year lease period is completed.

So-called land locators are nothing but a private service and some of their salesmen are clouding the facts and exaggerating what must be done to meet requirements as laid down by the United States Government.

First check with the Bureau of Land Management, Nevada State Office, Post Office Building, Reno, Nev. This writer wishes that he had checked on facts on the three methods to meet requirements and not listened to double talk to determine if:

1. You only have to put up a shack, fence, or "bed down" a trailer on the 5 acres or if you have to construct a house or cabin in compliance with Clark County, Nev., Building and Sanitation Code.

2. You only have to dig a water hole 5 or 6 feet deep or if you have to have a domestic water well drilled by a licensed well driller in compliance with the specifications of the State engineer of Nevada (and this type of drilling runs into money).

3. You, in an outright purchase arrangement of the 5-acre tract, pay the Government's fee of $25 and the locator's fee (usually $100) plus what the locator told you was the appraised value per acre or if you pay the Government's fee of $25, the locator's fee, the appraised value per acre (set by the Government—perhaps not what the locator stated) plus $700 more to the Government.

Also if:

The payment of $25 and the locator's fee includes escrow, lawyers, and surveying fees or if no escrow or lawyer's fees are necessary and the only surveying done was done by the Government on a large scale (not for 5-acre tracts).

The appraised value of the 5 acres the locator quotes is the Government's figure or if the Government hasn't appraised the land as yet and when it does the appraised value will be much more than the salesman stated.

There are honest locators and there are dishonest ones.

The racket for the dishonest land locators is a sweet one. They receive $100 to make out a form, put it in an envelope and affix a 3-cent stamp and mail it. Then they have 3 years (during the lease period) to clean up and be on their way before the facts come to light and the roof blows off.

Be cautious—learn the facts from the party with whom you are doing business—the United States Government, Bureau of Land Management.

L. E. D.

LOS ANGELES.

[From the Los Angeles Times of May 15, 1955]

Exercise your rights as a United States citizen. You as a native-born or naturalized citizen over 21 have the privilege of claiming up to 5 acres of Government land. Choice locations now available near booming Las Vegas, Nev. Land-filing service open daily, including Sunday, 9 a. m. to 9 p. m., in Hollywood, 1213 North Highland, HO-56111; in San Fernando Valley, 14802 Ventura Boulevard, STate 49951; in Long Beach, 806 American Avenue, L. B. 77469.

[From the Los Angeles Times of April 30, 1955]

HEMISPHERE RESOURCES AND DEFENSE

There is an important paragraph contained in the report filed by the United States Senate's subcommittee entrusted with a study of the availability of strategic materials which would be needed in the event of another war. The paragraph is this: "The Western Hemisphere can be defended and will be the only dependable source to the United States of critical materials in the event of an all-out war."

COUNSEL BY EXPERTS

This was the summation of an investigation which took the better part of a year and in which more than 360 witnesses, representing some of our most distinguished scientists, engineers, military and economic experts, gave their advice and counsel. The end result was, in their opinion, that the United States and Canada, with the close cooperation of the countries of South America, can provide themselves with all of the materials of modern warfare without reliance on the countries of Asia and others scattered in far parts of the world.

These materials range from antimony and asbestos to vanadium and zinc with such familiar items as rubber, tin and manganese included in between. In all, there are 77 minerals and materials listed as essential to the capabilities of the United States in fighting a major war, and in practically every instance the subcommittee, which was headed by Senator GEORGE W. MALONE, of Nevada, reports that our own hemisphere is able to meet the needs that would arise in the time of a major war.

It is on the premise that we are not taking full advantage of the potentials that exist in our own production of strategic materials that the Malone committee report makes some of its strongest points. There is the case of titanium, for example. It is among the most modern of metals, light, durable and strong, and its use in modern fighting planes is a must if our Air Force is to be considered as a first-class fighting force.

TESTIMONY GIVEN

Yet the testimony presented before the Malone committee showed that we are producing approximately 2,000 tons of this metal annually—with two-thirds of our production concentrated in one State—when the considered judgment of witnesses before the committee was that we need a minimum of 150,000 tons annually in the production of military planes alone.

Titanium ores abound extensively not only throughout the United States but in such other countries as India, Australia, Norway, Brazil, Sweden, and—significantly—the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics. It is scarcely to be doubted that the Soviets are taking full advantage of all the titanium ores they can lay their hands on.

As far as titanium is concerned, it is a case of not making the most of our own natural resources. With such things as rubber and tin, however, we long depended on Malaya as a principal source of supply and our complacency in this direction received its first rude jolt when the Japanese plunged us into World War II. We built up a synthetic rubber industry, of course, which helped meet the emergency and we scraped and skimped on not only rubber but tin and scores of other materials that we formerly had brought to us from faraway shores.

The chief thing now, as the Malone report points out, is whether we are going to continue to depend on long-overwater shipments of vital materials to this country in the event of a new war. Such shipments were a hazardous enough undertaking in the days of World War II under the constant threat, as they were, of submarines and aircraft which have long since been outmoded.

POTENTIAL ENEMY

Convoys which were mauled and hurt in some degree by the Nazi submarine wolf packs in World War II would face obliteration in the explosive vaporization of a single atom bomb in the event of another world war. And there is no guaranty, either, that the foreign countries from which we obtained so many of our vital resources in the past would be kindly disposed toward selling them to us; particularly those which are within range of quick atomic destruction from our potential enemy.

The Malone report says that the natural resources and the technical ingenuity of the United States, Canada, Central and South America are such that this hemisphere with the proper planning and foresight can stand on its own two feet and live and protect itself, for and by itself alone, if ever such an emergency should arise.

It is an encouraging departure from the thought insidiously promoted in some sections of former administrations that the United States must always depend on the importation of certain strategic materials from lands far across the seas. Among the ardent advocates of such viewpoint in the Truman-Roosevelt administrations was the late Harry Dexter White, who has been revealed as an obedient servant of the Soviet espionage ring that was active in his time in Washington.

BIG INDUSTRY FOR SYSTEM—SMALL PROSPECTOR OUT IN COLD

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, the Times editorial is a description of Senate Report No. 1627, a digest of 10 volumes of testimony of 360 witnesses showing how the Western Hemisphere can become self-sufficient in the production of critical materials. This report and hearings are by the Minerals, Materials, and Fuels Economics Subcommittee of the Interior and Insular Committee, of which I was the chairman.

Mr. President, I refer to page 192 of the printed proceedings of the hearings on S. 1713, which were held in Washington, D. C., in which 8 or 10 witnesses appeared, including only 1 man who had had any experience whatsoever in mining. All the rest were Government officials, or persons hired by an organization to put this bill over.

In this connection, I refer to the testimony of Mr. Holbrook. He was the principal witness. He works for a large company in Salt Lake City which would benefit from a leasing system.

Any large company which has the money to pay attorneys and engineers and keep them continuously on the payroll cannot lose under a leasing system; but a prospector who has nothing but his food supply—and many times a poor one—and who lives on one of these claims, would be put in jail for nonpayment of salary if he employed a lawyer or an engineer, because he does not have the money.

TESTIMONY OF COLORADO MINING SPOKESMAN CITED

I refer now to the testimony of Mr. Robert S. Palmer, executive vice president of the Colorado Mining Association. He is also in the uranium mining business. He was discussing minerals which are discovered by persistent prospecting and exploration. The prospector can own the mineral when and if he finds it.

Perhaps in one out of 500 locations a prospector will discover a small property which will produce some paying ore. The difference between ore and country rock is the profit—ore is country rock that can be mined at a profit. Out of 500 properties which produce some paying ore, there may be one big producer, if people are willing to gamble. But the gambling does not pay off for everyone. We hear only about the successful miners.

In connection with Virginia City in the old day, we hear about the Mackeys, the Floods, and the Fairs, making millions of dollars. We do not hear of the thousands of prospectors who honeycombed the hills around Virginia City, 17 miles out of Reno, and died broke.

If one were to calculate the value of the labor expended in those hills, he would probably find that more money in labor and supplies was put into those hills than was ever taken out--and a billion dollars was taken out.

PROPOSED BILL WOULD HAVE STYMIED WESTERN MINE DEVELOPMENT

What would have happened if those operations had been under the direction of an official of a Bureau of Land Management who handled cattle and sheep, and did not even know much about that subject? He would have told the prospector that no prudent man would dig where he was digging—and get rid of him.

For months a type of silver ore was being thrown away as waste, and the mines were not paying. It was a murky looking ore, a kind of blue mud. No one had ever seen anything like it. Most of the prospectors went broke and left or disposed of their holdings before the values were discovered. Then someone had the blue mud assayed, and that ore proved to be the highest paying silver mine in the world.

Under a leasing system, long before that time the prospectors would have been put off by a graduate of some college who came out there to regulate cattle and sheep, on the theory that no prudent man would dig there. And he would have been 100 percent right—but thank God they were not prudent men—they were prospectors and miners—fighters with the look of the eagle in their eyes.

After testifying for several minutes before the committee, Mr. Palmer said:

I say that officially we agree with you on this legislation. We are trying not to disagree with you. If it were sponsored by others we certainly might.

He is speaking to the acting chairman of the committee [Mr. ANDERSON], who has always supported the mining people. He said:

You are Chairman of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

URANIUM EXPERIENCE CITED AS EXAMPLE

I should like to illustrate how wrong one can be with respect to this subject.

As late as a year ago the former Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission wrote a book—I refer to Gordon Dean—

Mr. President, I have a high regard for Gordon Dean. I think he was one of the best chairmen the Atomic Energy Commission ever had. I think he is an honest man, an earnest man, a man of integrity, and a man who understands his business. He wanted to be helpful—but he was wrong. He was reporting, as of that time, the knowledge which was available.

As late as a year ago the former Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission wrote a book—I refer to Gordon Dean—A Report on the Atom, which led the reader to conclude that there were no substantial amounts of primary uranium ore in the United States. In other words, the United States was largely dependent for its sources of atomic energy on outside sources.

PRESIDENT'S SPEECHES RECALLED

Mr. President, I digress from that testimony to say that 3 years ago the President of the United States made certain speeches on this subject. About certain areas that we must protect to secure certain minerals. I do not blame the President of the United States, because certain information was placed before him. He, of course, had no personal knowledge of the situation. He has not made any such speeches lately—not since last August.

Reading further from the testimony:

Senator ANDERSON. That is not the interpretation of that statement, I don't believe. Gordon Dean knows that the Colorado plateau is full of uranium, and says so in the book A Report on the Atom.

Mr. PALMER. Gordon Dean specifically stated in the book that there were no substantial amounts of primary uranium ore in the United States.

Senator ANDERSON. Is there?

Mr. PALMER. Since that report the people to whom you have referred as going out and locating mining claims have uncovered primary deposition of substance in the United States. Just before leaving the West it was announced—

This was on the 19th of May—

that in a new area in Utah which had previously been pronounced barren, uranium ore was being found as a result of drilling. Claims which some people would have condemned as invalid locations were now valid.

PROTECTING CLAIM NOW DIFFICULT, EXPENSIVE

We have even had testimony to the effect that a man who has plenty of money, and who is in the uranium business in that locality, has hired people to dig continually on each claim, so that there can be no doubt that it is a valid location, because if one of these bureau officials, who got all his information from a book or in school, but has acquired no actual experience, came out there, they would be able to put him off the land, because he could not hold the claim without a discovery on which a "prudent man dig" or have a man continuously digging to hold the ground even under the 1872 act if he was to hold the ground against the onslaught of the horde of bureaucrats.

Mr. Palmer goes on to say:

Claims which some people would have condemned as invalid locations were now valid. Because somebody had sense enough to put down a drill hole, and ore was found at a depth.

Mr. President, the Senator from New Mexico is quoted as stating:

Gordon Dean and I discussed that before his book was published and while he was engaged in the writing of it. So I say to you that it is a confusion of terms. He understands that there is uranium in this country.

HARRY DEXTER WHITE THESIS STILL HELD BY SOME OFFICIALS

However, Mr. President, high officials in this Government, especially those who are not particularly interested in this Government—the modern Harry Dexter Whites—were saying that there was no uranium in this country, as they had been saying for 20 years that we were running out of other minerals and as Harry Dexter White said in a memorandum to Secretary of the Treasury that we only had a 12-year supply of petroleum—that it must be saved for emergencies while we imported what we annually used. Silly but dangerous to our national security. The modern Harry Dexter Whites said that therefore we must defend Africa and we must defend Europe and Asia in order to import those critical minerals and materials.

HEMISPHERE SELF-SUFFICIENT IN URANIUM, CRITICAL MINERALS

After the Minerals, Materials, and Fuels Subcommittee had written its report and submitted it to the Senate on July 2, 1954—and the report had been printed as Senate Report No. 1627—I said to a high Government official, "If you will just treat our taxpayers half as well as you do the foreigners, you will have uranium running out of your ears in the United States within 2 years. If you add Canada and Mexico, that is all the area you need from which to get your uranium."

As I have said so often, and as it stated in the report, we could produce all the critical minerals and materials in the Western Hemisphere that we need to fight a war or to live in peace. No one has questioned that statement.

UNITED STATES MINERAL OUTPUT WILL INCREASE IF CONSTITUTION FOLLOWED

In the report we said that the production of critical minerals and materials could be materially increased in this country if we acted in accordance with the Constitution of the United States and recommendation No. 2 in the report. That Congress reassume its responsibility of regulating foreign trade and the national economy—in accordance with article I, section 8 of the Constitution.

PALMER TESTIMONY REPRINTED

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point Mr. Palmer's testimony on pages 193 to 204 of the hearings.

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

Senator ANDERSON. I am sure there must be a misunderstanding as to his use of the term because at the time he wrote the book, just prior to his writing the book, he discussed with me the large mining in New Mexico which has $100 million worth of uranium ore. You and I know which State now has the largest undeveloped uranium ore deposits in the Union.

Mr. PALMER. I recognize your leadership, sir.

Senator ANDERSON. Gordon Dean and I discussed that before his book was published

and while he was engaged in the writing of it.

So I say to you that it is a confusion of terms. He understands that there is uranium in this country.

Mr. PALMER. Yes as to the deposits which are not considered as primary. I think the term I am using is correct. I think the term used by Gordon Dean was correct at that particular time. I am not criticizing Mr. Dean. I have a very high regard for him.

But the point I make is that some people are criticized for making questionable locations, which later developments prove are very much in the public interest. The people who are primarily responsible for the uranium development in the United States are not major companies and are not necessarily engineers or capable locators but just average Mr. America. The people who have brought into production the major deposits of uranium in the United States have been the prospectors concerning whom Senator GEORGE MALONE has addressed a great many of his comments.

I wish to point the value of the prospectors.

Senator ANDERSON. I don't argue this question of prospectors, not only in these minerals but in oil. We all know the story as to who digs up the new fields and brings them in.

As I say, I recognize that you don't always succeed.

You are familiar probably with the mining venture that I got myself into in the northern part of New Mexico.

Senator MALONE. Mr. Chairman, I would say right at that point, and I think the distinguished Senator from New Mexico, if he stops to think, knows as well as the Senator from Nevada or the secretary of the Colorado Mining Association, that it is the wildcatters and prospectors without adequate funds, many times without any funds, to carry through the operation, that go out and find this material—oil, gas, and minerals—because they just have nothing better to do. They spend their lives doing that. If they hit it, they make some money; that is, if Washington does not interfere with it; and if they do not hit it, they die broke.

Hundreds die broke where one makes it. We all know that. It is a fever.

Now, the men with the money generally are represented by an engineer of some reputation. He sends his engineer in after the discovery has been made. These engineers really go out on exploration ahead of time.

Now, they do have some that do that, but the majority of the explorers and prospectors and wildcatters are financed by their friends or through selling stock.

I could name 5 or 6 men that have money or have backing, like Odlum, who has gone in and bought out 1 man that did not know any more about prospecting for uranium than my grandson, bought him out for $9 million or $10 million. He says himself in his life story that he knew nothing about uranium, but he went in there with his wife and they worked like a pair of slaves and they had a little luck of the Irish and they found some ore that the money was attracted to.

I could name 5 or 6 that have gone in there, but they did not go in and find it. They go in on some of these people that found it on the claims that these experts, these soft-cushion experts in Washington, would have run off the claim.

They are the people I am talking about.

The fellows that these men have testified to, this is the second day, would not let these people go. They would say no prudent man would put his money in there. Of course, they wouldn't. But they are not prudent men, these wildcatters, in the oil and gas. They are not prudent men these prospectors. They are men sometimes at the end of their rope. They have to do something and they have this fever. When they get the showing, which 1 out of every 100 maybe gets, gets something like Odlum or someone representing them, and they buy control.

Very often the man who sells it doesn't make much money, but it is a good deal to them. But they have money to lose. But the men we are interested in are the men these people have been talking about for 3 or 4 days. What did they call it? They had a name for it. Fraud. That is what they said. These are fraudulent claims that this man found this uranium and got $10 million. That is a fraudulent claim, if these fellows had examined it ahead of time.

Senator ANDERSON. That is not correct.

Senator MALONE. There is nothing in there that a prudent man would put money in.

Senator ANDERSON. Let me ask this question: Is it any cheaper for a miner to defend himself under the rules and procedure now established under the law of 1872 than it would be under S. 1713?

Mr. PALMER. The answer to that question obviously as to the validity of his claim is "no." But the full answer to the question is that there is an obligation placed upon the locator under the terms and conditions of this bill which does not exist in the present legislation.

Senator ANDERSON. As to surface rights not needed for mining?

Mr. PALMER. Well, of course, people may differ as to what surface rights needed for mining are.

May I point out, to you, Senator, that there are some other questions involved in this bill which are quite substantial. For example, at the present time, they are finding uranium in conjunction with coal beds. Now, under the terms and conditions of this bill it is possible for a licensee to acquire coal lands and to have a very definite advantage over a locator of uranium on the same area; that is a question which I do not think can be decided at this hearing, and undoubtedly will require some interpretation.

I understand the commission is giving it some thought and consideration at the present time.

Senator ANDERSON. Let me say that when that arrives, I will try just as hard as I tried on the original Public Law 585 to be fair and to be helpful to the people in that area as will Senator MALONE and everybody else. I do not believe we have different goals. I do believe very strongly that the continued filing of mining claims for the purpose of getting surface rights and not intending to try to get the minerals is placing the whole mining program in jeopardy. Such practices make it more difficult to be of assistance to mining than it has been in the past.

My whole purpose in sponsoring this proposed legislation from the very beginning was to try to make sure that we did not get so many bad practices that the prospecting for minerals would get into difficulties. I still hope to keep it on that basis.

Mr. PALMER. Will there be bad practices under your law as well as under present law?

Senator ANDERSON. I think there will not be. I think, for example, the people who go and try to acquire a piece of mineral land for the sake of water and timber will not do it.

Mr. PALMER. I wish to point out, Senator, and I am sure you are familiar with the area in which most of the uranium is being found, that it is not in a green forest with a babbling brook flowing through it but an isolated area where temperatures go as low as 25 or 26 below, where mud conditions are extreme and where sand and other difficulties are encountered causing a great hardship for those miners who seek to locate claims in these areas.

Senator ANDERSON. I agree with you completely. I wish you would do this, Mr. Palmer, if you have any additional suggestions with regard to this bill or any additional points that are at issue, that you would submit them to the committee.

We do not want you to feel that we are not interested in your opinion. We are very much interested.

Mr. PALMER. Thank you very much.

Senator MALONE. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask Mr. Palmer a couple of questions because I think it might clear up some of the uncertainties in the testimony.

Would you for the record, Mr. Palmer, give us a statement on the coordination of the Federal and State laws as far as the location of mining claims is concerned, whether the Federal laws cover it and the area covered by State laws?

Mr. PALMER. May I call your attention to the fact, Senator, that the State of Colorado and the State of Wyoming have recently amended the location requirements?

Senator MALONE. This is important, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. PALMER. In other words, doing away with the necessity of the former requirement of a 10-foot pit or shaft. Both of those statutes have nothing to do with discovery but simply with location shafts and, under new procedure both in Colorado and Wyoming was adopted permitting other methods of discovery. These State laws were designed to do away with the criticism that bulldozers were being used across the country and ruining the grazing and forestry areas. No longer in these two States, nor in Utah for that matter, is it necessary to sink a location shaft.

I think the practice in Wyoming and Colorado will be to use other methods of discovery of minerals in place rather than digging a pit 10 feet deep; such a shaft is still required in Nevada, I believe.

Senator MALONE. That is a pit?

Mr. PALMER. That is right.

Senator MALONE. Now, you changed the law there so that the required amount of work, $100 worth of assessment work, can be done in a different way?

Mr. PALMER. A drill hole is sufficient.

Senator MALONE. If you spend $100 in diamond drilling, for example, you have done your work?

Mr. PALMER. And make a discovery.

Senator MALONE. That, then, is in the control of the State itself, is it?

Mr. PALMER. Well, the discovery provision is a Federal provision.

Senator MALONE. But the method of discovery?

Mr. PALMER. The method of discovery or the regulation is a matter of State requirement.

Senator MALONE. The discovery that is required by the Federal statute has nothing to do with the type of work?

Mr. PALMER. That is right.

Senator MALONE. Does it specify the amount of work?

Mr. PALMER. It simply is that the accepted definition of a discovery is a mineral in place and such quantities as will justify a reasonable person in pursuing the development of his claim.

Senator MALONE. That is now the law?

Mr. PALMER. That is the law.

Senator MALONE. The point is, then, that there is no requirement in the Federal law that any work be done at all. If you make your discovery in an exposed ledge, that is all that is necessary?

Mr. PALMER. That is right, except the annual assessment requirement of $100 a year.

Senator MALONE. That is a Federal law?

Mr. PALMER. That is a Federal requirement.

Senator MALONE. That is what I wanted to establish for the record. How you do that $100 worth of work is within the purview of the legislature of the State.

Senator ANDERSON. The discretion of the individual, is it not?

Mr. PALMER. The detailed requirements are generally set forth in State legislation on location. I know of no specific provisions on annual assessment work but the courts have

held consistently that the work must be done in improving the property.

Senator MALONE. You say that the law has changed from a 10-foot shaft in Colorado and in Wyoming to allow the work to be done in another manner, like the diamond drilling?

Mr. PALMER. That is right; that is in the establishment of your valid location.

Senator MALONE. And could be by a bulldozer?

Mr. PALMER. It can be done by a bulldozer, yes.

Senator MALONE. In Utah, you say it is still a law that you have to have this 10-foot shaft?

Mr. PALMER. No, it has never been the law in Utah but it is the law in Nevada, I believe.

Senator MALONE. But that has not been changed?

Mr. PALMER. That has not been changed.

Senator MALONE. And you still have to have the 10-foot shaft?

Mr. PALMER. That is right.

Senator MALONE. For discovery?

Mr. PALMER. Yes.

Senator MALONE. And to do the assessment work?

Mr. PALMER. It has nothing to do with the assessment work.

Senator MALONE. Establishing the location?

Mr. PALMER. Establishing the validity of your location; that is right.

Senator MALONE. In other words, if you in Nevada discovered a ledge, outcropping, you still have to sink your 10-foot shaft?

Mr. PALMER. Senator, that is a matter of Nevada law and I am not thoroughly familiar with the court interpretation in your State, but I feel reasonably sure they would follow the same reasoning and procedure which exists in Colorado.

Senator MALONE. But it is the law?

Mr. PALMER. It is the law.

Senator MALONE. Now, as long as that is the law, that you have to have a discovery, then, if I have followed your testimony, all the departments have to do is to enforce the law?

Mr. PALMER. That is correct.

Senator MALONE. Now, I am very much interested in your testimony and your resolution there that this act, if it is passed, be confined to the forest areas.

Does your resolution confine it to the forest areas or the forest reserves?

Mr. PALMER. To the national forests, the reason for that being that the complaint we have read in the press has generally been designed to impress the public with the incorrect idea that miners are going out and making locations in forests and destroying the forest reserves of the Nation.

If that is the intent and purpose of this legislation to correct that, then why should these isolated areas such as I have mentioned in the Four Corners district in which uranium is being found be placed under this particular type of legislation?

Senator MALONE. Is it not a fact that the areas in States like my own State of Nevada are practically all isolated when you get away from the small towns and the population centers?

Mr. PALMER. That is correct.

Senator MALONE. So that what we have been trying to do over the years is to induce people to go out there and do a little digging and to acquire property; is that not right?

Mr. PALMER. That is right.

Senator MALONE. What happens when a man locates a mining claim and he has a valid location filed, keeps up his assessment work; is he subject to the county assessor waiting on him just the same as any other property?

Mr. PALMER. That is correct. In Colorado and in your State they have the right to assess and in Utah they have the right to assess unpatented mining property.

Senator MALONE. That is up to the State?

Mr. PALMER. That is up to the State.

Senator MALONE. The Federal Government does not interfere with it one way or the other?

Mr. PALMER. That is correct.

Senator MALONE. Now, the Federal Government comes in and if there is an income from the sale of this ore or the sale of the property, then the United States Government gets is share according to the law?

Mr. PALMER. That is right.

Senator MALONE. I think you covered this particular question that I had in mind but are you familiar with the fact that prominent officials in this Government, very prominent I might say, are making continual speeches up until last summer that of course we had to defend Belgium in order to get uranium from the Belgian Congo because there was no adequate amount here and that it was just assumed up until very recently that there was no adequate amount of uranium in sight; is that a fact?

Mr. PALMER. That is correct.

I call your attention to the often-cited illustration of a meeting in the Blair House, at which time it was represented that unless certain secrets were disclosed with respect to the manufacture of atomic energy, that our foreign supply of uranium would be curtailed or cut off.

Senator ANDERSON. I have no knowledge of such a meeting.

Mr. PALMER. It was attended by the two Senators from Colorado—Senators Millikin and Johnson. I understand the decision was made that the information would not be disclosed and that the program of the Atomic Energy Commission was adopted which encouraged the production of uranium in the United States and we have found substantial deposits here which many feel would make us self-sufficient in case of an emergency.

Senator ANDERSON. When was that meeting?

Mr. PALMER. Approximately 1948, I would say.

Senator MALONE. There was much publicity at the time, not of the meeting, Mr. Chairman, but evidently the result of this meeting that unless publicity throughout the country fostered by international mining publishers, and I could name a good many of the people that would make us break down and cry, that unless we disclosed these secrets they would do the same thing in uranium that they had recently done in monazite sands in India.

They thought we did not have monazite sands so in peacetime India curtailed the shipment of monazite sands, not that they needed the money but they thought they could blackmail us into another agreement. That is exactly what was attempted under this uranium setup.

Now, this committee rendered a report last August with which the chairman of this committee is fully familiar and assisted in the work, and since that time there have been no such speeches made by any prominent Government official that you had to go across an ocean to get such material. I do not believe there will be any more made because it would be very embarrassing.

I want to call attention to the fact that this publicity is carried forward for another objective, in the opinion of the Senator from Nevada, to carry out something that they want to do, having an objective, and then they use this shortage of this material as a weapon.

Many people want to buy all of the materials from the foreign nations and I guess they are going to accomplish that unless the people rise up and destroy the foundation for it, which I feel they will do in time.

One more question in that regard. The people that have really discovered these minerals and are profiting by it, are they always the experts and engineers that have found them? What kind of people are they?

Mr. PALMER. No; I have stated that most of the men who have been the most successful are the inexperienced prospectors.

One man from Minneapolis found one of the most substantial deposits.

Senator MALONE. Do you think the experts in the Forest Service or the experts in the Bureau of Land Management would be qualified to determine whether a man had a valid location or not?

Mr. PALMER. Well, there has to be some reasonable gage, I will admit that. I will say that even in the opinion of Mr. Woozley, the field examiners have been incorrect in some of their examinations.

Senator ANDERSON. That, however, could likewise be said about some of the people who have made examinations of oil properties?

Mr. PALMER. Correct.

Senator ANDERSON. They said, "You have a good prospect here and a bad prospect there." You develop the bad prospect and get oil and the good prospect is a dud.

Senator MALONE. You are right, Mr. Chairman. For 50 years the geologists said there was no oil in a volcanic area. In Nevada we forgot it, they were experts.

I was in school when they first made that statement. Finally, in Utah some of these wildcatters got off the reservation and spent money in an area where the Bureau of Land Management would not let them locate in the first place and they hit an oil well.

We now have an oil well in the middle of Nevada and the geologists say that it is likely it will spread over a considerable area.

We are all familiar, of course, with the great worry of the Department of the Interior over a couple of decades that we were running out of oil and had to save it. Now it is running out of our ears and we do not know what to do with it, but due to the wildcatters, not the people who come out of Chicago and New York and get these nice jobs down here out of school and immediately become experts.

What is the history of mining? You have been familiar with it, Mr. Palmer, over a long period of years. When these fellows who do not know anything about it go out there and finally get it, 1 out of 5,000 of them because the rest die broke, what becomes of this prospect? Does he carry it through, or does someone with plenty of money set him up as part owner to go on and develop it, or how is it done?

Mr. PALMER. The trend on the plateau at the present time is consolidation with substantial financial interests in the further exploration and development of the properties. I think that has been the history of the mining industry, generally speaking, that many the small miner under trends in world events has been pushed out of business and some more substantial people have been able to take over properties and operate them.

I think that one of the tragedies throughout the United States is the slaughter of the small miners.

In your State of Nevada, I used to attend large meetings where there would be thousands of people who were in the mining business.

In Colorado we used to have thousands of small miners before the uranium boom.

In New Mexico, when I used to address the New Mexico Mining Association, it was composed of a large number of small operators.

I would say that conditions are quite changed today.

Senator MALONE. To what do you attribute the decrease in the number of enthusiastic small prospectors, miners?

Mr. PALMER. Well, there are quite a few factors. I would say that had this committee passed a piece of legislation in which our group was very much interested, or had the Congress passed that legislation, I

think much of the difficulties which exist would have been alleviated.

I think that it has been well established that with cheap transportation from abroad by boat, with low-cost labor abroad, with the international trend that seems to prevail, that it is possible to import materials into the United States at a much lower cost than they can be produced in the United States under American standards of living.

Senator ANDERSON. Could I break in to ask you if you had reference to S. 2105 that we struggled with in this committee as one of the things that might have helped?

Mr. PALMER. I want the chairman to know that the mining people throughout the Rocky Mountain region are still deeply grateful to the chairman and the other members of the committee for the great battle you put up in behalf of that legislation.

Senator ANDERSON. We tried hard. Senator MALONE and I went down together on each one of those rounds.

Senator MALONE. I want to follow just a little further.

Is the fact that we have put our miners in direct competition with these low-wage countries in the matter of the production of these minerals, has that had anything to do with the lack of young people going into this business?

Mr. PALMER. It has made the mining business, up until the incentives which were offered for uranium, very unattractive, and I think that in the event of an emergency in the United States, we are going to find a definite shortage of experienced miners.

Senator MALONE. This uranium incentive, that is a fixed price to 1962?

Mr. PALMER. Right.

Senator MALONE. I predict that after 1962, you will either have to extend the special price or guarantee for a substantial length of time or you will have to have a tariff on uranium to stay in business.

Is it not a fact for as long as I remember, which is quite a considerable length of time, that most of these prospectors and miners that are out there without capital, their chief hope is to discover something of a nature that an engineer that represents capital will come down and look at it?

Is that not the common talk which has been going around for 30 or 40 years?

Mr. PALMER. Well, I think that is correct, Senator.

Senator MALONE. Then the hope is that he will recommend that one of his clients spend a few thousand dollars to go deeper to find out whether he has anything; is that right?

Mr. PALMER. We find that $10,000 for developing a mining claim today is insignificant as compared with a few years ago.

Senator MALONE. Well, that is true, but as long as these people can make money with discovery, if they made a lead discovery or tungsten discovery, generally a prospector had a pretty good idea how rich it had to be to interest anyone but as long as the condition prevailed that when he discovered a deposit of a certain value per ton, they knew they would operate; would they not?

Mr. PALMER. Yes.

Senator MALONE. What is the reason they are not operating there now, that if they make the discovery they still cannot make any money?

Mr. PALMER. That is correct.

Senator MALONE. I think, Mr. Palmer, you have made a great contribution to the testimony. You are the only one, so far, with any mining experience to appear before the committee.

I say again, Mr. Chairman, that I would like very much that the importance of this legislation I have noticed over a period of years that it is not the legislation that you do not pass that hurts the country. If we could have time at the end of this session to hold hearings out through the mining country and get some evidence from people who perhaps cannot afford to come back here on their own and do not represent an association, and do not represent a Government department on an expense account, I believe this committee would be in a much better position to pass on a modification of the mining law.

I wanted to ask once more the question if you would have any particular objection to this act if it were confined to the forest reservation?

Mr. PALMER. That is the resolution of our association, that they would support the bill with that reservation.

Senator MALONE. One more. Does your association, your members, or any association that you know about, have they been flooded with information for a considerable time that they would either take some legislation like this or you would get a more restrictive act?

Mr. PALMER. Yes, I think that is the general sentiment; that was the information which has been passed on and is the explanation which has been given as to why some of the organizations which have felt that strict enforcement of the present law would answer the problem have succumbed and are endorsing this proposal.

Senator ANDERSON. Mr. Palmer, you mean in New Mexico? Have you talked in New Mexico to any miner who has that impression?

I have letters without end from down there and not one has told me that.

Mr. PALMER. That is correct.

Senator ANDERSON. Did Joe Taylor tell you that?

Mr. PALMER. No; Joe Taylor did not.

Senator ANDERSON. Can you find me one that did that I do know?

Mr. PALMER. I have a very high regard for Joe Taylor and I respect his judgment very highly.

Senator ANDERSON. You may.

Mr. PALMER. I think that it is a mistake for mining executives in eastern mining offices to make decisions on legislation as important to the average life of the average miner as this legislation is without consulting with the fellows who day after day are confronted with the problem of making valid locations.

I know there is more understanding in the mind of an executive than in the mind of the average miner. I am fully cognizant of the fact that there are pressures here which must be taken into consideration by the Congress, but I would say without any fear of contradiction that if hearings were held on this proposed legislation in most of the mining camps of the West, that there would be very strong opposition to its passage.

There has been strong opposition expressed to me not only by miners but by very, very prominent geologists and mining engineers whose names I would prefer not to mention. A certain amount of leadership is required here and a certain amount of understanding which I think is being exercised by the leaders of the mining congress and others.

If this is to set a precedent, however, then I feel that in other matters, when additional legislation is introduced it would be very much worthwhile to hold hearings in the areas where the miners themselves can attend and express their feelings.

Senator MALONE. Mr. Chairman, this would be embarrassing to some people, but it is not to me. I know all of these people and some of these larger organizations referred to by the secretary of the Colorado Mining Association. I have the highest regard for them. I think they are very efficiently run, they make money, they are wonderful people, and maybe if I were president of one of the companies I would do just what they are doing, because they are working for their stockholders. I want to say to you that legislation that does not touch those people, or if it does touch them it helps them, because any time you can make a thing more technical, make location a little harder to comply with, make it more technical, you help a going concern, large company, at the expense of the smaller fellow, because this thing, this evolution, is going on all the time.

When a man that did not know anything about uranium at all went out and stuck a stake down, and there are probably 5,000 of them out there that have done the same thing but have not made any money, other than this one man who came out with $10 million. Now, he is not too close from now on to the fellow like he was when he started because he is now doing the best he can to promote the whole setup, but he is not down there with them every day.

People that come in with the money, that an engineer represents, people that will spend $2,000, $5,000, $10,000, $50,000 to develop a prospect that a prospector has found, they are not prospectors, and it is making it easier for them to get this from the prospector because he does not have the money, for example, to do what someone testified to yesterday, that the large operators, they have a man on each claim out there. No prospector can do that. When he makes a new discovery he locates 7 or 8 mining claims around it, and you correct me if I am wrong, Mr. Palmer, you are an attorney long experienced in this business.

You can do your assessment work on one spot if it is reasonable to suppose that you can develop the whole group.

Mr. PALMER. If it tends to improve the whole group.

Senator MALONE. In other words, you do your best to locate along the line of the vein or discovery. Maybe you are right, and maybe you are wrong, but you can do it if you have 5 claims, you can do $500 worth of work on one place if you are reasonably sure that it will develop the whole thing?

Mr. PALMER. That is right.

Senator MALONE. Those things are well established in court, as Mr. Palmer has said.

I want to say to you, Mr. Chairman, one more time. I know a lot of these people. I grew up with them. I surveyed their mining claims in their locations and in their further patents, many of them. A lot of those fellows, if they have a tobacco can in their pocket and a piece of note paper to make the location, that is a secondary consideration.

He looks around for that after he makes his discovery. He gets to his county seat and that is as far as he is going to go, or he sends somebody; that location is made. If he had to file with somebody else or if he has to answer a newspaper advertisement to come in and defend himself, he is simply not going to do it in 99 percent of the cases.

Senator ANDERSON. And of course he does not have to.

Senator MALONE. He does not have to if he does not lose some stuff under this bill.

Senator ANDERSON. Not a thing in the world.

Senator MALONE. In other words, he will lose the timber.

Senator ANDERSON. Not if he needs it for mining.

Senator MALONE. If he does not establish it at that time, he has lost it.

Senator ANDERSON. No; he does not lose it.

Senator MALONE. All right, I will read it to you again. It says that after this notice, 9 consecutive weeks of having it published, that if this man does not come in within 150 days from the date of the first publication of such notice, "which date shall be specified in such notice, a verified statement which shall set forth, as to such unpatented mining claim," and then you have 1, 2, 3, 4, 5. I have already read them into the record.

Senator ANDERSON. Yes.

Senator MALONE. If he does not do that, he is subject to these other provisions.

Senator ANDERSON. Those provisions are that he loses his claim to the surface except what is needed for mining.

Senator MALONE. That is right, but he does not know what is needed for mining until several years have passed.

Senator ANDERSON. He does not have to. This preserves him. This preserves all of his rights.

Senator MALONE. In the meantime, they can take the timber off.

Senator ANDERSON. Exactly, and that is what Senator Millikin has suggested, and that is what we are going to try to correct.

Senator MALONE. I should say that there are several things we need to correct, and one of them is to confine it where the damage is being done.

I have no quarrel with the Forest Service, because we have 5 million acres that I hope to get reclassified sometime to put it out of the Forest Service. We will come to that someday here, because it ought to be in the public-land classification and should not be in the Forest Service at all; that is something we can take up later, because if it is a question then of damage done to timber, and it is more valuable for a forest reserve than anything else, and I hear that statement made all the time that, regardless of the mining location, if it is more valuable for something else, a miner should not be there.

I would go along with that, but, Mr. Chairman, I am very reluctant to go along with a bill that digs these fellows out of the canyons, and they have to come in and make a showing and register with an outfit, with a Federal registration, that they are simply, many of them, not only incapable of making without an attorney which they could not hire, but they do not have the money to come in and do it.

Mr. Palmer, I am very appreciative that you have come before this committee. I think you have assisted in establishing a good record.

Senator ANDERSON. I am, too.

Mr. PALMER. Thank you.

EXPERIENCED MINING EXPERTS EXPRESS VIEWS ON BILL

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I have in my hand a communication from three men who are in the mining business in Reno, Nev.

One of them is Mr. H. B. Chessher, a broker.

The second man is Mr. W. E. (Bill) Sirbeck, an alltime prospector. He does not claim to be an engineer, but I will take his judgment on a piece of ground long before I would take the opinions of the gentlemen who testified before the committee in connection with the pending bill.

The third is Joe E. Riley, who has produced probably more tungsten in Nevada than any other "small" miner anywhere in the West. He did not do it in Washington, D. C., and he did not do it by arguing with a bureau official who had never seen a mine or had never seen any ground that carried any minerals, because such an official would probably have told Joe, who has had only 30 years of experience in mining, that no "prudent man would dig" on that ground.

No prudent man would have dug on much of the ground that Mr. Riley dug on during the last 30 years. He is a well-to-do mining man today, and he made it all in mining because he was not a prudent man.

S. 1713 SHARPLY CRITICIZED

I hold in my hand a memorandum which I received from these three men. It is signed by them. They are men who are listened to in the mining fraternity. One of them is a broker. One is a prospector and miner. The third is a real down-to-earth miner. He is Mr. Riley.

TEXT OF MEMORANDUM

They addressed their memorandum to the senior Senator from Nevada, and in it they say:

It is our opinion that S. 1713, the companion bill to H. R. 5561, is too broad in its powers under sections 1, 4, and 5. Please note that under section 1, the Secretary of the Interior may dispose, under a lease, of any body of sand, stone, gravel, clay, and also timber and forest products, even including brush products, such as yucca, manzanita, mesquite, and cactus. The aforesaid materials and vegetation, in varying proportions, constitute the main part and parcel of any valuable mining claim. How could anyone expect a small mining claim owner to operate his valuable mining claim, and to make improvements thereon, if the Secretary is vested with the power to issue a lease upon the sandstone, gravel, and clay adjoining, or constituting a part of, the claim owner's ore body?

The bill in its present form, if enacted into law, will permit any large mining corporation, if it elects, to conspire to acquire the mining property of a small mining claim owner, to hire any applicant, so inclined, to apply for and obtain, as the henchman for the large mining corporation, a lease upon the sand, stone, gravel, clay, or any other products named in section 1 that might be found on the small mineowner's valuable mining claim, and in such a manner the effort to mine by the small mineowner could be seriously hampered and interfered with.

He could be forced to engage in endless litigation, thereby exhausting his limited resources until forced to sell his valuable mining claim directly or indirectly to the large mining corporation at the latter's price.

We believe that the entire text of said bill is designed and made to act as a vehicle for any large mining corporation to ride roughshod over the small mineowner, all to be done with the aid and assistance of the Secretary, who, if S. 1713 becomes law under its present text, might innocently act as an aid and accomplice to the scheming designs and fraud that might be inflicted upon the small mineowner. No wonder the large mining corporations, as a general rule, are in favor of the passage of S. 1713.

SMELTER SPOKESMAN PRESENTS CONTRASTING VIEW

Mr. President, I come back to the testimony of Mr. Raymond D. Holbrook, the attorney for the United States Smelting, Refining, & Mining Co., and chairman of the public lands committee of the American Mining Congress.

He speaks for the public lands committee of the American Mining Congress, but his real job, and for which he gets paid, is with a large smelting company, which does not prospect in the same way that prospecting is done by the small prospector I have described. They take them over after they have been discovered and developed to the point that their engineers judge there is a good chance to make a mine.

Mr. President, I was in the engineering business for 30 years. Engineers do not discover mines; they turn them down; they break the hearts of prospectors. But when they do see something they want as a result of the work of thousands of prospectors tramping the hills under the 1872 Mining Act, then, according to those authorities in the mining business they could enlist the Federal authorities in acquiring such ground—they say it is water on the wheel of the large mining companies.

SENATOR COMMENDS MINING COMPANIES IN NEVADA

Do not misunderstand me, Mr. President. I am for the large mining companies. There are some of the best and largest mining companies in the whole history of the United States situated in Nevada and Utah. They are all well-run companies. But sometimes they outsmart themselves. Sometimes we have to protect them from themselves. If we get these little fellows out of the hills, which can be done with an act like this, we will not continue to discover new prospects at the rate needed.

Mr. President, the man about whom I have spoken is Raymond B. Holbrook, attorney, United States Mining and Smelting Co., Salt Lake City. He is chairman of the Public Lands Committee of the American Mining Congress and is testifying as such, but his pay comes from the mining company. I think the American Mining Congress is a great organization, but they should not advocate such a radical change in the 1872 mining law without hearings in the public land mining areas.

NEVADA MINING TRIO'S MEMORANDUM CONTINUED

Continuing reading from the memorandum sent me by the three gentlemen in Nevada who are both experienced and prominent in the mining business there:

Section 4 (b) of the proposed law most certainly is viciously designed for creation of the circumstances hereinabove described. Do you believe any buyer would want to purchase a mining claim containing a valuable ore body from a small mine owner if a henchman of a large mining corporation held a lease from the Secretary of Interior upon any of the products named in section 1?

If you do, Mr. President, it shows lack of experience in this business.

Reading further from the memorandum:

The possibilities for continuous and expensive litigation are enormous and the small mine owner with a valuable ore body could be made the victim and ultimate loser at the instigation of the scheming desire of any large mining corporation.

Your attention is respectfully directed to section 5 of the proposed law. It is in effect an attempt to legislate a scheme by enactment of a retroactive law.

It contains the brazen attempt to force the small mining claim owner to hire an attorney and to spend traveling expenses and time for purpose of defending his valid title previously acquired under existing mining law. In other words, by the imposition of section 5 (b), there exists an attempt to take from the small mining claim owner the rights which the courts have repeatedly held were his, as is evidenced by a long list of mining decisions.

By enactment of the proposed law containing section 4, you will observe the bill is so written as to make all unpatented mining claims previously located subject to the stringent forfeitures set forth in section 5 (b) which thereby, under certain conditions which are adverse to the interests of the small mining claim owners, makes previously located mining claims subject to section 4, and if this is not a left-handed attempt to make the proposed law retroactive, then we must admit that we cannot read very well and that we do not understand the English language.

We fully comprehend that section 5 (b) provides that the small-mining-claim owner may prevent his rights being forfeited, and he my prohibit the automatic transition of his previously located mining claim to the application of the terms and conditions of section 4 if he wins the decision in the initial hearing to be conducted and refereed by an employee of the Department of the Interior. Do you believe the small-mining-claim owner will receive fair and equal treatment in such proceedings?

The above-described proceedings make it essential that the small-mining-claim owner shall possess the funds necessary to hire a lawyer and to pay traveling expenses and to lose the time, all being expenses necessary to defend a perfectly valid title against harsh terms and conditions imposed under section 5 (b) (c). We all know that there are thousands of small-mining-claim owners who do not have sufficient funds for purposes aforesaid. Why should any small-mining-claim owner, who has heretofore acquired a perfectly valid title under the existing mining law, be forced to stand the expense, time, and delay in defending his tile in any action brought by the Secretary of the Interior in an attempt to make retroactive, against a previously located mining claim, the proposed terms of sections 4 and 5?

It is our opinion that any attempt to pass S. 1713 and H. R. 5561 should be defeated. All anyone has to do is to read section 7, and in conjunction with the reference to section 5, you will note the subversive attempt to find a way to take advantage of the small-mining-claim owner who is unable to defend his title against vicious attempts of scheming adventurers. They endeavor to impose upon the small-mining-claim owner a series of legal difficulties and costs, which will make retroactive the stringent terms of section 4 if the small-mining-claim owner is financially unable to defend his title, is an act no Member of the United States Senate and House should be a party to.

To force the small-mining-claim owner to defend his title to previously located mining claims throughout a series of hearings, court trials, etc., which the Secretary of the Interior may, under section 5, be authorized to instigate against said small-mining-claim owner if the paid and prejudiced employee of the Department of the Interior, who will sit as a "referee" in the adjudication of the proceedings instigated under sections 4 and 5 of said proposed law, decides in favor of the Secretary of Interior in the initial hearing held under section 5 (c), is a scheme in which no Western United States Senator or United States Representative should participate or permit by voting for passage of said bill.

The small-mining-claim owner, if he elects to fight for his rights, could be kept in litigation for many years, all because the Secretary of the Interior may elect to take away from the small-mining-claim owner, under sections 4 and 5 the vested rights he has previously acquired under the present mining laws. Not only is the proposed bill an attempt to legislate retroactively, but it is also an attempt to confiscate the property of the small-mining-claim owner.

It is our opinion that the present mining laws contain sufficient protection to the people of the United States of America. The present law prohibits acquisition and holding of lands under which there is no valid discovery. Are we to believe that this great and magnificent branch of our Government, the Department of Interior, has to instigate and lobby for a bill designed to deprive the small-mining-claim owner of his rights in order to defeat abortive efforts of certain would-be mining claim locators who attempt without discovery of mineral in place, to acquire and hold parts of the public domain under alleged mining locations?

An alleged fraudulent attempt to unlawfully appropriate parts of the public domain by people who have no intention of mining, should not be the basis for imposing upon the small-mining-claim owner the stringent terms imposed by sections 4 and 5 of said S. 1713. The Department of Interior has plenty of ammunition to correct all abuses of the present mining laws, because the said laws contain sufficient provisions and penalties for removing any fraudulent locaters from the public domain. Is it possible that the Department of Interior wants to take more than that which, by law, it is entitled to take?

We believe you should strive diligently to defeat the passage of S. 1713 and H. R. 5561, and we respectfully petition the exercise of your efforts towards that end.

Respectfully submitted.

H. B. CHESSHER.
W. E. SIRBECK.
JOE E. RILEY.

RENO, NEV.

HEARINGS INADEQUATE ON BILL AFFECTING ALL PUBLIC LANDS IN UNITED STATES

Mr. President, in closing, I do not believe that a bill of this magnitude should be enacted, affecting as it does all the public lands of the United States, practically all of which are located in the 11 Western States, most of them west of the Rocky Mountains, without adequate hearings in the areas affected, and allowing the real prospectors and miners to help work it out.

The hearings in Washington are all right to start with and to end with, but certainly no legislation of this type should be enacted until the areas and the men affected have been heard.

FOREST RESERVE "REMEDY" BEING APPLIED AND SAGEBRUSH JUNIPER

Furthermore, if, as is believed by some persons, attempts have been made to gain control of some forest preserve land by locating mining claims thereon—I do not believe that is possible, because when one makes such a location, he does so subject to all the laws of the land—but if the testimony is to be believed, the chief trouble is to be found in the administration of the forest preserves, and not on the public lands, such as those which are located in my State of Nevada, where there are 5 million acres of forest preserve areas, but a very small acreage of real forests.

I have inspected every square mile in my State, both as State engineer and in my private engineering business. If there are more than 100,000 acres of real merchantable timber in Nevada included in the nearly 5,000,000 acres of forest preserves, I simply have not seen it. The 4,900,000 acres of forest preserve is comprised of sagebrush and of juniper, which ranchers cut for posts, when they can persuade forest officials that it is the right use to put the juniper trees on the public domain.

REAL PARTIES IN INTEREST DESERVE FULL, FAIR HEARING

Secondly, no such far-reaching legislation as embodied in S. 1713 should be passed until those who are vitally affected by it can be heard. The entire 11 Western public land States are affected.

Mr. President, I ask the Senate to defeat the bill.

PROPOSED TARIFF COMMISSION STUDY OF EFFECT ON UNITED STATES TEXTILE INDUSTRY OF RECENT GATT AGREEMENTS

During the delivery of Mr. MALONE'S remarks,

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nevada yield briefly to me?

Mr. MALONE. I am glad to yield to the distinguished Senator from North Carolina.

Mr. THURMOND. Let me point out that I have the honor of being a Senator from the State of South Carolina.

Mr. MALONE. I beg the Senator's pardon; I should have said South Carolina.

Mr. THURMOND. However, either State is a mighty good one.

I thank the Senator from Nevada for yielding to me.

Mr. President, I rise to make a brief statement concerning a resolution which I intend to submit in the Senate, and to inform the Senate of my reasons for proposing such a resolution.

I am deeply concerned as to the likely effects of the recent agreements entered into between this country and other nations on the American Textile Industry and its employees. My information from a reliable source is that the tariff reductions agreed to in the GATT Conference in Geneva will run as high as 27 to 48 percent on the basic products of the textile industry.

As I have pointed out previously on the floor of the Senate, the textile industry of this Nation employs more than one million persons, approximately 133 thousand in South Carolina alone. Related industries in the Nation employ another million persons. In many sections of the Southeast and in New England, the whole economy is directly tied to the healthy operation of the textile industry.

Also, the textile industry is closely allied with production of items essential to national defense.

For these reasons, I am fearful that the agreements made in Geneva at the GATT Conference pose a threat of disaster to the textile industry and its million employees.

Although the agreements entered into were under provisions of the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1951, and do not go into effect until September 10 of this year, I do not believe we should wait until it is too late to protect the people of our great textile industry.

Under statutory authority, the Tariff Commission may by resolution of the Senate be directed to make an investigation of the effect of the agreements entered into at Geneva. I believe it essential that such a study be started immediately on the effective date of the agreements, because of the severity of the tariff reductions entered into at the GATT Conference. In spite of the fact that, under provisions of H. R. 1, which I advocated and supported, no more reductions can be made on the items to which I refer, I now advocate prevention, instead of attempted remedy, of the damage which I fear will be done the textile industry.

The escape clause of the Trade Agreements Act provides that the Tariff Commission shall report if "actual or relative" imports of competitive products "cause or threaten serious injury to the domestic industry producing like or directly competitive products." Under the law, in determining whether cause or threat of injury has arisen, the Tariff Commission must take into consideration a downward trend of production, employment, prices, profits, or wages in the industry or a decline in sales; an increase in imports, either actual or relative to domestic production; a higher or growing inventory; or a decline in the proportion of a domestic market supplied by domestic producers.

Upon receipt of the Tariff Commission report, the President of the United States may make such adjustments in the rates of duty, impose such quotas, or make such other modifications as are found and reported by the Commission to be necessary to prevent or remedy serious injury to the respective domestic industry.

Mr. President, I believe the resolution which I intend to submit should be approved by the Senate as a preventive measure against disaster to a vital industry of the Nation. If the Tariff Commission should determine that no injury has been caused or threatened by the reduction of tariffs agreed to at Geneva, then no harm will have been done by the resolution. But if serious damage or the threat of serious damage is found by the Commission, time will have been saved by the adoption of the resolution which I shall submit. That time saved could well mean the difference between continued operation and curtailment of the operation of many of our textile plants.

Mr. President, I hope every Member of the Senate will give most serious consideration to this matter, and will support the resolution when it is submitted.

I ask unanimous consent to have the text of the proposed resolution printed at this point in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks; and I desire to state that all other Senators are invited to join in sponsoring the resolution.

There being no objection, the text of the resolution proposed to be submitted by Mr. THURMOND was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas the tariff reductions on basic textile products agreed to at the recent negotiations in Geneva amount to as much as 27 to 48 percent of the present tariff rates; and

Whereas more than a million persons are employed in the textile industry of the United States and more than another million are employed in allied industries; and

Whereas in many sections of the Nation the entire economy of a community is tied directly to the healthy operation of the textile industry; and

Whereas the textile industry of this Nation is vital to defense production; and

Whereas the tariff reduction agreements entered into with other nations are scheduled to become effective September 10, 1955, and possibly will damage or pose the threat of damage to the textile industry of the United States: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the United States Tariff Commission is directed to make an investigation pursuant to section 7 of the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1951, as amended, to determine whether any textile product is, as a result, in whole or in part, of the duty or other customs treatment reflecting concessions granted by the United States under the agreement for the accession of Japan to the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade signed at Geneva on June 8, 1955, being imported into the United States in such increased quantities (either actual or relative) as to cause or threaten serious injury to the domestic textile industry producing like or directly competitive products. The investigation required by this resolution shall be commenced with respect to any particular product on the date on which the concessions granted by the United States by the Geneva agreement become effective with respect to such product.

JAPAN AND GATT—TEXTILES AND THINGS

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Carolina yield for a question?

Mr. THURMOND. I yield.

JAPAN TAKEN INTO GATT AS TRADE ACT EXTENDED

Mr. MALONE. Is the Senator from South Carolina aware that while he was voting for a 3-year extension of the 1934 Trade Agreements Act, the Geneva General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade was including Japan as a member of GATT with all rights and privileges, and at that moment was adjusting such duties or tariffs downward on textiles?

Mr. THURMOND. We understand that negotiations were under way at that time. Because we were fearful of the situation with regard to the textile industry, 16 other Senators joined me in submitting amendments which I presented to the Senate Finance Committee, and which were adopted.

Mr. MALONE. Yes.

Mr. THURMOND. The disaster we fear would not develop under the new law, which I voted for this year; I refer to the law as it was amended this year by the amendments reported by the Finance Committee. Instead, the disaster we fear would develop under the old law.

THE TEXTILE INDUSTRY MORTALLY INJURED

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, if the Senator from South Carolina will yield further to me, let me ask him whether or not he understands that the amendments did not check in any way the transfer of constitutional responsibility of Congress for the regulation of our national economy and foreign trade to the President; and that the President has the last word now as he had under the original act of 1934, regardless of the amendments the Senator sponsored; and that the President can lower the duties or tariffs to the extent allowed by the law, without consulting Congress and that Congress has nothing to do with it.

Is he aware that through admitting Japan into GATT, that the President can finish the job on the textile industry, large sectors which are already mortally injured—and that this includes the Senator's great State of South Carolina.

Mr. THURMOND. The old law contained a provision under which if there were a disaster, or threatened disaster, to an industry, either body, the Senate or the House, could adopt a resolution asking the Tariff Commission to investigate the subject. That is all I am asking here. I am asking that there be adopted a resolution requesting the Tariff Commission to investigate the tremendous reduction in tariffs on textile products at the recent GATT Conference.

Mr. MALONE. Then, under the law, what will happen?

Mr. THURMOND. Under the old law the President could take action if the Tariff Commission made a recommendation to him, including the finding that there was a disaster or threatened disaster to any particular industry.

Mr. MALONE. Does the distinguished Senator understand that the President has taken only two affirmative actions as the result of numerous recommendations for relief by the Tariff Commission, which included a finding that harm was being done to an industry since 1934?

Mr. THURMOND. I am not familiar with the number of occasions on which he has acted.

SOUTHERN TEXTILE INDUSTRY ALREADY STRICKEN

Mr. MALONE. If the Senator will further yield, the harm has already been done to the textile industry in South Carolina. It cannot possibly survive the all-out attack from 19-cent-per-hour labor. The damage has already occurred. The industry in South Carolina is like the man who fought with an adversary who wielded a razor. When his adversary slashed at him he stepped back and said, "Never touched me." His antagonist said, "Just try to move your head." [Laughter.] All the industry in South Carolina has to do is to try to move its head. Then it will find out what has happened.

Mr. THURMOND. Under the law which was enacted this year, I feared there would be serious injury, and that is the reason I submitted certain amendments to the Senate Committee on Finance, in which I was joined by other Senators, to protect our textile industry.

Mr. MALONE. The Senator did the best he could and supported the extension of the 1934 Trade Agreements Act.

Mr. THURMOND. I realize now more than ever the importance of the adoption of those amendments. I am very grateful to the Senate Finance Committee and the Senate for including them in the bill.

TRADE ACT EXTENSION IS CAUSE OF INDUSTRY'S WOES

Mr. MALONE. All we had to do was just not extend the 1934 Trade Agreements Act, not just pass anything, and the textile industry in the Senator's State would be back in business, under the 1930 Tariff Act.

Under that act, the Tariff Commission could study the situation and recommend that the adjustable duty or tariff be fixed on the basis of the differential of cost between the wage standard of living, taxes, and other costs of doing business in this country, as compared with costs in the principal competing country on each product.

What is happening to the textile industry in the South now is what happened to it in New England when it

moved to the South because of lower wages than in New England. Now some foreign nation will get the business, paying less wages than your State of South Carolina. It is just as simple as that.

The difference is, of course, that we are one Nation, under one Constitution, and industry gets where the factors of labor, transportation, markets, power, and so forth add up the lowest cost of production.

MULTIPLE USE OF SURFACE OF PUBLIC LANDS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1713) to amend the act of July 31, 1947 (61 Stat. 681), and the mining laws to provide for multiple use of the surface of the same tracts of the public lands, and for other purposes.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, the bill, S. 1713, to provide for multiple surface uses of the public domain, has been very carefully considered by the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. I had the honor of introducing the measure on behalf of the senior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. BARRETT], the junior Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT], the senior Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS], and the senior Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], as well as on my own behalf.

The proposed legislation was drafted and introduced only after very extensive conferences with the executive agencies concerned, and with spokesmen for the industries that would be directly affected, namely, mining, lumbering, and stockgrowing industries, and with conservationists' and sportsmen's groups. At the very outset of the discussion I wish to pay tribute to the cooperation of all of these groups with me and the other sponsors of the bill and the members of the committee staff in our efforts to draft a bill that would meet a situation that is rapidly developing into a national emergency, and yet at the same time not interfere with existing rights or with bona fide mining activities, either now or in the future. I feel that our efforts have been successful in the main, and although the committee has made several amendments to the bill, all of them are of a perfecting or clarifying nature.

Exhaustive hearings on the measure were conducted by the full Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and all of its members had full opportunity to participate actively in questioning witnesses and obtaining complete information. The size of the hearings indicate that this was done. At the hearings spokesmen for all of the groups which would be affected by the measure were heard and cross-examined, as were officials representing the executive agencies concerned with administration. In addition, literally hundreds of letters and telegrams were received by members of the committee, and all were given careful attention.

Mr. President, S. 1713 would achieve its purpose to permit multiple, and more intensive, use of the resources of our public lands and forest lands by the following means:

First. Provide that deposits of common varieties of sand, building stone, gravel, pumice, pumicite, and cinders on the public lands, where they are found in widespread abundance, shall be disposed of under the Materials Act of 1947 rather than under the mining law of 1872.

Second. Amend the Materials Act to give to the Secretary of Agriculture the same authority with respect to those common, widespread materials located on lands under his jurisdiction as that which the Secretary of the Interior has with respect to lands under the jurisdiction of the Secretary of Interior.

Third. Amend the general mining law to prohibit the use of any hereafter located unpatented mining claim for any purpose other than prospecting, mining, processing, and related activities for development of mineral resources.

Fourth. Establish, with respect to mining claims located prior to enactment of S. 1713, particularly as to invalid, abandoned, dormant, or unidentifiable claims, a procedure in the nature of a quiet-title action, whereby the United States could expeditiously resolve uncertainties as to surface rights on such locations.

Mr. President, in view of some of the statements which have been and may be made concerning this measure, I emphasize that the holder of any claim in existence at the time of enactment of this legislation could retain all present rights to any and all surface resources on the claim by establishing, under prescribed procedures, his need for such surface resources for development of the claim's mineral resources. On a claim located after enactment, the locator would have full right to all surface resources of the claim which may be needed for carrying on mining activities.

His rights to subsurface resources remain unchanged on claims located both before and after enactment. Upon proceeding to patent, he would have full title in fee simple absolute, as heretofore, to both surface and subsurface.

Mr. President, mining is a major industry in my own State of New Mexico, as it is in Utah and Wyoming, which are represented in this body by other sponsors of S. 1713. My record as a Member of the House, as Secretary of Agriculture, and as a Member of the Senate shows conclusively that I always have tried to further the development of our mineral resources to the fullest possible extent. I have the most profound respect for the mining law of 1872, and have pride in the achievements that have been made under it.

The mining law of 1872, based as it is on private initiative and free enterprise, should and must be preserved. Senate bill 1713 does not in any way disturb the basic principles of that law.

S. 1713 specifically makes mining activity the dominant use—the "paramount" use, if I may use a word that became famous during our debate on submerged lands—on lands on which valid mining claims have been located. I call the Senate's attention to the provision in section 4 of the bill, found on page 5 beginning at line 19:

> Any use of the surface of any such mining claim by the United States, its permittees or licensees, shall be such as not to endanger or materially interfere with prospecting, mining, or processing operations or uses reasonably incident thereto.

Again, subsection (c) of section 4, page 6, line 15, recognizes that a mining claimant has the first right, the first call on any and all surface resources of his claim which he needs for carrying on activities related to mining. This affirmative right to use surface resources extends to timber he needs on his mine or processing operations, to sand and gravel to build his road, to grass for his mules, and the like.

Again, in section 7 of the bill, the affirmative rights of a mining claimant are recognized and protected, as are the full and unlimited rights of a claimant who proceeds to patent. The section provides:

> SEC. 7. Nothing in this act shall be construed in any manner to limit or restrict or to authorize the limitation or restriction of any existing rights of any claimant under any valid mining claim heretofore located, except as such rights may be limited or restricted as a result of a proceeding pursuant to section 5 of this act, or as a result of a waiver and relinquishment pursuant to section 6 of this act; and nothing in this act shall be construed in any manner to authorize inclusion in any patent hereafter issued under the mining laws of the United States for any mining claim heretofore or hereafter located, of any reservation, limitation, or restriction not otherwise authorized by law.

At this point it might be well to state again that S. 1713 does not in any way interfere with, or have any bearing upon, the full and complete ownership—ownership in fee simple absolute, as the lawyers say—of a mining claimant who proceeds to patent his claim. After enactment of the bill, as at present, a patentee will own both the surface and subsurface, and all their resources—mineral, animal, and vegetable. Both the bill and the report make this fact plain and clear beyond question or doubt.

One member of the committee, the junior Senator from Oregon [Mr. NEUBERGER], did not think the bill went far enough in this respect, and filed individual views, pointing out that a patentee of a mining claim located in forest lands could still get title to 20 acres of valuable timber, with no limit to the number of such 20-acre tracts. By way of reply, I point out to the able Senator that, first, there must be affirmative proof of a bona fide mineral discovery on the claim before a patent will issue on it. In practice, the Department of the Interior sends a minerals surveyor out to the claim, and he must be satisfied, and be able to satisfy the Secretary of the Interior, that ores in commercial quantities and quality have been discovered on the claim. The claimholder must also show he has done at least $500 worth of work on the claim.

During this time, if the claim is located on forest land with valuable standing timber on it, the executive agency administering the surface of the land will have ample opportunity to dispose of those of the surface resources that are not required for mining operation. Therefore, I believe, and the majority of the committee believes, that the danger pointed to by the junior Senator from Oregon is more apparent than real.

Mr. President, the committee report states the factual background of this legislation. The facts speak for themselves as to why it is necessary. It also explains why existing remedies are inadequate. I will not delay the Senate by repeating those facts here, but I commend those sections of the committee report to the attention of the Senate.

Also, I call the Senate's attention to the most impressive list of national organizations which have endorsed the bill.

The Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs earnestly recommends enactment of S. 1713, with the committee amendments.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SCOTT in the chair). The amendments of the committee will be stated.

The amendments of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs were on page 1, line 7, after the word "to", to insert "common varieties of the following: "; on page 2, at the beginning of line 4, to insert "including, for the purposes of this act, land described in the acts of August 28, 1937 (50 Stat. 874), and of June 24, 1954 (68 Stat. 270),"; in line 8, after the word "including", to insert a comma and "but not limited to, the act of June 28, 1934 (48 Stat. 1269), as amended, and"; in line 19, after the word "municipalities", to strike out "or any person"; on page 4, line 3, after the word "except", to insert "that revenues from the lands described in the act of August 28, 1937 (50 Stat. 874), and the act of June 24, 1954 (68 Stat. 270), shall be disposed of in accordance with said acts and except"; on page 5, line 23, after the word "thereto", to insert a colon and "*Provided further*, That if at any time the locator requires more timber for his mining operations than is available to him from the claim after disposition of timber therefrom by the United States, he shall be entitled, free of charge, to be supplied with timber for such requirements from the nearest timber administered by the disposing agency which is ready for harvesting under the rules and regulations of that agency and which is substantially equivalent in kind and quantity to the timber estimated by the disposing agency to have been disposed of from the claim: *Provided further*, That nothing in this act shall be construed as affecting or intended to affect or in any way interfere with or modify the laws of the States which lie wholly or in part westward of the 98th meridian relating to the ownership, control, appropriation, use, and distribution of ground or surface waters within any unpatented mining claim"; on page 7, line 5, after the letter "(a)", to strike out "The Secretary of the Federal Department" and insert "The head of a Federal department or agency"; on page 17, line 8, after the word "any", to insert "reservation"; and in line 9, after the word "law", to insert "or to limit or repeal any existing authority to include any reservation, limitation, or restriction in any such patent, or to limit or restrict any use of the lands covered by any patented or unpatented mining claim by the United States, its lessees, permittees, and licenses which is otherwise authorized by law.", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 1 of the act of July 31, 1947 (61 Stat. 681), is amended to read as follows:

"SECTION 1. The Secretary, under such rules and regulations as he may prescribe, may dispose of mineral materials (including but not limited to common varieties of the following: sand, stone, gravel, pumice, pumicite, cinders, and clay), and vegetative materials (including but not limited to yucca, manzanita, mesquite, cactus, and timber or other forest products) on public lands of the United States, including, for the purposes of this act, land described in the acts of August 28, 1937 (50 Stat. 874), and of June 24, 1954 (68 Stat. 270), if the disposal of such mineral or vegetative materials (1) is not otherwise expressly authorized by law, including, but not limited to, the act of June 28, 1934 (48 Stat. 1269), as amended, and the United States mining laws, and (2) is not expressly prohibited by laws of the United States, and (3) would not be detrimental to the public interest. Such materials may be disposed of only in accordance with the provisions of this act and upon the payment of adequate compensation therefor, to be determined by the Secretary: *Provided, however*, That, to the extent not otherwise authorized by law, the Secretary is authorized in his discretion to permit any Federal, State, or Territorial agency, unit or subdivision, including municipalities, or any association or corporation not organized for profit, to take and remove, without charge, materials and resources subject to this act, for use other than for commercial or industrial purposes or resale. Where the lands have been withdrawn in aid of a function of a Federal department or agency other than the department headed by the Secretary or of a State, Territory, county, municipality, water district or other local governmental subdivision or agency, the Secretary may make disposals under this act only with the consent of such other Federal department or agency or of such State, Territory, or local governmental unit. Nothing in this act shall be construed to apply to lands in any national park, or national monument or to any Indian lands, or lands set aside or held for the use or benefit of Indians, including lands over which jurisdiction has been transferred to the Department of the Interior by Executive order for the use of Indians. As used in this act, the word "Secretary" means the Secretary of the Interior except that it means the Secretary of Agriculture where the lands involved are administered by him for national forest purposes or for the purposes of title III of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act or where withdrawn for the purpose of any other function of the Department of Agriculture."

SEC. 2. That section 3 of the act of July 31, 1947 (61 Stat. 681), as amended by the act of August 31, 1950 (64 Stat. 571), is amended to read as follows:

"All moneys received from the disposal of materials under this act shall be disposed of in the same manner as moneys received from the sale of public lands, except that moneys received from the disposal of materials by the Secretary of Agriculture shall be disposed of in the same manner as other moneys received by the Department of Agriculture from the administration of the lands from which the disposal of materials is made, and except that revenues from the lands described in the act of August 28, 1937 (50 Stat. 874), and the act of June 24, 1954 (68 Stat. 270), shall be disposed of in accordance with said acts and except that moneys received from the disposal of materials from school section lands in Alaska, reserved under section 1 of the act of March 4, 1915 (38 Stat. 1214), shall be set apart as separate and permanent funds in the Territorial Treasury, as provided for income derived from said school section lands pursuant to said act."

SEC. 3. A deposit of common varieties of sand, stone, gravel, pumice, pumicite, or cinders shall not be deemed a valuable mineral deposit within the meaning of the mining laws of the United States so as to give effective validity to any mining claim hereafter located under such mining laws: *Provided, however*, That nothing herein shall affect the validity of any mining location based upon discovery of some other mineral occurring in or in association with such a deposit. "Common varieties" as used in this act does not include deposits of such materials which are valuable because the deposit has some property giving it distinct and special value and does not include so-called "block pumice" which occurs in nature in pieces having one dimension of 2 inches or more.

SEC. 4. (a) Any mining claim hereafter located under the mining laws of the United States shall not be used, prior to issuance of patent therefor, for any purposes other than prospecting, mining, or processing operations and uses reasonably incident thereto.

(b) Rights under any mining claim hereafter located under the mining laws of the United States shall be subject, prior to issuance of patent therefor, to the right of the United States to manage and dispose of the vegetative surface resources thereof and to manage other surface resources thereof (except mineral deposits subject to location under the mining laws of the United States). Any such mining claim shall also be subject, prior to issuance of patent therefor, to the right of the United States, its permittees, and licensees, to use so much of the surface thereof as may be necessary for such purposes or for access to adjacent land: *Provided, however*, That any use of the surface of any such mining claim by the United States, its permittees, or licensees, shall be such as not to endanger or materially interfere with prospecting, mining, or processing operations or uses reasonably incident thereto: *Provided further*, That if at any time the locator requires more timber for his mining operations than is available to him from the claim after disposition of timber therefrom by the United States, he shall be entitled, free of charge, to be supplied with timber for such requirements from the nearest timber administered by the disposing agency which is ready for harvesting under the rules and regulations of that agency and which is substantially equivalent in kind and quantity to the timber estimated by the disposing agency to have been disposed of from the claim: *Provided further*, That nothing in this act shall be construed as affecting or intended to affect or in any way interfere with or modify the laws of the States which lie wholly or in part westward of the 98th meridian relating to the ownership, control, appropriation, use, and distribution of ground or surface waters within any unpatented mining claim.

(c) Except to the extent required for the mining claimant's prospecting, mining, or processing operations and uses reasonably incident thereto, or for the construction of buildings or structures in connection therewith, or to provide clearance for such operations or uses, or to the extent authorized by the United States, no claimant of any mining claim hereafter located under the mining laws of the United States shall, prior to issuance of patent therefor, sever, remove, or use any vegetative or other surface resources thereof which are subject to management or disposition by the United States under the preceding subsection (b). Any severance or removal of timber which is permitted under the exceptions of the preceding sentence, other than severance or removal to provide clearance, shall be in accordance with sound principles of forest management.

SEC. 5. (a) The head of a Federal department or agency which has the responsibility for administering surface resources of any lands belonging to the United States may file as to such lands in the office of the Secretary of the Interior, or in such office as the Secretary of the Interior may designate, a request for publication of notice to mining claimants, for determination of surface rights, which request shall contain a description of the lands covered thereby, showing the section or sections of the public land surveys which embrace the lands covered by such request, or if such lands are unsurveyed, either the section or sections which would probably embrace such lands when the public land surveys are extended to such lands or a tie by courses and distances to an approved United States mineral monument.

The filing of such request for publication shall be accompanied by an affidavit or affidavits of a person or persons over 21 years of age setting forth that the affiant or affiants have examined the lands involved in a reasonable effort to ascertain whether any person or persons were in actual possession of or engaged in the working of such lands or any part thereof, and, if no person or persons were found to be in actual possession of or engaged in the working of said lands or any part thereof on the date of such examination, setting forth such fact, or, if any person or persons were so found to be in actual possession or engaged in such working on the date of such examination, setting forth the name and address of each such person, unless affiant shall have been unable through reasonable inquiry to obtain information as to the name and address of any such person, in which event the affidavit shall set forth fully the nature and results of such inquiry.

The filing of such request for publication shall also be accompanied by the certificate of a title or abstract company, or of a title abstractor, or of an attorney, based upon such company's abstractor's, or attorney's examination of those instruments which are shown by the tract indexes in the county office of record as affecting the lands described in said request, setting forth the name of any person disclosed by said instruments to have an interest in said lands under any unpatented mining claim heretofore located, together with the address of such person if such address is disclosed by such instruments of record. "Tract indexes" as used herein shall mean those indexes, if any, as to surveyed lands identifying instruments as affecting a particular legal subdivision of the public land surveys, and as to unsurveyed lands identifying instruments as affecting a particular probable legal subdivision according to a projected extension of the public land surveys.

Thereupon the Secretary of the Interior, at the expense of the requesting department or agency, shall cause notice to mining claimants to be published in a newspaper having general circulation in the county in which the lands involved are situate.

Such notice shall describe the lands covered by such request, as provided heretofore, and shall notify whomever it may concern that if any person claiming or asserting under, or by virtue of, any unpatented mining claim heretofore located, rights as to such lands or any part thereof, shall fail to file in the office where such request for publication was filed (which office shall be specified in such notice) and within 150 days from the date of the first publication of such notice (which date shall be specified in such notice), a verified statement which shall set forth, as to such unpatented mining claim—

(1) the date of location;

(2) the book and page of recordation of the notice or certificate of location;

(3) the section or sections of the public land surveys which embrace such mining claim; or if such lands are unsurveyed, either the section or sections which would probably embrace such mining claim when the public land surveys are extended to such lands or a tie by courses and distances to an approved United States mineral monument;

(4) whether such claimant is a locator or purchaser under such location; and

(5) the name and address of such claimant and names and addresses so far as known to the claimant of any other person or persons claiming any interest or interests in or under such unpatented mining claim;

such failure shall be conclusively deemed (i) to constitute a waiver and relinquishment by such mining claimant of any right, title, or interest under such mining claim contrary to or in conflict with the limitations or restrictions specified in section 4 of this act as to hereafter located unpatented mining claims, and (ii) to constitute a consent by such mining claimant that such mining claim, prior to issuance of patent therefor, shall be subject to the limitations and restrictions specified in section 4 of this act as to hereafter located unpatented mining claims, and (iii) to preclude thereafter, prior to issuance of patent, any assertion by such mining claimant of any right or title to or interest in or under such mining claim contrary to or in conflict with the limitations or restrictions specified in section 4 of this act as to hereafter located unpatented mining claims.

If such notice is published in a daily paper, it shall be published in the Wednesday issue for 9 consecutive weeks, or, if in a weekly paper, in 9 consecutive issues, or, if in a semiweekly or triweekly paper, in the issue of the same day of each week for 9 consecutive weeks.

Within 15 days after the date of first publication of such notice, the department or agency requesting such publication (1) shall cause a copy of such notice to be personally delivered to or to be mailed by registered mail addressed to each person in possession or engaged in the working of the land whose name and address is shown by an affidavit filed as aforesaid, and to each person who may have filed, as to any lands described in said notice, a request for notices, as provided in subsection (d) of this section 5, and shall cause a copy of such notice to be mailed by registered mail to each person whose name and address is set forth in the title or abstract company's or title abstractor's or attorney's certificate filed as aforesaid, as having an interest in the lands described in said notice under any unpatented mining claim heretofore located, such notice to be directed to such person's address as set forth in such certificate; and (2) shall file in the office where said request for publication was filed an affidavit showing that copies have been so delivered or mailed.

(b) If any claimant under any unpatented mining claim heretofore located which embraces any of the lands described in any notice published in accordance with the provisions of subsection (a) of this section 5, shall fail to file a verified statement, as above provided, within 150 days from the date of the first publication of such notice, such failure shall be conclusively deemed, except as otherwise provided in subsection (e) of this section 5, (i) to constitute a waiver and relinquishment by such mining claimant of any right, title, or interest under such mining claim contrary to or in conflict with the limitations or restrictions specified in section 4 of this act as to hereafter located unpatented mining claims, and (ii) to constitute a consent by such mining claimant that such mining claim, prior to issuance of patent therefor, shall be subject to the limitations and restrictions specified in section 4 of this act as to hereafter located unpatented mining claims, and (iii) to preclude thereafter, prior to issuance of patent, any assertion by such mining claimant of any right or title to or interest in or under such mining claim contrary to or in conflict with the limitations or restrictions specified in section 4 of this act as to hereafter located unpatented mining claims.

(c) If any verified statement shall be filed by a mining claimant as provided in subsection (a) of this section 5, then the Secretary of the Interior shall fix a time and place for a hearing to determine the validity and effectiveness of any right or title to, or interest in or under such mining claim, which the mining claimant may assert contrary to or in conflict with the limitations and restrictions specified in section 4 of this act as to hereafter located unpatented mining claims, which place of hearing shall be in the county where the lands in question or parts thereof are located, unless the mining claimant agrees otherwise. Where verified statements are filed asserting rights to an aggregate of more than 20 mining claims, any single hearing shall be limited to a maximum of 20 mining claims unless the parties affected shall otherwise stipulate and as many separate hearings shall be set as shall be necessary to comply with this provision. The procedures with respect to notice of such a hearing and the conduct thereof, and in respect to appeals shall follow the then established general procedures and rules of practice of the Department of the Interior in respect to contests or protests affecting public lands of the United States. If, pursuant to such a hearing the final decision rendered in the matter shall affirm the validity and effectiveness of any mining claimant's so asserted right or interest under the mining claim, then no subsequent proceedings under this section 5 of this act shall have any force or effect upon the so-affirmed right or interest of such mining claimant under such mining claim. If at any time prior to a hearing the department or agency requesting publication of notice and any person filing a verified statement pursuant to such notice shall so stipulate, then to the extent so stipulated, but only to such extent, no hearing shall be held with respect to rights asserted under that verified statement, and to the extent defined by the stipulation the rights asserted under that verified statement shall be deemed to be unaffected by that particular published notice.

(d) Any person claiming any right under or by virtue of any unpatented mining claim heretofore located and desiring to receive a copy of any notice to mining claimants which may be published as above provided in subsection (a) of this section 5, and which may affect lands embraced in such mining claim, may cause to be filed for record in the county office of record where the notice or certificate of location of such mining claim shall have been recorded, a duly acknowledged request for a copy of any such notice. Such request for copies shall set forth the name and address of the person requesting copies and shall also set forth, as to each heretofore located unpatented mining claim under which such person asserts rights—

(1) the date of location;

(2) the book and page of the recordation of the notice or certificate of location; and

(3) the section or sections of the public land surveys which embrace such mining claim; or if such lands are unsurveyed, either the section or sections which would probably embrace such mining claim when the public land surveys are extended to such lands or a tie by courses and distances to an approved United States mineral monument.

Other than in respect to the requirements of subsection (a) of this section 5 as to personal delivery or mailing of copies of notices and in respect to the provisions of subsection (e) of this section 5, no such request for copies of published notices and no statement or allegation in such request and no recordation thereof shall affect title to any mining claim or to any land or be deemed to constitute constructive notice to any per-

son that the person requesting copies has, or claims, any right, title, or interest in or under any mining claim referred to in such request.

(e) If any department or agency requesting publication shall fail to comply with the requirements of subsection (a) of this section 5 as to the personal delivery or mailing of a copy of notice to any person, the publication of such notice shall be deemed wholly ineffectual as to that person or as to the rights asserted by that person and the failure of that person to file a verified statement, as provided in such notice, shall in no manner affect, diminish, prejudice or bar any rights of that person.

SEC. 6. The owner or owners of any unpatented mining claim heretofore located may waive and relinquish all rights thereunder which are contrary to or in conflict with the limitations or restrictions specified in section 4 of this act as to hereafter located unpatented mining claims. The execution and acknowledgment of such a waiver and relinquishment by such owner or owners and the recordation thereof in the office where the notice or certificate of location of such mining claim is of record shall render such mining claim thereafter and prior to issuance of patent subject to the limitations and restrictions in section 4 of this act in all respects as if said mining claim had been located after enactment of this act, but no such waiver or relinquishment shall be deemed in any manner to constitute any concession as to the date of priority of rights under said mining claim or as to the validity thereof.

SEC. 7. Nothing in this act shall be construed in any manner to limit or restrict or to authorize the limitation or restriction of any existing rights of any claimant under any valid mining claim heretofore located, except as such rights may be limited or restricted as a result of a proceeding pursuant to section 5 of this act, or as a result of a waiver and relinquishment pursuant to section 6 of this act; and nothing in this act shall be construed in any manner to authorize inclusion in any patent hereafter issued under the mining laws of the United States for any mining claim heretofore or hereafter located, of any reservation, limitation, or restriction not otherwise authorized by law, or to limit or repeal any existing authority to include any reservation, limitation, or restriction in any such patent, or to limit or restrict any use of the lands covered by any patented or unpatented mining claim by the United States, its lessees, permittees, and licensees which is otherwise authorized by law.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendments reported by the committee.

The amendments were agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of H. R. 5891, a bill to amend the act of July 31, 1947 (61 Stat. 681), and the mining laws to provide for multiple use of the surface of the same tracts of the public lands, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from New Mexico.

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

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I move to strike out all after the enacting clause of H. R. 5891 and to insert in lieu thereof the provisions of S. 1713, as amended.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from New Mexico.

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question now is on the engrossment of the amendment and the third reading of the bill.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question now is, Shall the bill pass?

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Flanders	McClellan
Allott	Frear	McNamara
Anderson	Fulbright	Millikin
Barkley	Gore	Monroney
Barrett	Green	Morse
Beall	Hayden	Mundt
Bender	Hennings	Neely
Bennett	Hickenlooper	Neuberger
Bible	Hill	O'Mahoney
Bricker	Holland	Pastore
Bridges	Hruska	Payne
Bush	Humphrey	Potter
Butler	Ives	Purtell
Byrd	Jackson	Robertson
Capehart	Jenner	Russell
Carlson	Johnson, Tex.	Saltonstall
Case, N. J.	Johnston, S. C.	Schoeppel
Case, S. Dak.	Kefauver	Scott
Chavez	Kerr	Smathers
Clements	Kilgore	Smith, Maine
Cotton	Knowland	Sparkman
Curtis	Kuchel	Stennis
Daniel	Lehman	Symington
Douglas	Long	Thurmond
Duff	Malone	Thye
Dworshak	Mansfield	Watkins
Eastland	Martin, Iowa	Williams
Ellender	Martin, Pa.	Young
Ervin	McCarthy	

Mr. CLEMENTS. I announce that the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] and the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] is unavoidably absent.

The Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] is absent by leave of the Senate to attend the International Labor Organization meeing in Geneva, Switzerland.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. WELKER], and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] is absent on official business for the Committee on Appropriations.

The Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] is necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is present.

The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall it pass?

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I wish to explain the bill for the benefit of the Senators who have entered the Chamber since the debate began.

H. R. 5891 GRANTS MORE POWER TO BUREAUCRATS

There is before the Senate a mining bill, House bill 5891, and S. 1713 which would place Washington officials, the heads of Government bureaus, in charge of prospectors and miners who have located mining claims on public lands under the 1872 Mining Act, and destroy much of their rights to hold it without undue interference from such bureau officials.

The 1872 act provided that any man, with or without capital, who made a discovery and set a stake down marking it, had 30 days to set his corners, and a certain length of time to do his assessment work.

Then, if he did $100 worth of assessment work a year—and such a requirement could be changed at any time, if $100 were deemed to be not enough, or too much—he could, by filing with the county recorder's office in his county affidavits to show that the assessment work had been done, hold the mining claim, just as a patented claim was held. After he had done $500 worth of work and had a valid discovery, and a mineral surveyor, who was under $5,000 bond, had made affidavit as to his discovery and to the $500 worth of work, the claim could be patented when the survey was completed and certain State and Government fees were paid.

HISTORIC ACT PROTECTED PROSPECTOR AND GOVERNMENT

The Government and the prospector were fully protected. I was a licensed mineral surveyor in two States, California and Nevada, for 25 or 30 years, in connection with my engineering business. If the affidavit of the licensed mineral surveyor proved to be wrong, he forfeited his bond and lost his license.

What is being sought is to place in the hands of the Bureau of Land Management, under the direction of persons who never understood mining, and are not required to understand it in their jobs, the authority to say that "no prudent man" would dig where a certain prospector was digging; therefore, he must abandon his claim. I say to Members of the Senate that no prudent man would dig where 98 percent of the prospectors dig because a prospector is not a prudent man and he is the man who discovers mines.

AREA HEARINGS ASKED BEFORE VOTE ON BUREAUCRATIC BILL

All I ask today, Mr. President, is that hearings be held in the mining areas—the public-land areas of this Nation—which is the 11 Western States. No such hearings were held on the pending bill.

The bill was cooked up in Washington. Eight or ten witnesses were heard. Only one had ever been even remotely connected with actual mining. An attorney for a mining company was one of the principal witnesses.

ONLY ONE ACTUAL MINING MAN HEARD ON MINING BILL

One witness, Robert S. Palmer, executive vice president of the Colorado Mining Association, is actually in the mining business and knows most of the miners of the West. He opposed the bill on the same ground the senior Senator from Nevada is opposing its passage—that no hearings have been held in the mining areas; that no small miner or prospector had had a chance to be heard.

Mr. President, any improvement of the 1872 Mining Act should be decided upon after hearings in the actual mining areas.

So, Mr. President, I move that House bill 5891 be referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs for that purpose, and I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE].

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were not ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE] to refer House bill 5891 to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

The motion was rejected.

RESTRICTION OF BILL TO FOREST SERVICE LANDS SOUGHT

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I move that the terms of the bill be confined to the Forest Service acreage of the public land States. I do so because practically all the evidence was to the effect that the objection to the act was that invalid locations were made within the national forests with the objective of getting possession of timber.

On the other hand, we of the mining country know that it is impossible to have an invalid location on the forest lands or any public lands if the bureaus do their work.

However, if the pending bill is bound to be put through today, I move that the terms of the bill be confined to the acreage located within the forest reserves.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is not open to amendment at this time.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, a point of order. As I understand, the bill is not open to amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It is not open to amendment.

Mr. MALONE. What is the parliamentary situation?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the final passage of the bill. The amendment is not in order. The bill has been read the third time. It is open to amendment only by unanimous consent.

AMENDMENT PERMITTED BY UNANIMOUS CONSENT

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I be allowed to offer an amendment, because I was trying to be courteous to the proponents of the bill, and I inadvertently allowed the bill to be read the third time before I offered my amendment. I ask unanimous consent that I be allowed to offer the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Nevada? (After a pause): The Chair hears none, and the Senator from Nevada may offer his amendment.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, what is the parliamentary situation?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Nevada.

Mr. MALONE. I proposed the amendment when I thought the bill was open for amendment. I propose in the amendment that the area affected by the bill shall be confined to the forest reserves.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment offered by the Senator from Nevada.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I rise merely to request that the Senate reject the amendment. It is impossible to segregate at this time the forest lands from the rest of the lands. This proposal was presented to the committee, and it was voted down in the committee. It will be impossible to segregate the sections of the bill at this time. I ask that the amendment be rejected.

EXPLANATION ASKED

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I should like to have the Senator from New Mexico explain to the Senator from Nevada how it is impossible to determine the acreage to which the bill would be confined under my amendment. May I ask for an explanation?

Mr. ANDERSON. It is impossible to segregate the sections quickly under an amendment like this. The bill is an inclusive bill, and the Senator's motion is that we strike out everything in the bill except the forest lands. I know of no easy way of doing it. That is why I hope the amendment will be voted down.

SOLE QUESTION IS WHAT ACTION SENATE WANTS TO TAKE

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, it is not a question of whether it is easy to do it or not. It is a question of whether the terms of the bill should be confined to the forest reserves.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. President, I am opposed to the Senator's amendment. The purpose of his amendment is to make the bill effective only as to lands in the forest reserves and leave the public-domain lands in their present status. We are having a rush of uranium mining claim-filings in our State at this time. We need this bill to protect those people who presently have acquired the right to use these public lands for grazing and other purposes. Under the Senator's amendment a person might file a uranium-mining claim or any other mining claim on lands leased by the Government under the Taylor Grazing Act and acquire the right to the exclusive use of the surface resources and could exclude the person having the right to use the surface from the land. We need this bill just as badly for the public-domain lands as it is needed for the national forest lands. This is a good bill and will correct abuses that have existed for many years and will not interfere with legitimate mining operations.

SENATOR URGES MINERS BE PERMITTED TO BE HEARD

Mr. MALONE. That is the reason I moved to refer the bill to committee and to hold hearings in the Western States, and in that way permit the miners to be heard on this subject most important to them.

I further say to the Senator from Wyoming that his own State can determine the kind of assessment work that must be done. His State can make that determination through its own legislature.

Mr. BARRETT. Many of the mining claimants in my State and the people who use the surface of the public lands have discussed the matter on many occasions. It seems to me that the general opinion of the people of Wyoming is in favor of the pending bill. They are opposed to the provisions of the Senator's amendment, because they feel they need some protection on the public lands as well as they do on the forest lands. They believe this bill will work out to the best interests not only of the people who use the surface resources but also to the miners themselves and to the public generally.

BILL BEING THRUST DOWN MINERS' THROATS

Mr. MALONE. In answer to the distinguished Senator from Wyoming, I would say that in my own State—and I have discussed the matter with every State mining association in the West—people have been told numerous times in the past 2 years, "You will take this bill, or something worse."

I ask for the yeas and nays on the amendment.

The yeas and nays were not ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE].

The amendment was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Shall the bill pass?

The bill was read the third time, and passed.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that S. 1713 be indefinitely postponed.

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

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, its reading clerk, announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3005) to further amend the Universal Military Training and Service Act by extending the authority to induct certain individuals, and to extend the benefits under the Dependents Assistance Act to July 1, 1959.

AMENDMENT OF UNIVERSAL MILITARY TRAINING AND SERVICE ACT—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I submit a report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3005) to further amend the Universal Military Training and Service Act by extending the authority to induct certain individuals, and to extend the benefits under the Dependents Assistance Act to July 1, 1959. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The report will be read for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read the report.

(For conference report, see House proceedings of today.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the report?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, will the Senator from Georgia yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Will the Senator state what amendment was made?

Mr. RUSSELL. There was no substantial amendment to the bill as passed by the Senate. The Senate conferees agreed to a reduction in the maximum age at time of induction of medical registrants from 51 to 46 years. That is the only substantial change made in the bill as it was passed by the Senate. The House agreed to the Senate provisions relating to the National Guard.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Including, I presume, the provision that a man who enlisted in the National Guard at the age of 18½ would not be subject to the induction after he reached 28 years.

Mr. RUSSELL. That is correct. The House conferees agreed to the other changes made by the Senate.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I think the conferees on the part of the Senate did their duty in splendid fashion.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The report was agreed to.

AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 542, S. 2220.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will state the bill by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 2220) to authorize appropriations for the Atomic Energy Commission for the construction of plants and facilities, including acquisition or condemnation of real property or facilities, and for other purposes.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I ask the Chair to lay before the Senate a similar bill which has been passed by the House of Representatives.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair lays before the Senate a bill coming over from the House of Representatives.

The bill (H. R. 6795) to authorize appropriations for the Atomic Energy Commission for acquisition or condemnation of real property or any facilities, or for plant or facility acquisition, construction, or expansion, and for other purposes; was read twice by its title.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, at this stage, H. R. 6795 is identical with S. 2220, which has been considered and reported to the Senate by the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy. I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of H. R. 6795, in place of S. 2220.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from New Mexico?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 6795), to authorize appropriations for the Atomic Energy Commission for acquisition or condemnation of real property or any facilities, or for plant or facility acquisition, construction, or expansion, and for other purposes.

THE DIXON-YATES CONTRACT

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, at this time I wish to speak and inform my colleagues about a shocking piece of duplicity in connection with the handling, by a group of public utilities, of a contract known as the Dixon-Yates deal.

I desire to bring to the attention of the Senate the shocking effort to cover up an employee of the Federal Government, a consultant to the Bureau of the Budget, who with his associates obtained business for the corporation by which he was employed, thus carrying water on both shoulders, representing both the Government and the other side in this outrageous transaction.

I wish to show, Mr. President, the effort of a committee of Congress to secure the facts about this deal, and the apparent effort to conceal and hide the true facts from the Members of Congress and the public, notwithstanding an earlier pronouncement that the complete information from the inception to the end would be made public.

In what I shall say this afternoon, I shall bring out other examples showing that the more we delve into this contract, the more scandalous it becomes and the more it approaches the point of suggested violation of criminal law, which ought to be looked into by the Attorney General of the United States. I think committees of Congress which have charge of legislation looking to the consummation of this deal should be fully informed about what has taken place.

Mr. President, in the beginning, a great deal of criticism had been made of the fact that a contract, which was entered into without competition and which was wasteful of the Government's money, had been personally ordered to be executed with specific persons by the President of the United States. This is the first time in the history of this Nation that such an order, overruling the vote of the then existing members of an independent commission, has ever been made. After this order had been criticized, the President of the United States, in a press conference on August 18, 1954, declared that all the information and details from the beginning to the end were public information and could be seen by any members of the press, individually or together. Much was made, as shown by newspapers of that date, that all the facts and circumstances, documents, and all information about the contract were going to be made public. I have here, as an example, a copy of the Washington Post and Times Herald with a front-page story, in which it is stated:

> The President said every action he had taken in the matter of the contract was on record, and added that anyone could go to the files of the Bureau of the Budget and the Atomic Energy Commission and get the whole story.

I also have before me a copy of the New York Times, quoting the same thing said by the President of the United States.

I should like to read exactly what the President had to say about wanting all the facts about this matter made public, quoting the paraphrase published in line with the policy of not directly quoting the President. It is a quotation from press conferences, the New York Times, and other newspapers:

> He said he was not going to defend himself, as he had told reporters time and time again he should not. He merely said that of course he approved the recommendations for this action and every single official action he took involving contractual relationships of the United States with anybody, and except when the question of national security was directly involved it was open to the public. Any one of you present may, singly or in an investigation group, go to the Bureau of the Budget and to the Chief of the Atomic Energy Commission and get the complete record from the inception of the idea to this very minute.

That was all he had to say about it.

Mr. President, following the August 18, 1954, statement, that all the facts about this matter were public property and that anyone could see the reports, and so forth, Mr. Hughes, the Director of the Budget, appearing before the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, made a similar statement, namely, that all the facts had been made public. Admiral Strauss made a similar statement before the joint committee. They undertook to issue a mimeographed release from both agencies giving the chronology and the history of what had taken place in connection with the negotiations and everything relating to the so-called Dixon-Yates contract. The chronology is found in the hearings before the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy of November 12 and 13, 1954.

It has been increasingly apparent, from bits of information which have been coming out piecemeal from time to time, that the chronology and information given out by the Atomic Energy Commission and the Bureau of the Budget are not complete; that very important meetings, in which important aspects of the contract were discussed and decided upon, were not reported in the chronology, as I shall show in a little while.

Also, it has become apparent, by piecemeal bits of evidence, that persons who were at the meeting and played an important part in the policy decision were not named in the chronology.

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

Mr. KEFAUVER. I yield.

Mr. BUTLER. Does the Senator refer to Mr. Wenzell when he says that

persons who made important policy decisions were not named in the chronology?

Mr. KEFAUVER. He is one of the persons to whom I am referring.

Mr. BUTLER. Did not the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, Mr. Hughes, testify yesterday under oath that Mr. Wenzell was a member of the staff, a mere consultant, and for that reason he had not mentioned Mr. Wenzell, or any other members of the staff, as distinct from persons who made policy, such as Mr. Strauss, or himself, as Director of the Bureau of the Budget?

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Hughes, of course, tried to explain the failure to mention this important figure who negotiated in this matter. But Mr. Hughes was most conflicting in his testimony. He has refused to divulge the full facts about this matter, as I shall show later; and the President of the United States, too, is trying to cover up. There is evidence that that is taking place.

So it is necessary to rely upon other testimony, which shows conclusively that important meetings were held, which were not in the chronology, and that Mr. Wenzell played a very important part in the matter.

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

Mr. KEFAUVER. I yield.

Mr. BUTLER. Did not Mr. Hughes further testify under oath that Mr. Wenzell had nothing whatsoever to do with the establishment of policy? That the policy had been determined before Mr. Wenzell was called in, and that he was called in solely to give technical aid on only one phase of the matter, namely, the financing?

Mr. KEFAUVER. Yes; Mr. Hughes had one idea of what was important policy; but, to me, it is important that Mr. Wenzell was the genius who, in the first place, helped work up the whole arrangement for the liquidation, or the attempted liquidation, of the Tennessee Valley Authority. He was connected with the Bureau of the Budget and was one of the engineers of the whole idea of destroying or cutting down the public-power program of the United States, in connection with supplying power to such agencies as the TVA. That is the subject matter of a report made by Mr. Wenzell in September 1953, and there is evidence that that was what he was working on. It is that report which is now being concealed and is not being released.

Mr. Hughes stated in a letter to the senior Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL] that Mr. Wenzell was working on the whole matter, so we must take it that he played an important part in the making of policy. If that be not true, what has the Commission or the Bureau of the Budget to hide or conceal at present? Why do they not put the facts on the table, as they said they would do?

Mr. BUTLER. Is not the Senator well aware of the fact that the executive branch must have some reasonable rule or regulation in connection with the inspection of their files? To throw all the executive department files open to any Member of Congress who sought to look into them certainly would be a violation of the doctrine of the separation of powers and would be destructive, I think, of good government.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I appreciate the statement by the Senator from Maryland. In some cases there are precedents for allowing the executive department files to be examined by committees of Congress.

But if the President did not want the facts to be known, if he did not want the files to be examined, if there was something he did not want the public to know about, then I see no justification for his statement of August 18, 1954, with all the fanfare accompanying it, changing that order, and inviting the public to see all the facts.

Mr. BUTLER. I respectfully say to the Senator from Tennessee that there has been no concealment whatsoever. Mr. Hughes came before the subcommittee——

Mr. KEFAUVER. If the Senator from Maryland will stay around, I think even he will agree that there has been very substantial concealment. If there has been no concealment, why do not the persons concerned stand by the word of the President? Why does not the President stand by his own word and let Congress and the public have the facts?

Mr. BUTLER. I answer the Senator from Tennessee by saying that the President has stood by his word, and that the subcommittee of which the Senator from Tennessee is chairman has received full and complete information in connection with the contract.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I shall develop that point. The Senator from Maryland was present when the officials concerned said they would let our staff have certain information.

Mr. BUTLER. I made certain that the record showed that when Mr. Hughes said the Senator from Tennessee could have access to the record, it would be in accordance with the terms of the Executive order of the President. The record is clear on that point.

Mr. KEFAUVER. The record is not clear. The record shows that the President held himself out as wanting the public to have the facts. The record is clear that the executive branch is now concealing them and is covering them up. They now do not want Congress and the public to have the facts.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Hughes is not that kind of man. He appeared before the subcommittee headed by the Senator from Tennessee, submitted to an oath, and told the truth. He has told the Senator from Tennessee that there is no additional information.

Mr. KEFAUVER. If the Senator from Maryland will be seated and will listen to my statement, I think he will be convinced that there is additional information. That will be developed as I proceed.

Mr. BUTLER. I do not intend to let the RECORD stand containing the statement that Mr. Hughes unequivocally said that the Senator from Tennessee or his staff could have access to the files, because Mr. Hughes did not so state. The record clearly shows he did not say what the Senator says he said.

Mr. KEFAUVER. The President of the United States said it. Now the President will not let the committee have all the information.

But if the Senator from Maryland will sit down and listen, I think he will agree that very important facts about the matter are being concealed, and that the executive branch does not want the public to learn about them.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I refuse to yield further at this point.

It has been brought out, for instance, that Mr. Adolphe Wenzell, beginning in May 1953, was employed by the Bureau of the Budget as a consultant. He became an employee of the United States and was paid a fee of $10 a day and his traveling expenses back and forth. From May 1953 to September 1953, he worked intermittently for the Bureau of the Budget.

It is important to consider who Mr. Wenzell is. Since 1934, he had been vice president of the First Boston Corp., which is an investment banking concern specializing in utility financing.

For the past 10 years, in addition to being vice president, he has been a director of the First Boston Corp., and he was a director at the time he was working for the Government.

It is shown by Mr. Hughes' own testimony and by his letter to the senior Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL] that during the first period of time Mr. Wenzell worked upon the general matter of public versus private power, namely, costs, TVA methods of financing as opposed to private power methods of financing, and the like. That is contained in a letter which I shall introduce shortly. So, Mr. Wenzell participated in getting the facts together, upon which a very important decision has been made.

It is not easy to understand how in a campaign in October 1952, the Republican candidate for President of the United States promised, not once but several times, that he would fully support the Tennessee Valley Authority; that it would be continued to be operated at maximum efficiency; and that the people living in the Tennessee Valley Authority area did not have anything to fear from the Republican candidate for President of the United States; while later there was a complete reversal, and the TVA was labeled "creeping socialism."

There was a policy change; the factual situation was developed to bring about that policy change. Now there is evidence to warrant the belief that Mr. Wenzell, working both for the First Boston Corp. and for the Government of the United States, even though his activity in the matter was carefully concealed, is the man who played an important part in the policy decision.

Mr. Wenzell came back to the service of the Government. In January, Mr. Hughes himself called him on the telephone and asked him to come back. Mr. Wenzell participated in making the financial arrangements as to interest for the Dixon-Yates group. He read the contract, and helped in its preparation.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McNAMARA in the chair). Does the Senator from Tennessee yield to the Senator from Maryland?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I yield.

Mr. BUTLER. I sat through all the hearings about which the Senator is talking. Mr. Hughes, under oath, said that when he called Mr. Wenzell in, he was called in for only one purpose, and that was to look into the interest rate so that the Bureau of the Budget would be in a position to know whether or not it ought to accept one or the other of the offers which it contemplated would be made in connection with the building of the plant. There was no mention whatever that I heard during the hearing of his having conferred with the Dixon-Yates group. He expressly denied he knew the Dixon-Yates group was in it. He was dealing with a purely technical question.

Mr. KEFAUVER. It is quite apparent that the Senator from Maryland does not have the record. Mr. Hughes, himself, in his sworn testimony before the SEC, which I was about to read, and shall read in a few minutes, testified Mr. Wenzell was in Washington working for both his corporation and the Government; that he did talk with the Dixon-Yates group, and that Mr. Hughes called him here.

Mr. BUTLER. That may be perfectly true, but Mr. Hughes' testimony was that he never knew anything about it.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I am not going to become too excited about Mr. Hughes' testimony, because he said he did not know the First Boston Corp. was in the picture.

Mr. BUTLER. That is the point I am making. He said he knew nothing whatever about it. The remarks of the Senator from Tennessee impugn his integrity and honesty.

Mr. KEFAUVER. If he is impugned, he has impugned himself. He said he did not know anything about the First Boston Corp., but later he said that the First Boston Corp. was not going to get any fee. Every statement I have made on the floor will be documented by sworn proof presented either before the SEC or before the committees of Congress, if the Senator will allow me to develop my facts.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I yield to the Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. In view of what has now been said, I should like to ask leave to read into the RECORD at this point from the transcript of yesterday's testimony. The testimony appears beginning on page 44. Having addressed the chairman of the committee, I asked a few questions of the witness, Mr. Hughes. Let me read them, as follows:

Senator O'MAHONEY. You had called him down?

"Him" referred to Mr. Wenzell.

I tried to summarize all of the subjects and the matters that would be under discussion between you, and your answer was that you didn't remember all of that.

So now I want you to, if you will, give us two questions that you submitted to Mr. Wenzell when he came down in response to your call. Give me two things that you asked him to discuss with you and that justified your calling him in.

Mr. HUGHES. He would have to—he sat in, he sat in a discussion of a number of the conferences when he had a staff discussion of these various phases of the operation.

Senator O'MAHONEY. Well, name one phase.

Mr. HUGHES. Proposal——

Senator O'MAHONEY. Name one phase.

Mr. HUGHES. One particularly was the interest costs; that was one thing we wanted to get him in primarily.

Senator O'MAHONEY. The interest costs on the bonds?

Mr. HUGHES. That is right, what they could be financed for.

Another thing was what kind of a percentage could be paid against equity with bond financing; that we didn't know anything about at all.

Senator O'MAHONEY. Then you were aware of the fact that the equity in this deal was the capital of the generating company, $5,500,000?

Mr. HUGHES. It had not reached that stage at that time, Senator.

Senator O'MAHONEY. Well, that was the agreed-upon capital, was it not?

Mr. HUGHES. Finally; yes.

Senator O'MAHONEY. You were there when it was agreed upon, that the capital would be $5,500,000, and the debt $92,914,000?

Mr. HUGHES. Which is about 5 percent. The question was whether it should be 5 percent or 10 percent, or what the ratio should be to have the bonds the best marketable security.

Senator O'MAHONEY. Well, were you and Wenzell in conference on the determination of the question of the disparity between equity and debt, $5.5 million—

I had not finished my question when Mr. Hughes answered:

Mr. HUGHES. Along with many others.

It will be seen, Mr. President, that my question to Mr. Hughes was:

Well, were you and Wenzell in conference on the determination of the question of the disparity between equity and debt, $5.5 million—

Mr. Hughes' answer was:

Along with many others.

So that it is clear from the record that Mr. Wenzell was called in conference by Mr. Hughes, not alone with respect to the interest upon the bonds, but with respect also to the disparity of the equity and the debt.

If the Congress and the people of the United States are to understand this transaction, the importance of that fact is that the Director of the Budget told us that he thought a representative of the First Boston Corp. was engaged in discussions of the amount of capital which should be put up and the amount of debt which should be allowed; that there was an issue as between 5 percent and 10 percent. This issue was finally determined upon the basis of $5½ million capital and $92 million debt.

As was clearly demonstrated from the other papers on file, and of public record, the interest upon the debt and the payments which were to be made by the United States would carry the debt, and this was an arrangement all made in chamber, behind closed doors, with the purpose of supplying power to the Atomic Energy Commission through the TVA—a measure which was designed clearly, from the evidence already before us, to destroy the Tennessee Valley Authority by indirection.

But what has developed since that time has clearly demonstrated another fact, namely, that the Government of the United States was asked by the same Director of the Budget to appropriate $6½ million, $1 million more than the capital stock of the company, to build a transmission line. The issue now pending before this body is whether or not we shall plunge our hands into the people's Treasury and spend $6½ million to build a facility to transmit power for the generating company which was set up as a result of negotiations testified to at the hearing—generating company whose equity is only $5.5 million, and whose debt, as approved by Government officials, in secret session, is in excess of $92 million.

It is one of the most amazing and, I think, scandalous transactions I have ever heard about in all my experience with the Government.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I thank the Senator from Wyoming very much.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will my colleague yield to me?

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, the Senator from Wyoming brought all this out very clearly yesterday, in the hearings before the subcommittee. It is quite apparent that over a long period of time the Senator from Wyoming has been, and he continues to be, one of the most eminent authorities, not only in the Senate, but in the Nation, on such matters. He has pointed out how Mr. Wenzell was there, not only with reference to the interest rate, but also with reference to how much money the Dixon-Yates crowd should put up and what their equity would be.

It is also important to note that Mr. Hughes testified that at the time when the important question of how much the equity capital should be came up, and also the question of whether the Dixon-Yates contract should be executed—and he saw, and had a part in, the development of the two contracts, according to his own testimony—Mr. Wenzell was called to Washington because at that time the Bureau of the Budget had no expert along that line; that Mr. Wenzell was an expert on that kind of financing, and called in for the purpose of advising and directing and helping the Bureau of the Budget in connection with it.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President——

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I yield now to my colleague from Tennessee.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I wish to point out to the distinguished junior Senator from Wyoming that the proposed transmission line to which he referred is not the only transmission line which goes to the Dixon-Yates combine, free of charge. There is capitalized within the Dixon-Yates contract another transmission line, to take the excess power to the Arkansas Power & Light Co., which transmission line is free of charge, to be paid for by the taxpayers of the United States. Does not the Senator from

Wyoming think that adds to the oddity of this contract?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. If I may reply, Mr. President, to the question, and may do so in the time of the senior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER]——

Mr. KEFAUVER. I yield again to the Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I thank the Senator from Tennessee.

Then let me say, Mr. President, by way of reply, that, of course, I agree with the statement of the junior Senator from Tennessee, and it emphasizes another factor in this transaction, namely, that the so-called Dixon-Yates contract is represented to the people of the United States as a necessary project to supply power to the Atomic Energy Commission, whereas the contracts, the agreements, and all the official papers which have been signed in connection with it show that the company will produce much more power than is necessary for the Atomic Energy Commission, and will distribute the surplus power to subsidiaries or associates of the holding companies which manage the Mississippi Valley Generating Co., otherwise known as the Dixon-Yates plant. Yet the Government of the United States is appropriating funds for the purpose of enabling this company—which would not subscribe sufficient capital to carry on as a private enterprise—to operate in this way. This is being done in order to attack what has been called the creeping socialism of the TVA. I do not know what name we can apply to an agreement of this kind.

Mr. GORE. The Senator from Wyoming would not call it free enterprise, would he?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. It is not free enterprise, because the enterprisers do not put up the money which is necessary, according to the evidence before the SEC and the evidence before our committee. The Government of the United States is putting up the money.

Mr. GORE. The profit is free.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. And that is the reason why the transaction is being concealed. That is why the Director of the Bureau of the Budget—after having said to the committee, yesterday, that he would be glad to receive the staff members of the committee and give them the information he did not have with him then—this morning refused to grant the information.

Mr. GORE. And now that the city of Memphis has officially determined to build its own plant, the administration is insisting upon the appropriation of $6,500,000 of the people's money to connect a nonexistent plant with a nonexistent market, in order to try to legitimatize this thoroughly unjustified proposition.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I thank the Senator for his contribution.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Tennessee yield to me at this time? I ask him to yield only briefly.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I am anxious to get back to a discussion of the corruption in this transaction. We know already that the Dixon-Yates proposal is outrageous.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Tennessee yield to me at this point?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I yield.

Mr. BUTLER. I am only interested in Mr. Hughes. I was at the hearing yesterday, and I heard Mr. Hughes testify. I think the Senator from Tennessee has abused Mr. Hughes. I wish to say to the Senator from Tennessee that Mr. Hughes made perfectly clear that Mr. Wenzell had nothing whatsoever to do, insofar as Mr. Hughes' knowledge went, with the formation of any policy in connection with the Dixon-Yates contract. He did say—as the Senator from Wyoming has said, and as I said some few minutes ago—that he had to do with the financing aspects. I did not say "the rate of interest"; I said, "financing." And then a little later I pinpointed the rate of interest. But the testimony is unequivocal that Wenzell had nothing to do with policymaking.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I can say that if the decision as to the amount of equity is not a policy decision, then I do not know what a policy decision is. If Mr. Wenzell did not have anything to do with this matter, and if they are acting aboveboard and want the public to know the facts, then why do they conceal the facts today?

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Tennessee yield once more to me—and then I will not bother him further.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Very well. I am anxious to have an opportunity to present my facts in an orderly manner.

Mr. BUTLER. The policy the Senator from Tennessee has talked about I assume is the so-called change of heart by the administration away from one of benevolence toward TVA.

Mr. Hughes said that the policy involved was whether the plant be built by free enterprise or at the taxpayers' expense. The administration set the policy that it be done by free enterprise. The method of carrying out that policy certainly has nothing whatever to do with anything but detail. It has nothing to do with the determination of the basic policy.

Mr. KEFAUVER. But the Senator from Maryland completely overlooks the fact that Mr. Wenzell was there, working for the First Boston Corp., carrying water on both shoulders.

Mr. BUTLER. But the testimony of Mr. Hughes was to the effect that he knew nothing whatever about that.

Mr. KEFAUVER. The Senator from Maryland is so wrong. Mr. Wenzell was there from May 1953, until September 1953; and the policy decision was made in November or December. As for Dixon-Yates itself, Mr. Wenzell returned to the Bureau of the Budget on January 14 and at that time there was no Dixon-Yates. He participated at the meetings at which the deal was being formulated.

Mr. BUTLER. But Mr. Hughes expressly said that insofar as his knowledge went—and he was in charge of the transaction—Mr. Wenzell had nothing to do with policy, but only with questions of financing.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Then why is Mr. Wenzell's report concealed? Why is it not put out on the board, where we can see it?

Mr. BUTLER. His report has not been concealed; and I take exception to the statements about "concealing."

Mr. KEFAUVER. Then why could not the staff get it, this morning?

Mr. BUTLER. The staff went there on a fishing expedition, and got no fish; that is all.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I shall read one paragraph of Mr. Hughes' letter, which I received about noon. I shall read the remainder of the letter, later on. The paragraph of Mr. Hughes' letter to me, which I shall read, is as follows:

> Under these circumstances we have also reviewed the report which Mr. Wenzell made as an adviser in September 1953, and find that that had nothing to do with the Dixon-Yates contract; and, as a confidential document, under the general ruling, therefore, cannot be available to your committee.

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

Mr. KEFAUVER. I yield.

Mr. ANDERSON. I should like the Senator from Tennessee to recognize that the discussion about free enterprise and creeping socialism is a pretty serious one to throw into this transaction. Actually, we built a plant known as the Ohio Valley Electric Co. plant. It was initiated during a Democratic administration. It was initiated by a Democratic member of the Commission. It involved a 100-percent use of so-called public utilities. They were privately owned utilities, and they supplied the power for the plant at Portsmouth—far more power than is involved in the Dixon-Yates contract.

Secondly, with respect to the plant at Paducah, the offer was made to the companies to take more power than they were furnishing. Private utility companies were supplying all the current they were willing to supply. The only reason TVA got as much business as it did was that the private companies could not take care of the demand. To say that that is no private enterprise is, in my judgment, a pretty serious misstatement of the fact. But this contract is neither free nor enterprise. You just sit down and eat watermelon, and do not have to spit out the seeds. [Laughter.]

Mr. KEFAUVER. I thank the Senator. No Member of the Senate is better qualified to analyze the contract than is the distinguished Senator from New Mexico, who is chairman of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

Mr. President, I desire to get back as soon as possible to the question of corruption, and the fact that the Senate and the people have not been treated fairly in this matter.

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

Mr. KEFAUVER. I yield to my colleague.

Mr. GORE. I realize that the Senator wishes to proceed with his speech. However, the question has been raised as to what is policy and what is not policy. I hold in my hand the articles of incorporation of the Mississippi Valley Generating Co. I read from article 7:

> The amount of paid-in capital with which the corporation will begin business is $300.

I ask my colleague if it is a matter of policy, or is not a matter of policy, to award a contract, without competition, to two men who have not yet even incorporated, and then agree to allow them to begin business with $300, and give them, without competition, a contract for $120 million. That is the kind of transaction in which Mr. Wenzell participated.

Mr. KEFAUVER. That may be policy, but it is a kind of policy which might well be concealed. I am not surprised that there is an effort to cover up and conceal it. That is exactly what Mr. Wenzell participated in. He was the financial expert and technician, working on this project long before the present contract was made. He was called back specifically by Mr. Hughes to help with the consummation of it. If he was not an important personage in this transaction, I do not know who was important. His name has been deliberately omitted from the chronology of both Mr. Strauss and Mr. Hughes. Such chronology consists of hundreds of pages.

To summarize briefly, the Dixon-Yates contract had been severely criticized. The administration had been criticized for entering into it. Whereupon the President of the United States, with much fanfare and much acclaim for wanting all the facts known, stated, on August 18, 1954, that the press and everyone else were invited—not merely permitted, but invited—to examine any papers in connection with the transaction, and get the complete record "from the inception of this idea to this very minute; and it is all yours."

I have referred to the fact that, following that statement, these so-called releases were made by Mr. Hughes and Mr. Strauss, with much fanfare. They boasted of having given out all the facts.

I have shown that in the testimony before the Securities and Exchange Commission, it developed that Mr. Adolphe Wenzell played an important part in this transaction, carrying water on both shoulders, working, at the same time, for the corporation which became the financial agent, and also for the Government. His name is not mentioned in the chronology.

I have spoken about a speech by the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL] bringing out certain facts. I have said that there were other meetings, which apparently have been purposely concealed from view and omitted from the chronology. I have said that there was reason why a meeting of a subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary was held yesterday to try to develop the entire story, put it all together, and ascertain just what part Mr. Wenzell played, as well as the part played by his associate, Mr. Miller. I shall discuss him later. We wanted to find out what happened at these unrecorded meetings.

We held a meeting yesterday. The Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] was present. The Senator from Maryland [Mr. BUTLER] was present. Mr. Hughes could be present for only a limited length of time. We were unable to discuss with him all the subjects we wished to discuss. So there will have to be further meetings.

At the hearing yesterday there was pointed out to Mr. Hughes President Eisenhower's order as to full disclosure. Then Mr. Hughes was asked quite a number of times whether he would make certain records available, whether the staff of the committee could go over certain records. Mr. Hughes stated, in substance, that so far as he was concerned, it was all right with him; that there was a general rule about reports, and so forth, but that, inasmuch as the President had made a statement, he did not see any objection.

I read one paragraph from page 13:

Senator KEFAUVER. Are you in conformity with the press conference remarks that the President wanted every bit of information disclosed to the public, it being a question that a committee of the Congress——

Mr. HUGHES. I shall try my best to work it out in conjunction with these too, and you will have to let me look at it first to make sure, but I see no objection at the present time.

Later he was asked if we could see the travel vouchers of Mr. Wenzell, and he said we could see the travel vouchers. Later we asked him if we could see the report made by Mr. Wenzell in September 1953. He said that our staff could see the report. The matter was summarized, and, so far as he was concerned, he felt it would be all right.

In colloquy, the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] asked about certain things. Finally Mr. Hughes said:

As far as I can see, I can see no reason—

Referring to no reason why the staff could not see certain memoranda and other information in this connection.

After a little further colloquy about specific requests, Mr. Hughes said:

I have no purpose in hiding anything, despite the implications of some of the questions. I have no intention of hiding anything, but I would not want to give incorrect information. I would not want to give misleading information.

Mr. President, this morning Mr. Keeffe and members of the staff of the committee went to the office of the agency to see the records and to get the full story, as we thought the President wanted the public to have it, and as the press had been invited to get it. They were met with a stone wall. They could not see anything. They could not see the travel vouchers. They could not see the report. No papers were available for them. Nothing was available for the staff of the committee.

Shortly before noon today I received a letter from Mr. Hughes, and I ask that it be printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT,
BUREAU OF THE BUDGET,
Washington, D. C., June 28, 1955.

Hon. ESTES KEFAUVER,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR KEFAUVER: As I told you yesterday, with regard to your request for any material in our files in addition to that which had already been released relative to Dixon-Yates and then also that your staff come down and go through our files, talk with Bureau staff, and determine for themselves what miscellaneous papers, interoffice memorandums, etc., they wish to extract, we have reviewed the situation to see what steps can be taken toward complying with your request. As pointed out to you, we operate under the President's general instructions with regard to interoffice and intraoffice staff material, that such material is not to be made public. All documents which involve final decisions of public policy have, of course, already been made public. You pointed out that you interpreted the President's statement at a press conference last fall to indicate that they did not apply in this case. I have checked on this matter and I am authorized by the President to state that his general instructions stand, but that we, of course, stand on the decision to make every pertinent paper or document that can be made public under this ruling available to you. A quick review of our files last night disclosed no other papers or documents to be added to the somewhat voluminous releases already made, but we shall make a full and careful search in the next few days to confirm this or to pick out material, if any, which should be added to that previously released.

Under these circumstances, we have also reviewed the report which Mr. Wenzell made as an adviser in September 1953 and find that that had nothing to do with the Dixon-Yates contract and, as a confidential document under the general ruling, therefore cannot be made available to your committee.

We will arrange, in order to be of such assistance as we can, to have Mr. Focke, our legal adviser, available for Mr. Keeffe so that Mr. Keeffe may make requests of him in writing for any particular paper or information that he thinks should be properly made available. Every such request will be considered on its merits and we will do our best to cooperate where we can do so properly.

Sincerely,

ROWLAND HUGHES,
Director.

Mr. KEFAUVER. The letter states:

All documents which involve final decisions of public policy have of course already been made public. You pointed out that you interpreted the President's statement at a press conference last fall to indicate that they did not apply in this case. I have checked on this matter and I am authorized by the President to state that his general instructions stand, but that we, of course, stand on the decision to make every pertinent paper or document that can be made public under this ruling available to you.

Mr. Hughes states that he will look around to see if he can find anything else.

It appears from this situation, and because of the scandal of Mr. Wenzell's employment by both the Government and the First Boston Corp., that there is an effort to conceal certain meetings in which he participated and to which I shall refer, and also to conceal from the public other important information. There is now a repudiation of the agreement to let members of the press and others have access to all the information. Members of the press are said to be entitled to it. Members of the United States Senate and their staff apparently are not to get it.

What is meant by saying that all the cards are on top of the table, when some of them are held under the table and up the sleeve, and when information is not disclosed, particularly when we are faced with the duplicity of this man working for both a private corporation and the Government?

Mr. President, this kind of thing will not stand up. It is one thing to get a big headline about wanting all the information to be made public, but another thing, apparently, when the rub comes, and information which will hurt someone is about to come out, to clam up and refuse to release any more information.

Let us see what some of the things are that we would like to inquire into.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a moment at that point?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I yield.

Mr. ANDERSON. Before the Senator from Tennessee enumerates the things he would like to inquire into, I should like to suggest to him two matters concerning which I would appreciate obtaining some information when Mr. Wenzell testifies. First of all, I should like to see the financial contract which has been drawn between Dixon-Yates and the suppliers of the money. There are some provisions, at least, referred to in the general report to the Atomic Energy Commission, which we are not able to find. I think it would be very interesting to ascertain exactly what the terms and circumstances are.

Secondly, I believe the Senator himself, coming from Tennessee, would be very much interested in finding out the length to which Mr. Wenzell went to obtain information on the Tennessee Valley Authority; that is, whether he did not call for information far more detailed than had ever heretofore been requested, with the obvious thought of some day of making the TVA go through the banking houses of New York for financing.

Mr. KEFAUVER. The Senator from New Mexico has brought up two very important matters which bear directly on this deal. However, I must point out to the Senator that, although there was a great deal of publicity about how this transaction being open and above board, I know of no way of getting that information, because those in authority have repudiated their agreement, they have gone back on what they said about candor in this matter, and are now adopting a policy of concealment. I hope we may be able in some way to find out about the two important matters the Senator has mentioned, although I do not know how we will do it.

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

Mr. KEFAUVER. I am glad to yield to the distinguished minority leader.

Mr. KNOWLAND. In the first place, is it not correct to say that the question relative to the authorization for this type of contract was rather fully discussed in the United States Senate a year ago in a protracted debate, which continued so long that we even held some long night sessions; that subsequently to that time the matter of the contract under the legislation was brought before the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, and very prolonged hearings were held by the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, in which there was full disclosure and full discussion of the matters leading up to the negotiation of the so-called Dixon-Yates contract?

The matter has been before the Committee on Appropriations, and it has been discussed on the floor of the House, where a move was made to strike out the appropriation for the transmission lines.

The Senator is also aware of the fact that the amount of power to be made available to the Valley of the Tennessee under the so-called Dixon-Yates contract is 600,000 kilowatts.

I know the Senator went before the Committee on Appropriations when we were discussing the matter, and the testimony before the committee was that even with the Dixon-Yates 600,000 kilowatts, and with the additional power generating facilities in existing plants, by the year 1958, I believe it was, there would still be a shortage of power in the valley of the Tennessee.

I am sure the Senator is also aware of the fact that the position of the President of the United States was that he did not want to deprive the people of the Valley of the Tennessee and the Tennessee Valley Authority area of any opportunity to move ahead in their development both industrially and domestically; and for that reason this suggestion was made.

The testimony, as I am sure the Senator well knows, is that at the present time the amount of the steam generation in that area, as distinct from hydroelectric power, is approximately 60 percent, and ultimately, by 1957 or 1958, will be almost 70 percent. The reason for the position of the President of the United States is that he felt we would get into a field in which, as a matter of public policy, Congress and the American people ought to determine whether the Federal Government should go into each of the 48 States of the Union and build hydroelectric plants——

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President——

Mr. KNOWLAND. If the Senator will permit me to continue——

Mr. KEFAUVER. I do not desire to cut the Senator off, but I want to get back to the issue I am discussing here today—one of corruption—and I do not wish to argue the Dixon-Yates matter on its merits at this time. However, I will not interrupt the Senator.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I will say to the distinguished Senator from Tennessee that he should disclose to the Senate and to the country that hearings, which were very prolonged were held before the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, and hearings have been held before the Committee on Appropriations. The Senator called a meeting of his subcommittee of the Judiciary Committee in the absence of the ranking minority members of the committee——

Mr. KEFAUVER. Just a minute.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I believe that the ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary in a telegram to the Senator from Tennessee requested that he be given 1 week and that the matter be taken up next week. I am sure the Senator from Tennessee would be the first to admit that he has not been entirely disinterested and an unprejudiced chairman in regard to the Tennessee Valley matter. It seems to me not at all unreasonable, from the standpoint of a sound public policy, that the minority should not be deprived of their representation in a hearing of this kind, where an effort is made further to embarrass the President of the United States and the administration on a program about which there may be an honest difference of opinion, but which cannot truthfully to be said to involve any corruption—a program by which the President was endeavoring to help the people of the Valley of the Tennessee to meet their power requirements, and one with respect to which I believe Congress should establish the basic policy.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I should like to answer briefly the Senator from California. However, I do want to get back as soon as I can to the thread of this story.

In the first place, I should like to respond to the Senator's suggestion concerning the committee. He usually has his facts entirely accurate, but this time he apparently has missed the boat.

The chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary appointed a special subcommittee, composed of the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], a Republican; the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY]; and myself, to conduct a hearing on the subject and on matters growing out of it. The matter was taken up with the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], who suggested that the hearing proceed. He was anxious that it be not held up. So the minority was consulted, and full agreement was reached with the minority.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Tennessee yield at that point?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I received a telegram from the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] on Sunday afternoon, saying he hoped the hearing could be postponed to some time when he could be present.

I telegraphed him that he was not a member of the subcommittee designated to hear the matter. Request was made in the Senate to hold a hearing, and there was no objection. The Senator from Maryland [Mr. BUTLER] was present. I cannot see why the Senator from California would want the hearing held up when it was designed to bring out matters which the President of the United States, in August 1954, said he desired to have brought out. I should think the Senator would wish to cooperate.

Mr. KNOWLAND. If the situation were reversed——

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I have not finished answering the Senator from California. I shall not yield until I have finished.

It is true that the whole matter has been debated, but it has not been in the light of all the facts. I am certain that the Senator from California would want a decision reached when all the facts are brought out, so that we could see who was involved, the background, and so forth. We have now struck an obstacle. We are having difficulty getting the facts.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Tennessee yield at that point? In other words——

Mr. KEFAUVER. I refuse to yield until I have finished my answer.

I am sure the Senator would agree that Mr. Wenzell was not mentioned in all the hearings and debate, although he played an important part in the matter, as both an officer of the First Boston Corp. and an employee of the Bureau of the Budget. If the minority leader can find in all the debate and in all the records any record of Mr. Wenzell, I will yield the floor and sit down now. I should think the minority leader would be very anxious to have a full disclosure made, particularly when there is a very strong suggestion that the Criminal Code has been violated.

Title 18, paragraph 434, of the Criminal Code, as the minority leader no doubt knows, reads as follows:

INTERESTED PERSONS ACTING AS GOVERNMENT AGENTS

Whoever, being an officer, agent, or member of, or directly or indirectly interested in the pecuniary profits or contracts of any corporation, joint stock company, or association, or any firm or partnership, or other business entity, is employed or acts as an officer or agent of the United States for the transaction of business with such business entity, shall be fined not more than $2,000 or imprisoned not more than 2 years, or both.

We have desired to find out about that. I do not think the Senator from California, honorable as he is, would want us to be deprived of information which would enable us to determine whether the Criminal Code has been violated.

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

Mr. KEFAUVER. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I think sound public policy is not being followed when the minority is deprived of representation in a Chamber which is divided 49 to 47. The ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary was entitled to be consulted and his recommendation obtained before the subcommittee was appointed. I think it was a very highhanded move to appoint a committee and to start hearings without the minority having representation and without the ranking minority members of the full committee being given the courtesy of being consulted. If I were on the other side of the situation, having 49 votes to 47, I would not consider it proper treatment of the minority to have a committee engaged in a pursuit of this kind go ahead on an investigation of this sort without the minority being represented, and when the ranking minority member of the committee had requested a 1 week's delay so that he could be present. I think that was a reasonable request.

It is not at all unusual for both Democratic Presidents and Republican Presidents to hold inviolate certain executive papers which constitute interoffice memorandums. The history of this country, from the time of George Washington until now, is replete with instances of the executive branch refusing to open up papers and documents to a general fishing expedition.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I may say in response to the Senator that the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] was chairman of the Judiciary Committee in the Republican Congress. The hearing was held with his consent and his knowledge. He was anxious for it to be carried on. I do not know that it is usual to hold up a subcommittee hearing to accommodate some Senator who is not a member of the subcommittee, particularly in view of the fact that the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BUTLER], an able member of the Committee on the Judiciary, was present. I am certain he will verify the statement that if he desired to ask any question he was recognized for that purpose.

If a suggested violation of the criminal code is involved, I should think the Senator from California would not wish any delay or any obstacle to be placed in the way of obtaining the information. That may be what the situation here is.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Tennessee yield?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I yield to the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. ANDERSON. I wonder if the Senator knows how hard we tried to find, when the previous debate on this subject was going on, whether there had been a broker involved in handling the Dixon-Yates deal. Day by day we tried to find out the name of the broker, who it was who had participated, and the answer steadily given was, "No one." Yet, by a mere accident one day, there was found a memorandum containing the name of Wenzell. There never was a report by any person connected with the Bureau of the Budget that Wenzell was involved in the transaction. But here was a name which no one could explain. We went around asking, "Who is Wenzell?" It was a long time afterward that we found the man was connected with a financing company. If there had been any disclosure that this was going on, the whole debate might have taken a different turn.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I am sure that no Members on the majority or minority side would have wanted the deal to go through if they had found out about this skullduggery.

Mr. ANDERSON. We considered a waiver which permitted the Dixon-Yates plant to go ahead. An election had been held. It was well known that if there was a delay the matter would naturally come to the 84th Congress, and the waiver would not be granted. Many of us pleaded for delay. But there was no delay, because there were enough votes at that time, and there would not be enough votes after January 1, 1955.

I have in my hand a Holding Company Act Release No. 12857, which was before the Securities and Exchange Commission April 27, 1955, in the matter of the Mississippi Valley Generating Co. On the second page it says that the generating company has entered into a joint purchase agreement with two life insurance companies which have agreed to purchase not exceeding $92 million principal amount of the generating company's 3⅝ percent first mortgage bonds.

If the able Senator from Tennessee could get hold of a copy of that agreement, which I have not been able to do, I would be deeply grateful to him.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I will say to the Senator that it sounds to me like pertinent information. I do not know how we can put side by side the Senator's request for pertinent information and my request for pertinent information, and reconcile them with the President's statement of August 18, 1954, when he said:

Any one of you present might, singly or in an investigation group, go to the Bureau of the Budget or to the chief of the Atomic Energy Commission and get the complete record from the inception of this idea to this very minute, and it was all yours.

I understand that some of the members of the press tried to get more than mere handouts, and they were refused. But it looks as if the chairman of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy should be able to get those documents, particularly when there was so much fanfare and so many editorials about this transaction being entirely above board, with nothing concealed. But when we come to get the facts we want, when we come to evidence of a man serving two masters, we find a closed door. I do not know how the Senator can get the facts.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President——

Mr. KEFAUVER. I yield to my colleague, the junior Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. GORE. The senior Senator from California referred to the Senate debate on the Dixon-Yates contract, then to the committee hearings, and then to subsequent Senate debate and action on the matter. As I understand, that is not the subject of the inquiry of the senior Senator from Tennessee. Those are all matters of public record.

It has now been testified under oath that there was a prior meeting—that is, a meeting prior to the Senate debate—between Mr. Dixon, representing a private power company; Mr. Adolphe Wenzell, who it now appears was representing both the Bureau of the Budget and the First Boston Corp.; Mr. Lewis Strauss, Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission; and Mr. Roland Hughes, Director of the Bureau of the Budget.

Is it not about what was done at such meetings as that that the senior Senator from Tennessee wishes information? He is not seeking information about the debate on the floor of the Senate and the proceedings before congressional committees, because those proceedings are matters of record; they are above board and in the open. It is the covert meetings about which the Senate and the country deserve information.

Mr. KEFAUVER. The Senator is correct. I should think there ought to be a unanimous effort to help the President carry out what he said he wanted to have done. It is somewhat disconcerting to find people talking both ways about these matters. Especially in a highly suspicious deal such as this, in which so many precedents have been broken, I think there should be no resistance to supplying the information which is sought by the chairman of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, the junior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], and by the chairman of the subcommittee of the Committee on the

Judiciary. It is information that perhaps the Attorney General of the United States might need in considering whether the criminal code has been violated.

Mr. Hughes himself in his testimony has brought out some matters which need to be gone into much further. He said that Mr. Wenzell came into the Government in May 1953, and stayed until September, when all the reports were called in from the TVA, and power studies were made. Of course, by the time immediately before the big policy decision was made, Mr. Wenzell had got together the facts, apparently, upon which to make that policy decision. He made a report to the Bureau of the Budget, so Mr. Hughes was asked if he would furnish it to the committee.

Mr. Hughes said he would endeavor to furnish it to the committee. It was thus understood that he would furnish the report to the staff of the committee today. But when the staff of the committee asked for the report today, they could not see it. What is in the report? What is there to hide? Mr. Hughes apparently is willing, or said he was willing, to have it submitted.

Mr. President, I have never seen such withholding, holding back, or covering up; but I can understand it, because it is necessary to have a lot of covering up to get a contract like this through Congress.

Let us see what else Mr. Hughes had to say. He did not even remember, or did not even know, that the merged First National City Bank had become the financial agent for the bond transaction. The First National City Bank was the bank of which he had been the comptroller.

I may say frankly for Mr. Hughes that there is no evidence that he had anything to do with the First National City Bank, the bank with which he had been associated before he came to Washington, being the agent chosen under the indenture arrangement. But as the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, who is supposed to know all about the matter, he did not even know that the First National City Bank had been made the financial agent.

Another strange thing was that Mr. Hughes wrote two letters to the senior Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL]. I want to examine those letters, to see if my colleagues in the Senate think he acted quite fairly with the senior Senator from Alabama.

The senior Senator from Alabama made a speech in the Senate in which the Wenzell matter was referred to. Prior to that, on February 11, the senior Senator from Alabama had called Mr. Hughes—apparently he got Mr. McCandless—in an effort to get a message from Mr. Hughes about who Mr. Wenzell was.

On February 11, 1955, Mr. Hughes wrote a letter to the senior Senator from Alabama, which appears on page 1716 of the RECORD of February 18. I shall read the letter. It is a very remarkable document. The letter was from the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, who had the leading oar in the whole matter, and who had been working on the financing from May to September.

Mr. Hughes personally called Mr. Wenzell back in January. He was there during all the transactions with Mr. Hughes. This is the letter which Mr. Hughes wrote to the senior Senator from Alabama:

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT,
BUREAU OF THE BUDGET,
Washington, D. C., February 11, 1955.

Hon. LISTER HILL,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR HILL: This is in reply to your inquiry of earlier today as to whether Mr. Adolphe H. Wenzell had ever been employed by the Bureau of the Budget and, if so, the nature of his employment.

Bureau of the Budget records show that on May 20, 1953, Mr. Wenzell was invited to serve as a consultant without compensation, to Mr. Joseph M. Dodge, then Director of the Bureau of the Budget. Mr. Wenzell's consultative services were used intermittently for a total of 34 days between May 20, 1953, and March 2, 1954, when he completed his work.

Mr. Dodge advises me that Mr. Wenzell was engaged as a technical expert to advise the Director of the Budget regarding the accounting system of the Tennessee Valley Authority, particularly as to comparison of its annual reports of earnings with those of private industry, which has differing requirements as to taxes, interest, etc. Mr. Wenzell was requested to analyze and explain the differences in the two types of accounting systems and their significance in measuring real results. Mr. Wenzell was also asked to review the allocation system for distribution of costs between power, navigation, flood control, and other purposes, concerning which the Bureau of the Budget makes recommendations to the President.

I trust that this provides the information you desire.

Sincerely yours,
ROWLAND HUGHES,
Director.

Mr. Hughes used the words, "Mr. Dodge advises me that Mr. Wenzell."

Mr. Dodge was not the Director in February 1955. Did not Mr. Hughes know what Mr. Wenzell was doing? It was Mr. Hughes who called Mr. Wenzell back. Mr. Hughes was previously the Deputy Director. He knew what Mr. Wenzell was doing; he testified that he knew what Wenzell was doing.

In the original letter is there not a definite effort to conceal the fact that Mr. Wenzell was working on the Dixon-Yates contract? The senior Senator from Alabama in his speech brought out the fact that Mr. Wenzell had been working on the TVA contract.

Following the speech by the senior Senator from Alabama, and apparently not wanting to let the matter stand in that situation, Mr. Hughes wrote the Senator from Alabama another letter, in which he brought out what the Senator already knew, namely, that Mr. Wenzell had been engaged by the Bureau for an additional period of time, and that during that time he had been working on the proposal made by the Dixon-Yates group.

Mr. President, that does not quite stand up. These letters do not ring true.

An important thing happened after the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL] made his speech. Mr. Hughes testified he wrote the President a letter and took it to the White House, or sent it there, with the speech of the Senator from Alabama. That is one of the documents we wish to find out about. What did Mr. Hughes say about the situation? What did he do about it? That is one of the documents we are denied today.

Mr. President, I do not like the attitude Mr. Hughes took toward a very distinguished Member of the Senate, in the face of uncontroverted evidence of what Mr. Wenzell was doing and what he knew. I asked Mr. Hughes, as appears on page 60 of the hearings of yesterday:

Mr. KEFAUVER. Well, you read Senator HILL's speech in February?

Mr. HUGHES. I was told it was not true.

Senator KEFAUVER. We will get to that later. I think there has been anything but sincerity in giving any information to a distinguished Member of the Senate, Senator HILL.

You read his speech, did you, Mr. Hughes?

Mr. HUGHES. I read it at the time.

Then he said he took it over with a memorandum and gave it to the President.

Mr. President, the speech of the Senator from Alabama was a very mild statement of the outrageous activities of this man who worked for both parties. It was a very mild statement of the concealment of that fact by the Director of the Bureau of the Budget. In the face of knowlege of that fact, the statement by him that "I was told it was not true" does not measure up to the respect which the Senate is entitled to receive, and it is certainly not playing fair with a distinguished Member of the Senate, the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL].

A very remarkable thing in this matter is that after finding out all about Mr. Wenzell, apparently, if it was not known before, nothing has been done. The speech of the Senator from Alabama was made on February 18. Nothing has been done to bring the facts before the public. Nothing has been done about making any apology or correcting the record with respect to a man who worked for both the Government and the First Boston Corp.

Let us consider some of the other matters about which we would like to get records, if we could have an opportunity to do so.

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

Mr. KEFAUVER. I yield to the distinguished Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. ANDERSON. Speaking about Mr. Wenzell, I wish to refer to the hearings which the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy held November 4 through about the 13th, 1954, considering the waiver of this contract. Admiral Strauss testified before our group. As appears on page 249 of the hearings, Representative HOLIFIELD questioned Admiral Strauss, saying he would like to get some idea of where the Dixon-Yates project was first brought to his attention, and asked if it was by Mr. Dodge. Admiral Strauss said no; it was by Mr. Williams. Then Mr. HOLIFIELD asked:

Do you know if Mr. Dodge was advised by a consultant who is now employed by any of the Dixon-Yates utility companies?

Admiral Strauss answered:

I have no knowledge of any consultants that Mr. Dodge may have had, or whether he had any.

Did I understand the Senator from Tennessee to say it was well known Mr. Wenzell was a consultant to Mr. Dodge?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I appreciate the Senator's referring to that matter. It would seem to me to be highly unlikely, in view of all the security measures in effect in the Atomic Energy Commission, that, in the first place, Mr. Wenzell, and Mr. Miller, his associate, of the First Boston Corp., could come into Admiral Strauss' office with Mr. Hughes and meet with him on the contract and consult with him in a very vital conference, without Admiral Strauss knowing he was a consultant. Mr. Wenzell testified he was with Admiral Strauss, that he had the original February contract, that Mr. Wenzell went over it, and that he also helped to make a second contract.

Mr. ANDERSON. Was that prior to November 13, 1954?

Mr. KEFAUVER. That would have been in January, February, or March, 1954. That was long prior to Admiral Strauss' testimony. One does not go to a secret meeting in the Atomic Energy Commission, with all the security clearances necessary in the Commission, without somebody knowing he is there. One does not turn over a contract to someone for revision, without someone in the Commission knowing he was there. I think the facts must fully substantiate Mr. Wenzell's own testimony that Admiral Strauss knew where Mr. Wenzell was, that he met Admiral Strauss, that he took part in the negotiations. Yet Admiral Strauss did not mention his name in the chronology released by the Atomic Energy Commission.

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

Mr. KEFAUVER. I yield to my colleague from Tennessee.

Mr. GORE. Does not the Senator think it is rather strange that this important figure, Adolphe Wenzell, is unmentioned in the chronology furnished by the Bureau of the Budget and the Atomic Energy Commission? Does the Senator not recall, in that connection, that Mr. Hughes acknowledged yesterday, before the Senator's committee, that he and Admiral Strauss conferred as to the contents of the report which was finally released?

Mr. KEFAUVER. Yes, he testified that they conferred about it. The report was apparently drawn up purposely leaving out several meetings which Mr. Wenzell attended. In my discussion I shall come to a very important meeting in New York to which Mr. Hughes sent Mr. Wenzell to talk to Ebasco and the Dixon-Yates group, a very important meeting of March 2, 1954. That matter is not referred to.

Senators will find many other names mentioned, but nowhere is there mentioned the name of Mr. Wenzell, vice president and director of the First Boston Corp.

Let us take the testimony of Mr. Wenzell before the Securities and Exchange Commission. Mr. Wenzell testified before the Securities and Exchange Commission on June 17, 1955. Many objections to questions were sustained, so that full information could not be secured from him. That is one of the reasons why we need to see certain records from the Atomic Energy Commission. However, we do have some very interesting testimony from Mr. Wenzell. He said he was the one who received the telephone call on January 14 from Mr. Hughes to come to Washington. Yet Mr. Hughes, in his first letter to the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL] did not seem to know anything about what he was doing. He had to ask Mr. Dodge about it. He said he reported everything he did to Mr. Hughes. Mr. Hughes did not seem to know very much about what he was doing, and did not even know that First Boston Corp. had become the financial agent.

Mr. Wenzell said he prepared memoranda from his discussions with various persons, including Mr. Hughes. Then he was asked this question:

In this February period that I mentioned earlier, this period that predated the February 25 proposal—

And a little later the question is:

Did you communicate that information with anyone?

Answer. I communicated it, I am sure, to Mr. Dixon and to Mr. Yates.

Question. Did you communicate it to the Bureau of the Budget?

Answer. I certainly did.

And a little later:

Question. At that time, as I understand your testimony, you were also performing as an official of the First Boston Corp. Is that right? You were not devoting full time to the work of the Bureau of the Budget?

Answer. That is right. I had many other duties.

Mr. President, that is some of the information we would like to have; and I think we should have cooperation in finding just what Mr. Wenzell did report.

Here is another question, appearing on page 797 of the SEC hearings:

Question. Did you see this letter before it was submitted to the AEC?

The letter being referred to was an important policy letter in connection with the Dixon-Yates contract.

He replied:

Yes; I saw it.

Question. And did you at the time discuss with Mr. Dixon and Mr. Yates the statement made in this paragraph which I have just read?

Answer. Let me amend my first answer. I think I saw it before it went in.

Then, on page 799, we find an astonishing statement. In connection with all of his work at the Bureau of the Budget, he was asked this question:

Did anyone else talk to Mr. Dixon and Mr. Yates from the First Boston Corp. at that time other than yourself?

Answer. I was the mouthpiece, as far as I know.

So he was being paid by the Government at the same time that he was the mouthpiece for the First Boston Corp., in talking with Messrs. Dixon and Yates. If Senators will examine the chronology, they will find that no meeting on March 2, 1954, is listed in it. But we have come across a memorandum of Mr. Tony Seal—Mr. T. G. Seal—of Ebasco Services, dated March 3, 1954, in which Mr. Seal, representing Ebasco, refers to Mr. McCandless, of the Bureau of the Budget; and Mr. Seal says, in the memorandum:

Those present at the Budget Bureau included Mr. Wenzell, Mr. McCandless, Mr. Schwartz, Mr. Warner, Mr. Pilcher, Mr. Donnelley, and Mr. Grahl and the undersigned.

That was a meeting with Mr. Seal, of Ebasco, who was doing part of this work or was arranging part of the contract for Dixon-Yates.

In the memorandum, at almost the end, Mr. Seal has this paragraph:

Following my visit with Mr. Cook—

Of the Atomic Energy Commission—

Mr. Wenzell rejoined me in our office about 5 p. m., when he had finished his day with the Budget Bureau people and told me that the memorandum had been finished and that Mr. Clapp, of the TVA, and General Nichols, of the AEC, and the Budget Bureau people were to get together today, March 3, in Mr. Hughes' office at 9 a. m. for further intragovernment discussions. We hope to hear how these discussions eventuate later today.

So on that date Mr. Wenzell was, at one and the same time, conferring with the Bureau of the Budget and conferring with Mr. Seal, of Ebasco services. Mr. Wenzell's presence at the conference was enough, in Mr. Seal's estimate, to cause him to put Mr. Wenzell's name first in the list of those present at the conference. This is discussed in the testimony; and we find that the important meeting of March 2 is discussed in the memorandum. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the memorandum printed at this point in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ALLOTT in the chair). Is there objection?

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

MARCH 3, 1954.

Monday night, March 1, I went to Washington at the request of the Budget Bureau people and Mr. R. W. Cook, of the Atomic Energy Commission, to further discuss the recent proposal by Middle South Utilities and the Southern Co. to furnish 600 mw of power to TVA for the account of the AEC. Those present at the Budget Bureau included Mr. Wenzell, Mr. McCandless, Mr. Schwartz, Mr. Warner, Mr. Pilcher, Mr. Donnelley, and Mr. Grahl and the undersigned.

The discussion was largely a review of what had been presented on the preceding Friday, except that it was a little bit more extended because the Budget Bureau people were still concerned about the $200 of capital required per kilowatt of capability. Their comments were not critical so much as they represented an effort to get thoroughly posted on the reasons for the figures, anticipating an argument from TVA, etc.

It will be remembered that at the conference on the preceding Friday we made considerable of the point that TVA's investment figures for any of their powerplant projects did not include interest during construction, working capital, or transmission facilities, and this idea had been pretty

generally accepted. It had been accepted to the point that Messrs. Donnelley and others had worked up figures to show that interest, transmission, and working capital should probably be of a magnitude that would raise the TVA's $180 figure to $200. While this represented considerable of a concession, I pointed out that he was still computing his transmission investment on a purely incremental basis but that I would, of course, readily admit that we had done the same thing. I conceded that if TVA's transmission account were to be evaluated on a system average basis which it will tend to attain over the years, that his figure was too low. We also had some mild disagreement about the size of his fuel inventory, but I told him it was purely a matter of judgment, that we had thought to have inventories adequate for reasonable contingencies, including work stoppages, etc.

The Budget Bureau people had drafted a memorandum which I was permitted to look at in its early stages, which was to be presented to Mr. Hughes last evening on his return from some trip. They were dissatisfied with certain parts of the memorandum and that is why they had asked me to come down.

There was considerable discussion of the effect of the joint proposal on the cost of power and I gave them a memorandum, copy attached, of my concept of how the thing would work. This seemed greatly to clear the air because we had had considerable discussions on the telephone a time or two on Monday about the mechanism.

It was developed that the base price involved in the proposal of $2.73 per kilowatt-month for 693 kilowatt-hours compared with $2.49 for the same service from TVA at Shawnee at the TVA base rate, and that this is $2.88 per kilowatt-year and for 600 mw the increased cost to the AEC would be $1,728,000 per year, and that this compared with an immediate outlay of probably $120 million which the Government would have to make for a Fulton of comparable capacity with all charges included. I took the position that this was due to the additional capital required compared with Shawnee, although I had to admit that Shawnee's $145 per kilowatt did not include working capital, interest during construction or transmission investment. This did not seem to be regarded as too important, however.

Messrs. Schwartz and McCandless finally stated that notwithstanding all the detailed argument, the problem was what the impact of the program would be on the Government, and wanted to know if I had anything to say about that. I told him that to me it was quite simple; that the Government had to get up lots of money at once if they were to permit TVA to build Fulton, whereas under our proposal the amount of money the Government had to get up to pay us was such that it would take many years for them to reach it. Messrs. McCandless and Schwartz thought this was a good argument. One or two of the technical people thought that it should be recognized the interest factor might enter into it. Messrs. McCandless and Schwartz said it was a budget problem.

Upon completion of the foregoing discussions I was excused about 1 p. m. and asked to get in touch with Mr. Cook. I finally was able to do this about 3 p. m. and went to his office, at which place he said that he apparently had a lot of misconceptions about the proposal and would I be good enough to tell him exactly what we had in mind. I told him much of the same thing we had previously told the Budget Bureau people on the preceding Friday. Generally, it was that we had determined the capital requirements from a study made previously as a basis for a proposal to TVA for a lesser amount of power; that we had used the unit costs developed there; that we had no idea as yet of what the exact installation would be; that our figures included about $108 million for production facilities, about $7 million for transmission which was to be used for back-up standby purposes, and somewhere between $4 million and $5 million for working capital; that our annual price, exclusive of taxes, was about $16.04 per kilowatt-year. That I knew that the TVA base rate had already escalated some but that I did not know how much. I did know, however, that representations had been made to the Congress about a year ago at the time of the legislation for cancellation payments, to the extent of about 48 cents per kilowatt-year; and I made it as plain as I knew how that we expected to have the same words and figures in any contract we made with them for the energy charge portion of our rate. That we had no exact idea of how much coal would cost and, while we had investigated to some considerable extent, there was no precedent for the transportation and delivery of coal in the quantities we were thinking about in this area and that it would undoubtedly cost more than it did at Shawnee but that for obvious reasons we had stuck to a base rate.

Some considerable discussion was had about the installation again, and I reiterated that we had no idea what we were going to install but that there was obviously not enough money in the capital requirements we had set up to greatly exceed what was necessary to fulfill the offer to the Commission.

I was then told that they were able to get a very poor understanding of just how the thing would work from our proposal, and was asked what we had in mind and I thereupon gave them the same two sheets (attached) that were referred to above in connection with the discussions at the Bureau of the Budget. This seemed to clarify the matter for them. Mr. Myer was with Mr. Cook during this discussion. I had previously been told that the Budget Bureau had done week-end figuring in connection with the proposal and that some of the AEC people had been participating in the figures.

I did not attempt any arguments with Mr. Cook or Mr. Myer, but tried to confine myself to facts underlying our proposal and the concept upon which it has been put together. This can, of course, be briefly stated as one by which, from our study of the entire situation, the least capital and hence the least total cost would be imposed upon everybody concerned, having in mind the places where TVA needed power as against the places where they had it.

At both the Budget Bureau and at Mr. Cook's office I again, as emphatically as I knew how, when the question came up, took the position that the offer was for the AEC in the interest of all the things the AEC does, but was not to be construed in any way as an offer which we would make to the TVA.

Following my visit with Mr. Cook, Mr. Wenzell rejoined me in our office about 5 p. m. when he had finished his day with the Budget Bureau people and told me that the memorandum had been finished and that Mr. Clapp of the TVA and General Nichol of the AEC and the Budget Bureau people were to get together today, March 3, in Mr. Hughes' office at 9 a. m. for further intra-Government discussions. We hope to hear how these discussions eventuate later today.

A copy of this memorandum is being sent to Messrs. Barry, Dixon, and Yates.

T. G. SEAL.

I. TVA will continue delivery of 600 mw and accompanying energy to AEC at Paducah and AEC will:

A. Pay TVA for 600 mw of capacity by furnishing to TVA (by means of contract with new company) 600 mw of capacity at State line near Memphis.

B. Pay TVA for accompanying energy by—

1. Substituting energy to TVA from new company at Memphis for that amount of energy required by TVA load in Memphis area; and

2. At the present rate, in the present contract for the difference in energy furnished to AEC by TVA with 600 mw of capacity and the amount substituted in IB (1) herein.

II. New company will deliver 600 mw of capacity to TVA at Memphis and no less energy than specified in IB (1) and AEC will—

A. Pay new company for 600 mw of capacity.

B. Energy delivered to TVA in IB (1).

Example:

(a) Assume AEC load has a load factor of 95 percent.

(b) Memphis area load has a load factor of 65 percent.

(c) Present rate for AEC/TVA energy is 2.0 mills per kilowatt-hour.

(d) Rate from new company for energy is 2.0 mills per kilowatt-hour.

(e) Capacity rate for TVA to AEC is $1.10 per kilowatt-month.

(f) Capacity rate for new company is $1.34 per kilowatt per month.

Then—

	AEC bill for 1 kilowatt and 693 kilowatt-hours		
	New company	TVA	Total
Kilowatt-hours at 95 percent load factor	475	218	693
Rate for energy (mills per kilowatt-hour)	2.0	2.0	2.0
Energy charge	$0.95	$.44	$1.39
Capacity charge	1.34	0	1.34
Total	2.29	.44	2.73
Average rate (mills)	------	------	3.94

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, there is no record whatsoever of this important meeting in the chronology of either the Bureau of the Budget or the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Tennessee yield to me at this point?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I yield.

Mr. ANDERSON. I hope the Senator from Tennessee will not lose the memorandum, because it is the first tip-off that anyone named Wenzell was involved in the deal. This memorandum set off the whole chain of circumstances which eventually made it possible to find out that there was a "broker" in the deal.

So I am very happy the Senator from Tennessee has put the memorandum in the RECORD, so it may have some permanence there.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I thank the Senator from New Mexico. I have read the testimony before the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, showing the tremendous effort made by the Senator from New Mexico and other members of the Joint Committee to learn who the "broker" in this deal was, but they never were able to find out. But the memorandum mentioning Mr. Wenzell happened to get around, and that was the "leak." However, since his name has been mentioned, the executive department has "clammed up." Mr. President, what do they wish to hide? I do not understand. If it was all right for Mr. Wenzell to be there, doing public service and at the same time carrying water on

both shoulders, so to speak—in short, taking a part in helping this official agency deal with the corporation, and also helping the corporation sabotage the TVA—why will not the Administration let the facts be known? I think the American people certainly are entitled to have the facts known.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks, the March 16, 1955, letter sent by the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, Mr. Hughes, to the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL]. The letter should be in the RECORD.

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

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT,
BUREAU OF THE BUDGET,
March 16, 1955.

Hon. LISTER HILL,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR HILL: On February 11, in response to your urgent request for an immediate reply that day, I wrote you concerning the consultative services of Mr. Adolphe H. Wenzell to the Bureau of the Budget. Although the condition and nature of Mr. Wenzell's services are set forth in that letter, supplementary information as to the period when his services were used has come to my attention and I am sending it to you to complete the record.

In addition to the services of Mr. Wenzell described in my letter of February 11, our records show that Mr. Wenzell attended, at our request, a few meetings between March 2 and April 3, 1954. Our records further show that these meetings were concerned with technical aspects of the proposal then being made by the Dixon-Yates group.

Sincerely yours,
ROWLAND HUGHES,
Director.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, we have some remarkable evidence showing the extent to which Mr. Wenzell was used as the chief consultant and agent and negotiator for the Bureau of the Budget. Mr. Wenzell was questioned regarding a meeting held about the first of February. I read now from the testimony:

Question. Will you tell us how that meeting came about?

Answer. I think that was a meeting that was—I think my first meeting with Mr. Seal was in New York, and I think that was along, as I said, about the first of February, and I think it came about from a suggestion from Mr. Hughes and Mr. Dixon to meet with some other people in Mr. Dixon's office. I think that time it was Mr. Seal and possibly Mr. Canaday. I think that was the first meeting I had with Mr. Seal. I think that was the origin.

Question. And at that time, at that meeting, were you representing the Bureau of the Budget?

Answer. Yes, sir.

Question. Was the Dixon-Yates proposal discussed at this meeting?

Mr. President, that question was objected to, and apparently the objection was sustained.

That meeting is not recorded in the chronology; I refer to the meeting held when Mr. Wenzell was sent to meet, in New York, with Mr. Seal and Mr. Dixon.

A very unusual thing comes about in connection with the fee to be obtained by the First Boston Corp. The First Boston Corp. acted as the financial agent in the so-called OVEC financing, in which a number of companies got together and built a plant for furnishing electric energy for the atomic energy installation at Portsmouth, Ohio. For that they were paid a fee of $150,000.

Mr. Wenzell says in his testimony that when he came down here first he would not have expected the First Boston Corp. to have received compensation. But, Mr. President, the man he had working for him, Mr. Miller, said that he wanted First Boston to get the business. In testimony before the Arkansas Public Service Commission at Little Rock, Ark., Mr. Canaday, who is an officer of Dixon-Yates, testified that the First Boston Corp. and Lehman Bros. helped a great deal and did considerable work for them, and would probably be paid a fee in connection with the loan.

It is a remarkable fact that after this transaction had been going along for quite a long time on the assumption that they were going to get a fee, as late as May 11, 1955, suddenly, when Mr. Wenzell's identity is finally evolved, there is a decision by Mr. Wenzell and his group apparently not to take a fee. I do not think that makes any difference under the criminal code. If they are working for the Government and, at the time they are doing their work, in the beginning or at any other time, if they expect to be compensated by, or are doing some work for a corporation in which they are interested, and which expects to get some business, and if at the same time they are being paid by the Government, there is likelihood that they have violated the criminal code. I am amazed that after this possible or probable violation of the criminal code came to notice nothing was done about it except to conceal the facts.

On page 851 of the testimony before the Securities and Exchange Commission, Mr. Wenzell was asked:

Now, reference has been made in the evidence as to meetings which you attended. Did you attend any meetings with Middle South representatives or Southern representatives, including personnel of Ebasco, other than at the request of the Bureau of the Budget?

Mr. Wenzell replied:

I did not.

Again, with respect to the meeting of March 2, which is not in the chronology, there is a long colloquy about Mr. Hughes directing Mr. Wenzell to attend that meeting.

We also have another person in this transaction, a Mr. Paul Miller. Mr. Miller is an employee of the First Boston Corp. and an expert on bond financing. Apparently after Mr. Wenzell got down here, in his dual capacity, he called Mr. Miller to come down to be his associate. Mr. Miller was not employed by the Federal Government. He was employed by First Boston Corp.

What did Mr. Miller do? Mr. Miller attended meetings at the Atomic Energy Commission. He attended meetings at the Bureau of the Budget. He was kept fully informed on the progress of the transaction. He expected First Boston Corp. to get the business. He testified to these things before the Securities and Exchange Commission.

He was asked:

Had you anticipated prior to that time that First Boston would get the business?

Answer. I certainly had personally hoped so.

Question. State whether or not you felt that your working with them would lead to getting the business.

Answer. I cannot state how I felt. I certainly hoped it would be. We were all going in the same direction.

What kind of situation is this, in which an agent trying to get business for his bonding house can come to Washington and attend secret meetings of the Atomic Energy Commission, with Admiral Strauss, discussing the Dixon-Yates contract, and also attending meetings with the Bureau of the Budget? That is not mentioned anywhere in the chronology. That is certainly information which the public and the Senate are entitled to have.

Mr. President, this is the fifth unusual procedure in connection with this contract.

The first unusual precedent, which has never been heard of in Government before—and Mr. Hughes so testified—was that the President ordered an independent agency, over its objections, to negotiate a specific contract. Mr. Hughes said there was no precedent for it. He had never heard of it being done before. Particularly there is no precedent for it if it is accomplished against the consent of the director of the independent agency, which was the case here.

The second unprecedented action of the President in this matter was specifying a particular firm to get the contract, without competition. It will be remembered, from this record, that the Director of the Bureau of the Budget was ordered to have the Atomic Energy Commission negotiate, not with a group of people, but with one outfit, Dixon-Yates. That is unprecedented.

The third unprecedented feature is that the President dictated the terms of the contract as set forth in the memorandum of the hearings.

The fourth is that he ordered complete tax reimbursement. The Government was to completely reimburse the contractor for all taxes.

The fifth unprecedented feature is that, after we start digging into the facts, there is a coverup of the activities of a very important person. There is a coverup with respect to certain important meetings. The Chairman of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy is denied certain information. A subcommittee of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary is denied certain information.

Mr. President, these five things are unprecedented. Apparently this concealment is with the consent of the President. The letter shows that Mr. Hughes has talked with him about it. I do not know where the idea came from, but I know that his newspaper release of August 18, 1954, cannot be reconciled with the facts of this particular transaction.

Mr. President, it is a strange thing that Mr. Hughes should invite people to come and get the facts, but that when the committee staff, headed by a capable

lawyer, goes to the Bureau to get the facts, they should be denied the facts. It is a strange thing for the press to be invited to get information, but to have the information denied to a committee of Congress. It is a strange thing that we should hear a great deal of talk about putting all the cards on the table, and then find strenuous efforts made to prevent the facts from being revealed.

I hope the appropriate committees of Congress will appreciate the fact that in this matter there has been a great deal of blowing hot and cold. I have seen enough of it to know that this is an effort to conceal and to hide and to prevent disclosure of pertinent information, and it is further evidence of the fact that we have not yet obtained all the information.

Sooner or later all the information is going to come out, in one way or another. I hope the committees of Congress, who have the great responsibility of deciding whether this contract, which has been commenced in iniquity and fostered in a very unusual and unfair manner, shall be continued; and I hope that the committees will be on notice that there is information about this matter which will have to be brought out and which they ought to know, and that it is very difficult to legislate on this matter without having all the information about it made available. Certainly the committees do not want to be a party to furthering something that must be hidden and concealed.

Mr. President, it is the determination of the subcommittee to do our very best to get the facts, notwithstanding the fact that an effort is made to close the door in our face.

We had Mr. Hughes before the subcommittee for an hour and a half or 2 hours yesterday. He said he could not appear before the committee very long, and for that reason we did not finish with his testimony. He said he had engagements for all of this week during the daytime. Therefore we expect to hold some night sessions of the subcommittee, in order to have Mr. Hughes appear before the subcommittee to give us the information we want.

The withholding of information is making it very difficult, but I am certain that the public will demand a full disclosure. I know that the Members of the Senate, before they pass judgment finally on this issue, will want to have a full disclosure of all the facts. We certainly invite the cooperation of all interested Senators and committees in helping us to secure the information.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 6795) to authorize appropriations for the Atomic Energy Commission for acquisition or condemnation of real property or any facilities, or for plant or facility acquisition, construction, or expansion, and for other purposes.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, the bill before the Senate, H. R. 6795, is the first measure presented to the Congress for the specific purpose of authorizing appropriations to the Atomic Energy Commission for acquisition or condemnation of real property, or for plant or facility acquisition, construction, or expansion.

It will be recalled that last year the Atomic Energy Act of 1946 was revised and many new statutory provisions added thereto. One of the additions modified the Atomic Energy Commission's authority to request appropriations and reads in part as follows:

> SEC. 261. Appropriations.—There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary and appropriate to carry out the provisions and purposes of this act except such as may be necessary for acquisition or condemnation of any real property or any facility or for plant or facility acquisition, construction, or expansion.

The purpose of this added language—the exception clause—was, as set forth in the report accompanying this bill, to require the Commission to "obtain congressional approval of new construction or expansion of its plants."

Prior to last year's revisions of the Atomic Energy Act of 1946, the Atomic Energy Commission had general authority to seek appropriations for the acquisition of land or the construction of new facilities as it deemed necessary.

The appropriating committees of both Houses have done a diligent job since 1946 in reviewing programs and appropriating the necessary money for operating expenses as well as for plants and equipment. These funds have made it possible for this country to remain strong in the field of atomic energy.

In revising the act last year, it was deemed advisable to give the Congress additional control of the Commission's program by adding a provision which requires the joint committee to initiate authorizing legislation for plant and facility items for the AEC, just as the Military Affairs Committees do for the Department of Defense.

Thus we now have the statutory committee, which is in possession of detailed and current knowledge of the entire field, passing upon the programmatic aspects of the Commission's proposed budget for new endeavors and for expansion and replacement, and thus certifying to the appropriating committees, as is done in the case of the military, that the programs are essential.

Starting with a $2 billion production system inherited from the Manhattan Engineer District, the wartime atomic energy agency, it is understandable that the Commission, of necessity, had to feel its way for several years. This, in turn, made difficult the accurate forecasting of construction needs in a rapidly changing program such as atomic energy. Among the many problems confronting the Commission during those early years was that of keeping this Nation strong in nuclear weapons and trying to anticipate the future trend of international affairs in order to judge how much effort could be devoted to the peacetime development of atomic energy. It is basic to our democratic system to desire that this great new source of energy should be directed toward peaceful applications. In this respect a remarkable job has been done in making progress on a very wide front encompassing both the national defense needs and the many peaceful applications of atomic energy.

During past years, as the dual program of the AEC unfolded, the appropriating committees have seen fit to place certain restraints or limitations upon the money appropriated for the Atomic Energy Commission's use. These limitations have served effectively in controlling expenditures.

In H. R. 6795 we have legislation which combines the best features of the experience gained during these past years in dealing with the Commission's financial operations while at the same time providing for the necessary flexibility to permit rapid progress in all the varied and essential programs which the Commission needs to continue or deems advisable to undertake.

The joint committee, and its authorizing legislation subcommittee, has considered the items in this bill at great length. The Commission has testified in detail on each of the items which appear in this bill. It is the considered opinion of the joint committee that they all are essential to a well-rounded and forceful program for the development of atomic energy. An examination of the bill will reveal that there are roughly as many projects for peaceful applications of atomic energy as there are items for expediting the military phase of the Commission's programs. I, therefore, can state unequivocally that this legislation authorizes a sound and adequate program.

Senators will note that this bill consists of five sections, the first of which, section 101, lists by item the various construction projects for which authorization is sought. Each of the items carries an identification number. This feature is somewhat new to this type of legislation, but the joint committee felt it desirable to number projects authorized in order to facilitate its future review of the Commission's activities and accomplishment.

Some of the items, it will be noted, are for completely new plants or production facilities while others are additions or modifications to existing plants or facilities for the purpose of continuing programs already underway. An example of the latter category are two items for construction of additional buildings and equipment to facilitate development of aircraft nuclear reactors.

The joint committee has considered each of these items as to their individual importance and as to their essentiality to the overall program. It has not endeavored to establish a hard and fast monetary value for each of these programs, except to set upper limits, but leaves the final consideration of this matter to the responsible appropriating committees of both Houses.

The second section of this bill, section 102, sets forth certain restrictions, deemed advisable by the joint committee, to limit the authority which this bill seeks to give the Atomic Energy Commission for requesting appropriations. These limitations are a combination of

the best features of restrictions contained in previous appropriation bills plus others which the joint committee thought advisable.

It will be recalled that in the previous fiscal year, the Commission was authorized to start construction on all of its projects if, at the time the project was initiated, the estimated cost thereof did not exceed by 35 percent the original estimated cost when the budget was presented to the Congress.

The scarcity of materials and the crash nature of some of the Commission's earlier programs were such that cost estimates were more often than not highly unrealistic and the Commission therefore needed and was given considerable flexibility.

The joint committee now feels, however, that this agency has matured to the point where most of its programs can be anticipated sufficiently far in advance for the preparation of detailed engineering drawings and more accurate cost estimates. Therefore, it has set forth in this bill three categories of construction items which have different degrees of financial flexibility.

The first group, which has been given a leeway of 25 percent—10 percent less than last year—contains projects which the committee feels have enough elements of uncertainty so as to make this degree of flexibility desirable. The second category carries a limitation of 10 percent deviation. Into this group fall the more or less conventional type of building and research equipment for which estimates should be quite accurate and for which only a nominal amount of flexibility needs to be provided. In the third category, which allows no deviation from estimated cost, is the access roads program in the Colorado Plateau area. This is such a routine construction job that no flexibility was deemed necessary.

The pending bill provides authority to request funds for all of the items requested by the executive department except one, and that is the $21 million for construction of a reactor for a nuclear-propelled cargo ship. This request was submitted with no advance notice after hearings had been started by the subcommittee on the original group of construction items.

Testimony received from the best technical authorities on the subject furnished the committee with convincing proof that the proposed propulsion system for the cargo ship—which utilizes a reactor of the type installed in the submarine *Nautilus*—is not the most efficient or desirable for accomplishing this very worthwhile purpose.

The testimony which convinced the joint committee on this point was to the effect that construction of this reactor, which is a copy of one already built, will not advance the art of reactor development one iota and will divert technicians and production facilities from more urgent and worthwhile work. At the same time, it would be an uneconomical use of valuable nuclear fuel.

After a full review of the matter, it was the concensus of the joint committee that better means were available to accomplish the same end. For this reason, the committee voted to eliminate this item.

Agreeing that this construction of an economically justifiable, atomically propelled cargo ship was desirable, the committee urges the Commission and the executive department to accelerate an already active program which was initiated months ago to develop a new and more efficient reactor powerplant for a large surface ship. This development envisions the use of multiple reactors, components of which would be suitable for installation in a cargo-type ship. The committee has been assured that this is feasible and that the amount of time which would be lost in awaiting the final testing of such a powerplant would be nominal, and that a more economical and much more highly developed propulsion system would be available for merchant ship use if this course is followed.

I, therefore, want to make it abundantly clear that a majority of the committee is not opposed to the basic idea of building an economically sound, nuclear-propelled merchant ship. It believes that in emphasizing the program identified as item 56–b–3 in section 101 this country can produce a really economic and convincing example of America's advance position in the peacetime application of atomic energy.

To assist the executive department in its program to demonstrate the American desire to exploit the atom for the benefit of mankind, the committee added an item identified as project 56–g–7 in section 101 of the bill. This item seeks authorization for an appropriation of $5 million to be expended in furtherance of the President's recently announced plan to provide scientific- and medical-type reactors to those nations which are willing to enter into bilateral agreements for cooperation. This amount of money would provide about 20 swimming-pool type reactors to recipient countries who will agree to finance half the cost thereof. By unanimous vote, the committee is happy to cooperate wholeheartedly in assisting the carrying out of this desirable program. This is the only item in the bill that has not been officially approved by the Budget Bureau.

Section 103 of this bill authorized the Commission to make use of funds available to it for advance planning for new buildings and projects. The committee feels that the Commission should have this authority so that it can make necessary plans to replace plants and equipment which become obsolete quite rapidly in the fast-moving business of atomic energy, and also to be prepared to put into production new materials and weapon designs as rapidly as they may be needed. This authority would permit the Commission to obtain the necessary architect and engineering services to prepare preliminary plans from which accurate cost estimates can be made. It would also save the Commission much time in getting construction underway on a competitive-bid basis if such projects were subsequently authorized, and will lead to closer estimates of final cost.

Section 104 of this bill provides the Commission with authority to utilize any money available to it to initiate replacement of or repair to any of its plants or equipment which might become damaged or completely destroyed in the event of a catastrophe.

Section 105 of the bill authorizes the appropriation of such funds as may be currently available to the Commission for the purposes of carrying out this act. It will be noted that this authority is in addition to that which is sought under section 101 of this bill. The purpose of this section is to permit the Commission to utilize money which it might have available as a result of economies in the construction of authorized projects.

Section 106 provides for the transfer of money authorized by this bill for a given project to another project provided that the substitution meets very precisely defined conditions and that the Commission will certify that such a substitution is essential to the common defense and security of the United States. Under this section the project substituted must not exceed the cost of the authorized project for which it is being substituted. Further, the substitution must be brought about by changes in weapon characteristics or logistic operations. Finally, the Atomic Energy Commission must certify that it is unable to enter into a contract with any person, on terms satisfactory to the Commission, to furnish from a privately owned plant or facility the product or services to be provided by the new project.

The joint committee recognizes that in the rapidly developing technology of atomic energy, particularly in the military applications thereof, the Commission needs some flexibility. It is for this purpose and after full consideration that the joint committee decided to recommend this flexibility so that the Commission will be enabled at all times to meet its program goals, and at the same time afford a closer control to the Congress on the initiation or modification of construction, acquisition or expansion of plants and facilities.

I therefore earnestly urge the passage of this bill so that the necessary request for authorization can be made by the Atomic Energy Commission, and it may then go forward without any delay with its important programs.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, on behalf of the distinguished minority leader and myself, I send to the desk a unanimous-consent agreement, which has been cleared with the distinguished chairman of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy and with the ranking minority member. I ask that the proposed agreement be read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will read the unanimous-consent agreement.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

Ordered, That, during the further consideration of the bill H. R. 6795, to authorize appropriations for the Atomic Energy Commission for acquisition or condemnation of real property or any facilities, or for plant or facility acquisition, construction, or expansion, and for other purposes, debate on any amendment, motion, or appeal, except a motion to lay on the table, shall be limited to 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the mover of any such amendment or motion and the majority leader: *Provided*,

That in the event the majority leader is in favor of any such amendment or motion, the time in opposition thereto shall be controlled by the minority leader or some Senator designated by him: *Provided further*, That no amendment that is not germane to the provisions of the said bill shall be received.

Ordered further, That on the question of the final passage of the said bill debate shall be limited to 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled, respectively, by the majority and minority leaders.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, I should like to address a question to the majority leader. I have an amendment, which I intend to offer. I would not be precluded from offering it by the unanimous-consent agreement, would I?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Oh, no.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The unanimous-consent agreement does not preclude the offering of amendments.

Is there objection to the unanimous-consent agreement? The Chair hears none, and the order is entered.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I have an amendment at the desk which might be stated at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from New Mexico will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 3, line 11, after the comma following the word "Tennessee", it is proposed to strike out "$750,000" and to insert in lieu thereof "$2,200,000."

On page 1, line 4, after the words "the sum of", strike out "$267,709,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$269,159,000."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there is no objection, the amendments will be considered en bloc.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. As I understand, under the unanimous-consent agreement the proposer of an amendment has 30 minutes, the time to be controlled by the mover of the amendment and the majority leader.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I am in favor of the amendment, so the distinguished minority leader will control the time against the amendment. I have told the distinguished Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] that I would yield him 10 minutes, and would yield 1 minute to the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BUTLER].

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I yield 1 minute to the Senator from Maryland.

ATTEMPTS TO SCUTTLE THE AMERICAN MERCHANT MARINE

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, even a policy of moderate internationalism, while hopefully intending to fortify the community of free nations, can at the same time unwittingly erode some of the most sensitive foundations of our industrial and economic structure. This unfortunate condition was brought sharply into focus last week when a two-forked attack was directed at legislation which would reserve for American shipping at least 50 percent of all Government-purchased or Government-financed cargoes.

Today, in the House, the recommendation of the House Foreign Affairs Committee to eliminate this vital provision is being debated, and I therefore ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, to include in the body of the RECORD a statement which I made to the press on Saturday, June 25, 1955.

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

STATEMENT BY SENATOR BUTLER

If the House of Representatives wants to scuttle the American merchant marine, it could not have devised a more destructive time bomb than to abolish the 50–50 cargo preference.

Congress has decreed that the protection as guaranteed by this provision was essential to preserve our merchant marine in a healthy state in order that it might survive unfair and cheap-labor foreign competition. Now the House Foreign Affairs Committee, in reporting out the Mutual Security Act of 1955, proposes to remove this fundamental security. If this action is endorsed by the Congress, it will be a body blow to American shipping.

As coauthor of the 50–50 cargo-preference legislation, known as the Butler-Tollefson bill, enacted by the Congress last year for the purpose of preserving the American flag on the high seas, I fear that the American merchant marine is being placed on the sacrificial block in our haste to dispense our surplus agricultural commodities and benevolence abroad. This latest development assumes greater incredibility when it is recalled that the Department of Agriculture, in May of 1954, specifically stated that it had no interest in the Butler-Tollefson measure.

Now, 13 months later, it is alleged that dispatching of surplus commodities, from the vast storage accumulated at great expense to the American taxpayers, has slackened through the unavailability of United States vessels. This is an assertion which in my considered judgment is open to grave question. Within the past 6 months, following extensive hearings conducted by the House Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee, at which all interests were represented, it was concluded that the 50–50 provision did not, in any way, deter the effective disposal of surplus commodities. Furthermore, the Maritime Administration accepted the function of notifying other governmental agencies as to any fluctuations in the availability of American bottoms with the view that foreign vessels could be utilized in the event of shortages.

It is unfortunate, at best, that the House Foreign Affairs Committee, did not give weight and credence to these earlier detailed and objective considerations of a matter so basic to the maritime and shipping industries of our country. Regardless of their motives or intentions in recommending the removal of the 50–50 reservation for American-flag shipping, one can only assume that the members of the committee did not realize the real significance and magnitude of the problem.

Were this recommendation to be sustained by the Congress, American shipping would suffer another 25-percent loss in cargoes. Contrasted with the fact that our own ships now carry a meager 29 percent of our own cargoes, further privation could only be alarmingly disastrous. Also, it cannot be argued that American shipping would be denied only infinitesimal tonnages through the elimination of the 50–50 shipping clause, from the $3.4 billion mutual aid bill or, if passed, about 75 percent of all foreign aid and agricultural commodity shipments would be transported in foreign ships.

Maryland, and particularly Baltimore, is vitally affected in this matter. We have an important port in Baltimore, and we have large shipping activities which will most assuredly suffer from unfair competition from foreign shipping subsidized by American assistance funds. It is indeed ironical that United States funds are granted to build foreign shipping to compete unfairly with American shipping, and then to add insult to injury every reasonable protection devised to cushion our own industry against such United States financed competition is removed.

Congress must defeat this disgraceful plan to scrap the 50–50 provision. Realistic judgment, rather than ill-conceived expediency, must prevail. If not, full responsibility for scuttling the American Merchant Marine must be assumed by those in Congress and elsewhere who seem bent on the destruction of our fourth arm of defense and an essential segment of our peacetime national economy.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I yield 10 minutes to the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS].

LOOPHOLES IN RETIREMENT LAWS

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, on previous occasions the Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPPEL], and I have called to the attention of the Senate certain loopholes in our retirement laws. Today, on behalf of the Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPPEL], and myself, I am reporting on four other cases wherein the individuals involved found a way to beat the Government retirement systems.

Contrary to what many people think, all Government employees are not under the same retirement system; in fact, the Government has over 20 different systems with various formulas under which Government employees can qualify. For a long time I have been advocating their consolidation.

In enacting Public Law 730, 84th Congress, Congress did partially correct these loopholes; however, loopholes such as I am calling attention to in these four cases today will never be effectively corrected until such consolidation has been arranged along with the adoption of a formula wherein employees will be given credit only for that period of Government service during which they made contributions according to the standard formula provided in the law.

The four cases are as follows:

CASE NO. 1

The individual's employment record prior to the manipulation is:

February 21, 1917, to September 24, 1919, Agriculture Extension Service.

February 1, 1922 to June 30, 1941, Agriculture Extension Service.

July 1, 1941, to December 22, 1950, Tennessee Valley Authority.

Had he retired at this point he would have been eligible for annual retirement benefits in the amount of $1,400.20 per year. However, he had a friend in the appropriate place, and instead of retiring with this annuity of $1,400.20 as most other employees would expect to do, he began certain maneuvers.

First, he withdrew from the Tennessee Valley Authority retirement system all his contributions in the amount of $5,632.41 plus interest of $501.68, or a total refund of $6,134.09.

Ten days later, on January 1, 1951, he was given a new appointment as Acting District Agent of the Extension Service, whereby he automatically became eligible to register under the regular civil-service-retirement system.

He held this position just 3 months, or until March 31, 1951, during which time he contributed into the civil-service-retirement fund a total of $64.04.

He then on April 1, 1951, retired under the civil-service retirement system claiming credit for all previous Government service, but the law did not require any restoration of the $6,134.09 previously withdrawn as contributions for his past service. His retirement benefits at this time, however, instead of being $1,400.20, were $3,612 per year.

Summarizing this case, the man withdrew from one Government retirement system $6,134.09, paid $64.04 into another, and hiked his retirement credits from $1,400.20 to $3,612, all with 3 months of maneuvering. This represents a 250 percent increase in his retirement benefits and a windfall of over $6,100.

CASE NO. 2

The early employment record of the second individual is:

September 17, 1891, to November 24, 1903, Post Office Department.

September 6, 1918, to February 23, 1919, Department of Labor.

September 26, 1923, to May 31, 1925, Department of Justice.

He was not under any retirement system and made no contributions to any retirement system during any of this service.

On August 1, 1953, then being at the age of 85, he was appointed as a staff member of a congressional committee at a salary of $619.83 per month, which position he held for exactly 1 month, retiring on August 31, 1953.

During this 1-month employment period he registered under civil service retirement and made a contribution of $37.19.

After this 1-month's employment he retired, claiming credit for all previous Government service but not making any back contributions, and as a result he was awarded an annual annuity of $720 a year.

CASE NO. 3

The early employment record of this individual is as follows:

October 1, 1900, to February 28, 1913, letter carrier, Post Office Department.

During this period he was under no retirement system since the Civil Service Retirement Act was not enacted until May 22, 1920.

January 3, 1939, to January 2, 1949, Member of Congress.

While serving as a Member of Congress he came under the congressional retirement system, and being of retirement age when his service ended on January 2, 1949, he filed for retirement benefits effective February 1, 1949, being eligible at that time to draw an annuity of $2,625, based solely upon his 10 years of service as a Member of Congress.

However, he was not satisfied with this, and in the meantime, on January 3, 1949, the day following his termination as a Member of Congress, he was appointed as a clerk to another Member of Congress at a salary of $2,189 per year, which position he held for exactly 28 days, during which time he elected to come under the regular civil service retirement system. His total contribution from his 1 month's salary to the civil service retirement fund was $10.22.

The sole purpose of this 28-day employment as a clerk to a Member of Congress was to qualify him under the regular civil service retirement fund, thereby making it possible for him to retroactively claim credit for his previous Government service other than as a Member of Congress, even though contributions had not been made to cover that period.

Effective February 1, 1949, he resigned from this latter position and filed for additional retirement credits under the civil service retirement system, claiming credit for his previous 12 years and 5 months as a letter carrier as well as for the 28 days as a clerk to the Member of Congress, whereupon he was awarded a second annuity in the amount of $444 per year. This $444 was in addition to the $2,625 he would draw from the congressional retirement system.

Thus, in this instance we find that this former Member of Congress, with a contribution of only $10.22, boosted his annual retirement annuity by $444.

CASE NO. 4

The early employment record of the fourth individual is as follows:

February 2, 1914, to June 30, 1917, Extension Service.

June 1, 1928, to September 7, 1933, Extension Service.

September 1, 1933, to May 15, 1952, TVA.

May 15, 1952, position abolished.

May 15, 1952, to May 15, 1953, served with TVA under a personal service contract.

May 15, 1953, resigned.

On that date—May 15, 1953—by leaving all his contributions in the fund he would have been eligible for retirement benefits under the Tennessee Valley Authority retirement system in the amount of $3,150.52.

Instead of retiring under that system, however, he too decided to do a little manipulating. First, he elected to withdraw all his contributions to the previous retirement systems and thereby received a check in the amount of $12,701.72, plus the accumulated interest of $2,132.88, making a total refund of $14,834.60.

Thirty days later, on June 15, 1953, he received a special appointment to the Extension Service, which position he held until October 1953, during which time he filed under the civil service retirement system, making a contribution of $136 from his salary.

He then made a deposit with the civil service retirement system of an additional $11,505 representing partial payments for prior Government service.

At the end of October 1953, he again resigned and retired at an annual annuity of $3,948 plus a survivorship annuity of $2,148 for his wife.

Thus we have this situation: This employee withdrew from one Government retirement fund a total of $14,834.60, then paid into another Government retirement system a total of $11,641, leaving him a cash windfall of $3,193.60, and by so doing increased his personal retirement benefits from $3,150.52 to $3,948 and gained in addition a survivorship annuity for his wife in the amount of $2,148.

In calling these four cases to the attention of the Senate it should be pointed out that these manipulations on the part of these Government employees, whereby they collected substantial refunds and at the same time pyramided their retirement credits, could not have been possible without the full knowledge and cooperation of the top officials of the agencies, congressional committees, and Members of Congress involved.

Again the Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPPEL] and I appeal to the Senate Post Office and Civil Service Committee and to the Civil Service Commission to join in recommending the necessary legislation to effectively close these loopholes.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE—ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its clerks, announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the Vice President:

S. 666. An act to extend the period of authorization of appropriations for the hospital center and facilities in the District of Columbia;

S. 1582. An act to amend Public Law 727, 83d Congress, so as to extend the period for the making of emergency loans for agricultural purposes;

S. 1755. An act to amend the act of April 6, 1949, as amended, and the act of August 31, 1954, so as to provide that the rate of interest on certain loans made under such acts shall not exceed 3 percent per annum;

H. R. 968. An act for the relief of Max Kozlowski;

H. R. 3005. An act to further amend the Universal Military Training and Service Act by extending the authority to induct certain individuals and by extending the authority to require the special registration, classification, and induction of certain medical, dental, and allied specialist categories, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 4549. An act for the relief of John J. Braund.

ENROLLED BILLS PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, June 28, 1955, he presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bills:

S. 666. An act to extend the period of authorization of appropriations for the hospital center and facilities in the District of Columbia;

S. 1582. An act to amend Public Law 727, 83d Congress, so as to extend the period for the making of emergency loans for agricultural purposes; and

S. 1755. An act to amend the act of April 6, 1949, as amended, and the act of August 31, 1954, so as to provide that the rate of interest on certain loans made under such acts shall not exceed 3 percent per annum.

AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 6795) to authorize appropriations for the Atomic Energy Commission for acquisition or condemnation of real property or any facilities, or for plant or facility acquisition, construction, or expansion, and for other purposes.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum, the time for the quorum call to be charged to the time allotted to me on the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. KNOWLAND. I am prepared to yield back the time controlled by me in opposition to the amendment, because I am not opposed to the amendment.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I merely wish to make a short statement relative to the amendment, which pertains to an addition to the Oak Ridge, Tenn., barrier plant.

I have discussed the amendment with the distinguished senior Senator from Iowa and other members of the committee. We are all in agreement that the increase is justifiable.

The amendment has been requested by the Atomic Energy Commission, and is justified by extensive tests recently completed after the committee's hearings, which show that this expenditure will result in substantial increases in the output of U-235, as well as in important increases in plant efficiency.

The original item of $750,000 for this purpose was presented to the committee at a time when test results were not final. The AEC thought then that improvements might be made to the plant by a different but more complicated device requiring a longer time to produce and install.

Fortunately, the device now decided upon lends itself to rapid production and installation in the Oak Ridge production facilities, so that the increased production of U-235 can begin to be realized by the end of this year if the amendment shall be accepted, and the necessary increased funds made available to the Commission.

I need not remind the Senate of the vital part U-235 plays in our national defense program, as well as its essentiality as a nuclear reactor fuel. Every extra kilogram we can produce is immediately reflected in an increase in our military posture and also in our ability to expand the peacetime uses of atomic energy.

Based upon detailed classified information supplied the joint committee, I can state that this increased expenditure is a good investment. It will pay large dividends in increased production of U-235 all out of proportion to the cost thereof.

I urge, therefore, that the amendment be adopted.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I yield 2 minutes to the senior Senator from Iowa.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, there is no disagreement, so far as I know, over the amendment offered by the junior Senator from New Mexico. I think the committee is united in its position that the amendment is worthwhile, and should be adopted. It will result in increased Uranium-235 production.

The actual processes and equipment to be fabricated and installed with funds authorized to be appropriated by the amendment are highly classified and cannot be discussed on the floor of the Senate. I can assure the Senate, however, that the competent technical personnel of the Atomic Energy Commission have informed the committee that the new developments are highly desirable and technically sound.

I support the amendment and urge its adoption.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time on the amendment.

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time on the amendment has been yielded back.

The question is on agreeing en bloc to the amendments offered by the junior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON].

The amendments were agreed to.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, I call up my amendment, which is at the desk, and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the senior Senator from Iowa will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 2, after line 20, it is proposed to insert the following new subsection:

11. Project 56-b-11, design, construction, and installation of a reactor facility and auxiliary facilities and equipment to provide power for a merchant ship, $21,000,000.

On page 1, line 4, it is proposed to strike out "$269,159,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$290,159,000."

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Iowa yield to permit me to ask that the yeas and nays be ordered, so that all Senators will be on notice with respect to the amendment?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, without the Senator from Iowa losing his right to the floor, there may be a quorum call, the time for the quorum call to be charged to neither side.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered; and, without the time for the quorum call being charged to either side, the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I should like to ask the minority leader if my understanding is correct. The pending amendment is the Hickenlooper amendment, on which the yeas and nays have been ordered, and 30 minutes are allowed to each side on the amendment. Therefore, 1 hour from now, if all the time is used, there will be a yea-and-nay vote on the Hickenlooper amendment. Is that correct?

Mr. KNOWLAND. The Senator is correct. It is possible that some time may be yielded back, so that a vote may come sooner than that.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Just a moment, please. The Senator from Texas reserved the right to object to the rescinding of the order for a quorum call.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, the Senator from Texas is willing to withdraw his objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the order for the quorum call is rescinded.

The Senator from Iowa is recognized.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, I yield myself such time as I may need within the 30 minutes available. It will probably be 10 minutes, but I cannot be certain.

Mr. President, I understand the amendment as read at the desk is technically two amendments. One is the amendment proposing the authorization of $21 million for the design, construction, and installation of a reactor facility and the auxiliary facilities and equipment to provide power for a merchant ship.

The second part, which I originally assumed was a part of the same amendment, must be considered as a different amendment. All it does is to increase the amount of the total authorization by $21 million, if the first part of the amendment is adopted. It will be necessary, if the first part of the amendment is adopted, to ask unanimous consent that the second part of the amendment be adopted as a conforming amendment.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, might not the procedure be better if unanimous consent were obtained to have the amendments considered en bloc, and let them rise or fall together?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. It is satisfactory to me to have them considered en bloc, so that they may rise or fall together, but I had understood the proper procedure to be to have them considered separately.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the amendments of the Senator from Iowa be considered en bloc.

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

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, on April 25, 1955, the President announced that the Atomic Energy Commission and the Maritime Administration were developing specifications for the construction of a nuclear-powered merchant ship. He said he would shortly thereafter submit a request to the Congress for the necessary authorization of

funds to carry out the project. The request has been submitted.

I shall not take very much time, Mr. President, for I think all Members understand what the amendment proposes to do. The Joint Committee on Atomic Energy considered the request for the authorization of an appropriation of $21 million for the construction of an atomic powerplant to be installed in a merchant-ship-type hull. That amount does not include the cost of the hull.

I understand that in the House of Representatives, Representative PATTERSON has introduced a bill providing, among other things, for the construction of at least 1 hull of this type, and authorizing an appropriation in the amount of $12,500,000.

Mr. President, at the very outset I wish to say that the atomic powerplant which is proposed to be installed in this merchant-ship hull will cost more to operate than will a conventional powerplant, and will cost more to build than will a conventional powerplant.

Stated simply, this proposal, if carried out, will mean that the United States has launched upon perhaps one of the most important and one of the most far-reaching programs in which we have ever engaged, in attempting to convince the world that the atom can be used and will be used by the United States for peaceful purposes.

Granted that $21 million for the powerplant is much more than the cost of a conventional powerplant in a ship, and granted that it will cost more per hour or per day to operate an atomic powerplant in a merchant ship; but it will be designed to show the people of the world that the United States is preeminent in the peaceful use of atomic energy, and is therefore proposing to use a powerplant which although it will cost more than the ordinary powerplant, will demonstrate that there is a practical use for atomic energy—a use which they can see and can observe in action. It is entirely conceivable that we can use many other means of showing this to the people of the world.

This ship will be a cargo ship, and it will have utility; for it can carry American products to foreign ports; or, if that is desired, it can be used—and I refer now to the ship's atomic-energy powerplant —to generate electricity in foreign ports. When the ship enters a foreign port, those in charge of the ship can be instructed to disconnect the atomic powerplant, and to hook it up with the electric powerplant of the city or port, and then light at least certain portions of the city, thus showing the people living there that the United States is pioneering in and is the leader in the peaceful use of atomic energy.

As a propaganda weapon for good and to demonstrate the peaceful intentions of the United States and our determination to aid the rest of the world in this great, new field, I think this ship will be invaluable.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Iowa yield to me?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I yield.

Mr. PASTORE. Is the distinguished Senator from Iowa quite sure that there will be an electric generating plant aboard the ship?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I am not sure. Our committee has advocated that, but that is a matter about which a decision will have to be made. I hope the ship will be provided with an electric drive, and that it will have electric generating facilities. But that decision will have to be made in the executive branch of the Government, and I think at this moment it is not to be made in the legislative field.

Mr. President, objection may be made because of the cost differential, that is, the cost of operating the ship as compared to a conventional-type ship, and also the cost of building it, although the cost of constructing it is fairly well known.

Today, we have in the ocean a completely operatable atomic-powered submarine. It is operating with far greater efficiency than we had hoped. It is operating much more successfully—I was about to say much more successfully than we had imagined in our fondest dreams. I shall not say that; but it is operating far more successfully than one would have believed possible, judging from the practical predictions of several years ago. The powerplant of that submarine is a fantastic one, and it can do things that no powerplant ever before developed in the world could do.

Mr. President, I cannot overemphasize the fact that I am not attempting to convince the Senate that the ship will be the most efficient one. But from the standpoint of carrying the message of this pioneering activity on our part in connection with the peacetime use of atomic energy, the ship will afford a dramatic demonstration

If this authorization bill is passed today by the Senate, and if the required appropriations are forthcoming, I think we shall be first in the field with an atomic-powered ship, and will be the first to provide a peacetime demonstration of a practical nature that the maritime nations of the world can understand and can see and can really appreciate.

So I think this matter is very important.

There is one more facet of this matter to which I desire to refer. The President of the United States, in his drive for accentuation of the peacetime use of the atom, has said to the other countries of the world—he did so in April, and he has repeated it—that the United States is going to build such a powerplant to be placed in a ship, to demonstrate what such a powerplant will do and what its possibilities will be. The President has said that one of our ships, having such an atomic powerplant, will be on the high seas.

Mr. President, if one considers the difference between the cost of a ship powered with such an atomic powerplant and the cost of a ship having a conventional powerplant, I think it will be found that the difference will be but a small expense, indeed, in comparison with the long-range good it will do for us, and the proof it will give of our good will in connection with the peacetime use of the atom, and the understanding it will carry to the various countries of the world.

I could talk for a long time about the details of the ship, but I do not believe that is necessary. The question is just this simple: Do we wish to take this step at this time, in supporting the statement the President of the United States has made to the world? If we do not, I fear there are countries which will say, "Well, our propaganda is right. After all, the Americans cannot run a ship with atomic power."

Mr. President, we know that the Russians have said that. They have said that we do not have an atomic-powered submarine, and that any statements to the effect that we do have such a submarine are false American propaganda.

So, Mr. President, if Congress refuses to permit this practical demonstration to be made—a demonstration by means of a ship which we can send into every deep-water harbor of the world—I wish to point out that there are possibilities of adverse propaganda value to those who would like to destroy our preeminence or to destroy the idea of our preeminence in the field of atomic energy.

So, Mr. President, the question before the Senate is just that simple. At the moment the details are not so important. They are technical details, which will have to be worked out by the Commission and by those who know how to construct ships and who know what they wish to have placed in the ships.

But the question now before the Senate is one of putting upon the ocean a peacetime ship which other countries will be able to see—and a ship which will prove our peacetime efforts.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Iowa yield to me?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Yes, although we are proceeding on limited time, and other Senators wish to make brief statements. However, I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Although I agree with the Senator from Iowa in his statement about the principal reason for putting such a vessel on the high seas, I desire to point out that I in part represent a State which is tremendously interested in and active in ship construction. I understand that the ship will be between 10,000 and 12,000 gross tons. Is that correct?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Its tonnage will be in that neighborhood, I believe.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Although the nuclear powerplant to be used in the ship may not be so efficient as one which ultimately will be worked out, for use in commercial vessels, yet it will be a useful nuclear powerplant, and, if installed in this ship, may be adapted to some other ship at a future time; is that correct?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. It will be an efficient powerplant, and the ship will have commercial utility—perhaps not as great commercial utility as other ships, but it will have utility.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. It will have utility in that it can be a cargo-carrying ship as it goes around the world.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. That is correct. It will demonstrate the practical ability of nuclear-powered ships to carry cargo in commerce in the peacetime activities of the world.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I am a member of the committee. We build prototype ships of various types. We build prototype tankers. We have authorized one, and have appropriated for it. We build prototype ships in various fields. This will be a prototype ship, and while perhaps it may be half again as expensive as a conventional commercial type ship, it will be a prototype ship, which will help us in the future in connection with the design of nuclear-powered vessels.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. The Senator is correct. I think the cost of the hull will be comparable with the cost of any other hull. The increased cost will be in the powerplant which goes into the ship, as compared with the conventional powerplant.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. So while the principal purpose is the purpose which the Senator has so ably described, the ship will not be a total loss by any means. The nuclear powerplant will not be a total loss. The ship will be a prototype, and will provide a demonstration to the Bethlehem Steel Co., the New York Shipbuilding Co., and the Navy plants as to how to build this type of ship.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. The Senator is correct.

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

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I must yield to the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] who wishes about 5 minutes. I yield for a question.

Mr. BUTLER. I suggest to the Senator that the great port of Baltimore, in my State of Maryland, which produced the famous frigate *Constellation*, the famous Baltimore clippers which in their day were known throughout the world for their speed and design and which has since built many of our present merchant fleet has the know-how and facilities to build an atomic merchant ship and would like to be favorably considered if this ship becomes a reality.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I yield.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Item No. 3, on page 2, line 6, of the bill, reads as follows:

3. Project 56-b-3, surface ship reactor facility, $25 million.

Is that project related directly to the proposal being considered at this time, or is it something else?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I shall have to inquire as to how much I can say about that particular item. It has nothing to do with the cargo commercial type of ship. It is primarily designed as a prototype development for a large carrier for military purposes.

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

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I yield for a question. My time is limited.

Mr. GORE. Does not the distinguished Senator think it would be a more readily available, a more economical, and a more practical demonstration of atomic propulsion if the *Nautilus* were to make a trip across the Atlantic, which it could do, as the Senator knows, entirely under atomic power?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. The Senator has a very good suggestion, which I think is not amiss. The *Nautilus* is going to make such demonstrations. However, from the psychological standpoint, the *Nautilus* is not a cargo-carrying ship. It is not a commercial ship. It is a war vessel. We are attempting to build this ship as a ship of peace. There are those—and I agree with them—who say that to use a warship as a demonstration of atomic power might carry the wrong psychology with it. It is considered that we had better have a ship of peace, which has utility, rather than a ship of war.

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

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Is it not also true that if a commercial ship such as the Senator is advocating goes into a port, a great many hundreds of people can go aboard and look at it, which would be helpful from the point of view of the United States. People cannot conveniently go aboard a submarine in large numbers.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I think there is a great deal to that suggestion. It is impracticable for a large number of people to go aboard a submarine and examine it. However, they can go aboard a cargo ship by the thousands. For demonstration purposes, the cargo ship would be the better.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I yield myself 12 minutes.

I must oppose this amendment, because I think this is a poor way to spend $21 million.

The question arose a moment ago as to whether or not the nuclear plant could be taken out of this ship and used in another ship. Of course it could not. This is the highest cost powerplant we could have. It is fine for a submarine. It uses enriched fuel. We would not attempt to operate a commercial vessel by the use of such fuel. It has been proposed that the atomic plant which is in the *Nautilus* be placed in a commercial ship. That is an entirely different field. That is primarily the reason why the joint committee was not attracted to this proposal.

The joint committee heard all the arguments and weighed them very seriously, and reached the firm conclusion that it could not be a party to this project. Not a single witness, from either the Atomic Energy Commission or the Maritime Commission, contended that the proposed ship would be economical. Its capital cost would be five times that of a comparable conventional-type ship. The estimate of operating costs runs as high as 10 times the cost of an equivalent conventional ship.

How does it help us to show how far away we are from the use of nuclear power? Only a few days ago one of the newspapers carried a story headed "Atomic Ships Put 15 to 20 Years Away." If we do not start development of these atomic ships on a proper basis, if we start using high-cost fuel, which makes it still further away, then I think we shall be doing a great disservice to the shipbuilding industry to which the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] referred.

Is this ship a step along the road of technical development toward a truly economical merchant ship? The answer from witness after witness was "no." It might yield some engineering experience, but even in that field it was agreed that the same experience can be acquired cheaper, better, and even faster, by other means.

Would this ship be a contribution to the development of better atomic powerplants for ships and other uses? Far from it. In fact, it was argued quite the contrary. Not only would this ship make no contribution, but it was argued that it would be possible to build it on the President's proposed 2-year time schedule only because it would involve no development work. It would consist of carbon copies of the *Nautilus* submarine reactor, which we have already been told is obsolete by comparison with reactors nearing design completion. We learned a great deal in building the *Nautilus*. We should be using that knowledge.

What, then, are the merits of the proposed ship? Would it be good propaganda? Would it convince anyone of our peaceful atomic intentions? I think not. This ship is supposed to sail into foreign ports as a smokestackless wonder, convincing all who see her that we are using atomic energy for peaceful purposes.

I wish I could say that such an atomic-powered ship is indeed now practical and ready for construction. I cannot say it, because it is not so. That is why there is in the bill, on page 2, line 6, project No. 3—

3. Project 56-b-3, surface ship reactor facility, $25,000,000.

That item is in the bill so that the United States can have practical, economical, atomic-powered surface ships for peaceful and military purposes as soon as possible. As I have said, that item is already in the bill; but this floating museum is completely unrelated to it.

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

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield.

Mr. PASTORE. Would it be good propaganda for the Senator to buy a brandnew Cadillac and go around showing it off to all his poor relatives?

Mr. ANDERSON. I do not think it would be very good. That is why I do not think this ship would be very good.

The average country cannot afford to put $21 million into a type of nuclear plant which we now recognize is already obsolete. Admiral Rickover says it is obsolete. The *Sea Wolf* is a far different pattern; and the fleet submarines to follow will be a great improvement over existing ships. Why repeat the mistakes we have already made?

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

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield.

Mr. JACKSON. Is it not true that in this situation what we are really doing is telling the world, "Look what we have, and look what you do not have"? What are we doing in this proposal to share

the peaceful atom with the other free peoples of the world?

Mr. ANDERSON. I do not think we are doing anything along that line.

I realize that the purpose is desirable. We need to demonstrate to the world that we have made a contribution. I would far rather accept the proposal made by the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE] a moment ago for sending the *Nautilus* across the ocean. I, for one, would be happy to see the submarine *Nautilus* cross the ocean and come up on the other side, so that the people might know what we have accomplished. That would be a very fine thing.

However, taking that powerplant, designed for a submarine, designed to operate on enriched fuel, constituting the costliest type of powerplant, and putting it into an old vessel and then sending it across the ocean into foreign ports, I do not believe would make much of an impression on foreign people.

I am persuaded that there are other countries which might want to do something along that line. However, to build a new type of ship of this kind will take some hardheaded business experience. I do not believe any country will build that kind of ship on an outmoded pattern. The *Nautilus* was outmoded on the day it was launched, thanks to the genius of the men who kept working toward new ideas.

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

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I have listened with a great deal of interest to the Senator from New Mexico. He has spoken entirely, as I see it, from the economic side, namely, the cost of building a commercial ship, and he has referred to the fact that the nuclear powerplant is not efficient under the most modern conditions.

My question is this: Has the Senator not forgotten the psychological factor that would be involved in this type of commercial ship going among peoples who are under great strain, and who have a deep sense of insecurity, and showing them that we are building atomic vessels for peace, not merely for war?

Let us assume that we spend $21 million for such a vessel—and the Senator from New Mexico and I have the same feeling about wasting money—that is only a drop in the bucket. Is there not a psychological factor and a factor of faith and optimism involved here?

Mr. ANDERSON. It is about as much of a psychological factor as there would be if we were to take a modern automobile and put into it the powerplant of a Stanley Steamer and then say, "We will take this automobile to Europe to show how our automobile industry has advanced." No man who is interested in the designing of surface ships would even contend that this should be done. He knows that it will not be done.

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

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield.

Mr. PASTORE. Is it not a fact that recently before the President made his speech, with reference to sharing one-half the cost of medical research reactors to be built and sold under some of the bilateral agreements which have been negotiated between the State Department and foreign governments, the members of the joint committee were unofficially canvassed, and they were unanimous that psychologically that was something which should be done, but that in the case of the merchant ship the same members felt it was a waste of money?

Mr. ANDERSON. That is exactly correct. When the proposal for the medical reactors came before the joint committee, the President had not even sent up his request for an appropriation for it, and we wrote it into the bill quickly, because we thought it was a fine thing to put $5 million in the bill for it, and we felt that if he needs more money for it he will have no difficulty getting it.

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

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield.

Mr. JACKSON. The distinguished senior Senator from Massachusetts has made a good point with reference to the need for making the proper impression throughout the world of our interest in the peaceful atom. I should like to ask this question of the Senate. Would the Senate rather appropriate $35 million for a merchant ship, about which we can brag to the world, or would the Senate rather make available medical reactors of the type that we are going to build at Brookhaven, which will cost $765,000 each? We can make 40 of them available to the free world in the fight against cancer.

I ask the Senator which would be more effective, to appropriate $35 million, for which we could build a fine atomic museum to boost our atomic ego and tell the world just what the Communists accuse us of, namely, that we are the "haves" and they are the "have nots," or, on the other hand, take some of that money and build 40 medical reactors to make them available to the less fortunate areas of the world? I do not know how we could better dramatize the peaceful atom for the good of mankind.

Mr. ANDERSON. That is what I am trying to suggest, namely, a better way to spend the money.

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

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield.

Mr. CAPEHART. A great deal has been said about telling the world, "We have something you don't have." Is that not the purpose of the Voice of America and of the technical-assistance programs and of the other programs?

Mr. JACKSON. Would the Senator have us monopolize the use of the peaceful atom?

Mr. CAPEHART. That argument does not make much impression on me.

Mr. JACKSON. Does the Senator feel that we ought to brag to the world that we have a monopoly of the peaceful atom? The President's program calls for sharing the atom. This would not share it. This would display and monopolize it.

Mr. CAPEHART. The Senators are making the argument that we should go forth and brag to the world that we have something that other people do not have. We have spent literally hundreds of millions of dollars for motion pictures and all sorts of things, to show the world that they ought to follow our pattern and our type of Government and that they should raise their standards of living and do the things we are doing. I am amazed that Senators on the other side of the aisle should make that argument. It does not make sense to me.

Mr. ANDERSON. When the Senator from Indiana was making a certain type of product, I am sure he did not use crystal sets in the construction of his radios. If he had, he would not have sold any of his radio sets. We do not want to take a type of powerplant which is designed for a submarine and put it in a merchant ship, where it could not possibly be a success, and then take the merchant ship around the world to show the people of the world how wonderful we are. That would not be a very smart thing to do.

Mr. CAPEHART. If industry had followed the argument of the Senators on the other side of the aisle, we would never have built any automobiles or radios or television sets, or any other modern products, because there never was a time when such products were put on the market that they were not already obsolete in the laboratory and in the engineering offices.

Mr. ANDERSON. The point we are trying to make is that we should show the people of other countries something that is practicable. This kind of ship could not possibly be practicable. On the other hand we have other devices which we can send throughout the world. For example, we have medical reactors, which we can send to other countries for very useful purposes. We will send one to the Philippines, and we will send one to Switzerland and sell it to that Government. We will send them all over the world. That is a very fine thing to do. Long before the request came to Congress the committee put money into the bill for that purpose.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from New Mexico has expired.

Mr. CAPEHART. Why do we not do both?

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield myself another minute. We will do both. We are putting $25 million in the bill for the careful development of the type of reactor which will do the job, which will be designed for use in a surface ship, and which can be used in carriers and cargo ships as well, but which will not be the equivalent of the kind of reactor that is used in a submarine. That is what we want to spend our money for.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I cannot emphasize too strongly my support of the amendment offered by the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER]. I find

it very difficult to understand the opposition to the construction of an atomic-powered merchant ship for demonstration for experimental purposes.

The United States for years has maintained leadership in the development of atomic energy. When the security of the free world was threatened, we developed atomic power for war, and we proposed to develop it for peace. Now other nations claim to have surpassed us.

Are we to sit back and let them prove to the world the truth of their assertion? Are we going to let them outdo us and send their own atomic-powered ships into the ports of the world to prove that we follow but do not lead in promoting the peaceful uses of atomic energy?

It has been said that the proposed ship will not be economic. Who expects it to be an economic ship? It will be the first atomic-powered merchant ship, and it certainly will not be economic.

As the Senator from New Mexico has said, the powerplant probably will cost five times as much as the powerplant of a conventional ship. Undoubtedly it will cost three times as much to operate such a ship as it costs to operate a ship with a conventional powerplant.

However, Mr. President, should we wait for a better ship before building one? Did we wait for the economic production of oil from shale before authorizing the construction of a pilot plant? Did we wait for the economic use of taconite ore before authorizing a pilot plant for getting it into use? Did we wait for a better ship before authorizing the construction of the submarine *Nautilus*, which, as the Senator from New Mexico has said, was outmoded the day it was finished? Why, then, do we wait for a better atomic-powered merchant ship before constructing the first one? Are we going to wait for England, Germany, Russia, or some other country, or are we going ahead on our own? Can we build a better ship than one which opens the way to peaceful uses of atomic energy?

Let us not fall behind other nations in the eyes of the world, for that is what some countries would like to have us do. Let us not quibble over the cost—a few million dollars for the greatest demonstration project which we could probably provide at this time. We cannot weigh the value of an atomic messenger of peace in dollars and cents. If we delay, can we explain to the world why we hastened to build a ship for destructive purposes, but refused to authorize one dedicated to the purpose of peace?

We have a great opportunity to convince the world of our superiority in the atomic field. We have a great opportunity to convince the world of our determination to seek the way of peace and better living for mankind. We must not foolishly pass by this opportunity.

I find the opposition to the amendment offered by the Senator from Iowa almost unbelievable.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, I yield a few minutes to the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART].

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President. I wish to join with the Senator from Iowa and others in recommending the adoption of the amendment, because it seems to me we should and must agree to it.

I do not quite understand the opposition, because I know something about engineering and developing, and I know it takes time and money. Of course, the first prototype built is always very expensive and inefficient, but as we go on from day to day, from month to month, and from year to year, we improve it. That has been the history of all our modern improvements in automobiles, radio, television, airplanes, and other products.

I can think of nothing which would create more good will and which would be visited by more people than would such a ship going around the world and docking in various ports, carrying items made in the United States. To me it would be one of the finest sales mediums we could have. It would enable us to secure the necessary experience in building atomic ships.

As I have said, Mr. President, I do not quite understand the opposition to the amendment. We have heard about a $25 million ship. I now understand that that has reference to some kind of a plant on land with which experiments will be made. But as one who has been in the experimenting and manufacturing business, I know it is essential to build things and get them into the hands of the people where they will be tested under the same conditions as those under which they left the factories. Otherwise, the tests are not very effective.

Senators say it will be an inefficient powerplant. Why should it be inefficient? We are going to appropriate X amount of money to build a ship. I have confidence that those who design it and build it will put into it everything they know at this time. Anything beyond that will come as the result of experience. At least, I am hopeful that that is the way it will work.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McNAMARA in the chair). The time of the Senator from Indiana has expired.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE].

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I think we are entirely missing the point when we say we must have the first before we can have the second. There is no experimental value to the type of reactor about which we are talking. There is not one single thing we can learn from it we do not already know. But this we do know, that when we come to construct a reactor to be used on a surface ship, we will not build one that burns U-235, because that is the most expensive fuel that can be used in a reactor, and it will not be used in a commercial ship.

I hope the discussion will not degenerate into another Dixon-Yates controversy. I hope we will not divide this issue by the middle aisle, because it is not a Republican question or a Democratic question. It is a question of what we shall do to convince the world that we are willing to share our knowledge of atomic energy.

When the President made his speech before the United Nations in December of 1953 he electrified the world because he had a good idea. It was a good program in connection with atoms for peace. I do not know who advised the President concerning this particular project, but someone sold him a wrong bill of goods, because if we wish to prove our willingness to share our great knowledge of atomic energy with the rest of the world, we will not do it by building a reactor such as was placed in the *Nautilus*, and placing it in a surface ship. Admiral Rickover said it was about the worst thing we could do. We should take advice from the man in whose mind the *Nautilus* was born.

Mr. President, no important decisions made by the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy have been predicated upon purely partisan considerations. This is not a Democratic question or a Republican question. I think it would be a serious mistake to expend $21 million to build a surface ship of the kind we have been discussing. If we want to spend $21 million to prove to the free world that we are willing to share our nuclear knowledge, let us build something that is worth while. Let us build medical reactors and prove that we are willing to eradicate pestilence and starvation from the deprived nations of the world. Do not drive a Cadillac in front of the home of a poor relative and say, "Look how rich I am, and how poor you are."

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

Mr. PASTORE. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The Senator has stated that the kind of nuclear powerplant which is in the *Nautilus* will not be put into a commercial ship. I disagree 100 percent with the Senator when he says it would be a waste of money to provide for the ship now proposed because if we can send such a ship into a harbor and show that atomic energy can be used for peacetime purposes as well as for wartime purposes, we shall be giving a lift of faith to the people that they would not receive in any other way.

The Senator from New Mexico spoke about a Cadillac engine being placed in a Stanley Steamer. The Stanley cars were built in Massachusetts, and the Duryea was built in Massachusetts, but they were not built for war purposes. If we put nuclear power into a peacetime ship and send it across the sea, is that not helpful as showing the people that there is some other purpose to which atomic power can be put than merely to kill people?

Mr. PASTORE. Yes; it would have a very telling effect upon the free world if we could put a reactor in a surface ship and say that atomic energy can be used for commercial purposes. But we do not put into a surface ship a reactor that uses U-235.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Rhode Island yield?

Mr. PASTORE. I yield.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. When I was a small boy the newspapers announced that someone had built what was called an automobile and that it had bicycle wheels on it, but no one in my section of the country had ever seen one, and no one thought it would run.

But there was a genius in our town, a blacksmith, who took an old one-

cylinder gasoline engine, which was used for turning a wood saw——

Mr. PASTORE. The Senator from Iowa is asking a question on 2 minutes of my time. I hope he will use some of his time for the question.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, I yield myself 1 minute.

The man used an old one-cylinder motor, mounted on a series of planks, to which he attached wagon wheels. He cranked up the engine, and ran the contraption up and down the streets of our little town. Everyone in that area on the frontier said, "By golly, there is such a thing as an automobile. We saw one chugging up and down the street."

It was 3 years before we saw a manufactured automobile in our town, but what we saw proved to us that there was such a thing as an automobile.

Mr. PASTORE. There is one thing the Senator forgets. We are not trying to impress people with the idea that we can sail a surface ship with or without a reactor. That is not the question we are trying to prove at all. All we are trying to say is that the type of reactor which is in the *Nautilus*, and is identical with the reactor that would be installed in a surface ship, is not the kind of reactor we should sell to ourselves or try to sell to the world, because when it comes to using atomic energy for the purpose of sailing a ship on the surface of the water, the Senator from Iowa knows better than I do that the type of reactor used in the *Nautilus* will not be used in a surface ship. We might as well recognize that now. If the Senator can contradict that statement, I should like to have him do so.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Rhode Island has expired.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I yield 1 minute to the able Senator from Indiana.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, numerous industrial firms throughout the Nation spend millions of dollars a week in advertising on television and radio and in the press.

As one who knows something about advertising and selling, I may say that if the Government spends $21 million, or whatever the amount may be, for an atomic installation on a surface ship which will be sent around the world, the United States will receive in return, in my opinion, hundreds of millions of dollars' worth of advertising value, and will create good will, because millions of people will inspect the ship. We shall have been the first nation to have built an atomic merchant ship.

I think we are completely, 100 percent, missing the point. If we want to sell the people of the world upon the United States, we ought to be willing to spend a few million dollars on projects of this type.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I yield 3 minutes to the junior Senator from Washington.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, in my judgment, there are two simple considerations in connection with the pending proposal.

First, we should consider whether the project is technically feasible. Second, will it promote the peaceful program envisaged by the President for our country?

Much has been said about the technical considerations of the proposed atomic ship. One would think that if the program were sound, there would at least be some scientific backing for it. The truth is that the technical personnel who are responsible, who have the know-how, and who understand atomic propulsion, have failed to support the proposal. Admiral Rickover, who is, as the junior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE] has pointed out, the father of atomic propulsion, has said that this program is not feasible.

How can Senators talk about the great technical advantage the United States will have in developing this type of propulsion system, when they fail to consider the fact that the persons who have the technical know-how are opposed to it? The matter is that simple.

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

Mr. JACKSON. I yield.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I call attention to the testimony of Admiral Rickover, which appears on page 15 of the hearings, in which he said—and I shall not quote it all:

> If you are going to get the job done fast, there is no other recourse but to use the *Nautilus* reactor. That is all I can say.

Mr. JACKSON. That is correct; but he also went on to say——

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. The Senator from Washington said that the *Nautilus* type of reactor was not feasible.

Mr. JACKSON. Admiral Rickover pointed out that if the job is to be done properly, an engine should be developed specifically for a surface vessel. He said that any kind of engine could be put into any kind of ship in order to get some movement. But Admiral Rickover told the members of the committee that he disapproved of such a project as is proposed. He saw no advantage, from the technical or scientific side, in supporting the proposal.

Admiral Rickover continued by saying that such a proposal would interfere with the Navy program. I quote now from his testimony on page 86 of the hearings, when he was interrogated, first, by Representative DURHAM, and then by Representative HOLIFIELD:

> Representative DURHAM. We are going to get into a priority of building these reactors.
>
> Admiral RICKOVER. Yes; with this merchant ship we are already in a priority, and it will delay the Navy program in doing this job.
>
> Representative HOLIFIELD. In other words, this will take the place of the *Sea Wolf*?
>
> Admiral RICKOVER. It wont' take the place of anything, but it will result in delay.
>
> Representative HOLIFIELD. In delay?
>
> Admiral RICKOVER. Yes.

It does not make sense to me that we should attempt to cram down the throats of the scientists, those who have the know-how, a program which is not workable.

Second, will such a program promote peace? It is obvious that if we want to make clear our peaceful intentions in the field of atomic energy, we ought to continue with the program which the President originally initiated.

This is a fine program because it involves the sharing of the peaceful atom. The present proposal fails to share the peaceful atom. One important thing which the Communists have been able to exploit is the fact that, as the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] has mentioned, we export moving pictures which portray our wealth, but we offer no formula to solve the problems of that part of the population of the world which wakes up hungry every morning and which cannot participate in the abundant life.

If the program of atoms for peace is to have meaning, we should make it possible for the people in other parts of the world to participate in the program.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, without the time being charged to either side, I may suggest the absence of a quorum.

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

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Flanders	McCarthy
Allott	Frear	McClellan
Anderson	Fulbright	McNamara
Barkley	Gore	Millikin
Barrett	Green	Monroney
Beall	Hayden	Mundt
Bender	Hennings	Neely
Bennett	Hickenlooper	Neuberger
Bible	Hill	O'Mahoney
Bricker	Holland	Pastore
Bridges	Hruska	Payne
Bush	Humphrey	Potter
Butler	Ives	Purtell
Byrd	Jackson	Robertson
Capehart	Jenner	Russell
Carlson	Johnson, Tex.	Saltonstall
Case, N. J.	Johnston, S. C.	Schoeppel
Case, S. Dak.	Kefauver	Scott
Clements	Kerr	Smathers
Cotton	Kilgore	Smith, Maine
Curtis	Knowland	Sparkman
Daniel	Kuchel	Stennis
Douglas	Lehman	Symington
Duff	Long	Thurmond
Dworshak	Malone	Thye
Eastland	Mansfield	Watkins
Ellender	Martin, Iowa	Williams
Ervin	Martin, Pa.	Young

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MCNAMARA in the chair). A quorum is present.

Do the Senators who control the time desire to yield back the remaining time? There is remaining a total of 13 minutes.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, I yielded 2 minutes to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, a year ago it was my privilege to travel in many nations of the world on a commission charged with developing the peaceful uses of atomic energy. I welcomed that opportunity, because every day then we saw, as now we see in the headlines of the papers, articles indicating the destructive possibility of atomic weapons, and I found in all the countries which I visited tremendous fear for the future if war should break out. The people know of the destructive possibilities of the terrible weapons which have been developed.

I found likewise a yearning and a very keen desire to know more and more of the peaceful uses of atomic energy and its byproducts. I found everywhere that the leaders of the nations which we visited knew something about the possibilities of the use of atomic energy in agriculture, in health, and in the production of power; and everywhere there was a shortage of power and everywhere there was a need for peaceful and health-giving uses of radiation and atomic energy.

So when the President made his recommendation, I could not help recalling those experiences, and realizing the tremendous impact which would be made by a ship powered by atomic energy, carrying not alone an atomic reactor for propulsion purposes, but likewise exhibits illustrating the peaceful uses of atomic energy in agriculture and in the domain of medicine. Everywhere we found the same reaction and the more we thought of the peacetime uses of atomic energy, the more possibilities we could see regarding the beneficent results of its application, and the less likelihood there would then be of war in the world.

So I wish to say to my colleagues that, as a result of that experience, I must heartily concur in the President's recommendation and also in the amendment which has been submitted by the Senator from Iowa. I know of nothing which would so actively engage the minds and hopes of the peoples of the world—many of whom are now depressed—for a better tomorrow than this exhibition, which would be sent around the world, into the various ports, and there would emphasize the peaceful and beneficial uses of atomic energy, and would promote better living for mankind, and thereby, we hope, would prevent emphasis upon war and the use of atomic power for destructive purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Ohio has expired.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I do not know that those of us on this side of the question will use all the time available to us.

Again, I wish to point out that we regard the proposed expenditure as very unwise, because, in the first place, it is technically bad. No merchant ship will be powered by a single atomic reactor; that will not be the pattern of development. We shall make no contribution if we put an atomic powerplant, such as the one designed for the submarine *Nautilus*, into a merchant ship. All the power experts oppose doing so. There was no testimony to the effect that such equipment would be of the type which eventually will be used.

We wish to stress the point that the bill calls for the authorization of an appropriation of $25 million for the development of the correct type of atomic power. But we shall do no good if we provide for placing atomic-powered propulsion machinery in a ship of the type now proposed. If we should equip such a vessel with atomic power, under the present proposal, I think it would do no good, because the people of the earth would not have a chance to participate in the development. No foreign nation will have a chance to participate in the design or in the use of such a design.

How much better it will be if we use atomic power in connection with developments which will be helpful to all of us for instance, medicinal developments which will be very worth while.

Already many questions are being asked. Among them are the following: Who will decide how to handle or manage the ship while it is in a foreign port? Who will decide what will be done with the atomic wastes coming from it?

I say it is far better to proceed with the normal atomic reactor program, and to spend $25 million or more on work which will lead to future progress, rather than to send the proposed vessel to the various harbors of the earth, where those who would be in charge of the ship would say, "Look. We have built this ship and this powerplant for it. It is not what we want, but we have built it, even thought it is not good."

I believe it would be far better for us to do something which would be good—not as the *Nautilus* submarine is good—but for us finally to construct a ship which will be useful in hauling cargoes.

Therefore, I believe that the amendment of the Senator from Iowa is bad, and should be rejected; and I hope the committee's proposal will be sustained.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, I yield 1 minute to the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California is recognized for 1 minute.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, as a member of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, I am supporting the amendment of the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER].

It is true that in the joint committee, there was a difference of opinion, just as differences of opinion develop in connection with many matters, in many fields, before other committees. But the President of the United States has made a special plea for the construction of this merchant vessel, which will have atomic power for its propulsion. The President believes that the construction of such a vessel will serve well our foreign policy, and will constitute an essential part of it.

All over the world, the Soviet propaganda machine has been grinding out statements to the effect that the United States does not have an atomic-powered vessel of any kind. Furthermore, in my judgment the Soviet propagandists have been interested in seeing to it that the United States is pictured only as a warmonger, and as owning an atomic bomb, and as not having any interest in the general welfare of humanity.

The President has made recommendations—and I think they are good ones—regarding the use of atomic reactors for medical and scientific purposes. The committee has supported that part of the program.

I say frankly that I think it would have been better if the President had made this suggestion to the committee, prior to the delivery of his speech in New York. That might have ironed out some of the difficulties.

But the fact is that the President, as the Chief Executive of our Nation, has made this recommendation and has submitted this request; and I hope the Senate will not repudiate it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from California has expired.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, I believe I have 3 minutes remaining.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct; the Senator from Iowa has 3 minutes remaining under his control.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, I hope I shall not use that much time.

I merely wish to say that there is no argument, on the part of anyone of whom I know, that the proposed vessel's propulsion will be economically sound, in comparison with present-day conventional propulsion, or that it will be economically feasible, as compared with atomic-powered ships as of 10 or 15 years from today.

On the other hand, I call attention to the fact that the proposed ship is to constitute a practical demonstration of ship propulsion, by means of atomic force, for peacetime uses.

Let us consider what such a ship, when constructed, will do. The ordinary men and women of foreign countries cannot observe the application of atomic reactors in connection with medical developments. They can only read about them, at best. I am in favor of helping in that connection; but the proposal now before us does not exclude our doing so.

I call attention to the fact that at the fairs at Bangkok and Rangoon, all sorts of fancy gadgets, materials, and machinery were displayed. The Russians had there an exhibit of what Russia was doing. But what stole the show, and where did the crowds go? They went to see Cinerama. At one point the Russians became so disgusted that they removed their exhibit—because the Americans were stealing the show, with Cinerama.

So this vessel, when constructed, when we are able to send an atomic-powered ship of our own into the harbors of the world, will constitute a most impressive demonstration. It will attract the attention and capture the imagination of the people of all the countries it visits, and will show them that the United States is making a practical peacetime use of atomic energy.

One Senator has said that the United States would not today send abroad a Stanley steamer, because the Stanley steamer is now obsolete. Of course that is true, although at one time the Stanley steamer was very practical indeed. Furthermore, let me point out that in the case of every airplane which has been manufactured, its design was obsolete by the time it left the drawing boards.

Certainly it is true that new developments will occur in the field of atomic energy, and certainly it is true that we shall have atomic-powered airplanes. However, we continue to build the conventional airplanes, until the new ones are proved to be efficient.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Iowa has expired.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I am prepared to yield back the remaining time available to our side.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, has all time been yielded back?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico has approximately 4 minutes remaining.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Flanders	McCarthy
Allott	Frear	McClellan
Anderson	Fulbright	McNamara
Barkley	Gore	Millikin
Barrett	Green	Monroney
Beall	Hayden	Mundt
Bender	Hennings	Neely
Bennett	Hickenlooper	Neuberger
Bible	Hill	O'Mahoney
Bricker	Holland	Pastore
Bridges	Hruska	Payne
Bush	Humphrey	Potter
Butler	Ives	Purtell
Byrd	Jackson	Robertson
Capehart	Jenner	Russell
Carlson	Johnson, Tex.	Saltonstall
Case, N. J.	Johnston, S. C.	Schoeppel
Case, S. Dak.	Kefauver	Scott
Clements	Kerr	Smathers
Cotton	Kilgore	Smith, Maine
Curtis	Knowland	Sparkman
Daniel	Kuchel	Stennis
Douglas	Lehman	Symington
Duff	Long	Thurmond
Dworshak	Malone	Thye
Eastland	Mansfield	Watkins
Ellender	Martin, Iowa	Williams
Evins	Martin, Pa.	Young

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is present.

The question is on agreeing, en bloc, to the amendments offered by the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER]. The yeas and nays having been ordered, the clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. McCARTHY (when his name was called). On this vote I have a pair with the senior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH]. If he were present and voting, he would vote "yea." If I were permitted to vote, I would vote "nay." I withhold my vote.

The rollcall was concluded.

Mr. CLEMENTS. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], and the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] is unavoidably 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. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], and the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] would each vote "nay."

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. WELKER], and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] is absent on official business for the Committee on Appropriations.

The Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] is necessarily absent, and his pair with the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. McCARTHY] has been previously announced.

The result was announced—yeas 41, nays, 42, as follows:

YEAS—41

Aiken	Cotton	Millikin
Allott	Curtis	Mundt
Barrett	Duff	Payne
Beall	Dworshak	Potter
Bender	Flanders	Purtell
Bennett	Hickenlooper	Saltonstall
Bricker	Hruska	Schoeppel
Bridges	Ives	Smith, Maine
Bush	Jenner	Thurmond
Butler	Knowland	Thye
Capehart	Kuchel	Watkins
Carlson	Malone	Williams
Case, N. J.	Martin, Iowa	Young
Case, S. Dak.	Martin, Pa.	

NAYS—42

Anderson	Hayden	McClellan
Barkley	Hennings	McNamara
Bible	Hill	Monroney
Byrd	Holland	Neely
Clements	Humphrey	Neuberger
Daniel	Jackson	O'Mahoney
Douglas	Johnson, Tex.	Pastore
Eastland	Johnston, S. C.	Robertson
Ellender	Kefauver	Russell
Ervin	Kerr	Scott
Frear	Kilgore	Smathers
Fulbright	Lehman	Sparkman
Gore	Long	Stennis
Green	Mansfield	Symington

NOT VOTING—13

Chavez	Langer	Smith, N. J.
Dirksen	Magnuson	Welker
George	McCarthy	Wiley
Goldwater	Morse	
Kennedy	Murray	

So Mr. HICKENLOOPER's amendments were rejected.

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

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill (H. R. 6795) was read the third time and passed.

REWARDS FOR INFORMATION CONCERNING ILLEGAL INTRODUCTION INTO OR ILLEGAL MANUFACTURE OR ACQUISITION IN THE UNITED STATES OF SPECIAL NUCLEAR MATERIAL AND ATOMIC WEAPONS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 627, Senate bill 609.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will state the bill by title for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (S. 609) to provide rewards for information concerning the illegal introduction into the United States, or the illegal manufacture or acquisition in the United States of special nuclear material and atomic weapons.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Texas.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 609) which had been reported from the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy with an amendment on page 4, line 20, after the word "includes", to insert "the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That this act may be cited as the "Atomic Weapons Rewards Act of 1955."

SEC. 2. Any person who furnishes original information to the United States—

(a) leading to the finding or other acquisition by the United States of any special nuclear material or atomic weapon which has been introduced into the United States, or which has been manufactured or acquired therein contrary to the laws of the United States, or

(b) with respect to an attempted introduction into the United States or an attempted manufacture or acquisition therein of any special nuclear material or atomic weapon, contrary to the laws of the United States,

shall be rewarded by the payment of an amount not to exceed $500,000.

SEC. 3. An Awards Board consisting of the Secretary of the Treasury (who shall be the Chairman), the Secretary of Defense, the Attorney General, the Director of Central Intelligence, and of one member of the Atomic Energy Commission designated by that Commission, shall determine whether any person furnishing information to the United States is entitled to any award and the amount thereof to be paid pursuant to section 2. In determining whether any person furnishing information to the United States is entitled to an award and the amount of such award, the Board shall take into consideration—

(a) whether or not the information is of the type specified in section 2, and

(b) whether the person furnishing the information was an officer or employee of the United States and, if so, whether the furnishing of such information was in the line of duty of that person.

Any reward of $50,000 or more shall be approved by the President.

SEC. 4. If the information leading to an award under section 3 is furnished by an alien, the Secretary of State, the Attorney General, and the Director of Central Intelligence, acting jointly, may determine that the entry of such alien into the United States is in the public interest and, in that event, such alien and the members of his immediate family may receive immigrant visas and may be admitted to the United States for permanent residence, notwithstanding the requirements of the Immigration and Nationality Act.

SEC. 5. The Board established under section 3 is authorized to hold such hearings and make, promulgate, issue, rescind, and amend such rules and regulations as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this act.

SEC. 6. Any awards granted under section 3 of this act shall be certified by the Awards Board and, together with the approval of the President in those cases where such approval is required, transmitted to the Director of Central Intelligence for payment out of funds appropriated or available for the administration of the National Security Act of 1947, as amended.

SEC. 7. As used in this act—

(a) The term "atomic energy" means all forms of energy released in the course of nuclear fission or nuclear transformation.

(b) The term "atomic weapon" means any device utilizing atomic energy, exclusive of the means for transporting or propelling the device (where such means is a separable and divisible part of the device), the principal purpose of which is for use as, or for development of, a weapon, a weapon prototype, or a weapon test device.

(c) The term "special nuclear material" means plutonium, or uranium enriched in the isotope 233 or in the isotope 235, or any other material which is found to be special nuclear material pursuant to the provisions of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954.

(d) The term "United States," when used in a geographical sense, includes the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, all Territories and possessions of the United States and the Canal Zone; except that in section 4, the term "United States" when so used shall have the meaning given to it in the Immigration and Nationality Act.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, S. 609 is virtually identical with the Atomic Weapons Rewards Act bill which was proposed last year, unanimously adopted by the joint committee and passed by the House on voice vote.

This year the bill was introduced again in both Houses and was unanimously reported by the joint committee.

Mr. President, if I may take just a moment so that the Members may have some idea of what this is about, first, let me assure you that it does not constitute an authorization for the expenditure of money which is not now presently authorized.

It does not constitute a grant of authority for the grant of an award that is not now presently authorized.

In substance it authorizes a reward of up to $500,000 to any person who may provide information or evidence leading to the detection of an atomic weapon which has been smuggled into this country or illegally manufactured in this country.

It is unnecessary for me to call to the attention of the Senate the dire consequences of a weapon surreptitiously brought into this country. The reward of $500,000 is a pittance in comparison with the value of the detection of the existence of such a weapon.

A board is created by this bill to pass upon the amount of the award and the entitlement to it. That board is composed of the Secretary of the Treasury, the Director of Central Intelligence, one member of the Atomic Energy Commission and the Secretary of Defense.

The one committee amendment this year was to include the words "the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico" within the definition of the United States, in order to clarify the status of that Commonwealth.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Mexico yield?

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, I wish to join in the statement made by the Senator from New Mexico. I have been familiar with the bill for the past 2 years. I approve of what he has said, and I agree that the bill is a good bill to pass from a psychological standpoint. I hope the Senate will accept it.

Mr. ANDERSON. I thank the Senator from Iowa.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

The bill (S. 609) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

CAREER APPOINTMENTS IN THE COMPETITIVE CIVIL SERVICE

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 580, Senate bill 1849.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will state the bill by title for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (S. 1849) to provide for the grant of career conditional and career appointments in the competitive civil service to indefinite employees who previously qualified for competitive appointment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Texas.

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

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I understand that this bill is to be made the unfinished business.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. The Senator took the words out of my mouth.

Mr. President, I am prepared to yield to any Senator who wishes to make an insertion in the RECORD.

THE PROPOSED HELLS CANYON DAM

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, the largest and most influential newspaper of the intermountain West, the Denver Post, published a cogent and effective editorial on June 24, 1955, entitled "The Dilemma of the Hells Canyon Dam."

The editorial underscores the fact that even the Federal Power Commission examiner who recommended construction of a small Idaho Power Co. dam actually recognized the superior efficiency and capacity of a high Federal dam at that site.

The editorial in the Denver Post stated, quite clearly and emphatically, that—

He (the examiner) found in favor of the high Hells Canyon Dam and said it was his "inescapable conclusion that with the marked and substantial advantage of the Government's credit, the high dam would be dollar for dollar the better investment and the more nearly ideal development of the Middle Snake."

Palmer Hoyt, nationally known publisher of the Denver Post, and his able editor, Robert W. Lucas, have done a service to sound resource development both in their own Rocky Mountain region and in the Pacific Northwest by publishing this splendid editorial. I commend the editorial to some Rocky Mountain Senators, who want their own $1,659,000,000 upper Colorado project, and yet are raising all kinds of specious and picayune objections to the $365 million Hells Canyon project.

I ask unanimous consent to have the editorial printed at this point in the body of the RECORD.

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

THE DILEMMA OF THE HELLS CANYON DAM

A decision by William J. Costello, presiding examiner for the Federal Power Commission, in the Snake River development case puts the Department of the Interior, the Congress of the United States, and the Commission itself in a very awkward position.

We are fearful, too, that what the administration does about the problem on the Snake will be decisive with respect to the passage of the upper Colorado River and the Arkansas-Fryingpan projects—both so critical to the economic welfare of Colorado and the Rocky Mountain States.

The case involves a petition by the Idaho Power Co. to erect three low-head hydroelectric dams in the Snake where it forms the common border of Idaho and Oregon. Opponents of the petitioning company are trying to obtain congressional authorization for one huge, high-head dam at Hells Canyon, which would be built in same same area.

The conflict between the two propositions has grown into a nationwide controversy between public versus private power.

In 1953 the Department of the Interior under Secretary McKay announced it was withdrawing former Secretary Chapman's objections to the private company's petition for a license to dam the Snake in Hells Canyon. The Department said it was the duty of the Federal Power Commission to referee the matter, and that the Department would abide by the Commission's decision. Speaking to the Idaho State Reclamation Association in Boise on November 4, 1953, Under Secretary Ralph A. Tudor said, "You should know that the Federal Power Commission has the right, and, I believe, the responsibility for recommending that the Federal Government go ahead with the high Hells Canyon project if, in the opinion of the Federal Power Commission, this is the proper answer."

Mr. Tudor had also said that the Department had "advised the Commission that if it should grant the license (to Idaho Power) certain restrictions should be placed on the Idaho Power Co. which would assure that their development would be adequate and would be integrated into the Northwest power pool."

In May of that year, the Department, in an official statement withdrawing its petition for intervention before the Commission on the Hells Canyon case, said: "The Department of Interior would be playing the reprehensible part of 'a dog in the manger' if it insisted on opposing a badly needed development that private capital is ready and willing to undertake if the plan proposed by the Idaho Power Co. is reasonably comparable as to results, while the Department itself has no assurance that it can carry out its plan without extended delay." The emphasis at that time was on the Idaho utility's petition to build 3 dams, Hells Canyon, Oxbow, and Brownlee.

Now, let's examine the provisions of the law fixing the jurisdiction of the Commission and setting forth its obligations in such matters. Does the examiner's decision answer the question raised by the Department of Interior? Does the decision meet the specifications of "adequacy" and "integration" so specifically demanded by the Department?

Section 7 of the Federal Water Power Act (as amended) provides that * * * "When-

ever, in the judgment of the Commission, the development of any water resources for public purposes should be undertaken by the United States itself, the Commission shall not approve any application for any project affecting such development, but shall cause to be made such examinations, surveys, reports, plans, and estimates of the cost of the proposed development as it may find necessary, and shall submit its findings to Congress with such recommendations as it may find appropriate concerning such development."

Mr. Costello sidestepped that section for his own reasons, later explained.

Section 10 of that same act directs that any plan approved for licensing by the Commission shall be such "as in the judgment of the Commission will be best adapted to a comprehensive plan for improving or developing a waterway or waterways for the use or benefit of interstate or foreign commerce, for the improvement and utilization of water power development, and for other beneficial public uses, including recreation purposes."

The examiner's decision admitted that the plan accepted was not the best available.

Mr. Costello's decision, issued May 6, was in clear conflict with the statute setting forth the responsibilities of the Commission. He found in favor of the high Hells Canyon Dam and said it was his "inescapable conclusion that with the marked and substantial advantage of the Government's credit, the high dam would be dollar for dollar the better investment and the more nearly ideal development of the Middle Snake." But he recommended that a license be granted the Idaho Power Co. to build only one dam, instead of three, "because of the applicant's failure to show a market which would provide some assurance that the licensee would proceed at once with the development of all of the sites."

Mr. Costello did not turn down the utility's application. He amended it and then recommended it for license. He did not make recommendations for the more feasible and adequate Federal development as directed by statute. Why? Because, in his own words, "the likelihood of the * * * appropriation for * * * the high dam project is so remote as to make a recommendation to the Congress * * * a completely useless action."

Mr. Costello's findings of fact rejected the argument that the Snake River's flow, even in a full low-water cycle, would not fill the gigantic Hells Canyon Dam reservoir; or that future upriver irrigation would draw down the river so as to make the big dam infeasible in the future. That demolished two of the Idaho Power Co.'s principal points of opposition to the high dam. And it also spiked the fear planted in the minds of upriver irrigators that their water rights would be jeopardized by a future conflict of interests—power versus farming.

Mr. Costello accepted the cost-benefit superiority of the high dam. And he affirmed the contention of the big dam's proponents, that it was a key unit in the main control program for the whole Columbia River basin. But Mr. Costello's decision referred only to the adequacy of one dam in serving the applicant's own market, and took no account of integrating the output of three dams in the Northwest power pool.

So by reference to the Department of the Interior's own public statements as of May and November 1953, Mr. Costello's decision would permit no "reasonably comparable development of the natural resources involved" as explicitly set forth by the Department as one of "two basic questions involved." And although Mr. Costello's findings clearly imply that the private utility's plan is not the "best adapted to a comprehensive plan for improving or developing a waterway" as required for the granting of a license, the license is recommended for grant anyway. Why?

Well, Mr. Costello concluded that, in his opinion, inadequate development of the middle Snake is better than no development at all. He put it this way: "I am convinced that the nonutilization of water resources could be in some circumstances just as shortsighted as less than maximum development."

So by tortured reasoning, by evasion of statutory responsibility and by what appears to us as an arbitrary invasion of the legislative function, Mr. Costello has contrived to justify a private utility's grab of a great power site. And then, as if his conscience were bothering him, he suggests on page 57 of his decision that, "If the Congress feels that the Commission has not performed its functions in the public interest and in accordance with the provisions of the statute, the Commission's power to issue a license may be withdrawn or suspended at any time."

We're not certain that Mr. Costello himself is to blame for this exhibit of doubletalk. But we cannot see how the Department of the Interior can accept the decision and abide by it—unless it is willing to face the charge of double-crossing the people of the Pacific Northwest. And acceptance of the findings by Congress will make a dead letter of its own Federal Water Power Act, while undermining the authority of the FPC and its future usefulness.

Mr. Costello's reference to the impact of the Supreme Court's Roanoke Rapids decision on any effort to reserve, forever, public development of a river simply because Congress, at one time, made it part of a "comprehensive plan" is well taken. But the responsibility of the Commission in view of its own examiner's findings of fact is clearly mandated in law. And the Department of the Interior—having insisted upon comparable development as a condition of licensing the private utility, will appear ridiculous if it lets the examiner's recommendations go without challenge.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that upon the conclusion of its business for today, the Senate adjourn until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

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

ATOMIC ENERGY AGREEMENTS FOR COOPERATION

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, the Washington Atomic Energy Report, an independent weekly publication on the development of nuclear energy for civilian purposes, in its issue for June 13, 1955, contains the following statement:

> The President has initialed Agreements for Cooperation with Argentina, Spain, Italy, Switzerland, Denmark, and Lebanon.

Certain information is given relative to the development of atomic energy, and reference is made to the allocation for lease to each country of six kilograms of uranium-235 for the construction and operation of research reactors. I am certain all of us agree that this is a fine program. I understand the agreements or pacts were sent to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy on June 13.

But, Mr. President, I do not believe that Congress should put the stamp of approval on a transaction with Dictator Peron after his mobs have slain hundreds of Argentine people whose only crime was a desire for freedom of worship.

I do not think we can afford to give prestige and backing to Mr. Peron, who has violated, as I see it, every principle of civil and religious liberty. At least, I wish to be recorded against doing so.

As I understand, the Joint Committee has 30 days from the time the agreements were submitted to Congress in which to consider and to take action on them. I hope they will be given careful consideration.

I think the matter should be thought over very seriously before any backing in this way is given to the Argentine dictator.

AMON G. CARTER

Mr. DANIEL. Mr. President, the sad news of the death of one of our greatest Texans, Amon G. Carter, came to the floor of the Senate last Friday while I was conducting hearings for a Senate Judiciary Subcommittee in New York.

Therefore, I take these few minutes today to express a word of tribute to his memory and a word of sympathy to his family and host of friends.

Mr. President, in the passing of Amon G. Carter, Texas and the Nation have lost one of the most able and patriotic citizens of our generation.

Amon G. Carter's patriotism and good citizenship began with his home town of Fort Worth. No man ever loved his city more. Few men have ever accomplished more for their city and its people than did Amon G. Carter.

I first knew Mr. Carter when I was a high school student in Fort Worth. He helped promote Boys' Week, during which Fort Worth boys were elected to and served in every city and county office. My first view of public service was as Boys' Week City Manager. Mr. Carter gave a banquet for us at the Fort Worth Club and encouraged us to take a keen interest in the processes of self-government. Later I served as a string reporter on his Fort Worth Star-Telegram. Throughout the years he inspired boys and girls to love their city and led men and women to work for it.

Lincoln once said:

> I like to see a man who is proud of the place in which he lives and who so lives that the place is proud of him.

Amon G. Carter was that type of man. He was proud of the place in which he lived, and he so lived that the place and all of its people were proud of him.

Typical of men with love and loyalty for their hometown, Amon G. Carter had the same love and patriotic zeal for his State and Nation. He was generous with his time and money in many efforts to promote better government and a stronger national security.

A brief summary of the more colorful side of his life was contained in the Associated Press story announcing his death. I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed at this point in the body of the RECORD.

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

[From the Amarillo (Tex.) Globe-Times of June 24, 1955]

FROM DISHWASHER TO MILLIONAIRE: SUCCESS STORY, TEXAS STYLE, ENDS AS AMON G. CARTER DIES

FORT WORTH, TEX., June 24.—Amon G. Carter, who rose from poverty to become the colorful multimillionaire publisher of the Fort Worth Star-Telegram, one of the major newspapers of the United States, died last night at 75.

His career started as a dishwasher and waiter in a Bowie, Tex., boardinghouse—and for all his life he was proud of his humble beginnings.

From there he traveled to the Indian Territory of Oklahoma to sell gilt-framed pictures, then to San Francisco as an advertising man, later to Fort Worth as head of his own advertising company, then organization of the newspaper.

In the 1930's, Carter became a very wealthy oilman—after his first 99 holes were dry—and turned his great fortune into philanthropy.

The publisher suffered 3 heart attacks early in 1953, but gained strength, took 2 cruises, and conducted some business, but this year decreased his activities to conserve his strength.

In 1952, he relinquished the presidency to his son, Amon Carter, Jr., but continued as chairman of the board and publisher of Carter Publications.

Carter was a booster of Texas, particularly Fort Worth and west Texas. He was a leader in bringing airplane, motor, and other plants to the Fort Worth area. His efforts led to the building of the large new international airport here and grateful citizens named the field and administration buildings for him.

He was noted for his entertainment, particularly at his Shady Oak farm on the outskirts of Fort Worth. He was the friend of Presidents, royalty, industrial executives, railroad leaders, bankers, cowhands, and many others. Many national figures wore the "10-gallon" hats he gave away profusely.

Courage in the oil business brought him great wealth. He drilled or had a substantial interest in 99 dry holes before his first strike, in the Mattix pool, Lea County, N. Mex., July 19, 1953. He drilled the discovery well in the Wasson pool which extended over two west Texas counties. To his credit also was the Keystone Ellenburger pool in Winkler County.

On September 1, 1947, his Wasson pool holdings in one county were sold to Shell Oil for $16.5 million, the largest oil deal in Texas to that time. This became the nucleus of the Amon G. Carter Foundation, which has poured millions into charitable and educational channels.

His gifts ranged from small ones for individuals to large ones for hospitals, schools, parks, and other purposes. Deprived of a formal education, much of his energy and funds went to schools, both public and private. It was as a result of his interest and that of others that Texas Technological College was established at Lubbock. He received the first honorary degree given by that institution. He also was a heavy contributor to Texas Christian University here.

Carter was a recipient of numerous honors. He was called "range rider of the air" for his contributions to aviation; "west Texas' top cowhand" for his support of that area, and the legislature appointed him "ambassador of good will" for the State. He was an official of several major companies.

In politics, Carter was an independent Democrat but supported Eisenhower for President.

He was a close friend of Franklin D. Roosevelt and once, when the late President passed through Bowie, Carter sold him a chicken sandwich for a dime—just as Carter had done to travelers when he was a youth.

Probably his best-known friendship was for Will Rogers, the humorist who was killed in a plane crash in Alaska in August 1935. Carter always kept a light burning, day and night, over Rogers' photo on Carter's desk.

Carter, then owner of an advertising firm, formed the Fort Worth Star, February 1, 1906, with D. C. McCaleb and A. G. Dawson. Thirty-five months later, Carter, with the aid of Col. Paul Waples, negotiated the purchase of the opposition Telegram. In 1925, the Star-Telegram purchased the Record, owned by William Randolph Hearst, and entered the morning field for the first time.

Carter and other Star-Telegram owners established radio station WBAP and WBAP-TV.

Although internationally known, Carter's greatest fame in his home State of Texas probably stemmed from the old Fort Worth-Dallas feuds which remain to this day.

But even in Dallas he was widely known and greatly admired.

Former Vice President John Nance Garner, the "Cactus Jack" of the early Franklin D. Roosevelt era, once said of the tall, husky, and handsome Carter:

"Amon Carter wants the Government of the United States run for the exclusive benefit of Fort Worth and, if possible, to the detriment of Dallas."

But the Dallas Morning News, on its front page, said today:

"Actually, through his aggressiveness for his beloved Fort Worth, Carter was a great stimulant to Dallas businessmen."

In 1939 the News said Carter had been made a honorary citizen of Dallas because "he punched Dallas like cowboys are wont to do slow steers in a shipping chute."

He had worked with Dallas civic leaders on a plan to make the Trinity River navigable from the Gulf of Mexico to Fort Worth.

He served as a director of the West Texas Chamber of Commerce, director of the Southwestern Exposition and Fat Stock Show, chairman of the first board of Texas Tech, a school for whose founding the Star-Telegram campaigned, and president of the Fort Worth Chamber of Commerce.

A Fort Worth high school, the Fort Worth airport terminal, and a stadium bear his name. He was highly instrumental in the building of Fort Worth's Will Rogers Memorial Coliseum, the Municipal Auditorium, the Texas Hotel, the Fort Worth YMCA, and Texas Christian University's stadium.

In 1936, when Texas celebrated its centennial, the State exposition was held in Dallas. But not to be outdone, Carter hired Billy Rose for a 100-day stint at $1,000 per day and put on a frontier celebration at the same time. The slogan at the Fort Worth show was:

"Dallas for education, Fort Worth for entertainment."

Billy Rose put on musicals at the Casa Manana, paraded beautiful show girls to music from the orchestra of Paul Whiteman. And not all the money spent on "going to the centennial" was spent in Dallas, to put it mildly.

Always the Texan, always a standout, his long polo coat and big western hat became trademarks and probably as much as any man ever will, he became and until his death remained "Mr. Texas" to the Nation.

Praise came for Carter from all sides today, from lonely ranch homes on the west Texas prairies and from marble halls in Washington.

Representative JAMES C. WRIGHT of Weatherford, Carter's Congressman, summed it up well:

His death, said WRIGHT, "leaves a void which no other person can quite fill. He was one of a very few truly great Americans.

"He has been the prime moving spirit in the growth and development of our region and an inspiration to many of us who have shared vicariously in his many great accomplishments.

"Fort Worth and all of Texas were the beneficiaries of his life; all are the losers in his death."

Survivors other than his son include his wife, Mrs. Minne Meacham Carter; daughter, Mrs. J. Lee Johnson III, the daughter of Mrs. Burton Carter, of Fort Worth; a sister, Mrs. Addie Brooks, Covington, Ky.; three half brothers—Roy E. Carter, Kermit; Grady Carter, San Antonio; and Ralph Carter, Houston—and five grandchildren. Mrs. Hugo Speck, a daughter of his marriage to Mrs. Zetta Thomas Carter, now of Chicago, died in Dallas, September 1, 1952.

Mr. DANIEL. Mr. President, the earthly life of this great American is ended, but his memory will continue to remind others of the opportunities which this country affords and the responsibilities which we owe to our communities, our country, and our fellow men.

Also, Mr. President, I ask that the following representative editorials be included in the body of the RECORD.

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

[From the Dallas Morning News of June 25, 1955]

AMON CARTER

To a much greater degree than can be ascribed to more than a very few men in a very few places, Amon Carter was responsible for the development of Fort Worth. By the time of his death Thursday, the city had grown to be too big to be only the enlargement of a single man, but for many, many years before the city attained full size, there was more truth than humor in terming our Dallas neighbor Cartersville.

From 1909, when two newspapers were combined, as the Fort Worth Star-Telegram's directing genius, Carter devoted almost his entire thought and energy to making Fort Worth see itself as a metropolitan rival of larger Dallas. He used the influence of his newspaper to that singleness of purpose. He may have liked power for itself but it is more probable that he saw it as a tool to develop his city. Certainly he used power—political, financial, journalistic—to achieve that result. Fort Worth has come a long way under the tremendous incentive that Amon Carter imparted to it. Today's Fort Worth is his lengthening shadow.

While Amon Carter's objective was city building, he saw clearly that this did not require personal service in public office but his journalistic leadership. In building a great Fort Worth, he proved himself simultaneously an able and successful publisher. When William Randolph Hearst bought the Fort Worth Record and invaded Carter's territory, the latter had already made his position secure for a newspaper battle. A Hearst newspaper took one of the chain's few defeats, ultimately disposing of the Record to the Star-Telegram. Carter fought Hearst as resolutely as he had fought for Fort Worth. That he had done the latter was the basis of his victory over Hearst.

Had Dallas fought Fort Worth as Carter fought Dallas, the results might have been different. Doubtless Carter recognized, as Dallas has always done, that there is ample room for two great cities on the Trinity within a few miles of each other. But Carter could only impart his own vision to his city by making Dallas the whipping boy of its ambition.

Amon Carter has written a remarkable and unique chapter both in Texas journalism and Texas city building. Fort Worth is his monument.

Texas and Texans will miss him.

[From the Big Spring (Tex.) Herald of June 24, 1955]

WEST TEXAS LOSES A GOOD FRIEND

Texas—and west Texas in particular—has lost one of its most distinguished and useful citizen in the death of Amon Giles Carter, Fort Worth publisher, oilman, philanthropist.

Many people came to consider Fort Worth and Amon G. Carter synonymous, and well they might. His list of promotions and benefactions in his home city are almost endless. Several institutions bore his name in testimony of his leadership and generosity.

There were two sides to Amon Carter—one the colorful showman who loved to do the dramatic and who undeniably basked in the limelight; the other a man who sincerely believed in his community and State and who gave back to them far, far more than he ever received from them.

More than most people realize, Amon Carter was one means by which national attention was focused more and more upon Texas. This was achieved in part by his ability to attract people of national prominence into Texas and Fort Worth; by his boldness in promotion, such as the fabulous Casa Manana during the centennial days; by his vision in many fields such as in the field of air passenger service.

These were some of the things which made news and which put the spotlight of public attention upon him. However, long after these things are forgotten, the deeper contributions of the man will stand as evidence to his fierce pride and big heart toward a city and region he loved. Amon Carter was given the trust of great wealth and power in his day, and when the wheat is shaken from the chaff, it is certain that he made wise use of them for his fellow man.

[From the New York Herald Tribune of June 25, 1955]

AMON G. CARTER

They called him "Mr. Fort Worth," because of his loyalty to the city where most of his adult life was spent—and the name was not unfitting. He represented the successful striving, the pride of locality, the hospitality, and the zest of a great and growing city.

Both Amon G. Carter and Fort Worth could tell of small beginnings and great achievements. The man swept floors and washed dishes in a boardinghouse at 12 and controlled large newspaper and business interests before he was 50. The city numbered 30,000 in 1923 and 300,000 30 years later. They grew together—Texas style—with an appreciation of broad horizons, or natural wealth that needed only courage and hard work to make it productive, or keen, tough competition among men and cities alike.

It would take much space to list the activities and accomplishments of Amon Carter—the Star-Telegram which he built up, the encouragement he gave to aviation, the Texas Technological College he helped to found, his charities, and his untiring efforts on behalf of Texas and Fort Worth. It is enough to say that it is a very American story, with just that added sweep and gusto that Texas has added to the saga of the States. The country—and the Southwest in particular—has lost one of its most impressive and colorful figures. But Amon G. Carter's monuments are everywhere in the city and State he loved and served so well.

[From the Houston Post]

AMON CARTER—"MR. FORT WORTH"

No one in the last quarter century wielded a greater influence in the affairs of west Texas than Amon G. Carter. He was the mainspring of Fort Worth's great development and, to a great extent, west Texas, since the early 1920's.

His newspapers, the morning and evening Star-Telegram, blanketed a farflung area from the Panhandle down through and beyond the South Plains, and from the Trinity Valley to the New Mexico line, molding public opinion throughout. In the history of that section his stature looms gigantic.

Amon Carter's influence extended even beyond the borders of Texas—all the way to Washington. He was on intimately friendly terms with the great and the near great. Few notables visited Fort Worth without calling upon Mr. Carter. Many of these friends also became friends of public endeavors which he advocated for Fort Worth and west Texas—war industries, hospitals, schools, Federal buildings, an international airport, railroad terminals, and so on.

The Carter influence was felt in most of the major economic and cultural developments in Fort Worth. At one time or another he headed virtually every important civic activity. He gave not only of his energy and leadership, but of his means. He made probably more money in the oil business than from his newspapers. The sale of part of the vast Wasson pool in 1947 brought him $16½ million. This went into a foundation, through which he contributed generously to many causes.

Born in a log cabin in Wise County 75 years ago, Mr. Carter's early life was one of hard struggles. Thus he had the "common touch"—and he never lost it. It was one of the secrets of his success.

Innumerable honors came to Amon Carter in recognition of his good works. Perhaps the most distinguished and most fitting of them all was the unofficial title—"Mr. Fort Worth."

[From the New York Journal-American of June 25, 1955]

AMON CARTER, AN AMERICAN PIONEER

A fellow who knew Amon Carter, Mr. Fort Worth, for 25 years, must feel bad that he is gone. He was a real American. One of the tough-fibered, never back-up, or give-up, sort that has been so important in the history of the country.

Not a pioneer of the type of Dan Boone, Kit Carson and the widely sung Davy Crockett, of course, Amon was a true pioneer, nevertheless.

A builder of the country, making the mistakes and blunders common to all men, but forever seeing a bright and wonderful future ahead and building toward it with foresight, hope, and almost unbelievable energy.

Born bone-poor in the land of the cowpony, where ponies came cheap, he never was affluent enough to have a horse to ride until he was a grown man.

Without formal education, or ever much of any, except the kind he picked up with his native sense, he was yet, years later, one of the first to see that the airplane was the transportation of the future, and he lived to see that future become today.

Once, not many years after World War I, he said to me about planes: "They get you there faster and when you're going somewhere, the way to get there is fast."

But it is not for such things as that, that I'll remember Amon. I'll remember him as a friend. As a generous-hearted friend, who, liking you, got pleasure from doing a favor in a quick, generous, and open-handed way.

Such as this one, which came before he hit the big jackpot under the ground that cured him of financial troubles, of which, too, for a lot of years, he had his full share.

There were years, and many of them, when he must have been able to pick a dry-hole oil well more unerringly than any man in all of Texas.

WITH AMON, NO QUIBBLE

There was a cartoonist here in New York, and a good one, who had run into more bad luck of various kinds than as nice a fellow as he was deserved to have.

This man came to see me one day, sick and despondent. He was taking a bus to California, he said, but he doubted that things would be better for him when he got there.

"Must it be California?" I asked him.

"Where else?" he asked me, "at least it's warm out there."

"I was thinking about a friend of mine in Texas," I told him. "Would you give it a hard hustle, if I could get you a job on his newspaper?"

"Yes, if you can get me the job," he replied, "but you won't."

I called Amon at the Fort Worth Star-Telegram and told him briefly the tale. There was no quibbling on his part. No story about the paper being oversupplied with cartoonists. No questions of the fellow's habits, or his looks, or beliefs, or anything at all.

"You say he's good, Bill?" he asked.

"One of the best for sure," I told him.

"When'll he be here?"

"Four or five days from now, I guess."

"Tell him to see me personally, and if I don't happen to be here, to wait until he can. Tell me his name again, and how it's spelled."

A few years later I was in Dallas and heard the rest of the story. The man walked into Carter's office and got a welcome so warm that he felt at home even before he sat down before the publisher's desk.

"You went on the payroll last Monday at X dollars a week. Do you think that's fair for a beginning?" asked Amon.

The man gulped and nodded; not perhaps that the salary was munificent but that it was there. He was an artist with a job again.

"O. K.," said Carter, "now I'll show you your office."

He led him into a pleasant sunny office on which, by some chance, the man's name had been painted on the glazed glass of the door.

The big winner, of course, was the man who that day began a bright and successful new career. He was that day a top member of the Star-Telegram staff. But Amon lost nothing, either.

On the contrary, he wound up with a great cartoonist, who proved to be a star for his newspaper. A paper for which, incidentally, he never ceased to be the top advertising salesman.

But the credo of living was what always intrigued me—that a friend of his was going to be all right with him. You don't find so many of those.

And so I'm sad that he's gone. It would be very hard for anybody to say, I think, that he wasn't quite a man in quite a State of quite a country.

If they walk and talk big in Texas, the jokes notwithstanding, it shouldn't be overlooked that they do pretty big, too.

AMON WAS TEXAS, ALL OVER

Amon Carter was one of them. He was Texas all over. So typical, indeed, that in the dark of night in Timbuctoo, one would have had to say: "Here comes Carter, here comes Texas."

I don't think that's bad. I think it's great.

I believe Amon Carter was in his time, by his lights and by his opportunities, an outstanding American citizen. I know he was a good American. I know that he was a good friend.

He worked like six Trojans to accomplish the things that he accomplished. He also had fun in sports with his beloved Horned Frogs and Dutch Meyer of TCU, Sammy Baugh, Davey O'Brien, Ky Aldrich, Fort Worth baseball, golf tournaments, racing, and the rest.

It was nice that he had that fun.

At 75, he had walked a full beat. He was a gentleman to have known. I'm glad I knew him pretty well. Because, as a fellow gets older, pleasant memories are nice to have.

SILLIMAN EVANS

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

Mr. DANIEL. I yield.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I wish to join with the junior Senator from Texas in paying high tribute to Mr. Carter. It was my pleasure to have known him for a number of years. He was a great citizen not only of Texas, but also of the Nation, and was one of the outstanding newspapermen of our time.

I call the attention of the Senate to the fact that he was a backer and sponsor of Mr. Silliman Evans, who became the publisher and president of the Nashville Tennessean. Mr. Evans went to Texas to attend the funeral services of his old friend and associate, Mr. Amon G. Carter, and the following morning Mr. Evans himself passed away while in Fort Worth.

Thus the Nation has lost two of its outstanding men in the newspaper field, and the South has lost two men who have fought valiantly for the economic and social development of our section.

PAN AMERICAN AIRLINES' 50,000TH FLIGHT ACROSS THE ATLANTIC

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, with the departure of a Pan American DC–7B from Idlewild Field, New York City, at 5 p. m. this afternoon, Pan American Airlines will be making its 50,000th flight across the Atlantic.

The first flight was made 16 years ago, and since that time the airline has carried 2,021,483 passengers a total distance of 200 million miles across the ocean.

The captain of the first flight was Harold E. Gray, now executive vice president of Pan American.

During the 16 years, the airline has run up an impressive total of 24,540,000 pounds of airmail, the equivalent of 552 million letters. More than 35,275,394 pounds of cargo have been carried by air across the Atlantic. This would total more weight than 11,700 modern automobiles weigh. The categories of freight airlifted range from heavy machinery weighing more than a ton to dresses fresh from the showrooms of the Paris designers and weighing only ounces.

It is interesting to note that for 2 years before that first flight, 16 years ago, Pan American conducted survey flights, and collected all possible data to guide them in their operations. For 5 years before the first flight, expeditions had been conducted in the Arctic to compile the necessary information on Atlantic weather, communications problems, and flying conditions.

The visit of King George VI and his Queen had just been completed, and the World's Fair was in full swing in New York, when Pan American's flying boat, the *Yankee Clipper*, cut through the waters of Long Island Sound near Port Washington for its flight to Southampton, England.

Once a week the 42-ton flying boat, weighing only a little more than half the weight of modern clippers, followed the northern route to Europe. It had a speed of only 140 miles an hour, and often required more than 24 hours to make the trip to Europe. The route went via Botwood, Newfoundland, and Foynes, Ireland, to Southampton. Each week the sister ship, the *Dixie Clipper*, flew the mid-Atlantic route through Bermuda, Horta in the Azores, Lisbon, Portugal, to Marseilles in France.

Often flights were long delayed because of high seas. Ice often held up flights in New York, and sometimes three-foot swells at the Azores could delay flights for days. With the war came intermediate landing fields, and the line changed over to landplanes.

The DC–4's came on the line in 1945, but as they were unpressurized, their altitude was limited to 10,000 feet. With the Constellation in 1946 came the first flights above weather, as the pressurized cabins permitted this new and safer service. This was followed in 1949 by the Boeing Stratocruiser, a double-deck, all-sleeper plane, with horsepower rated at 3,500 per engine.

With new planes, including the Super-Stratocruiser, the Douglas DC–6B, and now the DC–7B, flying time has gone from the 140-mile-per-hour speed to 353 miles per hour. Instead of 24 hours required to reach London, the flying time today is only 11 hours. Within sight of early delivery is the new Douglas DC–7C, which will have a flight range of 5,000 miles.

The pioneers in transatlantic flying paid off big dividends during World War II, when experience, training, and weather knowledge made it possible for the United States to maintain close contacts with Europe by air. Among the famous persons flying to Europe by Pan American during the war was President Franklin D. Roosevelt, who flew to the Casablanca conference in 1943, marking the first time that a President had flown while in office. Others included Gen. Dwight D. Eisenhower, Gen. George C. Marshall, Queen Wilhelmina of the Netherlands, and many other notable persons.

The airlift of cargos was vital, too, and often dangerous. Under PAA's contract with the Air Transport Command, loaded shell fuses reached General Montgomery's troops at the critical moment before the battle of El Alamein.

Technically, the pilots say, progress has been made little by little during the past 16 years. The "least time track" has served to take advantage of the path having the most favorable tailwinds, so that in 1949 a record was set for New York to London nonstop of only 8 hours, 55 minutes.

Pressurized airplanes have made possible greater safety by flying over the weather, and have added much to passenger comfort as well. Radiophone has replaced the laborious dot-and-dash method. Navigation was greatly improved by the addition of the loran gear, a method of locating planes more accurately while in flight, and improvements have been made in octants and in the installation of radio altimeters.

Longer-range airplanes gave pilots more choices of alternates, and higher octane fuel provided more power for engines and lower fuel consumption. Supercharging and the use of power-recovery devices again improved performance. Bad weather landings were made safer by radar at airports. The logical outgrowth of ground radar is airborne radar, now just coming into use.

In addition to the improvement of flight techniques, additional services and travel plans have continued to build up a demand for transatlantic service. First came the off-season rates put into effect in the winter of 1947 to smooth out offseason peaks. Next came the inauguration in May 1952 of two-class service, and the inauguration of tourist trips at a 25-percent reduction in cost. Business increased some 69 percent in this innovation of lower cost fares. Other plans may lower present costs, with a projected family plan being readied for next fall.

While the service of transatlantic flying looms large in the international travel picture, we must never overlook its importance in keeping alive air transport that can be useful for our defense of the great Atlantic community. The long-range, four-engine fleet could deliver to Europe a total of 7,600 troops a day in case of need.

ADJOURNMENT

The VICE PRESIDENT. What is the pleasure of the Senate?

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, pursuant to the order previously entered, I move that the Senate adjourn until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 7 o'clock and 1 minute p. m.) the Senate adjourned, the adjournment being, under the order previously entered, until tomorrow, Wednesday, June 29, 1955, at 12 o'clock meridian.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate June 28 (legislative day of June 27), 1955:

HOME LOAN BANK BOARD

William J. Hallahan, of Maryland, to be a member of the Home Loan Bank Board for a term of 4 years expiring June 30, 1959.

IN THE ARMY

The following-named officer to be placed on the retired list in the grade indicated under the provisions of subsection 504 (d) of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947:

To be general

Gen. Matthew Bunker Ridgway, O5264, Army of the United States (major general, U. S. Army).

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, JUNE 28, 1955

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Thou who art the great companion of our hearts and the counselor of our minds, Thy eternal truth is our light and Thy spirit of love the bond of unity among men and nations.

We penitently acknowledge that in these dark and perilous days the hope of establishing peace on earth seems at times so remote and unreal.

Help us to believe that there is no crisis we cannot face if our inner life is armored with Thy divine righteousness and controlled and guided by a desire to do Thy will.

Grant that our President, our Speaker, our Congress, and all who represent our beloved country in the field of international relations may be blessed with the art and the resources of statesmanship and diplomacy but above all with a faith that never wavers and a courage that never falters.

Hear us in the name of the Prince of Peace. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

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

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

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

H. R. 880. An act for the relief of Paul Y. Loong;

H. R. 935. An act for the relief of Mrs. Marion Josephine Monnell;

H. R. 943. An act for the relief of Luzie Biondo (Luzie M. Schmidt);

H. R. 968. An act for the relief of Max Kozlowski;

H. R. 973. An act for the relief of Mrs. Elizabeth Dowds;

H. R. 977. An act for the relief of Mrs. Ellen Hillier;

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

H. R. 995. An act for the relief of Frieda Quiring and Tina Quiring;

H. R. 997. An act for the relief of Irmgard Emilie Krepps;

H. R. 998. An act for the relief of Meiko Shikibu;

H. R. 1028. An act for the relief of Melina Bonton;

H. R. 1047. An act for the relief of Armenouhi Assadour Artinian;

H. R. 1083. An act for the relief of Robert Shen-yen Hou-ming Lieu;

H. R. 1157. An act for the relief of Milad S. Isaac;

H. R. 1158. An act for the relief of Emanuel Frangeskos;

H. R. 1205. An act for the relief of Cynthia Jacob;

H. R. 1299. An act for the relief of Miss Toshiko Hozaka and her child, Roger;

H. R. 1300. An act for the relief of Luther Rose;

H. R. 1337. An act for the relief of Victorine May Donaldson;

H. R. 2973. An act to provide for the conveyance of all right, title, and interest of the United States in a certain tract of land in Macon County, Ga., to the Georgia State Board of Education; and

H. R. 4549. An act for the relief of John J. Braund.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with an amendment in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 3359. An act for the relief of Raymond George Palmer.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bills, a joint resolution, and concurrent resolutions of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 288. An act to provide for the reimbursement of Meadow School District No. 29, Upham, N. Dak., for loss of revenue resulting from the acquisition of certain lands within such school district by the Department of the Interior;

S. 501. An act for the relief of Ki Young Kwan;

S. 578. An act for the relief of Edmund Lowe and Richard Lowe;

S. 871. An act for the relief of Dominic Gaetano Morin;

S. 1159. An act for the relief of Wilma Ann Schilling and her daughter, Ingertraud Rosalita Schilling;

S. 1522. An act for the relief of Lieselotte Brodzinski Gettman;

S. J. Res. 21. Joint resolution to establish a Commission on Government Security;

S. Con. Res. 42. Concurrent resolution favoring the suspension of deportation in the case of certain aliens; and

S. Con. Res. 45. Concurrent resolution providing for the reenrollment of S. 195, for the relief of Giuseppe Minardi.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendment to the bill (H. R. 4904) entitled "An act to extend the Renegotiation Act of 1951 for 2 years," disagreed to by the House; agrees to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. BYRD, Mr. GEORGE, Mr. KERR, Mr. MILLIKIN, and Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate disagrees to the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 1464) entitled "An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to acquire certain rights-of-way and timber-access roads," requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. LONG, Mr. ANDERSON, Mr. NEUBERGER, Mr. MALONE, and Mr. DWORSHAK to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

APPROPRIATIONS FOR DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE AND RELATED AGENCIES, 1956

Mr. PRESTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Appropriations may have until midnight tonight to file a conference report on the bill (H. R. 6367), making appropriations for the Department of Commerce and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO SIT DURING SESSION OF THE HOUSE TODAY

Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that a subcommittee of the Committee on Education and Labor dealing with school construction may sit this afternoon during general debate in the House.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that a special subcommittee of the Committee on Education and Labor dealing with Public Laws 815 and 874 may be permitted to sit during general debate in the House this afternoon.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. STAGGERS asked and was given permission to address the House for 5 minutes today following the legislative business of the day and any special orders heretofore entered.

ALASKA TIDELANDS

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 am today introducing a bill conveying title in Alaska tidelands to the Territory of Alaska.

In general, the provisions of this bill follow those of the Submerged Lands Act of 1953. The bill, among other things, transfers ownership of the lands beneath those navigable waters lying within the boundaries of the Territory of Alaska to the people of the Territory, and likewise gives them ownership of and management powers over natural resources in and under these waters. Such resources include fish; management of that resource has been sought by the citizens of the Territory for ever so long. It is interesting to note that the statehood bill which was recently before this House used the language of the Submerged Lands Act of 1953 in pointing out and emphasizing that the fishery resource should go to Alaska instead of having ownership and management remain in the Federal Government.

The bill expressly provides that the Territory may not sell the submerged lands or any of the natural resources. The bill requires that development of such resources shall proceed only under leasing arrangements in accordance with laws to be passed by the Legislature of Alaska.

Mr. Speaker, I trust that early and affirmative consideration may be given this proposed legislation. During the many discussions of and debates on Alaska statehood it has not been argued to my recollection that the Federal Government has ever done enough for Alaska in the way of making resources available so that proper development may be accomplished under sound conservation policies. The great land has been locked up; this is an effort to turn the key part way in that lock. Under Federal management policies, which at one time blow hot and at another time

blow cold, and which are always attended by the limitations inherent in a vast Federal bureaucracy, we can look forward to little in the future if the experiences of the past are duplicated. Here we seek to strike out for ourselves in a search for long-delayed utilization of our resources. Such utilization will, I am confident, proceed under soundest policies not only because it will be the intent and desire of Alaskans to have it so but because the bill itself through its leasing requirements will prevent any giveaways.

Enactment of this bill and enactment of other bills to give Alaska more home rule and more opportunity for growth certainly should be granted now that statehood has been denied us. I have a bill pending to transfer to the Territory of Alaska 20 million acres out of the vast Federal holding amounting to over 350 million acres. I have other bills approval of which would, I am sure, place Alaska in a position where its economic soundness could never again be disputed. Doubtless I shall be introducing other bills for other changes and improvements. We Alaskans continue to hope and believe that our Government will not deny us the right to grow up and prosper under the same rules which brought about growth elsewhere in the West. Passage and approval of the submerged lands bill for Alaska would be a massive prop in the foundation for a prospering Alaska.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. FLOOD asked and was given permission to address the House for 30 minutes tomorrow, 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 the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce may have until midnight tonight to file a report on the bill (H. R. 6645) and that that permission may also apply to any minority report or separate minority views.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

COMMISSION ON INTERGOVERNMENTAL RELATIONS—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 198)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Government Operations and ordered to be printed with illustrations:

To the Congress of the United States:

Pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 109—83d Congress, as amended, I hereby transmit to the Congress of the United States the final report of the Commission on Intergovernmental Relations.

One hundred sixty-eight years ago the Founding Fathers designed our Federal form of government in response to the baffling and eminently practical problem of creating unity among the Thirteen States where union seemed impossible. The farmers of our Constitution reached a solution now recognized as one of the most significant advances in the history of representative government.

Since their day, our Federal structure has been adapted successfully to such phenomenal changes as a fortyfold increase in our population, the industrialization of our economy, and the rapid urbanization of our society. No other federal system, since established, has so effectively blended the capacity for energetic and responsible national action and the spirit of local initiative and autonomy.

In our time, however, a decade of economic crisis followed by a decade of war and international crises vastly altered Federal relationships. Consequently, it is highly desirable to examine in comprehensive fashion the present-day requirements of a workable federalism.

The interests and activities of the different levels of government now impinge on each other at innumerable points, even where they may appear to be quite separable. The National Government's defense policies and programs, for example, have important repercussions on virtually every phase of State and local activity. Conversely, the effectiveness of our national defense policies depends on a myriad of State and local activities affecting the health, safety, and social and economic welfare of our people.

Because of this increasingly intricate interrelationship of National, State, and local governments, it is important that we review the existing allocation of responsibilities, with a view to making the most effective utilization of our total governmental resources.

To this undertaking the Commission on Intergovernmental Relations has made a notable contribution. Its report includes numerous specific recommendations. Insofar as these would entail action by the executive branch, I shall see that they are given the most careful consideration. I commend to the attention of the Congress, as well as of State and local executives and legislatures, the recommendations pertaining to them.

The Commission on Intergovernmental Relations is the first official body appointed to study and report on the general relationship of the National Government to the States and their local units. Consequently, the Commission wisely devoted much of its time to an examination of the general nature of our Federal system, and of the means whereby it can be made to work more effectively. I am confident that its report will result in increased and sustained interest in this vitally important problem of government.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *June 28, 1955.*

PROPOSED RESEARCH ASSISTANT

Mr. JONES of Missouri. 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 Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, there seems to be considerable misunderstanding about a proposal to readjust salaries of certain employees of the House of Representatives, to increase certain allowances for postage, telephone, telegraph, and travel expenses for Members of the House, and to include the addition of another employee in each Member's office to be known as a research assistant, at a salary in excess of $12,000 per year.

I am opposed not only to many of the proposals that have been made, but am unalterably opposed to the addition of the research assistant on the basis indicated in the proposal.

Not only am I opposed to many of the proposals, but this opposition is further emphasized by the procedure which has been followed in attempting to secure not only approval for, but for the appropriation which would be necessary in taking care of this increase in the cost of operation of the House, which totals more than $5 million annually.

This proposal has not been adequately considered by the House Committee on Administration, which, in this instance, appears to be surrendering its authority, responsibility, and duty by attempting to transfer to the House Committee on Appropriations the responsibility for studying and drafting the necessary legislation granting the authority for this $5 million increase.

As a member of the Committee on House Administration, I feel that this committee should accept its responsibility in dealing with this proposal. The House should have an opportunity to express itself on a clear-cut proposition and a bill carrying all of these items should be brought to the floor under an open rule under which amendments would be in order.

To include this proposal, which has not even been recommended by the full Committee on House Administration, in a legislative appropriations bill would be contrary to the established custom of the House, if not an actual violation of the rules of the House. If, on the other hand, this proposal should be included in an appropriations bill I am hopeful it will be under a rule whereby Members will have an opportunity to express themselves on a record rollcall vote. I know I am expressing the views of many Members of Congress who, like myself, want the opportunity to vote against such a proposal.

STOP AND START NATIONAL DEFENSE

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, in the time that has passed since we acted on appropriations for the armed services, some significant events have occurred.

Despite attempts by the administration to laugh off reports of the rapid development of Soviet air power, the administration itself finally felt compelled to announce that a step-up was needed in our own aircraft procurement.

The great crusaders who used to talk about a "mess in Washington" managed to produce their own incredible confusion and bungling. The Vice President made a speech one day about the upcoming Big Four Conference and solemnly proclaimed that it offered perhaps the world's last chance. He was promptly denied endorsement by his own administration's State Department, and a few days later President Eisenhower himself denounced fatuous expectations about the Conference and warned that it could offer, at most, the beginning of a quest that may last a generation.

The Secretary of Defense first ridiculed the report that Soviet modern long-range bombers were already flying in combat formations. But a few days later he admitted that the Pentagon was taking a very good look at our own needs. Then the Air Force announced a step-up in B-52 production and asked the Senate for supplemental appropriations. Assurances were given that there would be an increase in fighter-plane procurement. The Senate declined to concur in administration proposals to slash the Marine Corps.

Mr. Speaker, it has been my belief that we should not take on naked trust assurance and economy measures offered by an administration that obviously has been guided by inadequate information, that contradicts itself or changes its mind in public about every third day. It has been my belief that we should have an agonizing reappraisal, if necessary, by the Armed Services Committee, to fulfill our responsibilities for the security of the country.

We know now, at least, that the administration itself has admitted that its proposed budgetary figures were too low, and the Senate acted on the appropriations bill with the knowledge of that admission. This should bear weight with the Members of this body serving on the joint conference committee. The situation has changed since we acted in the House—and the administration acknowledges the change. I would urge the conferees of the House, in their wisdom, to take this situation into account in their discussions with the Senate conferees.

FOREIGN AID PROGRAM

Mr. DAVIDSON. 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 New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. DAVIDSON. Mr. Speaker, I will vote for the foreign-aid program which our committee has reported. However, I must say in honesty that I have misgivings about it. Do not misunderstand me. I believe the program to be in America's best interest. I think the economic and technical assistance portion of it too small and would prefer a larger authorization. In my judgment, the proposal before us, recommended by the administration, lacks vision and life. It is niggardly advanced and so couched in militaristic terms as to belie our purely defensive and peaceful purpose. It is a far cry from the bold new plan the administration hinted at.

We are asked to approve a program of $3,285,800,000, of which $2,472,500,000 is for military use. We are asked to approve one vast global program without the breakdowns formerly furnished. I vote for it only because nothing more will pass due to the apathetic attitude of the administration. General MacArthur recently said it very plainly: It is our leaders who are laggards. The people regard our foreign affairs as the most crucial issue before us. The administration concentrates on the budget and big business.

In the past there have been regional breakdowns of military aid funds. The authorization this year is global. In view of conditions in the Middle East, we should be informed as to how much military aid is going there and to whom it is going. Certainly, it is in the interest of the United States to encourage the development of strong and free democratic governments throughout the world. Certainly, too, these friendly countries should be strengthened so that they can defend themselves against aggression. There are 3 paramount sources of aggression today: First, The Soviet Union; second, Communist China; and third, the Arab States unceasing propaganda and economic warfare directed against Israel.

Since they obtained United States military aid, Iraq has never once changed or modified its attitude toward Israel. Only a short time ago, when Egypt's dictator belligerently stated Egypt was ready to go to war again if need be, Iraq promptly announced she would go to Egypt's aid—New York Times, June 5, 6, 1955.

The strategic importance of the Middle East is well known. It is geographically most significant; its natural resources are needed by the West; the Suez Canal is a vital economic and military facility. Continued unrest and the threat of war in that area is not in our best interest and plays into the Communists' hands, as the Bandung Conference indicated.

The secret arming of some of the Middle Eastern countries does not help this situation. We should know the amount of arms going to each country. Certainly it would be preferable that no arms at all be sent to this area until there is a real peace there.

The one thing which will help and which Israel has constantly sought, and which the Arabs have constantly opposed, is a full-scale peace conference between Israel and the Arab States.

It should be borne in mind that the basic cause of the present Near East tension is the refusal of the Arabs to sit down at such a conference and fully discuss with Israel the issues which divide them. Actually, the primary source of trouble may readily be found at the Egyptian door. There are no outbreaks along Israel's borders with Syria and Lebanon. Unless the Egyptians sit down at such a conference in good faith, the unrest and tension will continue. The Times reported again yesterday that the Egyptians have once more refused to do so. In these circumstances, I submit that it is reckless on our part to furnish arms to the Arabs. The spectacle of our supplying arms to those who abjure peace is most strange.

Our Government should make a concerted and direct effort now to obtain such a peace conference. Israel is willing to discuss any and all issues at such a conference. Long distance name calling will not resolve the differences. A conference will.

In summation, it seems to me that the administration proposal relegates the foreign economic development and technical assistance program to a back place. It is obvious that the Communists are engaged in an all out propaganda campaign to capture the support of the world. They picture us as militaristic, and materialistic only. We must refute this lie. We must balance our defensive preparations with understandable efforts to encourage democracy and freedom. Such phrases as "massive retaliation" and "agonizing reappraisal" are not calculated to win us friends. The bombastic tone of self-appreciation and infallibility exhibited by our foreign affairs spokesman gains us no new friends and only antagonizes those we have.

When President Eisenhower speaks out personally, he helps correct this appalling state of affairs. The difficulty is that he is apparently so hemmed about with advisors that he does not speak often enough or forcefully enough.

I hope Mr. Speaker, that we can go forward quickly with this program. Both its aspects, defense and economic development, should be stabilized at high levels. Increased economic and technical assistance is urgently needed in many areas. I share the concern others have expressed in any reductions in this program, particularly in the Near East. The situation remains critical there; it is equally tense in Asia; in Guatemala conditions appear to be going from bad to worse.

If we are to achieve victory in what seems to be a new period of peaceful competition, we need a truly dynamic program which will foster understanding, good will and knowledgeable long-range planning as the Marshall and Truman plans once did.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Obviously a quorum is not present.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 98]

Alexander	Green, Pa.	Meader
Bell	Gubser	Miller, N. Y.
Berry	Henderson	Morrison
Bolton, Oliver P.	Holt	Moulder
	Horan	Mumma
Boykin	Jackson	O'Konski
Buckley	James	Polk
Canfield	Kearney	Powell
Chatham	Kearns	Quigley
Davis, Tenn.	King, Pa.	Reed, N. Y.
Dingell	Knox	Rivers
Doyle	Knutson	Robsion, Ky.
Eberharter	Krueger	St. George
Ellsworth	Lovre	Scherer
Frelinghuysen	McDowell	Simpson, Pa.
Gamble	McGregor	Steed
Gray	Mack, Ill.	Tumulty

The SPEAKER. Three hundred and eighty-two Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

1955 AMENDMENTS TO THE UNIVERSAL MILITARY TRAINING AND SERVICE ACT

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H. R. 3005) to further amend the Universal Military Training and Service Act by extending the authority to induct certain individuals, and to extend the benefits under the Dependents Assistance Act to July 1, 1959, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House may be read in lieu of the report.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. No. 902)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3005) to further amend the Universal Military Training and Service Act by extending the authority to induct certain individuals, and to extend the benefits under the Dependents Assistance Act to July 1, 1959, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate to the text of the bill and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following: "That this Act may be cited as the '1955 Amendments to the Universal Military Training and Service Act'.

"TITLE I

"SEC. 101. (a) Subsection (a) of section 6 of the Universal Military Training and Service Act, as amended, is amended by inserting at the end thereof the following new sentence: 'Any person who subsequent to June 24, 1948, serves on active duty for a period of not less than eighteen months in the armed forces of a nation with which the United States is associated in mutual defense activities as defined by the President, may be exempted from training and service, but not from registration, in accordance with regulations prescribed by the President, except that no such exemption shall be granted to any person who is a national of a country which does not not grant reciprocal privileges to citizens of the United States: *Provided*, That any active duty performed prior to June 24, 1948, by a person in the armed forces of a country allied with the United States during World War II and with which the United States is associated in such mutual defense activities, shall be credited in the computation of such eighteen-month period.'.

"(b) Subsection (b) of such section is amended by amending paragraph (3) to read as follows:

"'(3) Except as provided in section 4 (i) of this Act, and notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, no person who (A) has served honorably on active duty after September 16, 1940, for a period of not less than one year in the Army, the Air Force, the Navy, the Marine Corps, or the Coast Guard, or (B) subsequent to September 16, 1940, was discharged for the convenience of the Government after having served honorably on active duty for a period of not less than six months in the Army, the Air Force, the Navy, the Marine Corps, or the Coast Guard, or (C) has served for a period of not less than twenty-four months (i) as a commissioned officer in the Public Health Service or (ii) as a commissioned officer in the Coast and Geodetic Survey, shall be liable for induction for training and service under this Act, except after a declaration of war or national emergency made by the Congress subsequent to the date of enactment of this title.'.

"(c) Subsection (c) (2) (A) of such section is amended by inserting at the end thereof the following new sentence: 'No person who has been or may be deferred under the provisions of this clause shall by reason of such deferment be liable for training and service in the Armed Forces by reason of the provisions of subsection (h) hereof after he has attained the twenty-eighth anniversary of the date of his birth.'.

"(d) Subsection (h) of such section is amended by inserting immediately after '*Provided further*,' the following: 'That the existence of a shortage or a surplus of any agricultural commodity shall not be considered in determining the deferment of any individual on the grounds that his employment in agriculture is necessary to the maintenance of the national health, safety, or interest: *And provided further*,'.

"SEC. 102. Section 17 (c) of the Universal Military Training and Service Act, as amended, is amended by striking out 'July 1, 1955' wherever such date appears therein and inserting in lieu thereof 'July 1, 1959'.

"SEC. 103. Section 16 of the Dependents Assistance Act of 1950, as amended, is amended by striking out 'July 1, 1955' wherever such date appears therein and inserting in lieu thereof 'July 1, 1959.'.

"TITLE II

"SEC. 201. Sections 4 and 7 of the Act entitled 'An Act to amend the Selective Service Act of 1948, as amended, so as to provide for special registration, classification, and induction of certain medical, dental, and allied specialist categories, and for other purposes', approved September 9, 1950 (64 Stat. 826), as amended, are amended by striking out 'July 1, 1955' wherever such date appears therein and inserting in lieu thereof 'July 1, 1957'.

"SEC. 202. The last sentence of paragraph (1) of section 4 (i) of the Universal Military Training and Service Act, as amended, is amended (1) by inserting immediately after the word 'subsection' the following: '(A) after he has attained the thirty-fifth anniversary of the date of his birth, if he applies or has applied for a commission in one of the Armed Forces in any of such categories and is or has been rejected for such commission on the sole ground of a physical disqualification, or (B)', and (2) by striking out 'fifty-first' and inserting in lieu thereof 'forty-sixth'.

"SEC. 203. Section 203 of the Career Compensation Act of 1949 (63 Stat. 809), as amended, is amended by striking out 'July 1, 1955' wherever such date appears therein and inserting in lieu thereof 'July 1, 1959'."

And the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate to the title of the bill, and agree to the same.

CARL VINSON,
OVERTON BROOKS,
PAUL J. KILDAY,
DEWEY SHORT,
L. C. ARENDS,
Managers on the Part of the House.

RICHARD B. RUSSELL,
HARRY F. BYRD,
LYNDON B. JOHNSON,
LEVERETT SALTONSTALL,
STYLES BRIDGES,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3005) to further amend the Universal Military Training and Service Act by extending the authority to induct certain individuals, and to extend the benefits under the Dependents Assistance Act to July 1, 1959, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

The Senate amendment struck out all after the enacting clause in the House bill, made several changes in the regular draft act and added as a separate title the extension of the Doctors Draft Act together with the special pay for physicians and dentists.

There were several major and some minor differences between the House version with respect to the extension of the regular draft law and the amendment as passed by the Senate.

EXTENSION OF AUTHORITY TO DRAFT INDIVIDUALS UNDER THE REGULAR DRAFT

1. Both the House bill and the Senate amendment provided for a 4-year extension of the regular draft.

2. Both the House bill and the Senate amendment provided for a 4-year extension of the Dependents Assistance Act.

3. The House bill provided that individuals who enlist in National Guard units prior to attaining the age of 18½ would not be liable for induction beyond the age of 26. Under existing law such individuals are liable up to age 35. The Senate amendment makes such individuals liable for induction up to age 28. This is the first significant difference between the House bill and the Senate amendment. The House managers agreed to this portion of the Senate amendment.

4. The House bill contained an amendment which reduced the age of liability from age 35 to age 26 for an individual who was deferred for physical reasons as a result of being rejected by an Army examining station or induction station. The Senate amendment struck out this language from the House bill and thus continues in effect the present law which makes these individuals liable up to age 35. The House managers agreed to this portion of the Senate amendment.

5. Both the House bill and the Senate amendment contained language to the effect that the supply of an agricultural commodity may not be taken into consideration either in denying or granting deferments. The Senate amendment merely rearranged the wording of the House bill without changing the effect of the House bill in this respect.

The House managers agreed to this portion of the Senate amendment.

6. The next difference between the House bill and the Senate amendment involved the amount of service necessary to qualify for exemption from induction on the basis of prior service. The House bill provided that an individual who served honorably on active duty after September 16, 1940, for a period of 6 months or more in the Armed Forces (or 24 months in the Public Health Service) would not be liable for induction except upon a declaration of war or national emergency by the Congress. The Senate amendment provided that an individual shall be considered as qualified for exemption if he serves on active duty for a period of 1 year in the Armed Forces unless he was discharged for the convenience of the Government after having served 6 months or more. The Senate amendment also added the Coast and Geodetic Survey to the 2-year active duty requirement to qualify for such exemption. The House managers agreed to this portion of the Senate amendment.

7. The Senate amendment provided for the exemption from registration and induction of members of the Reserve components of the Armed Forces while employed as veterinarians of the United States Department of Agriculture. This same provision was also applied to prior-service exemptions by another subsection of the Senate amendment which provided that no member of the Reserve component "who has been employed as a veterinarian by the United States Department of Agriculture for a period of 24 months from and after the date of enactment of this paragraph shall be liable for induction except in time of war or national emergency declared by the Congress."

The House managers objected to this portion of the Senate amendment on the grounds that these civilian employees of the Department of Agriculture are not serving in such employment as members of the uniformed services. The Senate managers receded from their insistence on this portion of the Senate amendment.

8. The Senate amendment also added a new exemption from induction of any person who, subsequent to June 24, 1948, served on active duty for a period of not less than 18 months in the Armed Forces of a nation with which the United States is associated in mutual-defense activities if the country of which such person is a citizen grants the same privilege to citizens of the United States. A similar proposal was contained in H. R. 9007 which passed the House in the last Congress, but did not pass the Senate. The House managers agreed to this portion of the Senate amendment.

EXTENSION OF THE DOCTORS DRAFT ACT

The Senate amendment added a separate title to the bill as it passed the House under which the Doctors Draft Act would be extended for 2 years, and entitlement to the additional extra pay for doctors would be continued for doctors entering on active duty prior to July 1, 1959. In addition, the Senate amendment contained an amendment to the Doctors Draft Act which provided that an individual after July 1, 1955, who had attained the 35th anniversary of the date of his birth and applied for a commission in one of the Armed Forces as a physician or dentist, and who was thereafter rejected for such commission on the grounds of physical disqualification, would no longer be liable for service under the doctors draft law.

In extending the Doctors Draft Act the Senate amendment made no change in the maximum age of liability of induction for physicians and dentists which, under existing law, is 51 years of age.

The House managers insisted that the age of liability for doctors under the Doctors Draft Act be substantially reduced from the present age of 51. The House managers attempted to reduce the age of liability to 41 on the grounds that this would provide physicians to take care of the medical needs of the Armed Forces for the next 2 years so long as no medical-school graduates are deferred during the next 2 years for purposes of residency training. Failing in this effort the House managers attempted to reduce the age to 42, 43, 44, and 45, but in each instance the Senate managers insisted that the age of liability remain at 51. The Senate managers insisted that the availability of physicians numberswise was not the sole criterion with regard to the procurement of physicians. The Senate managers likewise insisted that any age below 50 with regard to the Doctors Draft Act would fail to take into consideration any upward revision in the strength of the Armed Forces during the next 2 years. The Senate managers were of the opinion that members of the uniformed services are entitled to the best possible medical care and that such medical care would not be available unless more experienced physicians and specialists served side by side with young men who have recently completed their internships. The House managers fully concur in the absolute need for experienced physicians for our Armed Forces. The Senate managers insisted that specialists, in particular, would not be available in adequate numbers if the draft age were reduced below 46. In view of the urgency of the situation and the insistence of the Senate managers, the House managers agreed to a maximum draft age under the Doctors Draft Act of 46. In other words, no doctor will be liable for service under the doctors draft law after attaining his 46th birthday.

The House managers, however, after agreeing to a draft age of 46 for doctors, insisted that any doctor over the age of 35 who had applied for a commission as a physician or dentist in one of the Armed Forces and had been rejected at any time, or is hereafter rejected, on the sole basis of a physical disqualification, should no longer be liable for service under the doctors draft law. The Senate managers agreed to this amendment to the Senate amendment.

The managers of the House and Senate likewise discussed the situation with regard to optometrists. Both the House and Senate managers are conscious of the fact that the Department of the Army are using optometrists in their professional capacity as enlisted men. It is the opinion of both the House and Senate managers that the armed services should, if they utilize optometrists in their professional capacities, offer such individuals commissions. In other words, if an optometrist who is inducted under the regular draft act is utilized as an optometrist he should be offered a commission commensurate with his professional attainment.

There was no disagreement between the House and Senate managers with regard to the continuation of existing law, which authorizes additional pay for doctors serving on active duty.

CARL VINSON,
OVERTON BROOKS,
PAUL J. KILDAY,
DEWEY SHORT,
L. C. ARENDS,
Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. VINSON (interrupting the reading). Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that the report and the statement of the conferees have been printed in the RECORD for the last 2 days, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the statement may be dispensed with and that it be printed in the RECORD at this point.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BONNER). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Georgia is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 25 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman is recognized.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, the conference report before the House deals with four very essential laws affecting our national security. These laws are the basic props of our national defense and must be passed before July 1—2 days hence.

What are these laws?

First. It extends the authority to induct men into the Armed Forces as regular registrants under the regular draft law.

Second. It extends the Dependents Assistance Act—the act under which enlisted personnel receive additional allowances from the Government for their dependents.

Now both the Dependents Assistance Act and the Draft Act are to be extended for 4 years.

Third. The conference report provides for the extension of the Doctors Draft Act for 2 years, and

Fourth. It provides for the continuation of special pay for doctors who enter on active duty prior to July 1, 1959.

Now, Mr. Speaker, last February 8, this House passed, by a vote of 394 to 4, the regular draft law.

In this same bill we passed the extension of the Dependents Assistance Act.

The House Committee on Armed Services did not attach the extension of the Doctors Draft Act to the regular draft, but instead reported a separate bill, H. R. 6057 to the House.

This report was filed on May 10, and on that same day I requested the Rules Committee to hold a hearing on the bill H. R. 6057 in order that we might debate this matter before the House in the Committee of the Whole.

We appeared before the Committee on Rules on May 17.

On June 17, 4 months and 9 days after the House passed the draft extension bill, the Senate passed H. R. 3005, the extension of the regular draft act with an amendment which extended the Doctors Draft Act for 2 years.

This bill was passed on June 17, 1 month after I had appeared before the Rules Committee to request a rule on a separate bill to extend the Doctors Draft Act. On Monday, June 20, I asked unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk H. R. 3005, disagree to the Senate amendments, and agree to the conference requested by the Senate. This was granted, and thereafter we held a full and free conference with the Senate on June 21, and as a result filed a conference report in the House.

Now let us see what the conference report provides.

It extends the regular draft act for 4 years until July 1, 1959.

It also extends the Dependents Assistance Act for 4 years until July 1, 1959.

And it makes some changes in the existing draft act.

As you know, under the law young men can enlist in the National Guard prior to attaining the age of 18½. They are deferred from induction so long as they participate in the National Guard. But remember that under the present

law, anybody deferred for any reason remains liable up to age 35. And this applies to National Guard men and any other person who gets a deferment. So the House bill provided that these individuals would not remain liable after they passed the age of 26.

The Senate bill accepted this principle of a reduction in the age of liability, but raised the age to 28.

Now the next question involved the amount of prior service necessary to qualify for exemption as a veteran under the draft law.

The conferees agreed that if a person was discharged with 12 months of service, or 6 months of service if discharged for the convenience of the Government, he would be classified as a veteran.

The Senate amendment provided a new exemption for persons who served on active duty for a period of not less than 18 months in the Armed Forces of a nation in which the United States is associated in mutual-defense activities so long as that country grants reciprocal privileges to American citizens residing in such foreign countries. Since the House passed a similar proposal last year, we agreed to the Senate amendment.

To sum up, let's see what kind of a draft law we will have after the conference report becomes law.

First. All young men attaining the age of 18 will still be required to register.

Second. They will not be liable for induction until they reach the age of 18½ and even then they can't be inducted if there is any person registered in their local board who is available and is over the age of 19. Today they are drafting men at the age of 21.

Third. Young men will still be deferred to complete high school or go to college.

Fourth. The exemptions will remain the same.

Fifth. Young men will still be able to appeal their classifications. The appeal processes remain the same.

Sixth. Young men will still be able to join the National Guard prior to attaining the age of 18½ and will be deferred from the draft so long as they satisfactorily serve in the National Guard up to the age of 28.

Seventh. Any man discharged for the convenience of the Government after serving 6 months on active duty will be considered a veteran and will be exempt from induction except in time of war or national emergency. All others discharged after completing 12 months or more of active service will be considered a veteran and will be exempt from induction except in time of war or national emergency.

Now that's the picture of how the new draft law will operate.

That brings us to the Doctors Draft Act which was added as a separate title by the Senate to the bill that extended the regular draft act.

The House Armed Services Committee reported a doctors draft bill to the House last May 10, as I have already mentioned. We appeared before the Rules Committee on May 17 for a rule. In the meantime, I discussed the matter with many Members of the House and with officials from the Department of Defense to determine whether we could possibly reduce the draft age of doctors, and had considerable correspondence with the chairman of the Rules Committee.

After going over the figures carefully with representatives of the Department of Defense; after carefully studying the testimony; and after going over the statistics with people from Selective Service, I asked the Armed Services Committee to authorize me to offer an amendment to the bill which we had reported to the House to reduce the age from 51 to 45 insofar as physicians and dentists are concerned.

The committee agreed to such an amendment.

Mr. Speaker, I have just as much respect for the medical and dental professions as anyone else. None of us like the necessity of drafting doctors, but we all know that the health of the armed services comes first.

We know that we cannot in good conscience extend a law to draft the young men of our Nation without assuring them the best possible medical care and that is the sole purpose of extending the law.

The Senate conferees were insistent that the age of liability for physicians and dentists remain at 51 as it is today.

We agreed upon a draft age of 46. No physician or dentist may be drafted under the doctors draft law after he attains the age of 46.

In other words, the Senate conferees agreed to come down 5 years from the present law.

Now let me give you the reasoning behind the draft age of 46.

There are just so many physicians in this country who are liable for service who will be graduating from medical schools and will complete their internships within the next 2 years.

In fact, there are only 6,691 physicians in this category.

Now the requirements for the uniformed services for the next 2 years amounts to 7,771, so if we took every single available medical school graduate during the next 2 years we would still be short 1,152 from our requirements.

But, in addition, we have got to think about the future.

If we take all our available medical school graduates for the next 2 years, then we will have no source of experienced physicians to call upon who will be liable under the regular draft act 2 years from now when the doctors draft law expires.

Some 1,800 of our available medical school graduates will be deferred to take residency training so that they can become specialists or more experienced physicians.

Now we suggested to the Senate conferees that we take all of the medical school graduates and not defer any one for residency training. When we did this we fully realized that in offering that suggestion we were creating a problem for ourselves that might be insurmountable 2 years from now.

The Senate conferees refused to go below a draft age of 46.

They said that a draft age below 46 would not assure the armed services of experienced physicians and specialists after the doctors draft law expires. We knew this was true.

They said that if we take all of the medical school graduates during the next 2 years and just a handfull of special registrants, we will have a medical service in the Armed Forces made up mostly of young men who have just completed their internships. In other words, most of the doctors treating our servicemen would be young, inexperienced doctors. We knew this would be the fact.

And finally, the Senate conferees said that if we limited the draft age for physicians to a point where it is barely able to provide physicians even by taking all of the medical school graduates for the next 2 years and deferring none, that we would be in serious difficulty particularly if there was any increase whatsoever in the size of our Armed Forces in the next 2 years.

We know how unsettled world conditions are and that no one can say with certainty what the size of our Armed Forces will be in the future. Last week's incident in shooting down a Navy plane in the Bering Sea is evidence of unsettled conditions that daily confront us.

Now a draft age of 46 will give us enough physicians to fill the requirements of the uniformed services for the next 2 years and at the same time will permit us to defer enough medical school graduates so there will be an adequate source of experienced physicians available still within the draft age 2 years from now when the doctors draft law expires.

Bear in mind that any person deferred for any reason since June 19, 1951, remains liable up to age 35 under the regular draft law. This is the way we will get physicians 2 years from now when the doctors draft law expires.

The Senate did agree to a provision which was contained in the bill we reported to the House that any physician or dentist who applied for a commission at any time in the medical or dental corps and who was rejected for physical reasons would not be liable under the doctors draft law after attaining the age of 35. This means that if a man tried to obtain a commission in the medical corps of the Army, for example, and was rejected for physical reasons and he is now 35 years of age, he is no longer liable under the doctors draft law.

Now it has been argued by some that there would be no need for a doctors draft law if we stopped treating dependents of service personnel and others who are entitled to medical care from service doctors in accordance with law.

Let us analyze this and see what the facts are.

Under the law medical care is authorized for civil service employees, foreign service employees, employees of the Bureau of Indian Affairs, certain nationals of foreign governments, seamen, and certain beneficiaries of the Veterans' Administration.

And in addition to that, medical care is authorized for the dependents of service personnel.

These authorizations are based upon law. But let us see if these laws are being abused.

In 1954 the beds occupied by patients in hospitals and infirmaries under the jurisdiction of the Department of Defense averaged 48,000 daily. Of this number, only 2,400 were not service personnel, retired personnel, or dependents of service personnel.

Of this 2,400, practically all, with the exception of veterans, were serving outside the continental limits of the United States in a civilian capacity or were employed by the Department of Defense in a remote area of the United States where no civilian medical facilities are available.

Are we going to ask civilian employees to work overseas with the Department of Defense and not assure them of an adequate American standard of medical care?

Are we going to ask civilian employees of the Department of Defense to work for the Federal Government in remote areas of the United States where the only doctors available are service doctors and refuse them the right to be treated by service doctors?

We have traditionally provided medical care for the dependents of service personnel and retired personnel.

I can think of nothing that would do more to destroy the morale of our Armed Forces than to deny the dependents of our service personnel medical care on a space and facilities available basis.

In other words, if the hospital is not there or the facility is not there, or it is overcrowded by service personnel, the dependent cannot receive treatment.

All of the dependents and service people know this.

But if there is space and if the facility is available, then these dependents are entitled by law to medical care. If the Congress wants to take away this privilege, it will have to be done by legislation.

Now widows and dependent children of deceased personnel of the Armed Forces are also entitled to medical care. But the actual number who benefit by this entitlement is a different matter.

The number of these people who occupy beds in hospitals and infirmaries is considerably less than 1 percent of the total average occupied by patients in hospitals and infirmaries under the jurisdiction of the Department of Defense.

Our committee has gone into the matter very thoroughly. As a matter of fact, I asked the Department of Defense to give me an estimate as to the number of uniformed physicians who are considered to be devoting a major portion of their duties to the treatment of individuals other than Armed Forces personnel and dependents of armed services personnel.

I was advised that if all medical care were abolished for all personnel now entitled to medical care from the armed services other than armed services personnel and their dependents we would only be able to eliminate about 40 uniformed physicians throughout the entire Armed Forces. That is veterans, civil-service employees, foreign-service employees, seamen, foreign nationals, and employees of the Bureau of Indian Affairs.

If we abolished all dependent medical care for the members of the armed services in the United States, we would only be able to reduce the number of uniformed physicians in our armed services by approximately 581.

I want to emphasize this point:

If we abolished all dependent medical care in the United States and all medical care for all civil-service employees and veterans who are admitted to the service hospitals in the United States and overseas, we would only reduce the call of uniformed physicians for our armed services by 621 physicians.

Now some of you may ask, Why do we not use more civilion physicians?

Well, the armed services do employ 311 civilian physicians in industrial dispensaries, ordnance depots, and places of that nature. There is no limitation on the number of physicians that may be employed by the Department of Defense—but a practical limitation is contained in the inability of the armed services to hire civilians under existing civil-service wage scales. It is a little difficult to compete with the net income of the average physician which is now in the neighborhood of $15,000 annually.

Now someone might say, Well we wouldn't have to take these older physicians if we took the younger doctors who have already served in the Armed Forces.

I am not going to support any program that requires us to force a doctor who is a veteran under the law to serve his country twice when there are many doctors in this country who are under the age of 46 who have never served a day in their life. The doctors who are coming in during the next 2 years will be doctors who have never served on active duty, and they are now in Priority III.

Mr. Speaker, we have looked at this proposition from every angle. And distasteful as it may be, discriminatory as it may be, disturbing as it may be, inconvenient to the doctors as it may be, nevertheless the servicemen of our Nation are entitled to to the best medical care we can provide. They will not get it unless you pass this conference report.

We cannot have adequate national security without proper medical care, and the only way we are going to get proper medical care for the next 2 years is by extending the Doctors Draft Act for 2 years.

Two years from now there should be enough physicians graduating from medical school who are nonveterans, plus those who have been deferred to take specialty and residency training to meet the needs of the Armed Forces if the strength of the Armed Forces stands where it is today.

For the next 2 years, there is no other solution to this problem but to pass this conference report extending the doctors draft law for 2 years.

The law I am asking you to extend gives the President the authority and the discretion to issue special calls under such regulations as he may prescribe as to how many doctors will be called to meet the needs of the services.

Now let me get this point across. The doctors draft law is an authorization law. If the facts change and no longer warrant its implementation, then the President has the authority to modify or change the calls to meet the conditions as they arise.

I have confidence in the President to administer this law in such a manner as to avoid arbitrary calls on physicians and dentists, and at the same time to assure the armed services adequate medical care.

The issue here is simple.

We either pass this conference report and assure an adequate source of medical and dental personnel for our Armed Forces and inconvenience some physicians and dentists who have never served a day of active duty in their life, or we let the convenience of a few physicians and dentists jeopardize the health of our armed services and the national security.

I have received telegrams from every dental and medical society in the United States, as I am sure every one of you have. They all oppose the draft law for doctors.

Not a single one of them, however, can assure the Armed Forces of an adequate source of physicians and dentists without the doctors draft law.

And as far as I am concerned, when it comes to a choice between the health of our Armed Forces and the desires of the American Medical Association and the American Dental Association, I shall elect to assure the members of our Armed Forces that they will receive the best possible medical and dental care.

We either vote to give to the men we draft or the men who volunteer the best in medical care, or we bow to the dictates of the American Medical Association.

I have before me a telegram from the American Medical Association urging that this conference report be recommitted.

Now what will you accomplish if you recommit this conference report.

Today is the 28th of June. These four important laws, the very props of the defense of the Nation, expire on midnight June 30—60 hours from now.

What would be the consequence if this conference report is recommitted and no agreement can be reached?

Everything stops on midnight June 30. The draft stops; the dependent wives and children will have their checks stopped and the whole machinery of these four main props of the defense of the Nation will be brought to a halt.

In a letter from General Hershey, dated June 24, he said:

> It is estimated that, should the Congress fail to extend the induction authority prior to July 1, 1955, at least 50 percent of the 10,000 men already called for induction in July would be affected to the extent that their orders for induction would have to be canceled.
>
> With respect to the effect of a failure to extend the so-called Doctors' Draft Act prior to its scheduled termination date on July 1, 1955, it should be pointed out that immediately upon termination of this act all actions of the Selective Service System with respect to classification and selection of physicians and dentists would be rendered void.

I ask you not to jeopardize the security of the Nation in such a manner.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question? I wanted to ask the gentleman a question about the ratio of physicians in the Army including the dependents that they take care of as compared with the civilian population. Can the gentleman give us any information on that?

Mr. VINSON. I do not have that information.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I understand that the ratio is about 4 physicians to 1,000 in the Army, and in the civilian population the ratio is 1 to 1,200 people in the United States.

Mr. JONAS. I want to ask the gentleman about the action of the other body in striking out an amendment I proposed on the floor and which was agreed to on the floor at the time the bill was originally passed by the House.

Mr. VINSON. That is in the conference report. They agreed to that.

Mr. JONAS. No, sir. That is not in the conference report. It was eliminated in conference.

Mr. VINSON. That is the provision with reference to a man who had been before the Board and rejected because of a physical disability. He cannot be called back. That is in the conference report. A man who has been passed on and to whom a commission has been refused because of a physical disability—that is the end of it—he cannot be called back.

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, the gentleman from Georgia, of course, has correctly stated the provision with reference to doctors who have previously been denied a commission on account of physical disability, but I believe the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. JONAS] is referring to the amendment adopted on the floor.

Mr. JONAS. That is correct. The amendment proposed by me and which the House adopted.

Mr. KILDAY. That is the regular draft extension which was adopted by the House under which a man who had been rejected at an induction station could not be called back.

Mr. JONAS. That is correct. The amendment was put in the bill on the floor and provided that if a registrant should be rejected at an induction station solely on the grounds of physical disability, his liability for service would expire at the age of 26. Why did the conferees agree to the elimination of that provision after the House, following considerable debate and thorough consideration, affirmatively approved it?

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, that particular provision is not in this bill. The conferees of the other body were adamant in their opposition notwithstanding the very sincere effort to retain the provision because it was a provision put in on the floor of the House. We did not prevail on that and that is not in this bill.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON. I yield.

Mr. McCORMACK. I congratulate the gentleman from Georgia on the able and powerful speech he has made. It is a speech which should convince the great majority of the membership of the House, and I join with the gentleman from Georgia in urging that the conference report be agreed to.

Mr. DIXON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON. I yield.

Mr. DIXON. Mr. Speaker, during the hearings on the extension of the draft law in the Senate the junior Senator from Utah, WALLACE F. BENNETT, indicated that, if necessary, he would propose an amendment to section 16 (g) of the Universal Military Training and Service Act, as amended, for the purpose of clarifying the exempt status of those persons called to serve as ministers of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints—Mormons—assigned to serve in the missions of the church.

The problem to which he sought solution has arisen because some local boards and State administrators have failed to recognize the IV–D status of these ministers—despite the fact that the National Director of Selective Service has always considered that the young men of this church, who are ordained as ministers and assigned to serve in the missions of the church, were within the definition of ministers of religion as defined in section 16 (g) of the act. In those instances where the local and State boards have failed to recognize the true status of these ministers the Director has had to rely on appeal procedure in order to get the proper classification.

After hearing Senator BENNETT's explanation of the problem, and General Hershey's testimony to the effect that he has always regarded these ministers as included in the definition of section 16 (g), the Senate Armed Services Committee concluded that the amendment proposed by Senator BENNETT was unnecessary.

The committee made the following report of the proposed amendment:

> Exemption of ministers of the Church of Latter-day Saints (Mormon): The junior Senator from Utah, Hon. WALLACE F. BENNETT, appeared before the committee in connection with a possible amendment to section 16 (g) (1) of the Universal Military Training and Service Act to specifically insure the exemption of those persons called as ordained ministers of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints (Mormon) and assigned to serve in the missions of the church. Assurances given in writing by the Director of Selective Service to the Senator from Utah reflected that such amendment was unnecessary inasmuch as Selective Service considers that these individuals are already entitled to IV–D classification under existing law. The letter referred to and a letter from the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Manpower and Personnel appear in the printed hearings.

This report, coupled with Senator RUSSELL's statement in the RECORD of June 16, 1955, to the effect that the committee expressly considers any clarifying amendment unnecessary inasmuch as these ministers are in fact already entitled to IV–D status under existing law clearly defines the position of our colleagues in the Senate.

I should like to ask the distinguished chairman of the House Armed Service Committee if he and his committee share that opinion in the light of General Hershey's testimony and the confirmatory comments of the Senate committee?

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, let me say to the gentleman from Utah that I concur completely with the report of the Senate Armed Services Committee and Senator RUSSELL's statement that no clarifying amendments are needed to the Universal Military Training and Service Act with regard to the exemption of ministers of the Church of the Latter Day Saints. It is my understanding that these young men are exempt so long as they are ordained ministers and assigned to serve in the missions of the church. As soon as they have completed their work in the missions, which I understand is 2½ years, the exemptions then cease and they become subject to induction like all other individuals.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Georgia has again expired.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I always hesitate to take issue with the distinguished gentleman from Georgia, my very close and dear friend [Mr. VINSON]. I do not think any man has lived in our generation who has done more for national defense than the distinguished chairman of that committee, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON], and I want to take this opportunity to compliment him on the great service he has rendered to the country.

Unfortunately, he is human. All human beings sometimes make mistakes, and this time it when he made a bloomer. It is a shame that the House is not permitted to have an opportunity to know what this is all about, but here the House has been deprived of an opportunity to discuss the doctors' draft by reason of this parliamentary maneuver which took place in another body. The gentleman says that the Committee on Rules did not give them a rule. It is true he came before the Committee on Rules. We were so unconvinced, and so thoroughly convinced that it was wrong, that no rule was granted, and the matter lay there for some time. Finally, I fixed a date on a Thursday for the final hearing on that bill. The day before the final hearing this little maneuvering went on, and the bill was adopted as a rider to the regular draft bill in another body. Then the chairman advised me that he did not want a rule, so no rule was granted.

That bill is on the calendar, and if it came to the floor we would have an opportunity to find out whether it was right or wrong. But I am going to tell you in the few minutes allotted me, and I am sorry it is not more, just what is the matter with it, as far as I have had time to see it.

In the first place, it is a thoroughly discriminatory bill. No other class of citizens in the United States is discriminated against and drafted into service simply because of their vocation in life. I expect I have done more than most members of the Committee on Armed Services, because I have read every page of the hearings and I know what I am

talking about. There is no need for a doctors draft. The evidence in these hearings shows that there is no need for it. It is admitted that there are ample graduates coming out of the medical schools to fill every need. The Health Resources Advisory Committee from the Defense Department which deals with this subject notified the American Medical Association in December of last year that the doctors draft was not needed and would not be asked for. Subsequently they came in and asked for it. The only reason they could give for changing their minds was that they wanted to defer 1,000 of the young doctors for further training and take in old doctors. That was the only reason. If they would use the young doctors who are coming out of the schools there would be no need for this draft, and the evidence quite clearly shows it.

During the Korean war when people were getting killed and wounded the Army got along fine with 1.6 doctors per thousand. Today, in time of peace, they are asking you for 2 doctors per thousand, more than they used in time of war.

Why do we have this need in peacetime? Here are five reasons:

First. They are treating 1,100,000 civilian employees of the Defense Department.

Second. They are treating all dependents of servicemen.

Third. All retired personnel and dependents.

Fourth. All the personnel of the foreign Embassies.

Fifth. All wards of the Bureau of Indian Affairs.

There will be a motion to recommit this conference report. I am not permitted, under the rules of the House, because I happen to be on the majority side, to make that motion, but I would if I could make a motion to recommit with instructions to strike out the doctors draft, but I am not permitted to do so. My astute friend wants to choke this thing down your throats without ever giving you an opportunity to know what you are doing, or to vote on the direct issue.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Not at the moment.

Mr. JUDD. In connection with the motion to recommit.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I will yield later if I have time.

Do you know you are drafting American citizens here to treat the personnel of foreign embassies in this country? I asked the chairman of the committee when he was before the Rules Committee: "Do you think it is the right American thing to do to draft an American citizen doctor 46 years old to treat the cook of the Russian Embassy?" That is what you are doing.

Sometimes there are questions of principle; this is a question of principle. I do not care about the doctors, but I do care about the vicious principle involved in this bill.

You are drafting, in the fifth place, doctors to treat all the Indians, the wards of the Bureau of Indian Affairs. Did you know that? How many of the Members knew it? But after all that, since the time the Army notified the American Medical Association that they would not ask for the draft of doctors, since that time it has been decided to reduce the Army by 450,000 men, yet they are still asking for a greater proportion of doctors than they did in the heat of hot war.

Mr. Speaker, are we going to stand for this? Are you going to stand here and push this thing down the throats of American citizens and not voice your protest?

This bunk about its going back to the conference committee and not having a draft bill, I want to say to you I voted for every draft bill that ever came before us. I was one of those who by one vote extended the draft 3 months before Pearl Harbor; so I am not any no-draft man, I voted for every draft bill.

When this bill goes back to conference it can be settled in 15 minutes, and we can bring the doctors draft bill to the floor of the House where we can do the right thing. If you vote for it, it is all right with me, but I insist, and I ask you to stand on the question of principle and not permit yourself to have you mouths closed and your opportunity for consideration denied to you by a parliamentary maneuver such as that with which we are confronted this afternoon.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. In just a moment. I want to make a statement about one or two little things.

Talking about these civilian employees of the Army, your drafted doctors in 1948 delivered 42,000 babies for personnel of various and sundry people of the armed services, 42,000 babies. All of that could have been done by civilian doctors under contract. In 1948 they delivered 42,000 babies, but in 1953 the doctors delivered 145,000 civilian babies. Is not that fine?

The answer to the problem is simple, and the chairman of the committee, my dear friend, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON] told the War Department in these hearings:

> Now, by the 15th of May you come up here with a plan to treat these civilians through contact with local doctors.

Nothing was ever heard of that. Apparently the armed services simply ignored that demand.

In connection with the conference report, may I say that the House conferees fought valiantly to reduce the age limit. They tried to reduce it to 40; they tried it to 42. They fought valiantly for their position and just as valiantly surrendered and signed the conference report.

I am asking you to send this back. Let them get together over there, and let them do the right thing. Let us also put out a little warning that the House is not going to sit supinely by and have its prerogatives taken away from it and not be given the opportunity to consider a matter that involves as great a principle as anything that ever came before this body.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. JUDD. With respect to the motion to recommit, the gentleman said he would not be given that privilege because he is on the majority side. May I say that I tried as a member of the minority side to get the privilege of offering a motion to recommit with instructions to strike out title II. That would give the House a chance to vote on this issue by itself. But I was denied that privilege on my side. So there will be offered by someone else on this side a straight motion to recommit which I hope will pass because it is better than letting the conference report go through in its present form.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DURHAM].

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Speaker, I hope, too, that this measure will be sent back to the conferees.

I realize that we have serious considerations at stake, since the Universal Military Training and Service Act expires on June 30. This circumstance, however, is not the fault of this body, since the House passed the bill extending the draft on February 28, with no thought of including the doctors draft extension in the basic draft legislation. Now, the present difficulty arises because the Senate saw fit to tack on to the draft bill a new title, not previously considered by the House, effecting the extension of the Doctors Draft Act and other related matters.

I am definitely opposed to such a legislative procedure. The doctors draft legislation is a highly important and controversial matter, which affects the welfare and health of the entire population of the United States. This measure could have been considered in the House as a separate piece of legislation in the usual way and in ample time, had not the other body combined the two pieces of legislation.

The Doctors Draft Act was a necessity born of an emergency. I have been opposed to it all along because it is "class" legislation and as such is not the American way of doing things. I went along with its original enactment and subsequent extensions, however, because I felt it was necessary during the Korean crisis. Now we have reduced our Armed Forces and I seriously doubt the wisdom of continuing this legislation which we all frankly admit is discriminatory.

From the evidence produced at the hearings on the doctors draft extension, and from my examination and study of this whole subject, I am convinced that if the armed services utilized all the medical skills and personnel available, and effected a better distribution of physicians and skilled medical personnel, we would not need to enact this class legislation. I know personally of doctors now classified as surgeons who are being used for nothing more than bandaging surface wounds and administering cathartic pills. These ministrations could be carried out by trained and available personnel if proper organization and planning are brought to bear on the subject.

There is no question but that all of us want to take care of the health and welfare of our men in the armed services and their dependents, but I believe this can be adequately provided for in the basic draft law if applied to doctors and dentists as to all other persons, without again inflicting class legislation on a particular occupational group.

The conflicting testimony on the necessity for drafting doctors and dentists before both House and Senate committees poses some grave questions as to the advisability of continuing this draft of specialized personnel for 2 years longer.

Dr. Frank B. Berry, Assistant Secretary of Defense, Health and Medical, told the Senate committee that—

> We have today slightly more than half of the total number of medical officers authorized for the regular corps of the three services. * * * In addition we have only a handful of career medical and dental Reserve officers on active duty.

This last statement points up the urgent need for the Department of Defense to formulate a determined program to attract and retain career medical personnel on a voluntary basis.

Earlier in the Senate hearings Dr. Reuben R. Chrisman, Jr., representing the American Medical Association, called attention to the figure announced by the Secretary of Defense for the planned military strength of the country, this figure being 2,900,000. By direction of the Secretary, the authorized physician ratio is 3 doctors per 1,000 troop strength, which would call for 8,700 doctors. Dr. Chrisman pointed out, however, that in earlier hearings before the House committee, the physician strength was shown to be 10,360 as of March 31, 1955. Estimated losses during the next 2 fiscal years were shown to be 7,424, leaving physicians on duty in the Armed Forces to the number of 2,936. Thus the number necessary to bring physician strength up to maximum authorization would be 5,764, although the Department of Defense claims a requirement of 6,926 replacement physicians, which includes 845 for the Public Health Service. This number would provide a greater ratio than 3 doctors per 1,000 troops, and the inclusion of 845 doctors, through draft, for Public Health Service raises a grave question of propriety.

In the face of this testimony, there is the report of the Health Resources Advisory Committee of the Office of Defense Mobilization in January 1955, which states that if mobilization continues at presently announced levels, it will be possible to maintain the present physician staffing ratios of the armed services with the new graduates of medical schools who are liable for service under the basic draft act.

The task force of the Hoover Commission is of this same opinion. The task force also recommends that the doctors draft law not be extended and expressed the belief it was unfair in principle and has in the past been abused in administration.

Testimony from the American Dental Association called attention to the conflicting estimates of the number of dental officer replacements needed by the Armed Forces and affirmed its belief that dental graduates subject to the draft could very effectively constitute the main source of dental officer replacements, especially so if the present dental officer staffing pattern is improved.

Serious questions have been raised in testimony before the committee indicating the need for the Defense Department to launch programs to attract to the services career physicians and specialists on a voluntary basis, to obtain services of civilian doctors in areas where they are available, to provide medical care for civilian employees and civilian dependents by other than drafted physicians, and related problems. The whole subject of how best to care for dependents of military personnel needs also to be thoroughly explored with the possibility of using civilian physicians and facilities wherever possible. In this connection a questionnaire filled out by 1,600 physicians separated from the service during the first half of the year 1954—reported by the AMA in its official journal on January 22, 1955—shows that military doctors spent 61.6 percent of time on their civilian patients. Of this amount of time, 28 percent went to dependents and 32 percent to other civilians. This was in the United States. Overseas the percentage was higher. Military doctors overseas spent 72 percent of time caring for civilians, with 8.4 percent of time going to civilian dependents.

Now, according to the AMA estimates, the total number of doctors in the United States totals 221,000 in a population of 165 million. This is a ratio of 1 doctor to every 747 civilians, as contrasted to the ratio of 3 per 1,000 troop strength in the armed services. Also, the Department of Defense ratio does not take into consideration the interns in military hospitals and only considers one-half of the military residency physicians on the grounds that they do not actually give medical care.

Mr. Speaker, in my opinion, the problems in the doctor's draft legislation are too large and too important to push this legislation through as an afterthought and as a mere appendage to the basic draft law. I urge that the bill be recommitted to the conferees for deletion of the title relating to the doctors draft.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. JUDD].

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, I voted for the doctors draft in August 1950. We were at war. It was necessary to enlarge our Armed Forces on a crash basis, calling back into active service tens of thousands of men who had already fought for years in World War II. The medical services had to be expanded in just as rapid and, to some extent, disorderly manner. Much as I regretted having to vote for a measure which openly discriminated against one group of our citizens, because of their professional skills in the healing arts, I was willing to swallow my convictions with respect to the Constitution of the United States under those circumstances, for the very reasons presented by the gentleman from Georgia. But his reasons do not apply today. We are not at war today and have not been for 2 years. Our Armed Forces have been substantially reduced.

I would vote to extend the doctors' draft law now if it could be demonstrated to be necessary to get enough doctors for the men in the Armed Forces. But that has not been and I think cannot be demonstrated. So I cannot vote for title II of this conference report under the circumstances now prevailing.

First. The procedure under which this conference report is brought before us is wrong, as the gentleman from Virginia has so well pointed out. We are asked to swallow here, without even gulping, a very controversial piece of legislation we have never been permitted to consider, debate, and amend under the usual rules and practices of the House of Representatives.

Even worse, the whole principle of discriminating against one group of citizens is wrong—and certainly unjustifiable unless it can be shown to be absolutely necessary. And that cannot be shown. The Health Resources Advisory Commission of the Office of Defense Management in January of this year said the doctors' draft was not needed to get enough doctors.

The Hoover Commission Task Force on Federal Medical Services, on February 19, of this year, specifically recommended that this piece of legislation, the doctors' draft law, not be extended or reenacted. Those are its words.

Then why does the Pentagon say it is necessary? You know the reason. It is a lot easier to get doctors and dentists by force than by building up an attractive medical service that doctors will be glad and proud to enter as a career. As long as the military can get them by compulsion under a draft, they will never build up again an adequate professional medical service.

The gentleman from Georgia asked, "How are you going to get doctors if you do not draft them?"

The answer is, "Get them the same way we get other specialized personnel—that is, provide a greater incentive."

What did we do when we could not get or keep enough sergeants and various types of specialized technicians in the Armed Forces? We passed a bill just a few months ago to make the positions more attractive. It is working.

We did not say, "We are going to draft you and make you spend 3 more years in the Marines because we need expert technicians, expert mechanics, and expert electricians in order to give our boys every proper service."

We did not go down to the filling stations and airplane hangars and grab all the top mechanics up to 45 years of age, to guarantee that the boys whom we draft to fly our planes and drive our tanks have the finest specialists to make sure their machinery is in tiptop shape and their lives will not be endangered. Why not?

We do not go down to the Statler and the Mayflower Hotels and say, "We are going to draft all your chefs under 45 because our boys must have the very best nutrition possible." Why not?

Just why do we pick out one particular group of our citizens and say that even in peacetime it has got to render a dif-

ferent type and degree of service than any other group of citizens, and at a time when the agencies set up to study this very problem say that it is not necessary?

Who should know more about it and give a more unbiased report than the Office of Defense Mobilization and the Hoover Commission? They say this doctors' draft is no longer needed.

Interestingly enough, the Department of Defense reported that the number of available doctors under the regular draft during the next 2 years would be 6,200. Surgeon General Armstrong testified there would be 6,600. The Health Resources Advisory Committee of the Office of Defense Mobilization said there would be 7,000. Now, here are 3 agencies of the executive branch that ought to know most about the matter and they come up with 3 different figures. Apparently they do not have enough of sufficiently expert accountants. Maybe we ought to draft into the Armed Forces all the CPA's under 45 years of age, and see if they cannot determine what the correct figure is.

Another reason why the military say they do not have enough doctors is because they do not use them efficiently. Almost every doctor in the service will tell you that.

Another is that it uses them to treat 3 million dependents and more than 1 million civilian employees. That may be necessary overseas, but not in most American communities.

Another is that it details them for various civilian medical agencies like the Public Health Service. That is a wonderful organization doing a very important work. But since when is it our system to draft men in middle age for civilian jobs?

Why, then, does the Pentagon say the draft is needed? Because it can get its doctors this way easily. They have not taken the trouble to develop a really attractive career service. And if the House passes this bill today, I venture to predict that they will be here 2 years from now, and then 2 years from that time, asking for further extension. It is human nature never to do voluntarily the things necessary to correct a situation, as long as one can overcome it by the coersive power of the Government.

Mr. Speaker, I hope the motion to recommit will be adopted. Then we can tackle this problem and solve it in the regular American peacetime way. No one in the Armed Forces is going to suffer for lack of sufficiently trained and experienced doctors.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 8 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHORT].

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, I shall not take 8 minutes which the chairman of the committee has so generously allotted me.

We have got to face a reality more than a theory here today. It is pretty tough when you are caught between the millstones of two great, able, and fine gentlemen like the gentleman from Georgia, the chairman of the committee, and the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH], the chairman of the Committee on Rules. It only goes to show that there can be an honest difference of opinion between wise and good men on a highly controversial issue.

None of us wanted to vote for the doctors draft law when we originally passed it. We frankly admitted that it was discriminatory. But how in the world are you going to draft the youth of this Nation into the different branches of our armed services without providing adequate and well-trained and highly qualified medical care for them?

The gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH] says that the doctors in our Military Establishment have delivered 45,000 babies. Well, I am glad that the population goes on. I do not know how you are going to control human nature, which is a powerful thing, by passing a bill on the floor of this House. And who wants to stop all the fun?

I cannot understand why anyone would vote for the extension of the general draft bill for 4 years and extend the dependency benefits, which we do in this bill, and which is absolutely necessary for our national security, and then refuse to vote not only for an adequate number of doctors, but doctors who are trained and well-qualified. Our armed services must have some experienced doctors and not all neophytes.

I want to point out to the House here that in conference the Senate was very adamant on this particular point. They pointed out that even if all the young graduates of our medical schools were taken in the Armed Forces we would still be 1,152 short of the required number; but that we could go from 51 down to 46 years of age and still defer perhaps about 1,200 doctors who could take their 2 years of residency.

What Member of this House would want his son or daughter in the service, regardless what branch of service, to be treated, or to be operated upon by a youngster just out of medical school, until he has had at least 1 year internship and 2 years of residency? Members of our armed services even in times of peace perform hazardous duties and in times of war face the gravest dangers. They suffer violent shock, the severest wounds, and the most intense pain. Who is there among us who would deny them the best—the very best—of medical care? We should insist upon quality as well as quantity of physicians. It is a mathematical problem. It is not difficult for anyone to compute. If you go below the age of 46 you will have such a narrow margin that practically all the men in our armed services will have to be treated by rather young and inexperienced physicians.

I might say that as a national policy the services have drafted doctors not older than 38 years of age, but we all know as a matter of practical, commonsense you must have older doctors sandwiched in with these new recruits or graduates out of our medical schools if you are going to protect the health and maintain the morale of our armed services.

I think the doctors by and large are fairly well satisfied. They are patriots. Of course, they do not like it. You can understand that. But there are only a few doctors who have been bitter in their criticism so far as I know. I have had two or three call on me. But when you realize that the vast majority of doctors that will be brought in under this extension of the act for 2 years are men who have never served a day in the armed services, I do not see what justification there is for much complaint about it. Some of these doctors got their education at Government expense and I do not want to recall doctors with prior service. It is just about as simple as that.

There are very few changes in these bills except we did lower the age of the men who enlisted before their 18½ birthday in the National Guard, liable under present law for call to duty up to 35 years of age. The House lowered that to 26, the Senate extended the age to 28. We have agreed to the Senate provision. I think it is an improvement in the present general draft law.

In the doctors draft law, we voted not only to lower the limit by 5 years, from 51 to 46, which will allow many doctors to escape service, but we will get a sufficient number so that these doctors that are brought in will be not only graduates of medical schools but will have had their residency training. I repeat we want quality as well as quantity and the best is none too good.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHORT. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. GAVIN. May I indulge your patience at this particular point. I would like to read from the statement that Rear Adm. Lamont Pugh of the United States Navy, former surgeon general of the Navy and now retired, made before this committee I think in 1953, which indicates why the doctors draft legislation is necessary:

> In December of 1948 the American Medical Association addressed a letter to each of 7,610 doctors in the United States who were then less than 26 years of age urging them to volunteer for active duty. Special reference was made to those who had received V-12 or ASTP training. The letters pointed out their liability for induction under the Selective Service Act which had been passed earlier that year and gave other pertinent information regarding the situation. Cards were enclosed for the recipient to fill out and return to the AMA, which in turn forwarded the cards to the Surgeon General of the appropriate armed service. The Bureau of Medicine and Surgery addressed a letter to each of the doctors from whom a card was received, giving complete information on how and where to apply for a commission and active duty. For those not holding commissions in the Medical Corps Reserve, the Bureau of Medicine and Surgery prepared an application letter, including a franked envelope addressed to the nearest office of naval officer procurement so that all that was necessary on their part to obtain the application forms was to affix their signature and mail the letter. A copy of the Bureau letter to each of these young doctors was also sent to our district medical officers and the appropriate officer-in-charge of naval officer procurement in order that they might contact each doctor and assist him in every possible way. Only 33 medical officers out of the total of 7,610 receiving the letter came on active duty for a period of 2 years as a result of this program.

Mr. SHORT. That is very true. But it does not reveal the true feelings of the doctors of America. They are fine men.

Let me say this in closing: Your conferees fought hard and diligently with the conferees of the other body trying to maintain every one of the positions of the House, but you know that all legislation is the result of compromise. We had to give as well as take. Those gentlemen over there were adamant. Both these laws are going to expire just 60 hours from now, on midnight Thursday. This administration, the White House, the Department of Defense, are very eager to have this conference report adopted today. I hope the House will go along with us, because we did succeed in persuading the Senate to lower the age from 51 to 46 for doctors.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHORT. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. The gentleman has referred to reducing the age limit in the regular draft from 35 to 28. What is the status of a man now who has already reached the age of 28? Will he be drafted under the new law if he is in class 1–A?

Mr. SHORT. If he is in class 1–A, he could be drafted under the law as it is today.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. But after the present law expires on June 30, does he come under the new law then, so that if he has reached the age of 28 he will not be drafted?

Mr. SHORT. I doubt if they can draft anyone after that.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHORT. I yield to the distinguished minority leader.

Mr. MARTIN. I would like to ask the gentleman from Missouri if it is not true that the President and the administration is very much opposed to the motion to recommit this conference report and are anxious to have this legislation passed because they know how pressing time is.

Mr. SHORT. Of course, it is as I stated. We are faced with a reality and not a theory. I rather deplore the fact that we did not have a full and open discussion of the extension of the doctors' draft as well as of the general draft law, but we did not have, although our committee reported out both bills weeks ago. Unless we act today, we imperil the safety of this Nation.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have permission to extend their remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, it is indeed unfortunate that this legislation which includes the complicated and involved doctors-draft bill, comes before the House through the back door. The chairman of the Armed Services Committee and several Members appeared before the Rules Committee some time ago in order to get a rule dealing with the doctors draft legislation. For some reason which is not clear, the chairman of the Armed Services Committee and members of the conference committee saw fit to attach the complicated doctors-draft legislation to the extension of the original draft bill after it passed the other body. As a consequence, 435 Members of the House are barred from debating, speaking, and amending the doctors-draft legislation because it comes in here under the limited 1-hour debate allotted to a conference report.

There is no question that the doctors-draft legislation is class legislation and it involves the welfare and families of thousands of doctors throughout the country. It also indirectly affects thousands of families in regard to their medical attention and services. Every Member of Congress should be given an opportunity to express himself if he so desires, to offer and to vote on amendments to legislation of this importance. Under the present back-door approach which the conferees have seen fit to use in order to carry out the recommendations of the Pentagon, I am compelled to vote to recommit this draft legislation with the recommendation that the doctors-draft amendment thereto be brought back to the floor as a separate piece of legislation.

I voted for the doctors draft in 1950 when we were in active war in Korea and voted for the extension on two different occasions. This is the first time Congress has been asked to consider the drafting of doctors or any other professional or classified segment of our economy in times of peace. There has been a lapse of 5 years since the original doctors-draft law was passed and today it calls for a more complete study involving change and improvement. A great deal of testimony was presented to the Armed Services Committee, setting out that the doctors-draft law is not necessary at this time. We do know that the present policy of the administration has been to curtail and shrink our Army personnel, but in spite of this decrease, the present medical-draft bill calls for more doctors in the miiltary than during wartime.

I am very much in favor of every member of the military and his family securing all the necessary medical attention to which he is entitled, by reason of his patriotic service, and I will gladly vote for any draft legislation that is essential for our military and for our defense. Considering the steamroller tactics used in ramming through the House this important medical-draft legislation as an appendage to the extension of the original draft bill, it is not fair to the public, the Members of the House, or the medical profession of the Nation. Therefore, I shall vote to recommit this bill with instructions that the doctors-draft legislation be returned to the House where it can be amply debated, amended, and passed in fairness to all concerned.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield the remainder of the time to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. KILDAY].

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a short question?

Mr. KILDAY. It will have to be very short as my time is limited.

Mr. JUDD. Accepting the argument that we must not draft boys into the armed services without giving them the very best medical care, does the gentleman think it is proper and constitutional to draft 845 physicians supposedly into the armed services to take care of our soldiers, and then detail them to work in a civilian agency—the Public Health Service and the National Institute of Health?

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Speaker, I decline to yield further. I have such a short period of time. I hope to cover that in my remarks.

Mr. JUDD. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Speaker, history has a way of repeating itself. Sometimes it has an alarming and frightening way of repeating itself. Those of us who were here in the summer of 1945 recall the letters we received within a matter of 2 or 3 days after V–J Day, "To get my boy out of the service". We remember that we helped to preside over not the demobilization of the finest fighting machine that was ever organized in the history of man—we did not see it demobilized—we saw it disintegrate before our eyes. Here we are talking about a draft in time of peace and we have it thrown out to us that we are attempting to draft doctors to treat the cook at the Russian Embassy. The Russians agreed to a meeting at the summit. Molotov traipses across the United States smiling—and we are willing to demobilize. For a period of more than 30 days the extension of the doctors draft was stymied before the Committee on Rules. We have pending as unfinished business before the House a minimum Reserve plan which is caught in a parliamentary snarl—so much so that there has been reported out of the Committee on Armed Services today another minimum Reserve plan in the hope that we can break that parliamentary snarl. Instead of talking about the cook at the Russian Embassy, let us talk about the Russian MIG's off the coast of Alaska which 1 week ago tomorrow shot down in flames an American plane flying so close to American territory that it crash landed on the beach of an American island. The American people are willing to seize upon the prospect of one smiling Russian and ignore the American plane in flames because it is what they want to believe—that things are going to be all right.

There has been no argument here against the drafting of young men for service—the argument is whether we should extend the doctors draft to take in doctors who have not done any military service at all. These unorganized youths with no spokesmen are to be drafted. Then it is said that we can get the doctors under the regular draft. In every draft law that we have ever passed, we have placed a provision that no man shall be inducted until adequate housing and adequate medical care is available for him. Are we now going to say that we are going to take these young men into military service, go wherever the dictates of necessity may demand, and we are not going to carry out what

we have done in the past to assure that they have the best of medical care available? Suppose you can get from the medical schools the number required, are you going to say that a young fellow who is out dealing with these horrible instruments of war, tanks, cannon, and guns, and whatnot, should his bones be broken in numerous places, that a man who has just completed his internship is going to doctor him, or are you going to say that he is going to have the best orthopedic surgeon that we can find at his disposal? This is just as simple and just as important as that. These are crucial times.

I have seen our Military Establishment go to pieces, but I hope not to see it again. I am sorry that a dispute has arisen between the chairmen of the two committees. I would have preferred to have discussed the doctors draft thoroughly on its merits. I would have agreed that the doctors draft is highly discriminatory and that it cannot be supported by reason and logic. It can only be supported because of the dire necessity that we must have the best of medical care when we draft the youth of the Nation and send them into service where they are subject to the dangers which exist.

Our laws have always provided for dependents of military personnel. It is traditional. We have all been alarmed in the recent past at our inability to retain career personnel, and we finally came to the conclusion that because we had been whittling away at the traditional benefits possessed by the military that we had lessened the attractiveness of a military career, and we have just begun to restore those traditional things when we are faced with this demand that they be eliminated.

How many doctors are assigned to all of these activities other than the military and veterans? Cooks for the Russian Embassy, if you please, and Government employees? A total of 40. A total of 40 are assigned to that type of duty. Eliminate them all and you have eliminated no part of the necessity of the extension of the Draft Act. Are you going to cut out the dependency care in an action such as this? I am in favor of providing an alternate program for taking care of the dependents. I propose to see to it that we get something done about it. Let us go to a group of doctors in the United States who know more about this subject than any other doctors in the United States. They were represented before our committee and the testimony appears at page 2674, Dr. William B. Walsh. He said:

> I appear here today as president of the National Medical Veterans' Society. I extend my gratitude on their behalf for your courtesy at similar hearings 2 years ago and at the opportunity to once again appear before this committee.
>
> The National Medical Veterans' Society supports the extension of the doctor-draft law for another 2-year period. After much soul searching and the consideration of the needs put forth by the military, we have no alternative but to support this discriminatory legislation.

He then explains the alternative for taking care of these dependents. Dependents consume, as the chairman has said, 800 of the total military personnel; the vast majority of these doctors are required for the active-duty military personnel. We must extend the draft notwithstanding the smiling Molotov in Chicago and San Francisco. We dare not send the President of these United States to a summit conference with it known throughout the length and the breadth of the world that the Congress of the United States has weakened in its support of the military program of the United States. Are we going to send him to a conference at the summit with it known by others participating in that conference that he can get so basic a thing as adequate medical care only through the greatest of effort and the bitterest of debate.

These things have plagued our Nation from the very beginning. Washington had them, so did Andy Jackson prior to the Battle of New Orleans; and again they plagued both sides after the first Battle of Bull Run, or the Battle of Manassas. And just before the Battle of Trenton, Thomas Paine wrote:

> These are the times that try men's souls. The summer soldier and the sunshine patriot will, in this crisis, shrink from the service of their country; but he that stands it now deserves the love and thanks of man and woman.

That is where we stand here now when we are not in a shooting war and when we want to prevent a shooting war.

Let us not be summer soldiers and sunshine patriots; let us adopt this conference report right now.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired. All time has expired.

Without objection, the previous question is ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I have a motion to recommit.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, I have a motion to recommit.

A parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MASON. When is the proper time to offer a motion to recommit?

The SPEAKER. The proper time to offer a motion to recommit is after the ordering of the previous question.

Is the gentleman from Illinois opposed to the bill?

Mr. MASON. I am, definitely.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, a point of order.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I offered a motion to recommit and I was recognized.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman had not been recognized by the Chair.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I had been recognized. I was looking at the Speaker and the Speaker was looking at me.

The SPEAKER. The point of order is overruled. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit of the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I notice in the rules of the House, rule 16, section 787, that a motion to recommit can be amended. I have a motion to amend the gentleman's motion to recommit; when would it be in order?

The SPEAKER. Not until the motion to recommit is reported. Then the Chair thinks the gentleman from Georgia would move the previous question before there were any opportunity to offer an amendment.

The Clerk will report the motion of the gentleman from Illinois.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Mr. MASON moves that the bill be recommitted to the conference committee.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the motion to recommit.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Under the rule the motion to recommit is subject to amendment, and I have an amendment.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Georgia has moved the previous question on the motion to recommit. If the motion for the previous question is voted down the Chair will then recognize the gentleman from Nebraska to offer his amendment to the motion.

The question is on ordering the previous question.

The question was taken and on a division (demanded by Mr. MILLER of Nebraska) there were—ayes 158, noes 80.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, I demand the yeas and nays on the motion ordering the previous question.

The yeas and nays were refused.

So the previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recommit.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 171, nays 221, not voting 42, as follows:

[Roll No. 99]

YEAS—171

Abbitt	Burnside	Durham
Adair	Byrd	Fallon
Alexander	Byrne, Pa.	Fascell
Andersen, H. Carl	Cannon	Fenton
Andresen, August H.	Carlyle	Fino
Ashmore	Carrigg	Flynt
Bailey	Cederberg	Forrester
Barden	Celler	Fountain
Barrett	Chase	Frazier
Baumhart	Chenoweth	Friedel
Beamer	Chiperfield	Garmatz
Bell	Christopher	Gathings
Bennett, Mich.	Chudoff	Gentry
Bentley	Church	Granahan
Berry	Clark	Gregory
Betts	Colmer	Gross
Blatnik	Crumpacker	Harris
Blitch	Curtis, Mo.	Harrison, Va.
Bow	Davidson	Harvey
Bowler	Davis, Ga.	Hays, Ohio
Boyle	Denton	Hiestand
Brown, Ohio	Dies	Hill
Brownson	Dollinger	Hinshaw
Broyhill	Dolliver	Hoeven
Budge	Donohue	Hoffman, Ill.
Burdick	Donovan	Hoffman, Mich.
Burleson	Dorn, N. Y.	Holifield
	Dorn, S. C.	Holtzman
	Dowdy	Hosmer

Hull
Hyde
Jenkins
Jennings
Jensen
Johansen
Jonas
Jones, Mo.
Jones, N. C.
Judd
Kee
Kilgore
King, Calif.
Klein
Lane
LeCompte
Lipscomb
Long
Lovre
McCulloch
McDonough
McDowell
McVey
Mack, Wash.
Madden
Mason
Matthews
Miller, Nebr.
Mollohan
Morgan
Multer
Natcher
Nelson
Nicholson
O'Brien, N. Y.
O'Hara, Ill.
O'Hara, Minn.
Passman
Patterson
Pelly
Philbin
Phillips
Powell
Prouty
Ray
Reed, Ill.
Rees, Kans.
Reuss
Robeson, Va.
Robsion, Ky.
Rogers, Colo.
Rogers, Fla.
Rogers, Tex.
Rutherford
Schenck
Schwengel
Scudder
Selden
Sheehan
Shuford
Siler
Simpson, Ill.
Smith, Kans.
Smith, Va.
Smith, Wis.
Staggers
Talle
Thompson, Mich.
Tollefson
Tuck
Udall
Utt
Van Pelt
Vorys
Wainwright
Watts
Weaver
Westland
Whitten
Wier
Williams, Miss.
Williams, N. J.
Withrow
Wolverton
Young
Younger

NAYS—221

Abernethy
Addonizio
Albert
Alger
Allen, Calif.
Allen, Ill.
Andrews
Anfuso
Arends
Ashley
Aspinall
Auchincloss
Avery
Ayres
Baker
Baldwin
Bass, N. H.
Bass, Tenn.
Bates
Becker
Belcher
Bennett, Fla.
Boggs
Boland
Bolling
Bolton, Frances P.
Bonner
Bosch
Bray
Brooks, La.
Brooks, Tex.
Brown, Ga.
Buchanan
Bush
Byrnes, Wis.
Carnahan
Chelf
Clevenger
Cole
Cooley
Coon
Cooper
Corbett
Coudert
Cramer
Cretella
Cunningham
Curtis, Mass.
Dague
Davis, Wis.
Dawson, Ill.
Dawson, Utah
Deane
Delaney
Dempsey
Derounian
Devereux
Diggs
Dixon
Dodd
Dondero
Edmondson
Elliott
Engle
Evins
Feighan
Fernandez
Fine
Fisher
Fjare
Flood
Fogarty
Forand
Ford
Fulton
Gary
Gavin
George
Gordon
Grant
Green, Oreg.
Griffiths
Hagen
Hale
Haley
Halleck
Hand
Harden
Hardy
Harrison, Nebr.
Hays, Ark.
Hayworth
Hébert
Herlong
Heselton
Hess
Hillings
Holmes
Hope
Huddleston
Ikard
Jarman
Johnson, Calif.
Johnson, Wis.
Jones, Ala.
Karsten
Kean
Keating
Kelley, Pa.
Kelly, N. Y.
Keogh
Kilburn
Kilday
King, Pa.
Kirwan
Kluczynski
Landrum
Lanham
Lankford
Latham
Lesinski
McCarthy
McConnell
McCormack
McIntire
McMillan
Macdonald
Machrowicz
Magnuson
Mahon
Mailliard
Marshall
Martin
Merrow
Metcalf
Miller, Calif.
Miller, Md.
Miller, N. Y.
Mills
Minshall
Morano
Moss
Murray, Ill.
Murray, Tenn.
Norblad
Norrell
O'Brien, Ill.
O'Neill
Osmers
Ostertag
Patman
Perkins
Pfost
Pilcher
Pillion
Poage
Poff
Preston
Price
Priest
Rabaut
Radwan
Rains
Reece, Tenn.
Rhodes, Ariz.
Rhodes, Pa.
Richards
Riehlman
Riley
Roberts
Rodino
Rogers, Mass.
Rooney
Roosevelt
Sadlak
Saylor
Scott
Scrivner
Seely-Brown
Shelley
Sheppard
Short
Sieminski
Sikes
Sisk
Smith, Miss.
Spence
Springer
Steed
Sullivan
Taber
Taylor
Teague, Calif.
Teague, Tex.
Thomas
Thompson, La.
Thompson, N. J.
Thompson, Tex.
Thomson, Wyo.
Thornberry
Trimble
Tumulty
Vanik
Van Zandt
Velde
Vinson
Vursell
Walter
Wharton
Wickersham
Wigglesworth
Williams, N. Y.
Willis
Wilson, Calif.
Wilson, Ind.
Winstead
Wolcott
Wright
Yates
Zablocki
Zelenko

NOT VOTING—42

Bolton, Oliver P.
Boykin
Buckley
Canfield
Chatham
Davis, Tenn.
Dingell
Doyle
Eberharter
Ellsworth
Frelinghuysen
Gamble
Gray
Green, Pa.
Gubser
Gwinn
Henderson
Holt
Horan
Jackson
James
Kearney
Kearns
Knox
Knutson
Krueger
Laird
McGregor
Mack, Ill.
Meader
Morrison
Moulder
Mumma
O'Konski
Polk
Quigley
Reed, N. Y.
Rivers
St. George
Scherer
Simpson, Pa.
Widnall

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Moulder for, with Mr. Mack of Illinois against.

Mr. McGregor for, with Mr. Buckley against.

General pairs:

Mr. Morrison with Mrs. St. George.

Mr. Polk with Mr. Simpson of Pennsylvania.

Mr. Eberharter with Mr. Jackson.

Mr. Dingell with Mr. Holt.

Mr. Quigley with Mr. Horan.

Mr. Chatham with Mr. Scherer.

Mr. Green of Pennsylvania with Mr. Ellsworth.

Mr. Gray with Mr. Gubser.

Mr. Rivers with Mr. Henderson.

Mr. Boykin with Mr. Kearns.

Mrs. Knutson with Mr. James.

Mr. Doyle with Mr. Knox.

Mr. Davis of Tennessee with Mr. Frelinghuysen.

Mr. BAKER changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. MOLLOHAN changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the conference report.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, on that I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken, and there were—yeas 389, nays 5, answered "present" 1, not voting 39, as follows:

[Roll No. 100]

YEAS—389

Abbitt
Abernethy
Adair
Addonizio
Albert
Alexander
Alger
Allen, Calif.
Allen, Ill.
Andersen, H. Carl
Andresen, August H.
Andrews
Anfuso
Arends
Ashley
Ashmore
Aspinall
Auchincloss
Avery
Ayres
Bailey
Baker
Baldwin
Barrett
Bass, N. H.
Bass, Tenn.
Bates
Baumhart
Beamer
Becker
Belcher
Bell
Bennett, Fla.
Bennett, Mich.
Fentley
Berry
Betts
Blatnik
Blitch
Boggs
Boland
Bolling
Bolton, Frances P.
Bonner
Bosch
Bow
Bowler
Boyle
Bray
Brooks, La.
Brooks, Tex.
Brown, Ga.
Brown, Ohio
Brownson
Broyhill
Buchanan
Budge
Burdick
Burleson
Burnside
Bush
Byrd
Byrne, Pa.
Byrnes, Wis.
Cannon
Carlyle
Carnahan
Carrigg
Cederberg
Celler
Chase
Chelf
Chenoweth
Chiperfield
Chudoff
Church
Clark
Clevenger
Cole
Colmer
Cooley
Coon
Cooper
Corbett
Coudert
Cramer
Cretella
Cunningham
Curtis, Mass.
Curtis, Mo.
Dague
Davidson
Davis, Ga.
Davis, Wis.
Dawson, Ill.
Dawson, Utah
Deane
Delaney
Dempsey
Denton
Derounian
Devereux
Dies
Diggs
Dixon
Dodd
Dollinger
Dolliver
Dondero
Donohue
Donovan
Dorn, N. Y.
Dorn, S. C.
Dowdy
Durham
Edmondson
Elliott
Engle
Evins
Fallon
Fascell
Feighan
Fenton
Fernandez
Fine
Fino
Fisher
Fjare
Flood
Flynt
Fogarty
Forand
Ford
Forrester
Fountain
Frazier
Friedel
Fulton
Garmatz
Gary
Gathings
Gavin
Gentry
George
Gordon
Granahan
Grant
Gray
Green, Oreg.
Gregory
Griffiths
Gross
Gwinn
Hagen
Hale
Haley
Halleck
Hand
Harden
Hardy
Harris
Harrison, Nebr.
Harrison, Va.
Harvey
Hays, Ark
Hays, Ohio
Hayworth
Hébert
Herlong
Heselton
Hess
Hiestand
Hill
Hillings
Hinshaw
Hoeven
Hoffman, Ill.
Holifield
Holmes
Holtzman
Hope
Hosmer
Huddleston
Hull
Hyde
Ikard
Jarman
Jenkins
Jennings
Jensen
Johansen
Johnson, Calif.
Johnson, Wis.
Jonas
Jones, Ala.
Jones, Mo.
Jones, N. C.
Judd
Karsten
Kean
Keating
Kee
Kelley, Pa.
Kelly, N. Y.
Keogh
Kilburn
Kilday
Kilgore
King, Calif.
King, Pa.
Kirwan
Klein
Kluczynski
Laird
Landrum
Lane
Lanham
Lankford
Latham
LeCompte
Lesinski
Lipscomb
Long
Lovre
McCarthy
McConnell
McCormack
McCulloch
McDonough
McDowell
McIntire
McMillan
McVey
Macdonald
Machrowicz
Mack, Wash.
Madden
Magnuson
Mahon
Mailliard
Marshall
Martin
Matthews
Merrow
Metcalf
Miller, Calif.
Miller, Md.
Miller, Nebr.
Miller, N. Y.
Mills
Minshall
Mollohan
Morano
Morgan
Moss
Multer
Murray, Ill.
Murray, Tenn.
Natcher
Nelson
Nicholson
Norblad
Norrell
O'Brien, Ill.
O'Brien, N. Y.
O'Hara, Ill.
O'Hara, Minn.
O'Neill
Osmers
Ostertag
Passman
Patman
Patterson
Pelly
Perkins
Pfost
Philbin
Phillips
Pilcher
Pillion
Poage
Poff
Powell
Preston
Price
Priest
Prouty
Rabaut
Radwan
Rains
Ray
Reece, Tenn.
Reed, Ill.
Rees, Kans.
Reuss
Rhodes, Ariz.
Rhodes, Pa.
Richards
Riehlman
Riley
Roberts
Robeson, Va.
Robison, Ky.
Rodino
Rogers, Colo.
Rogers, Fla.
Rogers, Mass.
Rogers, Tex.
Rooney
Roosevelt
Rutherford
Sadlack
Saylor
Schenck
Schwengel
Scott
Scrivner
Scudder
Seely-Brown
Selden
Sheehan
Shelley
Short
Shuford
Sieminski
Sikes
Siler
Simpson, Ill.
Sisk
Smith, Miss.
Smith, Va.
Smith, Wis.
Spence
Springer
Staggers
Steed
Sullivan
Taber
Talle
Taylor
Teague, Calif.
Teague, Tex.
Thomas
Thompson, La.
Thompson, Mich.
Thompson, N. J.
Thompson, Tex.
Thomson, Wyo.
Thornberry
Tollefson
Trimble
Tuck
Tumulty
Udall
Utt
Vanik
Van Pelt
Van Zandt
Velde
Vinson
Vorys
Vursell
Wainwright
Walter
Watts
Weaver
Westland
Wharton
Whitten
Wickersham
Widnall
Wier
Wigglesworth
Williams, Miss.
Williams, N. J.
Williams, N. Y.
Willis
Wilson, Calif.
Wilson, Ind.
Winstead
Withrow
Wolcott
Wolverton
Wright
Yates
Young
Younger
Zablocki
Zelenko

NAYS—5

Barden
Crumpacker
Hoffman, Mich.
Mason
Smith, Kans.

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Christopher

NOT VOTING—39

Bolton, Oliver P.	Gubser	Morrison
Boykin	Henderson	Moulder
Buckley	Holt	Mumma
Canfield	Horan	O'Konski
Chatham	Jackson	Polk
Davis, Tenn.	James	Quigley
Dingell	Kearney	Reed, N. Y.
Doyle	Kearns	Rivers
Eberharter	Knox	St. George
Ellsworth	Knutson	Scherer
Frelinghuysen	Krueger	Sheppard
Gamble	McGregor	Simpson, Pa.
Green, Pa.	Mack, Ill.	
	Meader	

So the conference report was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Mack of Illinois for, with Mr. McGregor against.

General pairs:

Mr. Morrison with Mr. Simpson of Pennsylvania.
Mr. Doyle with Mr. Scherer.
Mr. Moulder with Mrs. St. George.
Mr. Buckley with Mr. Frelinghuysen.
Mr. Green of Pennsylvania with Mr. Ellsworth.
Mr. Chatham with Mr. Horan.
Mr. Boykin with Mr. Holt.
Mr. Rivers with Mr. Jackson.
Mr. Polk with Mr. James.
Mr. Eberharter with Mr. Kearney.
Mr. Quigley with Mr. Kearns.
Mr. Dingell with Mr. Henderson.
Mr. Davis of Tennessee with Mr. Gamble.
Mr. Sheppard with Mr. Gubser.
Mrs. Knutson with Mr. Canfield.

Mr. BARRETT changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

Mr. CHRISTOPHER changed his vote from "yea" to "present."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate by Mr. Ast, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed a joint resolution of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. J. Res. 85. Joint resolution to extend for temporary periods certain housing programs, the Small Business Act of 1953, and the Defense Production Act of 1950.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3005) entitled "An act to further amend the Universal Military Training and Service Act by extending the authority to induct certain individuals, and to extend the benefits under the Dependents Assistance Act to July 1, 1959."

SELECT COMMITTEE ON SURVIVOR BENEFITS

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Select Committee on Survivor Benefits may have until midnight tonight to file a report on a bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

MUTUAL SECURITY BILL FOR 1955

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules I call up House Resolution 288 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 (S. 2090) to amend the Mutual Security Act of 1954, and for other purposes, and all points of order against said bill are hereby waived with the exception of the language beginning on page 16, line 24, down through and including line 11, page 17, and the language contained on page 19, lines 7 to 16, inclusive. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed 4 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield one-half of my time to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ALLEN].

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 288 makes in order the bill S. 2098, which is the mutual security bill for 1955.

The amount in this bill is considerable. As passed by the Senate it provided an authorization of $3,425,000,000. The Committee on Foreign Affairs recommends an authorization of $3,285,800,000, which is a difference of $139,200,000.

Without attempting to go into the specific items, the Committee on Rules provides 4 hours of general debate. This is an open rule. Points of order are waived except in two instances that refer to the carrying of cargo in American ships. At the proper time points of order will be made to strike out those parts.

I know of no objection to the rule and recommend and urge its adoption.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN] such time as he may require.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to speak out of order.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, 30 years ago there was an important event in the political history of Massachusetts, when our State selected its first woman Representative in Congress, Mrs. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS. Mrs. ROGERS was elected by an overwhelming vote. I am very happy to say that through the years her majorities have been increasing because of the able and intelligent service she has rendered. Mrs. ROGERS blazed the way for a good many women who later became Members of Congress because of her excellent service. Today we have 16 women Members of the House, including the Delegate from Hawaii.

I remember very well her initial campaign. Having been just elected to Congress, the Republican State committee sent me over to aid in her election as successor to her husband, the late John Jacob Rogers. I find her to be an excellent campaigner and a candidate with appeal.

Through the years Massachusetts and New England have never had a more valiant fighter for its interests than EDITH NOURSE ROGERS. She was a champion in behalf of New England industries. She is particularly known not only in Massachusetts and New England but throughout the country as a valiant champion of the rights of veterans. She came naturally by her solicitude for the veterans. In the First World War, while her husband was a Member of Congress, she very generously gave her time and was a hospital worker not only here in Washington but abroad as well. That devoted interest to the veterans has been increased through the years. So we from the State of Massachusetts are very proud of EDITH ROGERS. We are proud of her record and proud of the efficiency and ability with which she serves as Congresswoman. No one ever comes to her door and asks for aid but what they find a ready champion. I am happy to rise here today and pay tribute to her great service; service which I am sure she will continue as long as she desires, and may she have many years of useful service ahead.

Mrs. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARTIN. I yield.

Mrs. CHURCH. I thank our distinguished minority leader, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN]. Mr. Speaker, the women of the House do honor to themselves in paying tribute to Mrs. ROGERS. I knew her here before I myself became a Member of the Congress. I can attest throughout the years to her humanity and her great kindness and her deep interest in the problems of all who come to her. She indeed did pioneer in the House of Representatives; and I think some of us who have followed her would particularly praise her for her endurance, if I may say so. But we honor her in fact not only for what she is herself as a woman, but for what she has done as a legislator. I think that there is no one in the House who is second to her in courage, patience and persistence. Her record of legislative accomplishment for our veterans speaks for itself. We only hope that there will be 30 more years of service for EDITH NOURSE ROGERS.

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARTIN. I yield.

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, I am very happy to associate myself with everything that the gentleman from Massachusetts has said as well as what my colleague, the gentlewoman from Illinois [Mrs. CHURCH] has said. I do have the best of it, however, when compared with all the other women in the House as I have had 15 of those 30 years with our very distinguished colleague EDITH NOURSE ROGERS. She was on the Committee on Foreign Affairs when I first began my service on

that committee. I shall never forget the first time I was in committee. We had the lend-lease bill up. I was very, very new and at the very bottom of the committee. I did not know what questions to ask. I had not even been to a committee hearing before. I asked a question which had been passed down to me by a member of the committee. I did not see anything out of order in the question, but all of a sudden there was a revolution in the committee—outside—and everywhere else—and the witness was forbidden to reply. Edith got up and with the most wonderful understanding she plead my cause. I have never forgotten it. That first meeting of the Committee on Foreign Affairs at which I was present was a really great time in my life. Since then I have had many opportunities to watch this charming woman who has given herself unstintingly to service in this House for 30 constructive years.

I went abroad during the war as she did to the camps and into the hospitals. Everywhere I went I found that the boys loved and trusted—EDITH ROGERS. They felt that she was constantly doing everything possible for them.

I am happy to add my congratulations not only to Mrs. ROGERS for the long years of selfless service that have been hers, but also to this House of Representatives and to all the people in her district and elsewhere whom she has served directly and indirectly. And today I join with all her colleagues in hopes that the years of service that be ahead of her will be as full of joy as those which have gone.

I thank the distinguished minority leader, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN] for the opportunity he has made possible to us all to express our appreciation of EDITH NOURSE ROGERS.

Mrs. HARDEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARTIN. I yield to the gentlewoman from Indiana.

Mrs. HARDEN. It is a very great pleasure for me to pay tribute today to my dear friend and colleague, the distinguished Representative from the Fifth District of Massachusetts, Mrs. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS.

When I became a Member of this House in the 81st Congress, my first committee assignment was on the Veterans' Affairs Committee—EDITH ROGERS was the ranking minority member of that committee.

I shall never forget the many courtesies she extended to me and her timely and helpful advice. She was always patient, gracious, and kind to me, a freshman on her committee. Her interest in veterans' affairs and her untiring efforts in behalf of all veterans are unsurpassed.

Mrs. ROGERS, I congratulate you upon your 30 years of distinguished service in the United States Congress. I also congratulate the people of the Fifth Massachusetts District upon the splendid representation which they have enjoyed during these years.

Mrs. ROGERS, you merit the honor as dean of the women of the House of Representatives. We love and respect you. May God bless you with health, happiness, and continued success.

Mrs. KELLY of New York. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARTIN. I yield.

Mrs. KELLY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I am very happy that the gentleman from Massachusetts has taken this occasion to pay this deserving tribute to our colleague, EDITH NOURSE ROGERS, of Massachusetts. I, too, join in paying tribute to her because by her patience and by her courage and persistent efforts for all our boys in the service, she has earned for herself the esteem and love of countless members of our armed services as well as the love and esteem of all her colleagues in the House of Representatves. I deeply hope that, with God's blessings, she will be permitted to be with us for many, many years to come.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARTIN. I yield.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased that the minority leader, our former Speaker, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN], has called to the attention of the House this significant 30th anniversary of the start of what has been one of the most distinguished careers in Congress, that is the election 30 years ago of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts, Mrs. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS. I join with my fellow feminine Members of Congress who have already spoken in expressing my congratulations to Mrs. ROGERS.

I would certainly want to mention the very gracious and wonderful way that Mrs. ROGERS has treated new women Members of Congress. She was especially helpful, friendly, and kind to me during my first term. I shall never forget what this meant to me at the time, for it was a friendly hand and a very encouraging and reassuring experience. As the ranking woman Member of Congress, Mrs. ROGERS has shown us all a good example in sponsoring and furthering legislation of the kind which will help people, including our veterans and particularly our wounded and disabled veterans. When her party was in the majority in the Congress she was, I know, an outstanding chairman of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, and as the ranking Republican on that committee she is ever alert to the needs of the veterans and to the kind of legislation which we must pass in their behalf.

Of course, the esteem in which she is held by all the Members of Congress, and particularly by the women Members, breaks down all the barriers of political difference. I congratulate the people of the Fifth District of Massachusetts for sending EDITH NOURSE ROGERS back to Washington all these years to represent them in the halls of Congress.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARTIN. I yield.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Mr. Speaker, I want to join with the gentleman from Massachusetts in every single word he said in paying tribute to our colleague, the gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS]. She has been a great friend of mine since I came to the Congress. She has gone out of her way to help me. I suppose I could stand here for another 5 or 10 minutes extolling her virtues, but I do not have to do it, Mr. Speaker, because the Members of the House know Mrs. ROGERS too well.

Mrs. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARTIN. I yield.

Mrs. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, I am very happy to join my colleagues in paying tribute to the beloved gentlewoman from Massachusetts who, on June 30, will observe her 30th anniversary of selfless service as a distinguished Representative of the Fifth District of Massachusetts.

She will always be remembered as the champion of legislation in behalf of the welfare of veterans and for her outstanding contributions as chairman of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs in the 80th and 83d Congresses.

She is a most charming, kindly, and gracious lady and it has been a privilege, indeed, to serve with her in this House.

EDITH NOURSE ROGERS has earned the respect and admiration of all of us and I wish to offer her my sincere and heartiest congratulations. The many tributes paid to her today by her colleagues, regardless of political affiliation, show what a great inspiration she has been to her fellow Members of this body.

Mr. HALE. Mr. Speaker, I want to join the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN] in the sentiments which he has expressed. It may not be as well known as it should be that the gentle lady from Massachusetts, Mrs. ROGERS, had her origin in Saco, Maine. She is a frequent visitor in Saco, Maine, in the district which I have the honor to represent. I consider her one of my most distinguished constituents. The people there are proud of her and of her record. She knows that area of Maine as well as anybody knows it. I frequently solicit her assistance and advice, and I am proud to have her as a constituent.

During the 13 years I have had the honor of serving in this House, I wish to say that I have had the happiest associations with her. In fact, she was conspicuously gracious and hospitable to my wife and me from the moment of our first arrival here. I wish her long life and long continued service in this body. I am sure that her district will keep her here as long as she lives.

Mr. MARTIN. I yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. MILLER].

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I have known Mrs. ROGERS longer than I have known any other Member of the House of Representatives. I knew her before she was a Member of this body. Back shortly after World War I, I was a minor official of the old Veterans' Bureau when she came to California as a dollar-a-year woman, representing the then President of the United States. She was making the fight for veterans. It was my privilege to accompany her throughout the 12th district of the old Veterans' Administration comprising the States of California, Nevada, and Arizona. I remember going to Prescott, Ariz., one cold evening to make a survey of the Whipple Barracks Hospital. While the staff traveling with her sought

the comfort of the hotel, she spent the rest of the night sitting up with a tubercular patient who was dying. This was characteristic of the nobleness of her character.

I have seen the bigness of her heart. I want to pay tribute to her, and I want to tell you that the veterans of this country will never know the great contribution she has made toward their welfare.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ADAIR].

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Speaker, I wish to associate myself with the remarks which have been made in honor of Mrs. ROGERS.

I think it appropriate to emphasize something which every Member of this House knows; that is, her warmhearted concern for veterans.

In the almost 5 years I have served with her on the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, I have observed, time after time, her willingness to give her time and attention to that great cause. She deserves not only the commendation of the House but of veterans generally.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. PATTERSON].

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Speaker, I, too, want to pay tribute to Mrs. ROGERS, a Representative from New England. I assure you that Mrs. ROGERS is held in high esteem by all of our veterans, especially those who are disabled. In fact, she is symbolic of the hope and future of our disabled American veterans. Mrs. ROGERS' devotion to the people of her district and the country at large has won for her a reputation of a great leader, humanitarian, and above all, the highest honor that can be paid a person, that of a great American. Seldom do we find in any one person the many excellent qualities possessed by EDITH NOURSE ROGERS. I extend to her my most fond respects and personal best wishes for many more years of good health and service in this Congress where she has no peers.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. JOHNSON].

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I join with the minority leader in paying tribute to Mrs. ROGERS and the wonderful work she has done.

EDITH ROGERS symbolizes help to the veterans of our country. As the chairman and as ranking members of the Veterans Committee of the House she has for years carried the torch for the veterans. This reputation is deserved and she is undoubtedly known by more veterans in the United States, as their friend, than any other person. Sometimes I wondered if she was not doing too much for veterans. I mentioned it to her and her answer was "You cannot do too much for disabled veterans" and after careful reflection, I agree with her. Men who have had their bodies broken for the protection of our country deserve everything we can do for them. Also, I am beginning to think that all veterans, especially combat veterans, should receive liberal consideration. Every segment of our population made big money during the wars—the First World War and the Second World War. Why should not those who made the victory possible also receive generous consideration?

EDITH ROGERS is also a great supporter of proper defense for our country. Since I have spent 13 years on the Armed Services Committee I can testify that many times she had discussed defense problems with me and those conversations have displayed a keen knowledge by her of what our country needs in the defense field.

As a friend and colleague, Mrs. ROGERS is wonderful. She is friendly, helpful, and kind in her contacts with Members.

I only hope we may have her with us for many more years as she is a distinct asset to the House of Representatives.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have permission to extend their remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BENNETT of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join in the tribute being paid to Congresswoman ROGERS on her service to veterans, to the armed services, and to our country generally. She is a gracious, warm-hearted person of courage and determination. I will always treasure her friendship. It is a pleasure to honor her on the important anniversary of her public service.

Mr. MACK of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to join with my colleagues in paying tribute on her 30th anniversary as a Member of Congress to Mrs. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS.

I had the privilege of being a member of the House Veterans Committee during the 83d Congress during which she was the able and result-getting chairman of that committee. American veterans and the veteran families of all our wars owe much to the distinguished gentlewoman from Massachusetts for the ability, zeal, and diligence which she always has employed in protecting their best interests.

Mrs. PFOST. Mr. Speaker, it was a lucky day for the people of the Fifth Congressional District of Massachusetts—and an even more fortunate day for the country at large—when, exactly 30 years ago, EDITH NOURSE ROGERS was elected to the House of Representatives. In her long and illustrious career she has written a record of achievement that few Members can equal.

She is best known, of course, for her great understanding of the veteran and his problem, and for the many fine measures she has sponsored for the benefit of those to whom we owe our liberty. She has twice served as chairman of the House Veterans Committee—the first Republican woman to head a House Committee—and is now the ranking minority member. She has demonstrated again and again that rare combination—a great heart and a deep-seated practicality.

Today EDITH NOURSE ROGERS is the revered and respected dean of women in the House—I frequently refer to her as the "Queen of the House." She has served longer than any other woman—there are few men who outrank her.

It is always a pleasure when a woman in public life has the opportunity to pay tribute to another woman in the same field. It is, however, with particular pride and sincere affection, that I, a comparative newcomer and a Democrat, pay tribute here today to EDITH NOURSE ROGERS, of Massachusetts. I glory in the record she has made and I thank her for what she has done to help pioneer the way for the rest of us.

Mr. LONG. Mr. Speaker, upon her completion of 30 years of service in the House of Representatives—an honor which few men ever attain, and perhaps no other woman—I am privileged to pay appropriate tribute to a great lady, our colleague from Massachusetts, the Honorable EDITH NOURSE ROGERS.

Throughout her years in Congress, and even before that time, Mrs. ROGERS has distinguished herself as a champion of the veteran's cause. Without a doubt her name will go down in history as the greatest single champion of veterans' rights and benefits.

When I first came to Congress only a few years ago, I was appointed to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs which she at that time headed as chairman. I say without fear of contradiction that her unswerving loyalty to the veteran, his widow and his orphan, was felt by every member of that committee during her tenure as chairman—a completely nonpartisan attitude which is still manifest. If her views were ever biased, it was certainly in the veteran's favor. It is my understanding that she became a member of the original committee of the House having jurisdiction over legislation for veterans soon after she was first elected to Congress, and has served continuously on the committee for the full tenure of her congressional career. She is the only Member of the House at the present time who served on that original committee.

Service and devotion to veterans go even beyond her tenure in Congress, for I am informed that prior to her election she was appointed by several Presidents as their personal representative in care of disabled veterans.

Hers is truly an enviable record. I know of no other Member of this body who, aside from service to his own constituents and State, has dedicated himself so completely to a single cause.

We are privileged, Mr. Speaker, to have her with us still, and I hope for many years to come.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. AYRES].

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Speaker, when I first came to the Congress, the dean of the Ohio delegation [Mr. JENKINS] suggested that I become a member of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs. I shall never forget his statement at that time, when he said: "You will have the privilege of working with one of the most understanding, humanitarian Members that has ever come to the Congress, in Mrs. ROGERS." It has been my privilege to sit next to her for almost 4½ years, and I say, Mr. Speaker, there probably is not nor ever will be a more humanitarian and understanding Member of this body than you, Mrs. ROGERS.

Mr. MARTIN. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK].

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I am very glad to join in the remarks of my friend from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN] and the remarks made by other Members in relation to Mrs. ROGERS. I have profound respect for Mrs. ROGERS. I do not know a more outstanding legislator. She has indomitable courage, and is one of the most courageous legislators I have ever served with. Mrs. ROGERS is not only a great legislator and a great American, but her charitable acts are known by countless thousands of persons, not only in Massachusetts but elsewhere.

May I also say that as a great legislator and statesman, in my opinion, Mrs. ROGERS has the best political sense of any Member of the House, and I highly compliment her for it.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ROGERS].

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Rogers bloc in Congress we recognize the lady, EDITH NOURSE ROGERS, as our dean and leader, because her accomplishments have upheld the name so well in the Congress of the United States. We like to pay tribute with our other colleagues to the outstanding work and human kindness that have been expressed by her in her service in this Congress.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to another of the Rogers bloc, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. ROGERS].

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, joining with the Rogers bloc in Congress, I want to associate myself with all the wonderful remarks that have been made today in behalf of our "cousin," EDITH NOURSE ROGERS, of Massachusetts. I also want to say that Hon. WALTER ROGERS of Texas has asked us to convey his best wishes also.

We wish the gentlewoman from Massachusetts many more years of service, and we are proud to be associated with her in this body.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SAYLOR].

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I want to join with the other Members in congratulating our distinguished gentlewoman from the State of Massachusetts because of her outstanding record. I have had the pleasure of serving with her on the Veterans' Committee. She is a real fighter. She is also a lady throughout; but when the time comes that she wants a bill through, you can rest assured that she has made the name "ROGERS" so well known in getting behind that bill that she will be remembered for many generations as the great champion of the veterans of all wars.

I want to commend her for her devoted work in the Congress and hope she will have many more years of service in this House.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARTIN. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, in my early service as a Member of this body it was my privilege to serve with Mrs. ROGERS on a committee and to observe her splendid understanding of legislative problems as they were presented.

I join with the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts and other colleagues in paying deserved tribute to her, a lady who possesses the highest attributes of Christian character, a most accomplished legislator, and one who deserves the admiration and respect not only of all her colleagues, but also of the people of this country.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts, [Mrs. ROGERS].

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed out of order.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Minority Leader, Mr. Majority Leader, and all of the Members who spoke, I am deeply grateful for your very generous and very kind words. If I talked for 24 hours I could not express my full appreciation of all you have meant to me in my service in the Congress of the United States and of the privilege I have always felt membership in this body to be—the greatest legislative body in the world. With all of its ups and downs I have enjoyed every minute of my service here.

I am and always have been deeply grateful to those who first elected me and who have reelected me all these years, my very kind and generous constituents of the wonderful Fifth Massachusetts District I represent. I have tried terribly hard to be worthy of that trust and to be a worthy Member of this great legislative body.

With all my heart I thank you.

To those of you who wish me more years of service here may I say that the first 30 years are the hardest.

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HARRIS].

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, as we are considering the rule for the mutual security program I think it is appropriate to call to the attention of the House that 16 years ago today the first commercial airline from the United States made its first flight across the ocean to foreign countries. At that time, 16 years ago, the Pan American Clipper made the first flight which brought the nations of the world closer together.

A Pan American DC-7B, newest of any over-ocean plane, will take off from New York at 5 p. m. this afternoon—Tuesday—to make the airline's 50,000th crossing of the Atlantic.

In the 16 years since the first flight, the airline has carried 2,021,483 passengers a distance of 200 million miles across the ocean—the equivalent of moving the entire population of Philadelphia 870 times to the moon.

Harold E. Gray, captain of the first flight, is now executive vice president of Pan American.

With the completion of the 50,000th flight, Pan American will have carried across the Atlantic 24,540,618 pounds of mail, the equivalent of 552 million letters. At the rate of 100 an hour, it would take almost 630 years to shove that amount into a post box.

In the interval between the first and 50,000th flight, Pan American has sped 35,275,394 pounds of cargo across the ocean. This amounts to as much as 11,700 modern automobiles weigh. But it was all sorts of cargo, from machinery weighing more than a ton to dresses fresh from Paris salons and weighing ounces.

Pan American's passenger flight No. 1 across the Atlantic on June 24, 1939, was the industry's first as well. Two years had been spent on careful survey flights and another 5 before that on expeditions to the Arctic to compile necessary information on Atlantic weather, communications problems, and flying conditions.

The world's fair was in full swing in New York, and King George VI and his Queen had just left for England after a tour of the United States and Canada when Pan American's flying boat, the *Yankee Clipper*, cut through the waters of Long Island sound near Port Washington for its flight to Southampton.

This 42-ton flying boat, a little more than half the weight of modern clippers, had a speed of 140 miles an hour and often required more than 24 hours to make the trip to Europe. Once a week it followed the northern route via Botwood, Newfoundland, and Foynes, Ireland, to Southampton Once a week, its sister ship, the *Dixie Clipper*, flew the mid-Atlantic route through Bermuda, Horta in the Azores, Lisbon, Portugal, to Marseilles in France.

First came the unpressurized DC-4's in 1945, limited to 10,000 feet. The Constellation in 1946 was the Atlantic's first pressurized Clipper permitting flights above the weather. It was followed in 1940 by the Boeing stratocruiser, a double-deck, all-sleeper plane with 3,500 horsepower per engine as compared with the flying boat's 1,500. The superstratocruiser, modernized since 1949, is the most luxurious aloft.

Douglas contributed the DC-6B in 1952, which carried the largest loads up to that time—82 passengers across the Atlantic. New in service is the DC-7B, the fastest modern airplane—353 miles an hour, 11 hours to London, as against 140 miles an hour and 24 hours in 1939. Coming next year is the 5,000-mile range DC-7C.

Clipper captains remember these highlights of the 16 years:

FIRST PRESIDENT TO FLY

President Franklin D. Roosevelt traveled PAA to the Casablanca Conference in 1943, marking the first time a President had flown while in office. Other famous wartime passengers: Queen Wilhelmina, of the Netherlands; Chiang Kai-shek; King Peter, of Yugoslavia; Gen. George C. Marshall; Gen. Dwight D. Eisenhower.

Cargoes were vital, too, and sometimes dangerous. Several flights under PAA's contract with the Air Transport Command were loaded with shell fuses bound for General Montgomery's troops in Egypt at a critical moment before the battle of El Alamein. More routine were flights carrying crude rubber from the

jungles of the Amazon to England and others carrying a 7,500-pound shipment of bombing tables for the Eighth Air Force.

LEAST TIME TRACK

Its years of weather research paid off with speed records as the company learned to use the "least time track" rather than the Great Circle course to arrive at its destination with the help of the most favorable tail winds. Pan American still holds the record for a New York to London nonstop of 8 hours and 55 minutes made on November 22, 1949, with the help of a monster tailwind.

Technically, the pilots say, progress has been made a little at a time during the 16 years. Pressurized airplanes made possible flying "over the weather," a great advance in passenger comfort and in safety. Radio phone replaced the laborious dot-and-dash method. Navigation was greatly improved by the addition of Loran gear, a method of locating planes more accurately while in flight, improvements in octants, and installation of radio altimeters.

Longer-range airplanes gave the pilots more choices of alternates. Higher octane fuel provided more power for engines and lower fuel consumption. Supercharging and the use of power-recovery devices again improved performance. Bad weather landings were made safer by radar at airports. The logical outgrowth, airborne radar, is now just coming into use.

SELLING ATLANTIC TRAVEL

Selling Atlantic travel has a history, too. Pilots remember the off-season fares first put into effect in the winter of 1947 to help smooth out the peaks and valleys of transatlantic sales.

But the first really significant milestone in bringing transatlantic flying to the average man was the inauguration of tourist-class service in May of 1952. Pan American first proposed a two-class service, with less frills for the tourist class, higher density seating and a fare of approximately 25 percent less as early as 1948. But it was not until 1952 that all airlines were ready. Business since has increased by 69 percent.

The familiar American habit of buying on time was first applied to air transportation successfully on May 1, 1954, when Pan Am's "Pay Later" plan went into effect. Over $4 million worth of business was done in the first year and the estimate is that 80 percent of the customers would not have flown abroad at all without the convenience of the financing.

FAMILY FARES THIS FALL

Newest promotional plan is next fall's family fares whereby the head of the family will pay full fare on a trip to Europe while each member of his family pays $300 less on first class and $200 less on tourist.

Clouds of war were on the horizon in 1939, 50,000 flights ago. And in World War II, Pan American alone was privileged to make more than half the total United States airline contribution. Pan Am's wings today are stronger than ever. Its long-range four-engine fleet could deliver to Europe 7,600 troops a day to help defend members of the great Atlantic community in case of need.

In the meantime, however, the bright new Clippers are contributing heavily to the ever-increasing prosperity of our peaceful neighbors across the Atlantic.

Mr. Speaker, I include as a part of my remarks the following editorial from the New York Times of Tuesday, June 28, 1955:

FIFTY-THOUSANDTH CROSSING

One day in June 16 years ago, when the world's fair in Flushing Meadows was in full swing and ominous rumblings of war were sounding across the ocean, a big Pan American clipper rose into the air from Port Washington and headed seaward. It was the first commercial flight across the North Atlantic.

Today a plane about twice the Yankee Clipper's size, a 353-mile-an-hour Pan American DC-7B, will take off from Idlewild on a nonstop flight to Paris. This is the line's 50,000th crossing of the Atlantic. In between these events lie a dazzling pyramid of statistics: 2,021,483 passengers, 20 million miles, more than 24,540,618 pounds of mail and 35 million pounds of cargo.

Today Pan American has some 30 flights a week across the ocean. Harold E. Gray, executive vice president, who was captain of the first flight, notes that planes are not only faster, they carry twice as many passengers. And Pan American today transports 17,000 persons a month across the Atlantic, compared to an average of 300 in the early days.

Great liners of the air come into Idlewild now flying the flags of many nations. Well over a hundred flights a day wing in from or take off for some foreign port. By 1946 the traffic on the Atlantic lanes alone had risen to 150,000 persons annually, counting the volume in both directions. Last year it was 590,000.

Pan American deserves much credit for its share in developing this traffic. From the beginning they saw far, and they dared. The record shows that Pan American took the lead in pressing for tourist class, for lower rates in both passenger and cargo business and for other ideas to sell air travel and transport to every far corner of the globe.

Mr. BEAMER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARRIS. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. BEAMER. Mr. Speaker, it has been my pleasure and privilege to visit some foreign countries on Pan American planes. It is appropriate that the word "American" is in their name because this company is another organization that serves as an ambassador of good will wherever it goes.

American businessmen have carried the best of our culture to all parts of the world. The advancement of aviation has made neighbors of all countries.

For this and for many reasons, I am pleased to add my tribute to Pan American World Airways on the occasion of their 50,000th transocean flight without 1 fatal accident. This is an accomplishment of which their company indeed can be proud. As a member of the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee that is charged with legislative problems of transportation, I share this justifiable pride.

Mr. MORANO. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARRIS. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. MORANO. I wish to associate myself with the remarks just made and to say that I have the honor of representing the district and live in the very town in which reside both the president, Mr. Juan Trippe, and the vice president, Mr. Samuel Pryor, Jr., of the Pan American Airways.

Mr. HARRIS. I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and to include an editorial from the New York Times.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, I should like to add a few words to the remarks made by our colleague, the gentleman from Arkansas.

I have done a good deal of traveling by air, both abroad and in this country. I have always been most happy when we chose Pan American Airways as our means of transportation. I should like to add my congratulations to this fine airline on the occasion of its 50,000th crossing of the Atlantic Ocean at 5 o'clock today, and to its officers and personnel. The record of safety and of excellent service consistently maintained by them is really outstanding. I trust that they will continue to maintain this wonderful record, and to aid in keeping the American flag aloft throughout the world.

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER].

INDIA AND YUGOSLAVIA

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to address myself briefly to the question of aid to Yugoslavia and India. There seems to be generating an opinion that aid should be denied those countries because of their recently improved relations with the Soviet Union. I take it, and I believe, that these better relations do not mean and should not mean a worsening of our relations with these same countries. I say this despite the recent joint demarche of Tito and Bulganin and Nehru and Bulganin.

What determines who the beneficiaries of United States aid shall be?

Is it not because we are a fortunate people blessed with spiritual and material strength and that our tradition as a people so blessed moves us to share with those less favored. Our aid is not a bribe. We are a people alive to suffering. We have given aid in the recent past to Red China, East Germany, Czechoslovakia, and Albania, all Communist-ruled countries. Indeed, throughout our history, we have rushed aid to disaster areas. More than 30 years ago under Herbert Hoover's leadership, we helped to feed the populations of the Soviet Union, when they were confronted with famine.

We are concerned with development of peoples everywhere as we are for ourselves in reaching upward to embrace principles of a just and moral civilization.

Surely we are concerned with peoples faced with great economic need who search for an answer and have not committed themselves to the false gods dangled before them by Communist Russia.

But also, we are concerned where our own self-interest demands that peoples not so committed be lured, through our own default, into the Soviet camp which spells for them captivity and ultimate disaster.

These reasons, among others, must compel us not to deny our aid, either to Yugoslavia or to India.

True, Yugoslavia is a Communist country, but equally and forcefully as true is the fact that Yugoslavia has wrenched itself free from Soviet domination; has demonstrated dramatically to the world that it can successfully defy the power of the Soviet Union, and this is of crucial importance to any negotiation or discussion the Western powers may have with the Soviet Union on the status of its now satellite states. It is acknowledged throughout Yugoslavia that United States aid, without strings attached, is more welcome a choice than the Soviet Union heavy-handed interference and attempted control of the Yugoslav people. They are a happier people spared the bleakness of dire economic want, because of the United States, and on the other hand because of our aid they were spared the tragedy of Soviet domination, and because of the United States aid they are enabled to resist the recent Soviet courtship. Starving people make desperate choices. If United States aid to Yugoslavia were now withdrawn, a severe blow would be delivered against world peace. A noncommittal joint statement released by the Soviet Union and Yugoslavia at the termination of the Soviet delegation's last visit revealed a suspected but heretofore unproven chink in the armor of the Soviet Union. Let it not be thought for a moment that the leaders of international communism in all parts of the world did not take notice and shudder. A blind trust which international Communist leaders had in many of the still free countries of the world was shaken. It is too soon for any of us to be able to measure the repercussions, but they are there, and the lesson of Yugoslavian resistance will not be forgotten. Yugoslavia will be watched carefully and as it grows in economic strength, it will be further demonstrated that the milk of peace and plenty does not always flow from the bosom of Mother Russia. This is a realization which will grow upon the wavering countries of Asia and upon those in the other countries of the world who have slavishly sold their hearts and their intelligence to the mint of Soviet omnipotence.

Like Yugoslavia, India has adopted a fierce independence, and while superficially it may appear that India looks with kinder eyes upon the Soviet Union than it does upon the West, the fact still remains that India with its newly-won independence stands fiercely jealous of her rights, her benefits, her privileges as a free nation, it is because of this stubborn independence that the Soviet Union works unceasingly to win with these countries.

I have been in India and encountered at first hand the sensitive, searching pride of the Indian people, the probing intelligence of its leaders. We have been critical of India as India has been critical of us. These are the attributes of sovereignty. There have been mistakes and misunderstandings on both sides. There is a gap in India's knowledge of our tradition, of our way of life just as there is a gap in our understanding of India and her life. We cannot dismiss the stubborn fact that India is an independent country and we cannot make her very independence the reason for withdrawal of aid. India is poor, India is struggling. Can we, in our own good fortune demand that Indian people eat not, because we disagree with some of her ways of life. If we use our material wealth as a whip to silence independent countries and by their silence make them eligible for our aid, then we stand condemned before the world as spiritually impoverished. It is time we exploded this caricature of the United States which Soviet propaganda has drawn of us and implanted in the minds of peoples of the East and in the West. Only the Soviet Union, so Soviet propaganda goes, is concerned with the welfare of people as people. The West wants only to buy friendship, says the Soviet Union. We, the Soviet Union not the United States, care about the hungry. It is this kind of talk which is the chain which holds international communism together. India is not a Communist nation. There are pools of Communist agitators in India, just as there are pools of Communist agitators in France and Italy. But the Indian leadership is keenly aware of the threat of internal subversion and is taking steps to counter it, as we have seen in the recent local elections in that country.

Let us now and forever divorce ourselves from any talk that United States aid exists only because of the Soviet threat. United States aid existed long before the ugliness of Soviet aggression and subversion. To this tradition we must be loyal. Let it not be said of us that if the Soviet aggression did not exist, the United States would have no concern with the starving peoples of other countries.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Utah [Mr. DAWSON].

Mr. DAWSON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, today the House Interior and Insular Affairs Committee approved legislation to authorize the upper Colorado River storage project. Since this overall basin development program was first conceived 5 years ago, it has been the center of controversy and misinformation. The most controversial feature was the inclusion in the project of Echo Park Dam within Dinosaur National Monument.

The measure as approved by the committee today and as it will appear before you for your action, does not call for construction of Echo Park Dam. This controversial structure is not in the bill. The opposition from conservation organizations has been such as to convince us in the four-State area directly benefiting from the project that authorizing legislation could not be passed unless this dam was taken out. We hated to lose it. I still feel that it would be better for the monument if it were built. But we in the sparsely settled, arid West have neither the money nor organization to cope with the resources and mailing lists of the so-called conservationists.

In dropping Echo Park Dam from the project, we now feel free to call upon those same organizations to change their attack to support. Time and again in testimony, spokesmen from conservation groups made it plain that their opposition was directed only toward the dam in Dinosaur and not to the overall project itself.

Leading spokesman for conservation groups and one of the most effective critics of Echo Park—Gen. Ulysses S. Grant III—testified as follows before the House Interior Committee:

> With a sincere desire to provide for the sound economic development of the upper Colorado Basin, we strongly recommend to your committee the passage of legislation (1) authorizing the immediate construction of the following dams, namely, Flaming Gorge, Cross Mountain, Whitewater (Bridgeport), and Glen Canyon; and (2) authorizing and directing the Bureau of Reclamation to proceed with the revision of the 1950 upper Colorado storage project eliminating therefrom the Echo Park and Split Mountain Dams.

General Grant is a noted engineer and president of the American Planning and Civic Association.

Many members have been approached by members of Izaak Walton Leagues in their districts on the subject of the upper Colorado River project and Echo Park Dam. With the elimination of Echo Park Dam from the project, supporters of this overall basin development should have the backing of league members for the bill.

Here is how J. W. Penfold, of the Izaak Walton League, testified before the House committee on this project:

> Colorado and western members of the league, and league nationally, are not opposed to the development of the Colorado River. We endorse the fundamental purposes and objectives of the upper Colorado storage project. We recognize that if the West is to develop along sound resource lines there must be a sound and coordinated program for the conservation and use of the limited supplies of water. We recognize that much of the water originating at elevations up to and exceeding 14,000 feet and dropping nearly 3 miles on its journey to the sea can and should create energy to serve human, agricultural, industrial, and commercial needs.
>
> We recognize that world demands as well as those of our expanding populations mean that America must plan for the optimum production of foods and fibers from all suitable lands including those suitable for irrigation. We recognize that under the 1922 compact, there must be some such storage plan as that now proposed, if the upper basin States are to be able to make full beneficial use of the waters allotted to them.
>
> Moreover, we in the league are thoroughly convinced that the arid and semiarid West must have a complete water-conservation program that extends from the very ridgepole of the Continental Divide to the sea.

From his testimony, it is apparent that the league's opposition was against Echo Park Dam only, not against the entire project.

The National Parks Association also has supported this project—provided it did not include Echo Park Dam. Here is what the organization's executive secre-

tary, Fred M. Packard, had to say to the House committee last session:

The national conservation organizations have not opposed the upper Colorado River project, and have no desire to impede orderly development of the water resources of the Western States. They have objected unanimously to one aspect of the plans for this project, namely, the including of Echo Park and Split Mountain Dams proposed to be constructed within Dinosaur National Monument.

We urge that the desirability of authorizing now other dams outside the national monument be considered by this committee, dams that are not injurious to other significant values, and about which no serious controversies have arisen. We suggest to the people of Utah and Colorado that they support the proposed revision, not only because it is in the national interest, but also because they stand to gain from it. They can realize the maximum local benefits in water and power, and still have available the great resource of a magnificent national park system area as an attraction to people from all over the country. We have been assured by delegates to Congress from these States that they will welcome a practical alternative proposal that will safeguard the national monument. We have presented such a proposal, and hope it will be adopted, with such refinement as may be desirable, as being in the interest of the local economy as well as of the Nation.

We in the upper Colorado Basin States are not so naive as to think that attacks against this project will cease because of the deletion of Echo Park Dam. Southern California interests will continue to finance vast propaganda programs in order to prevent us in the intermountain area from using the water promised us by solemn compact in 1922. But we do expect the responsible, genuine conservation organizations who opposed Echo Park as an invasion of the national park system to come to our support. There is no conservation program as vital to the Nation as the conservation of our soil and water. This project does just that and provides that the Government will be reimbursed entirely for the money advanced.

I urge all Members of Congress to look through the specious cost figures being circulated in order to determine the cause and originators of the attack. It is no coincidence that opposition to reclamation such as is directed against the upper Colorado only comes when any project would use water that ultimately flows through California. Southern California would rather have the upper basin States go dry. They would continue the present situation whereby our water wastes into the sea because, in the course of its wasting, it turns turbines in the lower basin and subsidizes industry with power sold at dump rates.

A vote against the Colorado River project is a vote to waste water and to subsidize southern California industries. A vote for it is a vote to continue the development of an area whose mineral riches are responsible, in a large measure, for the wealth and strength of this Nation.

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. KLEIN] may be permitted to extend his remarks in the RECORD immediately following those of Mr. HARRIS of Arkansas.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. RICHARDS. 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 (S. 2090) to amend the Mutual Security Act of 1954, and for other purposes.

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 S. 2090, with Mr. TRIMBLE in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 20 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, the so-called mutual security bill before us authorizes the funds necessary to continue the mutual security program for another year. The total authorized is $3,285,800,000, which is $139,200,000 less than the amount requested by the executive branch. It exceeds the amount appropriated last year for the same purpose by $504,300,000.

This year I do not believe that it is necessary to take up the time of the Committee discussing why we have a mutual security program. This year I think it is readily apparent that the enormous investment which we have made in providing assistance to other nations is beginning to pay off. We can see signs in all areas of the world that this is true.

There are some members of our Committee on Foreign Affairs, who are just as conscientious as the majority of the committee, which reported out this bill by a vote of 20 to 4, who have filed a minority report. That they certainly had a right to do. I am sure that in their hearts, when they are against the foreign-aid program, as was shown by their vote last year, and their vote this year, and perhaps the year before last, they are just as conscientious as I am in the position they take. Although they do not agree with our position, I honor them for filing this minority report, even though I think it unfortunate that it comes from the minority side, which represents the administration of President Eisenhower in this great body.

I did not think the time would ever come when I would have to try to defend the President's mutual security program, not only to some few members of my own party, but to defend it from attacks and onslaughts of a very able and conscientious segment of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, who are Republicans.

There is another distinguished minority member of the committee who will be offering many amendments to this bill. He is a dear neighbor and friend of mine. I am sure he finds himself in a rather anomalous position. He will probably carry the ball for the administration on his side, yet will probably attempt to improve the bill by an amendment of his own. Though I love him and admire him, I am wondering how he is going to accomplish those two purposes and bring his aims together on any ground.

At the recent Conference at Bandung, we had a demonstration that the newer nations of the world, in spite of their deep-seated resentment against what they regard as the past injustices they have suffered at the hands of their recent colonial masters, nevertheless spoke out firmly, with courage and determination, against Soviet imperialism.

In Europe, after years of negotiation and frustration, a substantial and definitive step was taken to bring about a united defense organization in which national pride has been submerged in a common effort in order to meet the realities of the present world situation. The treaty establishing the Western European Union has been ratified, and today we can see France, Germany, Italy, Belgium, Luxembourg, and the Netherlands united to meet Soviet aggression as a single unit.

In our own hemisphere we have seen the people of Guatemala rise against the advocates of world communism and, with the firm backing of the other American Republics, throw out the Communists and reestablish democratic government.

We see today that there is a new party line for the foreign policy of the Soviet Union. I want to make clear that I believe it to be nothing more than a change in the party line. I am sure that the basic policies and intentions of the leaders in the Kremlin have not changed and that the danger to the free nations of the world has not diminished in any way. Nevertheless, it seems to me that the evidence is clear that the Soviet dictators have found the tide beginning to run against them throughout the world, so that they have decided that it is necessary for them to invoke new measures in their effort to stave off the inevitable disaster with which they are confronted.

I am sure that everyone understands that in spite of my optimistic remarks, I do not believe that we are yet out of the woods. The situations which I have cited are only indications; none of them is decisive in itself. The danger which confronts us is as great as ever, and the problems which we have to solve are challenging. The fact remains, however, that this year we can point to significant favorable results of the policy which we have continued so long and which has been so costly to us.

In previous years, in defending the mutual security legislation on the floor of the House, the primary argument in its support was merely that it made sense. Most people agree that the only argument the Soviet Union understands is strength; therefore, it is essential that the United States do all it can to build strength. It has been clear, also, that if the resources of Europe, Asia, and Africa were lost to the Soviet Union, the United States would be significantly weakened and the power of the Soviet Union would be very much greater as a

consequence. It made good sense also that the United States should have bases in various locations throughout the world from which defensive action against Soviet aggression could be taken. It has always been clear that we could not have such bases unless we had the organized support of the nations where the bases are located in carrying out a common effort. Further it has made good sense to have the forces of other nations organized, armed, and equipped in order to meet a Soviet attack. The only possible way of attaining this objective was for us to contribute substantially to this end.

As I have said, the logic of this argument has been stated many times and has been accepted by the overwhelming majority of the American people. This afternoon it is possible, however, to say that this logic has been put to the test in a number of important instances, and the results of these tests are favorable.

Mr. Chairman, I propose to devote most of my time this afternoon to certain questions which I am sure exist in the minds of many Members of the House in connection with this bill. I want to touch briefly on four principal matters: First, why are we authorizing more money this year than we last year appropriated? Second, why are we providing so much of what is commonly called economic aid? Third, why do we authorize so much new money when there is so much carryover? And, fourth, why do we give money to countries like Yugoslavia and India, who do not seem to be firmly committed to our side?

Let me begin with the fact that we are authorizing more money for fiscal 1956 than was appropriated for fiscal 1955. I think that, for more than any other reason, the answer is this. We have an enormous worldwide program under way which is beginning to pay off, and we want to keep it going. The important point is that the program is organized, and it is in operation. As a result, the choices as to its structure and its magnitude have already been made.

There is a certain analogy in considering the fuel requirements of a launch as compared to an ocean liner. There is no question but that the foreign-aid program we have is on the scale of an ocean liner rather than a motorboat. This fact limits our maneuverability. This year we have better evidence than ever before that the program we have developed is working. There are undoubtedly some who believe that it should have been developed on a motorboat scale. If we try today, however, to redesign and reconstruct the program in this way, it would mean cutting out major types of aid and leaving out major areas of the world.

Such a course would seem to be dangerous when the evidence we have points to the fact that the operation is working. One thing is very clear: an ocean liner has to have more fuel than a motorboat, or it won't run. There is nothing more futile than providing funds on a motorboat scale for this program.

I would like to remind the Members of the House in this connection that a foreign-aid program is a new development in the field of foreign policy. No country ever tried it before. The principles of foreign policy which our European ancestors developed over a period of centuries do not give us too much guidance as to how such a program should be run. We learn a little more how to do it each year. It is very possible that sometime in the future we will find that we have been spending millions to accomplish results that could have been accomplished with thousands. The fact remains that on the basis of what we know today, the present program is the best we know how to develop. We know further that it will not work unless we provide the funds necessary to keep it going.

One further point: I do not believe that there are many in this House or among the American people who believe that we can cut down on our foreign-aid program because the danger is diminishing so that we can relax. Personally, I have encountered no American who has any illusions about the significance of the present Soviet line. Evidence that this belief is supported by most Americans, I think, can be found in the fact that our national-defense appropriation for fiscal 1956 will be about $2 billion higher than it was last year. We all know that we must continue to strengthen our own military forces in spite of the peace talk that we hear everywhere. Those who believe, as I am sure most of us do, that the mutual-security program promotes the security of the United States, recognize the necessity of maintaining it while the danger continues.

Next I want to refer to the question of why there is so much of what people commonly refer to as economic aid in this bill. The actual authorization for military assistance for fiscal 1956 is $1,133,000,000. The total nonmilitary authorization is $2,152,800,000. It is not at all uncommon to hear the argument made that supplying guns and tanks to foreign countries seems to make a certain amount of sense but that economic aid is a giveaway program which cannot be justified.

In the first place, it is important to recognize that nonmilitary assistance includes several different elements. Some forms of so-called economic aid are directly connected with military assistance and the justification is very much the same. Consider the situation in Formosa and that in Spain. On the island of Formosa there is a large Chinese army which is too big for a country of that size to support. The demand which such an army makes on the economy of that country tends to distort the entire economic structure. As long as the United States regards Formosa as being of strategic importance to us, and as long as we regard the Chinese forces there as being worth maintaining, it is essential that we contribute to the support of the Formosan economy. We cannot have strong forces there if the general population is hungry or if there is widespread unemployment and discontent.

The situation in Spain is similar. The strategic importance of Spain to the United States is apparent to everyone. We have already embarked on a large-scale program for the construction of air and naval bases in that country. We are committed to strengthen the Spanish military forces. From an economic point of view, Spain is in a bad way. Spain is not rich in natural resources at best. Her capital equipment has run down continuously since the days of the Spanish revolution before the war. It is essential that aid be given to Spain for rebuilding transportation facilities, providing capital equipment, and improving the standard of living for that country if the United States military program in Spain is to be successful.

We are giving a very substantial amount of nonmilitary aid to countries which do not have military programs. We recognize, however, that these countries are important in the world struggle against communism. The danger in most of them, however, is not from armed attack. The problem in so many of the newer nations and underdeveloped areas of the world is that of subversion. The United States can never afford to forget that the Soviet leaders are the acknowledged masters of the techniques of conquest by infiltration and subversion. They prefer to make their conquests in that way. They are focusing their efforts in areas where there is unrest among people who believe that they have been unjustly denied the better things of life.

The United States has to recognize also that the Communists will always be able to talk better than we will. It is easy to make promises and it is easy to use slogans and arguments which have appeal when it is possible to disregard the truth. The only way we know of preventing the people in many parts of the world from viewing the situation entirely through Communist eyes is for us to demonstrate through our deeds primarily that there are better alternatives than those offered by Moscow.

A major reason why the nonmilitary aid is relatively large in the 1956 program is the shift of emphasis of the entire program from Europe toward Asia. Actually, the only nonmilitary aid planned for Europe in the year to come will go to Spain, Yugoslavia, the city of Berlin, and a small—$5 million—program of technical assistance for all Europe. None of the countries which originally participated in the Marshall plan are to receive any economic assistance at all. In Asia, on the other hand, we are attempting to provide all the direct military assistance that can possibly be used, but we recognize that in this area there is not yet a military structure in existence which can be built up and equipped on a large scale or in a short time. Our biggest problem, therefore, is that of subversion, and our major effort must be in the direction of helping people develop their own resources and raise their living standards.

I want next to devote a few minutes to the matter of carryover of funds and unexpended balances. The latest and best estimate that I have, and this was submitted only a few days ago, is that on June 30, next Thursday, there will be $8,717,100,000 unexpended of funds already appropriated for the mutual-security program. On this same date there will be a total of $670 million unob-

ligated and unreserved. These are enormous amounts and I can understand why the question is so often asked: Why then do we need more money?

Let me refer first to the matter of the unexpended balances. Of the total that I gave of eight-billion-seven-hundred-odd million dollars as being unexpended, $8 billion is already obligated or reserved. That means that $8 billion of this total has been committed already to pay for airplanes, tanks, and weapons which are on order. There is a further factor in the case of foreign-aid spending which is not present when the United States makes appropriations for its own procurement. This arises from the fact that this money is already programed and committed to other nations; that is, in our defense plans for Europe, Asia, and other parts of the world, we have told the individual countries that if they would raise so many divisions, build so many airfields, or train so many pilots, we would deliver to them so many items of equipment, so many planes, and so forth. I want to make clear that these are not legal commitments which it is impossible for us to get out of. All such agreements have been made with the understanding that United States action is subject to the will of Congress. I merely want to emphasize the point that the $8 billion that is unexpended but obligated has very definite strings attached to it, not only in terms of contracts and other arrangements with suppliers but also in terms of agreements with nations whose own defense plans are tied to the delivery of military equipment on schedule.

There is no question but that what nations actually will receive in the form of weapons, equipment, airplanes, and so forth will be financed almost entirely from these unexpended funds which I am talking about. Very few of the 1956 requirements will be financed with the funds authorized in this bill. Most of these funds go to supply nations after 1956. The best available indication of how these unexpended funds will be used is shown on page 11 of the committee report, where there is a short table showing the distribution of these funds by geographic areas. The total shown on that page is less than the one I have just given you because it is based on an earlier estimate.

Let me point out to the House that there is a good deal of dissatisfaction with the situation reflected by this $8 billion of unexpended funds. The Appropriations Committee, which knows much more about such matters than I do, has explored the matter rather thoroughly and is dissatisfied with what it has found. I believe it is generally agreed that an $8 billion unexpended balance is too large for this program, and the Committee on Foreign Affairs was informed by the Honorable Struve Hensel, Assistant Secretary of Defense, that this balance should and would be worked down to a lower level in the next year. I am aware also that the Appropriations Committee has required a number of changes in procedure to improve this situation which will undoubtedly be effective.

My point is that I am not able to defend the magnitude of the $8.7 billion unexpended balance figure. I have every reason to think it is too large.

I do say, however, that this $8 billion fund is not just lying in the bank waiting to be spent; it is pretty much already committed. I say further that if the mutual-security program is to continue to operate, we have to feed some new money into it each year. The Defense Department in submitting its request for funds to the committee did not bring in this year a long list of programs of guns, ammunition, tanks, and airplanes for individual countries; instead, the Defense Department recognized that the immediate requirements of the armed forces of these countries were already covered in these unexpended funds to which I have referred. The Defense Department did, however, point out that the United States has already entered into commitments with other governments, which require additional financing, and that current funds have to be authorized for training costs, administrative expenses, spare parts and maintenance.

The situation which confronted the committee and which confronts the Congress today is that we have an enormous military-aid program in the works. $8 billion has already been committed for this purpose. This $8 billion, however, has strings attached to it. In addition to this program that is already in the works, there are additional commitments that require funds. These commitments have been entered into with other nations as a result of their committing themselves to call up manpower, to build bases or permit us to build bases, and so forth. At the same time the United States must continue to supply substantial amounts of spare parts and maintenance equipment each year. The tanks, the planes, and the electronic equipment are for the most part only manufactured here, and it is unlikely that the spare parts and other equipment for these items will be obtainable for some years to come from any other source. In addition, the training costs and the administrative expenses of the program are financed on a year-to-year basis. The funds must be provided or the program stops.

The matter of the unobligated and unreserved balances presents a different problem. You will recall that I stated a moment ago that the latest estimate is that there will be $670 million of such unobligated funds.

When the committee began its consideration of the foreign-aid bill this year, we were told that the estimated unobligated balance at the end of the current fiscal year would be $100 million. Then about the middle of June after the Senate had included in its bill a limitation that no more than $200 million of unobligated balances could be carried over into fiscal 1956, we were informed that the unobligated balance would exceed $200 million so that the Senate requirement would involve a substantial cut in military funds. Finally, on June 21, the day before the Foreign Affairs Committee completed its markup of the present bill, we received word that the estimated unobligated balance on June 30 would be $670 million.

I am aware that there are certain technical reasons why this situation occurred. The rules governing the process of obligation of funds were changed this year by the appropriations legislation, and this has interfered with operations in the Pentagon. The Appropriations Committee knows all about the significance of these changes and is in a position to make the necessary adjustments when it passes on the appropriation for this program.

I do know this, however, that if we had known when our basic work on the military aid authorization was being done that over $600 million of unobligated funds were going to be carried over into fiscal 1956, our authorizations would have been different. Consequently the committee has retained the Senate amendment limiting the unobligated carryover to $200 million, since it was impossible for us to redo our work in the light of the new evidence that came to us at the very end of our consideration of the bill.

We must not lose sight, however, of the fact that we have a going program in operation. Each year we have to put in some new money in spite of the fact that there is old money in the pipeline. The authorization in this bill has been carefully considered and represents the best judgment which the committee could make as to what the proper amount this year should be.

Perhaps the most troublesome aspect of this bill to many people is the fact that it authorizes assistance to Yugoslavia and to India. I suppose that every Member of this House has asked himself why we should continue to supply assistance to these countries when their leaders perform as they do.

The answer is a simple one. The only objective that the United States has toward each of these countries is that it remain free. Neither country is in a position to do very much for the United States. If either of them applied for statehood, we would in all probability regard it as a liability rather than an asset. Their resources are limited; their standard of living is low. It is not nearly as important to us that they join anything as that they refrain from joining with the Soviet Union or falling under its influence.

In the case of Yugoslavia, we have to recognize that it occupies an important strategic location from a military point of view. If that country were occupied by Soviet forces, the defense of Italy, Greece and Austria would be much more difficult than otherwise. We have to consider also that Yugoslavia has a very great symbolic significance, particularly to the other Balkan nations which now lie behind the Iron Curtain. The fact that Marshal Tito has been able to follow a course of defection and get away with it gives constant encouragement to dissident elements in those countries which may some day bear fruit.

I believe that Marshal Tito in merely following his own selfish interests will take action that will benefit the United States. If he is ready to defend his country against invasion to the last man, it

seems to me that that is all we could ask him to do. I would like to point out, moreover, that in all probability he knows too much about the Soviet Union, its policies and its techniques of subversion to join up again with them. What has he to gain? I do not believe that he wants to invite the Soviet spies, saboteurs and assassins back into his country. He knows from first-hand experience that Russia is not a land of milk and honey, where great economic benefits will automatically flow to his nation if he casts his lot with the Soviet Union. It seems clear to me that Tito will definitely be better off if he remains independent, and it is clear to me that he needs United States aid if he is to do so.

I want to make it clear that I am not in any way endorsing the Tito regime or the way in which our own aid program has been administered in Yugoslavia. I wholeheartedly concur in this statement, contained in the committee report:

The committee gave special consideration to the situation in Yugoslavia and explored carefully the question of continuing assistance to that country. The committee reached the conclusion that no specific limitations should be imposed on the supplying of aid to that country. Testimony disclosed, however, that the Yugoslav Government has not been fully cooperative in carrying out the requirement of the Mutual Security Act that United States representatives be permitted "continuous observation and review" of the use made of equipment supplied by the United States.

The provisions of the law are clear in this respect and the committee believes that United States officials responsible for the administration of the mutual assistance program have not been sufficiently insistent that the Government of Yugoslavia live up to the terms of its agreements. The committee has refrained from including in the bill legislative restrictions on further assistance to Yugoslavia only because it is confident that henceforth the letter and the spirit of the law will be carefully observed.

Now in reference to India, let me say that I believe that Mr. Nehru and the overwhelming majority of the people of India want to remain free. I dislike Nehru's talk and actions as much as anyone can. During my service at the United Nations 2 years ago I was in daily contact with Mr. Krishna Menon, who is one of Mr. Nehru's principal advisers. Mr. Menon deliberately opposed and insulted the United States whenever possible, and never failed to support the proposals of the Soviet Union. Nevertheless, I am convinced that Menon does not speak for the majority of officials and the rank and file of India. I do not believe that Nehru plans to lead his country into the Communist camp.

The danger in India is subversion. The opportunity for subversion will come if that country fails to bring better things to its people. It has been possible for many years for the people of India to blame their unfortunate lot upon the British. Now the British are gone. They are finding that the task of raising the standard of living of the masses of that very large country is enormously difficult and complex. If they cannot show results, the people of India will have the strongest incentive to listen to the voice of Moscow as pointing the way to the attainment of the things which they desire.

I believe it is in our interest to help. We may be better off if Nehru prefers not to ally himself with us or enter into other formal commitments to us. The important thing is that India does not fall under Russian domination.

Mr. Chairman, let me remind you in closing the situation which confronts us. I concede that this authorization involves a large sum of money and that it imposes a very heavy burden on the American people. Let us keep in mind that the United States has appropriated since the war $344 billion for our own defense.

The United States military expenditures alone for World War II were $290 billion. One unofficial estimate from the Pentagon places as the military cost to the United States of the Korean war at $18 billion.

Everyone here will agree that the $50 billion we have spent on foreign aid since World War II will not have been wasted if it prevents world war III. As we meet this afternoon we can see scattered indications that the program is beginning to produce the results which its advocates have always anticipated.

Let us not do anything today which may prevent the program from working as it should.

Now in general terms that is the program. As we go along there will be some differences of opinion, but I am confident this House in the long run will not seriously hurt this bill.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICHARDS. I yield.

Mr. GROSS. First I want to commend the gentleman for the wise choice of words that he used in his opening remarks when he called this "so-called mutual-security bill." I appreciate the so-called mutual security.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from South Carolina has again expired.

Mr. RICHARDS. I yield myself 2 additional minutes.

It has been called the Marshall plan, mutual security, foreign aid—I do not care what the gentleman likes best. I like to satisfy the gentleman.

Mr. GROSS. I do not like any of those sugar-coated titles. The gentleman can have them.

Mr. RICHARDS. I know you do not.

Mr. GROSS. I have been troubled about this direct forces support, military assistance, economic aid, and so on. Will you tell us how you separate economic aid from defense support or direct forces support?

Mr. RICHARDS. I tried to do that. Military assistance as such is the end item, such as guns and munitions that the Army has to have. Direct forces support goes directly to the armed services of the recipient countries and includes gasoline, copper for shells, machinery for government arsenals and so forth. Defense support is economic aid to keep up the military establishments, which cannot afford to use so much of their manpower and capital for defense if they did not have our help.

Mr. GROSS. Then, what is economic aid? Where does that fit into the picture?

Mr. RICHARDS. All of that is economic aid.

Mr. GROSS. That is what I thought.

Mr. RICHARDS. It is economic aid, but it has an entirely different purpose than the Marshall plan originally had. The program started as a recovery program. It is now a defense program. Everyone agrees that Europe has recovered. The trouble with Europe now is that without our help in a few countries their defense effort would decline.

There is old-fashioned economic aid for Asia and Africa in the boon of development assistance. These countries do not have defense programs, but we give aid to try to keep the Communists from taking them over.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICHARDS. I yield.

Mr. JUDD. As a matter of fact, is not the truth the reverse of what the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS] said? Practically all of it used to come in under the heading of economic aid. Now it is broken down into different categories so that nothing will be disguised. It is more specific under the present bill than before.

Mr. RICHARDS. That is right. We use these terms to avoid fooling anybody.

Mr. GROSS. But under "defense support" you are fooling or misleading again.

Mr. JUDD. No. It is aid that goes to a country to enable it to support the military establishment, which our own military people believe that country must have if it is to make its full contribution to our mutual defense.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has again expired.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count. [After counting.] One hundred and one Members are present, a quorum.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 15 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio is recognized.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, this is a foreign policy bill. It does not appropriate a dime, but determines policies. We will have an appropriation bill on this program in a few days, when we can decide on how much money to spend on these policies.

This is the bill where the House has its chance to implement the foreign policies of President Eisenhower or to wreck them.

I think before we get into the details of this bill a general review of what it is about might be helpful.

This bill carries forward the law that last year replaced 14 different acts, but this is still a package bill that covers all of the programs and policies that were in those acts, covers all areas of the world and involves our relations with the United Nations and with regional organizations such as NATO, the Organization of American States in the Western Hemisphere, the Southeast Asia

Treaty Organization in Asia; it covers the whole world.

There has been talk about how much of it is economic aid. Let us remember that as far as the United States taxpayer is concerned all of it is economic aid, the whole $3,285,000,000 is economic dollars. It is true that $1,133,000,000 is spent for military hardware and training.

It is true that $2,472,000,000 is spent in support of military purposes. But if you want to fuss about words, all of it is economic aid, but you should also remember that all of it is needed because of the security interests of the United States.

To show what I mean by saying that military aid is dollar aid, consider the reimbursable military aid provided in this program. Up to April 30, $843 million in military weapons have been purchased from us. Canada, for instance, pays for all the weapons she obtains from us. If this reimbursable aid program could be expanded further we might get the weapons where we need them for mutual security without having to bear the dollar burden. Most of the countries, however, cannot afford to buy all the weapons they need. Hence they need dollar aid from us in obtaining these weapons.

In this bill, our target is a program for the whole world; and we are aiming at a moving target, because the world situation is changing all the time. The figures we get in committee are out of date before we can bring them to the floor because the program is going on all the time, deliveries are being made, plans are being changed to meet events, and it will continue to go on unless and until we falter or fail.

It is interesting that under the Republican administration this statutory consolidation has taken place of the various parts of our foreign-aid program. I will speak a little later about the change in organization that has taken place.

It is also interesting and somewhat gratifying to me that the Republicans have been in power for 3 years and if we compare the previous 3 years of the Democratic administration beginning with fiscal 1952, we will find that the last 3 years of this program under Democratic administration involved appropriations to the extent of $21,271,300,000. In the 3 years under the Republican administration the appropriations, including this present authorization, will total $10,598,800,000, or a little less than half of the previous 3-year period. We are trying to get this thing down to size.

Here are the figures:

Fiscal year:	
1951	$7,940,500,000
1952	7,328,900,000
1953	6,001,900,000
Total	21,271,300,000
Fiscal year:	
1954	4,531,500,000
1955	2,781,500,000
1956	3,285,800,000
Total	10,598,800,000

Our committee felt it was unnecessary to attempt to reevaluate the fundamental principles involved in this program. However, my beloved brethren and sistern in their minority views made some statements that cause me to think that perhaps some reevaluation is needed.

They say:

> This bill demonstrates a shocking lack of confidence in the fundamental principles which have made this Nation great.

They also say:

> In the past we have urged what to us has seemed natural and logical—a thorough study, a reappraisal, a redefining of foreign policies, techniques and statutes concerned with the goal of international peace and security, which we all seek.

They also say:

> The executive branch has not seen fit to do this before submitting this bill to the Congress.

In the hearings you will find the brilliant reevaluation of the program by Secretary Dulles, and a complete reevaluation by many other executive witnesses. Let me call your attention, however, to the message of the President of the United States sent up here on April 20, 1955. It is an interesting document because it states fundamental principles that have made our Nation great. It is not in the hearings or in the report because it has been distributed to every Member and is in the RECORD, but it is available at the table and in your offices.

Here is what the President said in his reevaluation of the fundamentals:

> I consider the program an indispensable part of a realistic and enlightened national policy.
>
> The fixed, unwavering objective of that policy is a just, prosperous, enduring peace. On this fundamental position we base our broad approach toward our world trade, our military alliances, our exchange of information and of persons, our partnership with free nations through the mutual-security program. This partnership is rooted in the facts of economic and defense interdependence and also in the understanding and respect of each partner for the cultural and national aspirations of the other.

Then the President proceeded to a "study, reappraisal, and redefining of our policies, techniques, and statutes" in every area of the world.

Toward the end of his message the President had this to say:

> The other free nations need the United States, and we need them, if all are to be secure. Here is a clear case of interwoven self-interest. The necessary expenditures to equip and maintain United States Armed Forces of air and land and sea at strategic points beyond our borders are never called aid. The necessary expenditures to enable other free nations associated with us to equip and maintain vital armed forces at these same strategic points beyond our borders should not be considered as aid. These, in fact, are defense-alliance expenditures clearly safeguarding in the most desirable manner, and at times in the only possible way, the security of the United States and of other free nations.

Mr. Chairman, we also had before us Admiral Radford, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs. We asked him about the security features of this bill.

Let me say in passing that we are in a very warm stage of the cold war. Recently an American was shot down off the coast of Alaska. Yesterday an American officer was in a plane shot down near Matsu by a plane reported to have had a Russian pilot. In December I flew high over Hokkaido in northern Japan and could see the Kurile Islands airstrip at Tofutsu which the Soviet MIG's used when they shot down an American B-29 over Japan. This is a rather hot cold war. Admiral Radford, appearing before us, said, page 239 of the hearings:

> First of all, I would like to state that the military-aid program is part and parcel of the United States Defense Department program. The expenditures abroad in support of our alliances do not differ in purpose, scope, or objective from our own military expenditures. The fact that this part of our program is not included in the Defense Department budget is more a matter of procedure and administration than of substance.
>
> In this connection, I can assure you that were it not for the strength which has been generated in the past 5 years by our allies and in most instances made possible by our aid programs, the requirements of our own programs would be much larger.

Then I asked him about where these forces were placed, and I commend Admiral Radford's full statement for your consideration. I said to Admiral Radford—see page 243 of the hearings:

> Mr. VORYS. As I get it, if these forces are placed where we think they should be, we help equip them as we think they should be equipped, and thus they contribute to our security?
>
> Admiral RADFORD. That is correct.

What about the economy to us of this sort of aid, call it military or not, which we furnish to our allies? Well, the cost of maintaining an average United States serviceman is $5,900 a year, consisting of personnel cost, $3,200, maintenance and operation $2,700 per man, and excluding the cost of equipment, new construction, cost of items for Reserve components, and other items. The cost of an American abroad in the place where our security demands forces is $5,900 a year without a gun in his hand. The cost to the United States taxpayer of a foreign serviceman as paid for in this bill is $747 per serviceman. This means that we have someone placed where it is important in our security and armed, for a cost of $747 per year, whereas it costs us to put one of our men there $5,900 a year without a weapon in his hands.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VORYS. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. It has been my privilege to visit almost every single military assistance group in the world. It started in 1950 and has continued almost up to the present time. And, I got a good impression of what those groups were doing; that they were really doing something for America. I would like to have the gentleman's appraisal: Does he think those groups are worth while and are they affording protection for the United States in our effort to bring about a peaceful world?

Mr. VORYS. They certainly are, and they are located in strategic places all over the world, surrounding our possible enemies.

Now, I mentioned that an organizational change was taking place. Next Thursday, June 30, FOA goes out of existence as an independent organization and goes into the State Department under Hon. John B. Hollister, from Cincinnati, Ohio, former law partner of our beloved Senator Taft, a man who served with President Hoover in overseas work and who has served as the executive officer of the Hoover task forces in their most recent studies. He is, of course, giving the whole program a new look. We found throughout the hearings that in the Defense Department they are giving the military program a new look. The joint force goals are being reviewed to see whether they are realistic in view of the present situation. I think, therefore, we can feel safe in going ahead with this program. It is in the process of being made increasingly realistic and effective.

Now, it has been mentioned that I am particularly interested in the matter of having as much of this program as possible in the form of loans. That is true.

Everyone agrees that our foreign aid should not be a mere "giveaway" program; that we should plan to get value received in one way or another, for whatever we do. There is general theoretical agreement with the proposal that our economic-aid program should emphasize loans rather than grants, wherever possible. There is disagreement as to the best way to carry this out in practice.

Experience shows that the tendency will be to make grants, not loans, in administration. It is argued that a percentage limitation militates against the placement of a greater percentage of loans. The record does not sustain this argument, for wherever loans have been permitted but not required, few or none have been made. It is said that a percentage figure is interpreted by would-be recipients as a maximum loan figure, rather than a minimum. If our officials accept the interpretation of our laws made by other countries, rather than their own, Congress can correct this. If a minimum percentage figure is inconvenient administratively, a minimum fixed amount can be used. Both types of minimum requirements were made by Congress last year. A 30-percent requirement in title II—section 201—on development assistance, and an overall requirement of not less than $200 million in loans—section 505. Neither of these requirements will apply to the amounts authorized in the committee bill this year. There is a requirement that 50 percent of the new $200 million Asian development fund be in loans—section 4187. This year's bill authorizes more economic aid than last year's appropriation. Thus, as economic aid goes up, required loans go down. I believe this tendency should be reversed.

THE RANDALL COMMISSION

My recommendations follow those of the Randall Commission, of which I was a member. This Commission studied and reported on the general possibilities of "Trade, Not Aid," and recommended that trade be increased, and economic aid decreased. Its recommendations as to trade have been generally accepted and acted upon by the administration and Congress. Its recommendations as to aid have apparently been forgotten.

The Randall report said:

The Commission recommends that economic aid on a grant basis should be terminated as soon as possible.

In cases where our security is importantly involved, the Commission believes that moderate grants-in-aid may serve the national interest of the United States.

The Commission recommends further that where support is needed to maintain military forces to conduct military operations connected with our own security beyond the economic capacity of a country to sustain, grants should be made, not loans. In other cases where substantial economic aid is necessary in the interest of the United States but cannot be obtained from private or international sources, loans should be made, not grants.

The President endorsed these recommendations of the Randall Commission in his message to the Congress on foreign economic policy of the United States last year, as follows:

I subscribe, therefore, to the principle that economic aid on a grant basis should be terminated as soon as possible, consistent with our national interest. In cases where support is needed to establish and equip military forces of other governments in the interest of our mutual defense, and where this is beyond the economic capacity of another country, our aid should be in the form of grants. As recognized by the Commission, there may be some cases in which modest amounts of grant aid to underdeveloped countries will importantly serve the interest of security. I further agree that in other situations where the interest of the United States requires that dollars not otherwise available to a country should be provided, such support to the maximum extent appropriate should be in the form of loans rather than grants.

GOVERNMENT FOREIGN LOANS

It is often said that Government loans are the same as gifts, that they are never repaid, and always create hard feelings. Our postwar experience does not bear this out. Here is the record, according to Department of Commerce figures:

Postwar loans by the United States to foreign countries

Total credits	$14,147,769,000
Total principal collected	3,176,216,000
Total interest collected	1,331,284,000
Total	4,507,500,000

Congress has required a series of loans in aid bills, largely through provisions originating in our committee. All of them were opposed by the executive branch. None of them were refused by the executive branch. All of the loans were accepted in other countries. None of the loans have been defaulted by any government. None of them have caused hard feelings.

Here is the series:

Loans required under ECA, MSA, and India wheat loan

Original ECA Act (Public Law 472, 80th Cong.)	$1,000,000,000
Loan to Spain (Public Law 759, 81st Cong.)	62,500,000
India Emergency Food Act of 1951 (Public Law 48, 82d Cong.)	190,000,000

Loans required under ECA, MSA, and India wheat loans—Continued

Mutual Security Act of 1951 (Public Law 165, 82d Cong.) (10 percent of ECA assistance)	$335,547,000
Mutual Security Act of 1954 (Public Law 665, 83d Cong.)	[1] 200,000,000
Total	1,788,047,000

[1] Loans of $194,500,000 have already been made under this requirement. Negotiations now in progress are expected to bring the total to the required amount.

Here is the status of the loans under the mutual-security program as of December 31, 1954:

	Amount authorized	Interest collected	Principal repaid
Asia and Pacific	$16,500,000	$375,000	
Europe	1,419,047,000	70,897,000	$278,000
Indian wheat	190,000,000	11,769,000	
Spanish loan	62,476,000	3,045,000	
Deficiency materials	177,201,000	4,642,000	24,631,000
Total	1,865,224,000	90,728,000	24,909,000

In 1948, when Congress enacted the first of the above loan requirements, by requiring $1 billion of the Marshall plan money to be in loans, there were executive protests. We were told that these were "fuzzy" loans, Europe was "all loaned up," and that these aid loans would overburden the economies of the recipient countries. Now that Europe has recovered so phenomenally with Marshall plan help, does anyone hear complaints that recovery was delayed by these loans? Is anyone claiming that these loans will never be repaid?

Last year, the executive position was that only $100 million of the program should be in loans. Congress required $200 million overall minimum and 30 percent of development assistance. The required minimums have all been loaned. No one is claiming that this crippled the program.

PROSPECT OF REPAYMENT

The above record, showing over $4.5 billion collected on postwar loans, including over $115 million on aid loans, would indicate that there is considerable prospect of repayment of these loans.

The Hoover Commission, in its report to Congress in May on overseas economic operations, said—recommendation 2 (f):

Wherever assistance is necessary and there is no prospect of repayment of a loan the assistance should be in the form of an outright grant.

There will be general agreement on this, but who decides whether there is "prospect for repayment"? Bankers? Must aid loans be "bankable" loans?

In this country our Government has loaned billions to its citizens on projects that were not bankable. During the depression thousands of homes, farms, and businesses were saved in this way and the loans have been repaid, although "prospects for repayment" looked dim for a while.

The policy of making foreign-aid loans was first suggested to me by remarks of former President Hoover in 1947, after he had finished his survey of relief needs

for President Truman. He urged that we should not make outright gifts of our aid, but should always require an obligation from the recipient. He first suggested the counterpart device, which was written into a relief bill on the floor, over administration opposition, and has been extremely useful ever since. As to loans, he pointed out that, even though "prospect for repayment" was not bright, there were two great psychological differences between loans and grants: First, a person asking for a loan tries to make his proposition as good as possible, but someone asking for a grant tries to make his condition look as bad as possible, so he will not be asked to repay; second, a person asking for a loan knows that he might have to repay it, and therefore asks for as little as possible, whereas someone asking for a grant asks for as much as possible.

Experience since then has shown that this same psychology applies to nations, and that nations, like individuals, tend to repay nonbankable loans.

DEVELOPMENT ASSISTANCE

In recent years we have started a new type of assistance, which is not relief, not military aid, not for war recovery, not mere technical assistance. Development assistance means substantial economic aid to nations with which we have no mutual-security agreements. Congress provided last year that 30 percent of such assistance should be in loans, and should end on June 30, 1955. Instead of winding up, $382 million of such assistance is in this bill as follows: In title II, section 201, development assistance, $182 million; in title IV, section 418, President's fund for Asian development, $200 million.

The definition of "development assistance" is broad, the limitations are few, but, in general, the idea is that we help undeveloped countries to develop as free countries, raise their standards of living, develop their resources. They have among their resources vast amounts of critical and strategic materials.

On the other hand, we are rapidly becoming a have-not country in natural resources, especially in critical or strategic materials, as shown time and again in our hearings this year.

If we furnish development assistance in loans repayable, not next year but over 10, 20, or 30 years, we will be helping these countries when they need help, and they can pay us back when we need help, in raw materials from the resources we helped them develop.

Mr. WINSTEAD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VORYS. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. WINSTEAD. If I understood the gentleman correctly, the gentleman showed figures there for the expenditure of military personnel in some of the other countries amounting to about one-fifth of what it would be in this country to maintain a soldier.

Mr. VORYS. Yes; I think less than that.

Mr. WINSTEAD. Per soldier in the foreign country, as compared with the cost of maintaining one in this country?

Mr. VORYS. Yes.

Mr. MORANO. It is about one-seventh.

Mr. VORYS. It is about one-eighth. If the gentleman will refer to page 243 he will see that the average cost ratio is approximately 8 to 1.

Mr. WINSTEAD. Eight to one. And is it not true that 1 American soldier would be worth 100 of most of those the gentleman talks about? This argument is used on the floor of this House year after year to show that this foreign-aid program is largely a military program for the security of this country.

Mr. VORYS. I think that in all modesty and realism we should appreciate that while we feel the American soldier is the best in the world, those of us who in various wars have fought against some of our opponents have found that there are some mighty good men in other forces. Those who fought recently in Korea had the highest praise for the individual ROK.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. ZABLOCKI].

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Chairman, I wish to join the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs [Mr. RICHARDS] and my colleagues of the committee in urging speedy and favorable action on the mutual security legislation before us. I want to reassure the House that the legislation has received thorough and conscientious study in our committee. Each section of the bill has been gone over carefully and every effort has been made to eliminate all expenditures and other provisions which are not of vital importance to the program. The committee worked on this bill many days and stayed late in session, several days into the late hours of the night.

We earnestly believe that the resultant piece of legislation is sound and conservative. There will be many arguments made that we ought to discontinue aid in some areas of the world. Amendments no doubt will be offered to discontinue the $200 million authorization for the President's Special Fund, as well as the continuance of aid to India.

I should like to refer the Members of the House to the committee report, because I think in the report we state more adequately, more concisely, why assistance should be continued to India, and why the $200 million authorization fund for Asia, the President's Special Fund, should be approved.

On page 19 of the report we find this committee statement:

> Before the committee reached a decision on further assistance to India, it carefully considered the effects of such assistance not alone on India but in the larger context of our Asian policy. It is clear that India's foreign policy is often divergent from that which the United States pursues. The committee believes that neutral or even hostile expressions by Indian Government leaders must not obscure the fact that our stake is in the preservation of the Indian subcontinent as an independent state.

Mr. GAVIN. 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. 101]

Barden	Green, Pa.	Moulder
Bass, N. H.	Gubser	Mumma
Bell	Holt	O'Konski
Bolton, Oliver P.	Horan	Polk
Boykin	Jackson	Powell
Buckley	James	Prouty
Burdick	Kearney	Quigley
Canfield	Kearns	Reece, Tenn.
Celler	Keating	Reed, Ill.
Chatham	Kilburn	Reed, N. Y.
Clevenger	Knox	Rivers
Cooley	Knutson	St. George
Davis, Tenn.	McDowell	Scherer
Dingell	McGregor	Simpson, Pa.
Doyle	McMillan	Thomson, Wyo.
Eberharter	Mack, Ill.	Vursell
Ellsworth	Mason	Wharton
Frelinghuysen	Meader	Wier
	Morrison	Wilson, Calif.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. COOPER, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee having had under consideration the bill, S. 2090, and finding itself without a quorum, he had directed the roll to be called when 377 Members responded to their names, a quorum, and he submitted herewith the names of the absentees to be spread upon the Journal.

The Committee resumed its sitting.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Chairman, I repeat that the Committee on Foreign Affairs, anticipating the opposition to continuation of assistance to India and opposition to the President's special fund of $200 million for the Asiatic area, made a careful study as to what effect such assistance will have.

Just before the point of order, I called to the attention of the membership to page 19, of the report of our Committee on Foreign Affairs, wherein the committee further stated that it believes that our assistance to India as elsewhere in the free world is directed toward strengthening the democratic base of government.

Mr. SIEMINSKI. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ZABLOCKI. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. SIEMINSKI. Has the gentleman read the editorial in today's Washington Post and Times Herald entitled "Our Independent Friends"?

Mr. ZABLOCKI. It has been called to my attention; yes.

Mr. SIEMINSKI. I think it is a splendid editorial. It commends the Committee on Foreign Affairs for its judgment in clarifying the criticism on Yugoslavia and India, and it is my intention at the proper time to ask unanimous consent to have the editorial appear at this point in the RECORD:

OUR INDEPENDENT FRIENDS

> The House Foreign Affairs Committee used good judgment in qualifying its criticism of Yugoslavia in the report on the foreign aid bill. Deliberate attempts to frustrate full observation of the use of American military equipment of course must be called to account. But it is the feeling of some

American experts that any lack of cooperation by Yugoslavia has been more the fault of bureaucratic indifference in lower echelons than of conscious policy. The House committee refrained from writing restrictions into the bill because it is "confident that henceforth the letter and the spirit of the law will be carefully observed."

This is a proper response. The United States has every right to insist that it know what is done with the military equipment it furnishes. At the same time, some caution on the part of Yugoslavia is at least understandable. One reason for the 1948 break with the Soviet Union was the degree of control the Russians tried to exercise over the Yugoslav army. It is not illogical that the Yugoslavs should be wary of anything that might smack of similar control by the United States. Of course that is not our intention; but suspicion and misunderstandings may easily arise.

Fortunately, Yugoslav officials reportedly have been anxious to remedy individual complaints. So long as this attitude exists aid to Yugoslavia is a good risk. The reason the United States undertook aid in the first place was not because it approved of Yugoslavia's political or economic system, but because Yugoslav independence from the Soviet bloc and willingness to fight against any Soviet aggression serve the free world cause.

The same basic consideration governs economic assistance to India which the committee also approved in full. The committee wisely avoided making agreement the test of aid. It recognized that although Indian foreign policy often is widely divergent from American policy, "neutral or even hostile expressions by Indian government leaders must not obscure the fact that our stake is in the preservation of the Indian subcontinent as an independent state." What is essential is to help the democratic base of government succeed.

This is an enlightened formula. Relations between India and the United States are improving as each country comes to respect more the other's individualism and motivations. Misgivings over Prime Minister Nehru's statements in Moscow—which, by the way, were a good bit more restrained than they might have been—ought not to cloud the basic point. An independent India and an independent Yugoslavia determined to remain that way meet the essential test for aid. We hope the full House will show similar understanding and forbearance when it votes on the aid bill this week.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. I thank the gentleman.

We must remember that India is a country adjacent to China, and though its leaders may not entirely follow the policy that we would like them to follow, nevertheless, if India fails, so much more important will Communist China appear to the other countries in that area of the world. I do hope, therefore, that those who are opposing assistance to some of the countries in that area of the world will carefully read the committee's report.

As was so adequately pointed out by our esteemed chairman of the committee the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RICHARDS] and the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VORYS], the mutual security authorization proposed in this bill is smaller than any considered by this House during the past 10 years, yet it is a very vital authorization because it will bring us more in terms of national security and economic well-being than a similar amount spent for any other purpose.

The principles on which the mutual security program is based have been studied, reviewed, and approved by this House on a number of previous occasions, and these very principles are embodied in the bill before us. They may be summarized in a very few words.

Through the mutual security program we solidify and strengthen our collective defense against aggression, against war. Through this program we bring modern weapons and training to the armed forces of our allies.

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ZABLOCKI. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. O'NEILL. I would like to inquire of the gentleman if in this bill there is any aid for the Peron government of Argentina. If there is, I hope to offer an amendment to strike it out. Could we spell into the RECORD whether or not there is any aid in this bill for Argentina?

Mr. ZABLOCKI. I can assure the gentleman there is no aid for Argentina, military defense support or economic.

Mr. O'NEILL. How about under title 3, economic aid?

Mr. ZABLOCKI. I just mentioned that there is not.

Mr. O'NEILL. Is there any possible way under title 1 in which Argentina would secure aid under this bill?

Mr. ZABLOCKI. It is my understanding that there is not.

Mr. O'NEILL. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. There are over 30 nations with which we have mutual defense agreements. We thereby secure, for mutual defense, the strength of those nations determined to resist any totalitarian onslaught.

In addition, we safeguard our bases in friendly countries located thousands of miles from our shores. In the age of the guided missile, of the jet plane, and of nuclear weapons, the value of these overseas bases cannot be overestimated.

Finally, through the mutual security program we promote the economic strength of our own Nation, and of the friendly nations whose well-being and stability are of vital importance to us. Through this program, we assure a flow of resources essential to our economy, and to our Military Establishments. We must remember that we are dependent on imports for 100 percent of our natural rubber, 100 percent of our tin, 99 percent of our chromite, 95 percent of our manganese, 72 percent of our tungsten, and for many other vital natural resources.

These advantages accrue to us for a small fraction of what it would cost us to provide an equivalent degree of security by building up our own armies, our own resources. This is an important point that we must bear in mind. Through this program, we obtain, at small cost, a great degree of security.

This is an important point that we must bear in mind, that we are dependent upon other countries of the world; that we are not self-sustaining and we are not self-sufficient in many of these items, and through this program, therefore, we obtain at a small cost a great deal of security. For these reasons, I earnestly hope that this bill will receive the careful consideration and the approval of this body.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has again expired.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the distinguished chairman of our committee, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CHIPERFIELD].

Mr. CHIPERFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I favor the passage of S. 2090, a bill to amend the Mutual Security Act of 1954. The purpose of this bill is to continue the mutual-security program for another year. I believe we must do this.

There are indications that the mutual-security program and other related programs of our foreign policy are beginning to pay dividends.

In Europe the Western European Union is an accomplished fact. This includes an armed Western Germany which together with the other countries of the Union greatly strengthens the defense of Western Europe. The Austrian Treaty is also a reality. Military arrangements have been made with Spain. In general, economic conditions in Europe have improved and strong defense forces have been established.

In the Near East new stability has been created in Iran and Egypt. There are military alliances between Pakistan, Turkey, and Greece which strengthens the defense of that area.

In the Far East there is an uneasy peace in Korea, Indochina, and the Formosa area. SEATO has also been created establishing a military alliance against aggression of the southeast Asian countries; also we have a treaty with Japan and a military alliance with Formosa. At the Bandung Conferences the free peoples of the Far East did not fall for the Communist line.

Guatemala has thrown out the Communist regime in Central America.

All these accomplishments and others have apparently forced Russia to realize the strong deterrent we have set up to resist aggression and bring about peace. This has caused the Communists, at least on the surface, to change their line of propaganda and methods.

We all know the meetings of the Big Four at the summit are to take place in a very short time. Our programs are apparently paying off now and this crucial period is no time to ease up on them. Exactly the reverse is true. We must continue the initiative we have gained and remain firm. At this critical time if we do not continue these affirmative programs it might reflect on the success or failure of the coming conferences. We must strengthen the hand of the President and Secretary Dulles at these meetings. The best way to do it is to pass this bill intact.

In this bill 39.6 percent is provided for the military defense assistance program, 9 percent for direct forces support, 28.3 percent for defense support, 4.7 percent for development assistance, 4.9 percent for technical cooperation, 5.7 percent for the President's fund for Asian economic development, 2.8 percent for the Presi-

dent's contingency fund, and 5 percent for other purposes.

When you exclude the military items, the greatest part of our aid will be allocated to Asia, 68.1 percent. Latin America would receive 2.5 percent, Europe 4.5 percent, Near East and Africa 14.5 percent, and nonregional areas 10.4 percent.

So the two large items are for military defense and economic aid. The latter is primarily for Asia and the Near East.

The military assistance in this bill was reduced by $145 million. This in my opinion is justified because the bill contains an unallocated item for a similar amount which is simply a reserve fund set up for contingencies.

We have also increased the aid to Spain by $22 million to facilitate her effort in constructing United States military bases in that strategic country.

We also provided that Greece should have the same amount in defense support as she had in 1955. This should enable her to keep her army at a level commensurate with NATO goals.

In Latin America we provided a fund of $15 million to Guatemala to meet acute economic problems faced by the new anti-Communist government. This will enable Guatemala to get back to normalcy after the disastrous Communist regime.

I believe we should not cut aid at this time to Yugoslavia although I certainly do not agree with some of the actions of that government. In the committee report we warned that continued aid to Yugoslavia could not continue indefinitely until we had the full cooperation of that government to permit full inspection of the aid we are giving them. A conference to accomplish this result has just been completed and indications are that compliance with our conditions will be met.

Certainly we of the free world do not believe in neutralists. On the other hand such a large country as India must not be driven into the hands of the Communists. The aid which we are giving to keep India on our side is of a negligible character compared to what we have at stake.

In my opinion if loan provisions are placed in this bill rather than grants they should be on a flexible basis so the administration can adjust its program to meet the varying conditions in the countries with which they are negotiating. Certainly I hope the administration will make loans rather than grants wherever possible.

The contingent fund the President is requesting for the Far East seems reasonable. The fluid conditions in those countries are changing rapidly and it would be unwise to try to work out a rigid program at this time. It would be much more to our interest to permit the President to meet emergency situations as they arise.

I have on previous occasions indicated I feel the point 4 program for rehabilitation of so-called backward countries should be continued and implemented. I do not know of any program from which we receive more benefit for as few dollars. However, we must be careful in its implementation that we confine it to its original purpose, namely, to help those countries to help themselves by giving them scientific knowledge and the know-how in the fields of education, agriculture, health, and sanitation. We should not permit these programs to grow into a worldwide WPA.

The President has said of the mutual-security program and its related policies:

> The fixed, unwavering objective of that policy is a just, prosperous, enduring peace.

I agree thoroughly with the President's statement. Unless this policy is successful all other issues become inconsequential.

Our foreign policy has expanded to all parts of the world, involving us in tremendous economic and political problems, until the very existence of our Nation depends upon their correct solution.

If we should become involved in the holocaust of a worldwide war with its H-bomb, jet planes, and the mechanized weapons of modern warfare, not only the future of our Nation but even the world would be at stake.

It is a slow, tedious and expensive program that we have undertaken but I believe if we continue it will help to bring about the permanent peace and security that the United States and all the free world is so devotedly striving to accomplish.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, first of all I want to express my regret for not carrying my part of the load when the hearings were in progress in our committee. Members of the committee, however, are aware of the reasons for my failure to attend many of the hearings. I know that the committee has worked diligently. I know that the chairman has been under pressure—I think too much pressure. Not sufficient time was allowed so the committee could consider all phases of this program. I think this is a program that requires thorough attention every time it comes before us; it should have minute scrutiny. I, for one, would express the hope that the time will come when we can consider the basic philosophy, of this kind of legislation and thus have sufficient time to thresh out some of the differences in committee of those of us in the minority. We believe it was our duty to file minority views on this bill.

In that connection I want to say that printed minority views are to be found on the desk where the majority report is on file. It was signed by the gentlewoman from Illinois [Mrs. CHURCH], by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ADAIR], and the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BENTLEY].

I want to agree with one of the best witnesses I listened to when I was at the hearings, and that was Mr. Hensel. So far as my experience on the committee is concerned, the presentation that he made was outstanding. He pulled no punches. He was honest with the committee. When he concluded his presentation I believe we had a better understanding of what was involved in the military phases of this program than from any witness who has ever appeared before us. He very frankly said that this is one of the programs we should take a look at. I want to quote some short excerpts from his testimony which Members may find in our minority views. He said:

> I spoke to you about the fact that although these programs had been made up, had been approved by the military authorities and by the Congress, we had certain skepticism about them, at least enough to require a review, because they had been made up on the basis of criteria, some of which were now open to question.

He also said:

> It is not too difficult just to spend money. It is much more difficult to spend it intelligently.

Also he said in conclusion on that particular phase of his testimony:

> I think Congress ought to examine very carefully into the manner in which the money is administered, because you cannot run it from here, expressing your opinion in a rigid statute, that executes itself. It just will not work.

From this, Mr. Chairman, the committee is justified in making a detailed study of the military requests covered by this bill. If Secretary Hensel and his Department have some doubts about the criteria heretofore considered as a basis for these requests certainly the Foreign Affairs Committee should carefully examine the requests that are before us.

That brings me to the position I have taken on this legislation heretofore, and I may say that this is the phase that I object to most strenuously. It is the question of these large carryovers and I think the majority members of the committee have brushed aside consideration of this important matter.

I had rather anticipated that the majority report would include a statement as to just how large a carryover we would have in this program. It did not, so we on the minority thought that we ought to set it up, we should indicate to members of this committee the balance that is expected to be carried over, at least, unexpended as of the 30th of June. There will be $8,717,000,000 as a carryover and yet the bill before us would authorize $3½ billion. This is incredible,

I know that my very good and able friend, the chairman of the committee, will say that this is necessary because we have this long pipeline to keep filled up. I call your attention to the fact that in all of the history of this legislation those who are administering this program have never been able to spend more than $6 billion, yet there is an anticipated unexpended balance as of the 30th of June of $8,817,000,000, I repeat we are authorizing by this legislation $3.5 billion more, and there are available in counterpart funds in other countries of the world over $900 million, almost another billion.

I say that we ought to stop and look. We ought to consider ourselves members of a board of directors. We are called upon to administer this program and to conserve wherever we can the taxpayers' money.

In view of the spending ability of the administrative departments, or lack of it,

I say to you that so far as the present authorization is concerned we need not authorize a dime and yet the program would not be affected in any way.

If we were sitting as a board of directors, we would say to the general manager of the plant, "How much can you spend?" I say to the administrators of this program, "How much can you spend?" It is an open record that $6 billion has been the top. It takes a lot of programing and good management to spend $5 billion a year.

I call your attention to our minority views again. You will note the table. It is interesting to observe that the carryovers this program has had every year since it was set up. In 1950 we had a carryover of $3,521,000,000; 1951, $7,145,000,000; 1952, $9,895,000,000; 1953, $10,000,000,000; 1954, $9,914,000,000; and for this year, 1955, $8,717,000,000.

If you take what we are going to have as of the 30th of June and add to it the request in this authorization, you will have close to $12 billion again. This is gross mismanagement. Has not the Congress lost control of this program? It seems to me it has. If your constituents came to you today and asked you how you justify appropriating $3½ billion when you have almost $9 billion on hand—how could you answer? I think in suggesting a review of this whole program that this carryover situation is one that commands attention.

The Hoover report speaks in very strong language of these carryovers and points out again, as I have, that by going along with our present policy the Congress has lost complete control of the financial phases of the program. We are defeating our very objectives.

The chamber of commerce in a very interesting report said, "This fund should be held to the lowest possible level to insure retention of firm congressional control over the program. Furthermore, the carryover funds should be reviewed annually by the Congress regardless of whether they have been committed."

The answers to the arguments that I am making in part is this: First, is the one of the pipeline, keeping it full, and then, secondly, the answer that this money while unexpended, yet is obligated under valid contracts. I would like to know whether or not the presentation teams presented, or are able to present signed contracts in justification for the money that is being requested? I would like to have an answer to my question. I am sure it would be a very, very interesting answer.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GAVIN].

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, I want to call to the attention of the House that even though 4 hours are provided for general debate on this authorization bill I could not get 2 minutes on my side, and I had to go over to the Democratic side to get 2 minutes, and all I could get was the 2 minutes even though I doubt if they will use up all time available.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GAVIN. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Time being so valuable to the gentleman, I think all of us should be here to hear him, and I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

Mr. GAVIN. The gentleman's point is well taken. Thank you for consideration given.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Mississippi makes the point of order that a quorum is not present. The Chair will count. [After counting.] One hundred and twenty-three Members are present, a quorum.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, I merely want to call to the attention of the Members that when the postal increase pay bill was up, we argued for hours and days on 7.6 percent and 8.2 percent, and there were 10 or 12 or 14 or 16 million dollars involved, which would go into the pockets of the American postal workers. Most of the Members were on the floor at all times. It was politically expedient to be in attendance. They all knew there would be careful check on the legislation as it affected the voters back home. Hours were spent on it. It was fully debated. But here is a bill today authorizing assistance to the foreign countries of the world that involves $3.5 billion, and yet we are unable to keep anything like a quorum on the floor of the House on this important authorization bill that will cost the American taxpayers billions of dollars. We quibble over a few million dollars for American postal workers, yet we complacently pass legislation involving billions of dollars with but little opportunity to debate the matter. In fact, I could get but 2 minutes to express my opinions. We have $8.7 billion in the pipeline, which makes $12.2 billion. A million dollars is a thousand thousand dollars, and a billion dollars is a thousand million dollars; and here is twelve thousand million dollars, and you have only a handful of Members on the floor of the House. I think this is a very important piece of legislation, and should be fully and carefully debated and clearly understood. Certainly, if the American taxpayers were in the galleries I feel quite certain that legislation involving billions of dollars would be given more definite and careful consideration. To pass over—with a few hours of debate—an authorization bill involving this amount of money is something I cannot understand. If the American people knew it, they also would be amazed.

My position on this foreign spending for economic recovery is well known. I have been listening year after year, and year after year, to the statement that we are going to stop these programs of spending billions for economic aid, yet we come up this year again with $3.5 billion, of which $375 million goes for economic aid, $172 million goes for technical cooperation, $165 million goes for development assistance.

In my State we have distressed coal areas. Thousands of miners are unemployed in Pennsylvania and West Virginia. Do you think one could get consideration for the situation existing in Pennsylvania's coal areas. Do you think anybody would sit down and make the study and effort to develop a plan or program of Federal aid to help the distressed coal areas of Pennsylvania? No. But, here, inside of a couple of hours you will authorize an appropriation of $3.5 billion even through you have available $8,700,000,000 authorized but unexpended. There is also a debt of $280 billion facing the American taxpayers today. Nobody talks about that even though the American taxpayer will eventually have to pay this bill. The American people have been sympathetic to the unfortunate people of the world for the past 10 years and it is time for foreign economic aid to be curtailed. Try to get some help for the people in your own back yard who are really in dire distress, and see how much you will get and how much attention and consideration will be given. I regret I have been given but 2 minutes as there is much I would like to add.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GAVIN] has expired.

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. KELLY].

Mrs. KELLY of New York. Mr. Chairman, before I discuss the necessity for and the merits of the Mutual Security Act of 1955, I want to pay tribute to the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, Hon. JAMES P. RICHARDS. By his patience and courtesy to both witnesses before and to members of the committee, he has earned the high esteem and devotion of all of us. His keen sense of humor is always a welcomed aside. We are very proud not only to address him as Chairman, but as Judge, and now Doctor. I would like to make brief reference to the remarks of the previous speaker, my colleague from Wisconsin [Mr. SMITH] when he referred to the minority report. He quoted remarks from the Assistant Secretary for International Security, Mr. Hensel. Those remarks in that paragraph were in the hearing. Right after that paragraph there was a discussion off the record, and then Mr. Hensel's remarks were returned to the public hearing. He at that time said that we were trying to do two things in that respect in order to make a somewhat short-range study to make certain we did not deliver items that would probably be unnecessary, pointing out that we were taking some risks, and so forth.

But in the real interpretation of his remarks I would say that he never questioned the need for this program. He only questioned that it is smart policy to always review the basic program of any administration. That has been the procedure over the years, and I am sure that it will be continued and that we will demand a review of all of our program.

I believe this legislation is essential, and it will be essential until a just peace is arrived at in this world. It is an essential part of our national policy, and was so stated by President Eisenhower on April 20 in his message to Congress in reporting to us the mutual security program. He said:

> I consider the program an indispensable part of a realistic enlightened national policy.

He has also stated that the program reflects greatly improved conditions in Europe and provides for the critical needs of Asia.

Thus it is an admitted fact that the mutual security programs of the past have begun to show a return on our investment, and it is essential that this investment be continued, that the effectiveness of the past program be maintained. The effectiveness of this past program is well stated by Mr. Stassen, also in the hearings at page 53, where he emphasizes the improvement of the conditions in Europe at this time.

This is concrete proof to me that the foreign policy of the United States under the previous Democratic administration was sound and was built upon a firm foundation. It is from our vantage point of strength that the United States can now proceed, and the interest of the United States and the free world must be maintained. I trust that nothing we do or that I might attempt to do in this bill will weaken that position.

The Marshall plan was pointed up as an indispensable factor in contributing to free world strength. This you will find on page 50 of the hearings.

Furthermore, as many of my colleagues have already pointed out, the moral principles upon which our country is founded make it further essential that we assist those who are less fortunate.

And, finally, as my colleague from Wisconsin brought out so ably, it is most essential for the United States' economic stability in order to maintain our industrial capacity. The United States is the largest exporting nation in the world. In 1954 the exports ran to $15,077,000,000. The imports were $10,267,000,000. The imports reflect raw materials needed to maintain United States industry. He ably brought out also the fact that we are a 100-percent importer of the necessary raw materials needed to maintain our industry. These factors are also brought out in the hearings at page 60 and at page 58.

At this particular time I want to emphasize a few facts relative to Europe. Of the nonmilitary funds authorized in this program, only $117 million, 5 percent of the total, is planned for Europe. As far as the military needs are concerned, they are not broken down by area or country, so that no indication of the proportion of these funds destined for Europe is possible; there is no way that we can tell at all today how much of the military authorization in this bill will ultimately be allocated to European countries.

The breakdown of this $117 million nonmilitary aid is as follows: Spain, $50 million; Yugoslavia, $40,500,000; Berlin, $20 million.

You will note that except for minor items for technical assistance none of the original Marshall plan countries is to receive nonmilitary aid.

In the case of Spain, we realize its strategic importance; and I also want to say that the Committee on Foreign Affairs included in the bill a provision that Spain is to get not less than $50 million of defense support funds. Reports from Spain indicate that the United States has received the full cooperation of the Spanish Government and the Spanish people. The information from Spain is that our program there is going very well.

There is no doubt of the necessity for additional assistance to the city of Berlin, this city isolated and surrounded as it is by the Iron Curtain.

As to Yugoslavia, I regret that there is this large item in the pending bill, but speaking from a military point of view, I want to say that this year, the past year, has shown the moneys that we have put into NATO defense has brought forth not the EDC plan of the past but a Western European union which will now make it possible for Germany to rearm.

It is true, as has been brought out by my colleague, that $5 billion of unexpended funds from previous appropriations remain to be spent in providing military assistance to Europe, but these funds, it must be realized, are all programed and a great deal of it—this is no secret—will go to assist the rearmament of Western Germany.

It is a source of great satisfaction to me that I can say that the mutual security program for Europe this year represents a tapering off of our efforts in that area. I share the optimism expressed by General Gruenther in his statement to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, which included this evaluation of the European situation:

> To summarize, I think it fair to say that thanks to major efforts on the part of all the NATO allies, the free world is today operating from a position of strength which has already paid great dividends. To make the most effective possible use of that situation, we must under no circumstances permit a weakening or relaxation of our effort, for that would inevitably have the effect of reducing the effectiveness of what we have done to date. One important material factor in attaining this position—and in my view assuring that we will keep it—is the United States mutual security program, current appropriations for which you are not considering.

He goes on to say:

> They recognize that the problem of the defense of the West will be solved together and in common or it will not be solved at all. Moreover, we now have a common concept for implementing that defense.

So, Mr. Chairman, I hope that the present legislation will be approved in order to maintain the present vantage point of free world unity and collective strength and hope. I also hope that nothing in this bill will hurt the appropriation or continuation of the program. The committee realized, as has been said, and recognizes the fact that we need to curtail the expenses of the United States; however, at the present time there is no practical alternative to us but to implement this program.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS].

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, this is without doubt the worst of the so-called, as the chairman of the committee well said, mutual assistance bills that we have had before us. I have contended in the past and I still contend that there is nothing mutual about these acts nor is there any particular security contained in them despite the fact that we have spent some $60 billion since the end of World War II on various projects all over the world.

We have printed hearings before us today, but these hearings ought to carry a subtitle reading as follows: "Off the record discussion." If you will read these hearings you will get down to the payoff on an important question only to find that the committee has gone off the record and the reader is left completely unenlightened. But it is possible to find a few things worth noting in the hearings. What is still unclear to me, Mr. Chairman, is the necessity for these labels: defense support, direct forces support, military assistance, and then elsewhere, economic aid. Now, what is the difference? The gentleman from Minnesota, I find in the hearings, very properly called this one-package thing we have before us a blank check, but he said "I am in favor or it." And, of course, that is where the gentleman from Minnesota and I part company.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield but not for one of the gentleman's speeches that are often made when he is yielded to.

Mr. JUDD. I will just give you the first chapter. I was complimenting Mr. Hensel because he had frankly said that in previous years it had been the custom to present a so-called illustrative program to the committee, so many dollars for this specific purpose and so many dollars for that, right down to the last farthing. Then when they received the total amount, arrived at by adding the cost of all these projects, and started to use it, they would find that some of the proposals simply did not fit the situation and drastic changes had to be made. We always kicked about that later. So he was perfectly honest with us and said, "We are not going to try to present such an illustrative program this year. We are asking you for about what we believe is needed and we can use effectively. The details will have to be worked out as we use it." It was then that I congratulated him on that forthright approach. "We know it amounts to almost a blank check. The control we have is by keeping your feet to the fire and your knowledge that when you come back next year you will have to justify the use of the funds given you before getting more."

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman. I think the gentleman has had enough of my time. Let me read what the gentleman said on that occasion:

> What it amounts to, in a sense, is that you will hereafter ask us to give you essentially a blank check, and the way we can exercise control is the knowledge in your department that when you come in the next year you will be put on the pan as to how the money was spent that we gave you.

They will be put on the pan all right, but it will be off the record. The gentleman further said:

> I think that is a far better way to do it.

And, I say again, that is where I part company with the gentleman.

Now, coming back to these labels, the distinguished gentleman from South

Carolina, the chairman of the committee, at one place in the hearings said that to him that, too, was a $64 question; direct forces support, military assistance, defense support, and so on and so forth. He was apparently unable for a time to distinguish what the witnesses were talking about as between those labels and economic aid. I hope he has figured it out in his mind now, and if he can enlighten me, I will be glad to yield to him. What is the difference between defense support, direct-forces support, military assistance, and economic aid. I do not know. As I understand it, we are not now going to give economic aid to the so-called Marshall-plan countries. Is that correct? But we are going to give them military assistance. Is that correct?

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield.

Mr. RICHARDS. That is correct. As to the original Marshall-plan countries, there will not be any economic aid except for $5 million for technical exchange and for the city of Berlin, on account of the situation there.

Mr. GROSS. Yes; and that is due to the sellout at Yalta when Berlin was left an island of isolation.

Mr. RICHARDS. I will yield the gentleman 2 additional minutes if I take too much of his time.

The only other countries in Europe getting economic aid were not in the original Marshall plan. They are Yugoslavia, where there is a peculiar military and economic situation, and Spain. That is all.

Now, I tried to answer the gentleman's question which he asked awhile ago as to what is the difference between direct forces support and defense support and economic aid. Certainly it is economic aid, but I tried to show the gentleman that direct forces support, while of an economic nature, is something directly that the military forces need to perform their functions, such as oil, tents, and materials for uniforms. That is economic aid. Now, defense support, true, is economic aid, but it is the kind of economic aid that is calculated to be necessary to keep up the military effort of a country. Now, this is the distinction. When the Marshall plan started, the purpose of economic aid was to put the countries on their feet economically. Military aid started later on. Marshall plan economic aid had no other purpose except to promote the recovery of the European countries after the war. We did not realize that we needed a military program at first. That is the way it is. I hope it is plain to the gentleman.

Mr. GROSS. In response to the gentleman, last year he talked about that old swamp owl down in South Carolina or Mississippi—I do not remember which—and it does not make any difference how thick or how thin you slice the meat off that old owl, it is still economic aid, is it not? If somebody were to take over the production of tanks in this country or the production of airplanes or aircraft carriers for this country, we would have more money to spend on the economy of this country, would we not?

Mr. RICHARDS. Certainly it is economic aid.

Mr. GROSS. Certainly it is. You bet your life it is.

Mr. RICHARDS. But it is also military aid.

Mr. GROSS. But you are saying that we no longer aid them economically.

Mr. RICHARDS. It is also military aid. It is military aid of an economic nature.

Mr. GROSS. But the illusion is created here that we are not giving them economic aid.

Mr. RICHARDS. The Committee on Foreign Affairs is not trying to create any illusions. We are trying to be absolutely plain about this matter and honest about it, about the carryover of funds and about what economic support is and what direct-forces support is and what military aid is. I am giving all the facts, to the best of my ability.

Mr. GROSS. Is it not true, too, that these unexpended balances, totaling $8 to $9 billion can be used for economic aid in these NATO countries, the funds which are in the handout pipeline, can be used that are not already obligated, for economic aid? Is it not true, even though there is no economic aid in this bill, that economic aid can be given to them through the use of unexpended funds in the pipeline?

Mr. RICHARDS. We have never authorized the use of unexpended funds for anything but their original purpose.

Mr. GROSS. Is it not possible to do that now, to give them economic aid through the use of the unexpended funds, from money that has already been authorized but is unexpended?

Mr. RICHARDS. If Congress says so.

Mr. GROSS. Only if Congress says so? The President has no authority over that?

Mr. RICHARDS. Not unless Congress has appropriated the money. And the Appropriations Committee has to approve every dollar of it before any of the funds can be spent.

Mr. GROSS. But under section 533 of the act that we approved last year, the President would have authority, would he not, to spend the funds in this bill or the carryover from last year in any way he sees fit?

Mr. RICHARDS. The only way they can spend the unexpended balances is by spending them for the same things they were originally authorized for unless Congress should specifically vote some other use. So far that has never happened.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. Briefly.

Mr. JUDD. On pages 231 and 232 of the hearings, there is a full discussion of this whole question. We sought to have a clear breakdown of the various kinds of aid. While half of it is economic, part of that goes directly to armed forces for their use. That is, the commodities go into the hands or for the use of the soldiers in the countries aided. Other parts go to support of the general economy, and so forth.

If the gentleman wants further discussion and more detailed definitions—and not off the record—they are in this big book which sets out each kind of aid, broken down into categories and country by country. This book covers aid of all of the European countries and the Middle East and Africa. This other book covers all of the countries we are assisting in Latin America and the Far East. There are hundreds of pages of specific information here which is not off the record.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS] has expired.

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 2 additional minutes.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I would rather refer the Members of the House to the tables to be found on page 46 of the hearings, which show that only one other country in the world contributed of their national budgets to military buildups in 1954 as much as did the United States, which contributed 62.8 percent. As to all but one of our so-called allies, we have expended 3 to 4 times as much as they have.

In reference to the appropriation authorized in this bill for Yugoslavia, I suppose it is necessary to give them some $36 million because they are going to need a lot of money if they keep on traveling over to Moscow and keep on entertaining delegations from the Kremlin in Belgrade. I suppose we ought to allot plenty of money in this bill for them.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. GAVIN. If I may have the attention of the chairman of the committee, instead of pushing these 2 voluminous volumes at us, could the gentleman break down the $8,717,000,000 authorized but unexpended so we will know where it is going, who is going to get it, and what it is going to be spent for? Nobody has the time to go through this kind of material. Could the gentleman give it to us item by item?

Mr. RICHARDS. If I had known that the gentleman was going to yield time in order to push that volume at me, I would not have yielded him time.

Mr. GAVIN. That is all right, but simplify it.

Mr. RICHARDS. I want to answer the gentleman's question. He will find on page 11 of the report a breakdown of the military-assistance program. I think that will answer the gentleman's question.

Mr. GAVIN. I am not talking about the military-assistance program; I am talking about the $8,817,000,000 authorized but unexpended. I want to know what you are going to do with that.

Mr. RICHARDS. That is it right there, on page 11, which I have called to the gentleman's attention. That is the breakdown of the unexpended funds, nearly all of which are military, we had when the report was printed. They are the very thing the gentleman is talking about, $7,779,000,000. That was the best figure which at that time could be furnished us. Since that time it amounts to over $8 billion.

Mr. GAVIN. That economic aid to Europe is not going to stop, that is quite

evident, because we have $5,246,000,000 for that.

Mr. RICHARDS. The gentleman asked about military aid, eight billion dollars and something. This is the breakdown of the military aid.

Mr. JUDD. That is all planes and tanks and other implements of war, manufactured here to be shipped to them. That money goes to American producers, most of it does not go abroad.

Mr. GAVIN. It is for the defense of Europe?

Mr. JUDD. That is right.

Mr. GAVIN. Then why did the French take our equipment and ship it down to north Africa to fight the Arabs down there? Was the money expended for that particular purpose?

Mr. JUDD. No; but the part of north Africa they are shipping it to is a department of metropolitan France, just as much a part of France as any other province of mainland France.

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York [Mr. DONOVAN].

Mr. DONOVAN. Mr. Chairman, I wish merely to point out to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS] that I did not observe him objecting particularly to the $36.5 million for Yugoslavia. Am I correct in my assumption that the gentleman knows very well that practically all of that is surplus agricultural products?

Mr. GROSS. I would object to giving $36 million to Yugoslavia. I object to the whole bill, period.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentlewoman from Ohio [Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON].

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, I would like also to pay my little homage to my chairman. This session has brought very heavy responsibility to him with more difficulties than in any year that I have known. I want to compliment the distinguished gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RICHARDS] on his patience, his tolerance, his understanding, and his delicious sense of humor. This last alone saved many situations. It is a privilege to serve on his committee, just as it was a privilege to serve with him at the United Nations.

In the presentation of this bill, which is brought to the floor after exhaustive hearings and much study on the part of the members, both the chairman and my distinguished colleague from Ohio have given you a broad picture, and other members have brought out certain definite points.

I would like to bring to you certain other phases of S. 2090 which to my mind have a worldwide significance in our efforts to reestablish a climate long lost in which peace can grow. I am not attempting to give you a smooth presentation. Rather am I trying to fill in a certain portion of the picture so that the total knowledge you glean will not be too arid. For instance, I would like to tell you about the Children's Fund. From a global long-range standpoint raising the children of today to be healthy, productive, and good citizens of tomorrow is a most important consideration in our total effort to achieve worldwide peace and economic stability. The attitudes people develop in their youth become completely ingrained and have a decided bearing on the will of the people to live in an atmosphere of peaceful productivity in the world community. Considerable progress has been made to date in improving the welfare of children. When we realize that two-thirds of the world's 900 million children lack adequate food and clothing and protection against disease, it make this work seem more than worthwhile.

It should be noted that UNICEF assistance no longer emphasizes the emergency handout. It works in a much more realistic fashion and it submits its programs to certain criteria.

First. The Government desiring assistance must initiate the request for aid to UNICEF.

Second. UNICEF emphasizes the aid to economically underdeveloped countries, particularly in the rural areas.

Third. UNICEF aid is concentrated on a few types of programs which deal with basic inadequacies in child care and which generally have a mass impact on the particular community.

These programs include assistance to rural maternal and child welfare centers in areas where child-care services are nonexistent or totally inadequate; extensive health campaigns against diseases affecting large numbers of children, such as tuberculosis, malaria, and yaws; and the raising of nutritional standards of children through better diets, including a wider use of milk.

Fourth. The assisted government must agree to match the funds allocated by UNICEF with a substantial contribution of its own toward each program. The amount of the matching contribution, which consists of local currency or services, is at least equal to and is generally more than the international funds assigned to a program. In 1954, governments receiving aid contributed a total of $32.5 million compared to the $17.1 million allocated from the central account, or an average of $1.90 for every $1 allocated.

Fifth. UNICEF aid is used to make a lasting contribution to the welfare of large numbers of children, through projects which the assisted countries can eventually carry on themselves. Programs are geared to the administrative and financial capacities of countries. Community participation is emphasized in all stages of the program. Thus a solid base is laid at national, provincial, and local levels enabling countries to continue the programs when UNCEF aid is terminated.

Sixth. The project should be useful as a demonstration to the requesting country and should result in the development of local organizational patterns which can be duplicated and extended elsewhere in the country.

UNICEF has been increasingly successful in stimulating self-help on the part of governments and assisted peoples. Self-help is not only evidenced by the substantial amount of "matching" funds which the governments are contributing, but is also reflected in a number of other ways. These include the actual taking over by governments of projects started with UNICEF aid; increased public health budgets for child health programs; the recruitment of more competent personnel for maternal and child health work; and, in some instances, the creation of maternal and child health or welfare departments. Even more significant perhaps than the record of Government action are the added desire and efforts made by the people to help themselves in improving their own conditions.

A clear division of responsibilities exists between UNICEF and such other international organizations as the World Health Organization, WHO, and the Food and Agriculture Organization, FAO, which are concerned generally with matters of health and nutrition. UNICEF provides the supplies and equipment which are not locally available; while the WHO or FAO, as appropriate, furnishes the technical assistance and know-how requested by the governments both in the planning and execution of the programs. This clear-cut difference in emphasis simplifies the question of coordination, and assures that "the resources of the United Nations in health, nutrition, and welfare are alined in a unified approach in helping governments meet children's needs."

In 1954 UNICEF continued to make significant progress in reaching larger numbers of children in a larger number of countries. During the year the fund aided 250 projects in 88 countries and territories. Thirteen of these countries received assistance for the first time. More than 28 million children and mothers benefited from UNICEF aid in 1954, as compared to 21 million in 1953. Over 13 million children were vaccinated against tuberculosis; 7 million children and mothers were protected from malaria and other insect-borne diseases; 1.5 million children were treated for yaws, and 1.3 million given a food supplement under the long-range feeding programs. For the 3-year period 1952–54, UNICEF furnished basic equipment and supplies for approximately 5,500 maternal and child health centers in rural areas. UNICEF also provided limited emergency aid to children in countries affected by catastrophes such as floods, droughts, and typhoons. UNICEF allocations for 1954, amounting to $17.1 million, are summarized by area and by type of program in the attached table.

UNITED STATES CONTRIBUTION TO UNICEF

The UNICEF program operates on a calendar-year basis, whereas the appropriation of a United States contribution is currently on a fiscal-year basis. This tends to complicate somewhat the pledging and contribution of funds by the United States, including the percentage question. The difficulties caused thereby have resulted in situations both in 1954 and 1955 in which the other governments have not known in advance in either year the total amount which the United States was prepared to contribute or the percentage applicable to our contribution to UNICEF's programs for these 2 years. This may well have resulted in less contributions than would otherwise have been forthcoming had the

other governments known and been able to take into consideration United States intentions before determining the extent of their commitments. For example, in announcing the United States contribution last September for the period January 1, 1954, to June 30, 1955, the United States representative stated he hoped other governments would assume a greater share of the costs of the program than they had borne in the past, and stated further that the percentage of the United States contribution would be reduced to 60 percent by June 30, 1955. However, the majority of the other governments had already made their pledges prior to the United States announcement, and could therefore not take the reduced United States percentage into account in determining the amounts of their 1954 contributions.

A similar situation prevails with respect to pledges and contributions to UNICEF's 1955 program. The United States is not able to pledge an amount or indicate a percentage applicable to UNICEF's total 1955 program since funds for the last 6 months of this calendar year—the first 6 months of fiscal year 1956—have not yet been appropriated and the United States does not make any pledge or other commitment for a contribution to UNICEF until the funds have been appropriated by the Congress. The next United States pledge will not be made until the Congress has completed action on the current request. The governments were told last September of the intention of the United States to reduce its contribution to 60 percent by June 30 of this year, and this goal will definitely be reached. In fact, as a result of vigorous efforts on the part of UNICEF following announcement of the United States pledge, this goal was almost achieved 6 months ahead of time—61 percent as of December 31, 1954. Since, as stated above, the United States has given no indication of the amount or percentage of the United States contribution in the last half of this year's program for the benefit of other governments in determining the amounts of their pledges to the total year program, and since the United States contribution has already been reduced by 12 percent over the comparatively short period, it is recommended that the United States not reduce its percentage further for the remainder of the calendar year 1955 at such short notice. However, in accordance with the policy that the United States should reduce the percentage of its contribution on a gradual basis, and that such action should be so regulated that it will not have an adverse effect on the UNICEF program, it is proposed that the United States contribution could be further reduced in calendar year 1956 to 57.5 percent.

Now I want to talk to you about these two problem countries—India and Yugoslavia. I wonder if you appreciate the fact that this program of ours is unique in the history of the world? On the one hand, we have America's long tradition of humanitarianism, the religious and moral concept of our way of life that always encourages us to help those who are less fortunate than ourselves. On the other hand, we have the ever-present struggle for survival with political, economic, and military facts which build our own security and which must be constantly strengthened. This program does the extraordinary thing of equating humanitarianism with national security. International developments this year have proved as never before that we have used sound judgment in authorizing this program.

Mr. Chairman, there are some very serious questions in the minds of certain distinguished Members of the House as to whether this aid should be continued to these two nations—India and Yugoslavia. It seems to me we must look at the situation in its very broadest aspects. India is a newly independent nation of 400 million people. It is, by its very existence, proving that free people can survive and prosper in Asia. It is a growing concern. Its people are no longer willing to accept conditions under which they have lived for centuries. They are helping themselves.

The upheavals in undeveloped areas have caused much ferment in Asia and in this chaos India and China are competing for leadership of the Asian nations. I would remind the House that India, under the provisions of this legislation, has been carefully planned for. All of Asia, which has been heavily propagandized with China's alleged productive gains, is watching the final result of India's 5-year plan, and this is the fifth year. If we let India down now, what will happen? She will be forced, in her need, to go to the only other power that would give them to her, which of course is Russia.

May I call attention at this point to an observation made by the committee on the question of continued aid to that country. You will read in our report that before the committee reached a decision on further assistance to India, it carefully considered the effects of such assistance not alone on India but in the larger context of our Asian policy. It is clear that India's foreign policy is often divergent from that which the United States pursues. The committee believes that neutral or even hostile expressions by Indian Government leaders must not obscure the fact that our stake is in the preservation of the Indian subcontinent as an independent state. In making a final determination on continued assistance, the committee points out that India insists it is a neutral country and it has a representative form of government which internally is strongly anti-Communist. The committee believes that our assistance to India as elsewhere in the free world is directed toward strengthening the democratic base of government. The more successful we are in achieving that objective, the more we make it possible for India to resist Communist threats and blandishments and to remain a part of the free world.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. I yield.

Mr. JUDD. The gentlewoman has properly pointed out the effect on India if at this moment she were to be cut loose without any other place to go for assistance except the Kremlin. But equally important are a half dozen other countries in that part of the world who are watching the results.

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. The gentleman feels it would have a great effect on those countries?

Mr. JUDD. If Communist China surpasses, they are going that way. If democracy prevails it is very likely that they will stay with us.

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. I thank the gentleman for his helpful contribution.

Now, I go to Yugoslavia, which in 1948 was a full-fledged member of the Soviet bloc because of historical circumstances, idealogical affinity, and the natural inclinations of its rulers. But in 1948 Tito defected. He broke away. In the face of Moscow's violent campaign of subversion against the Tito regime which continued from 1948 to 1953, the Yugoslavs were forced to turn to the West for support. This experience taught them the dangers of over-dependence on foreign nations, especially great powers. The alternative, which has since guided Yugoslav policies, was to follow a course guaranteeing the maintenance of Yugoslav independence and freedom of action.

The switch in Soviet tactics over the past year in the world in general, and toward Yugoslavia in particular, has already allowed Tito to put his post-1948 lessons into practice. The lessened threat from the East has reduced his dependence on the West. Yugoslavia is thus relatively free to carve its own niche on the European and world scenes. Yugoslavia wishes to do this to enhance its own prestige and to gain a chance to influence world events, a chance which small nations rarely get. The country's chief aim is to avoid war, which would not only be a disaster in physical terms but would seriously endanger the continuance of the regime, regardless of which group of major contesting powers might win the war. Tito feels that he has the right to explore his own methods of helping the world to avoid war. These methods largely coincide with those also practiced by India under Nehru and by some other countries under the general term "active peaceful coexistence."

Tito has been anxious to normalize his relations with the U. S. S. R. and the Soviet bloc as part of the job of strengthening his nation's influence and bargaining power. He especially wants to be able to exercise this influence in eastern European countries where the U. S. S. R. is now dominant. Hence Tito's great desire is to see Soviet controls over eastern European states loosened so that they can play independent roles again and perhaps eventually even line up with Yugoslavia, India, and similar countries in a group of uncommitted powers.

Tito wanted an official apology for past Soviet conduct, as well as the payment of damages for various economic losses suffered by Yugoslavia. He was also anxious to have the Soviets acknowledge that it was permissible for him to associate with satellite bosses whom he could then try to influence toward greater independence. This permission was obtained when the Soviet leaders agreed in effect that there were

legitimate alternate roads to socialism and that the U. S. S. R.'s path need not be slavishly followed by other leftist nations. Tito also received the right to exchange Socialist experience with Soviet and satellite parties, trade unions, youth groups, and so forth, thus gaining a means of contacting satellite officials.

Tito apparently paid very little for these Russian concessions. The policy declarations made in Belgrade on June 3 were largely reiterations of previous Yugoslav position, for example, on the admission of Red China to the United Nations, opposition to the existence of military blocs, and so forth.

The United States has supported Tito because his fight with the U. S. S. R. weakened the latter not only in geopolitical terms, but also as the self-proclaimed leader of world Communist forces. An independent Yugoslavia instead of a satellite Yugoslavia made for an improved Western military posture in the Mediterranean Sea and Central Europe. We have never pretended to support Tito because we approve of his regime, which is a somewhat modified Communist dictatorship, since we obviously strongly dislike such a system of government. Tito is an avowed Communist—if an independent one. He often interprets world events as do other Communists loyal to Moscow because all use Marxist analyses and Leninist dogmas and prejudices. And apart from ideology, he sometimes sees world issues differently from us, as do other nations. Nor would we wish otherwise since our aim in the world has been to build strong independent nations impervious to Soviet threats and not to obtain vassal states dominated by us. However, where Yugoslavia's own national interests come into play, Tito defends these against all comers. This explains his adherence to the Balkan Alliance with such strongly anti-Communist states as Greece and Turkey.

From our point of view, the Yugoslavs may indulge in some wishful thinking on the changes allegedly taking place in Soviet-satellite relations, but we withhold our judgment for the time being. Our only concern is that the Yugoslavs do not overestimate their own capacity as an independent and unalined nation—not backed up by the strength of any coalition save the Balkan Alliance—to deal effectively and bargain on equal terms with the Soviet Union and Soviet orbit. The Yugoslav state, however, that their eyes are wide open and that they can guard their own position.

The American stake in this picture is clear. With major help from us to the Yugoslav economy and army, Yugoslavia can now stand up to the strongest nation in Europe. Its position is proof to all Muscovite Communists everywhere that the Kremlin is not infallible. Soviet concessions to Yugoslavia open up the possibilities of ideological confusion and division in the heretofore monolithic Soviet bloc.

This result is what we have striven for in our Yugoslav policy, even though we could hardly have foreseen the exact course of events. For this gain to continue, Yugoslavia must remain reasonably strong and independent. Our aid will provide that in physical form, as well as be a concrete token of our continued moral support of a nation against threats of aggression. It will not now mean support of communism, even Tito's brand of communism, any more than in the past 5 years.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. I yield.

Mr. GROSS. Does the gentlewoman think Tito had to normalize his country by saying he would hand Formosa over to the Chinese Communists?

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. I am saying very definitely, I may say to my very distinguished colleague from Iowa, that we do not agree with Yugoslavia in many things. But I say further that the important thing is to see that the Yugoslav people have a chance to broaden their own freedom within the Tito community, and so be able to keep outside the Kremlin bloc.

The CHAIRMAN. Each side has 1 hour and 14 minutes remaining.

The gentleman from South Carolina is recognized.

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HAYS].

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. Mr. Chairman, so many fine things that I endorse have already been said that I shall move very swiftly over some references I had intended to make. I subscribe to the complimentary references to our beloved chairman and also to his own kindly statements about the minority who have filed a vigorous dissent. It is obvious to those of us who have had to labor hard over a technical bill of this kind that all are trying to do a patriotic duty. It is easy to recognize with hard work day after day and night after night, that all are trying to do the best we can for our common country. While there are, of course, points in the debate at which feelings become rather tense, I think it would be helpful for us, at this stage, to take a broad view of the problems that confront the Nation at this time.

The world is still full of danger. How different the world is from what we had anticipated at the conclusion of the war when our victory over Germany and Japan and those allied with them was so impressive, how different the congressional service some of us enjoy from the service we had anticipated. When I first aspired to be a Member of Congress back in the thirties, I thought of things I might do for the farmers of the Ozark region, but my energies have been devoted largely to international problems, not unrelated to the farmers of Arkansas, it is true, but quite different in character from the problems I thought I wanted to wrestle with as a Member of this legislative body.

We are living in a world that forces recognition of the fact that our interests are identified with those of other nations. It is not that we who sponsor legislation that will help other countries are more concerned about them than our own country, it is a matter of intelligently identifying our interests with others.

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. BONNER. I was out of the chamber when the gentleman began to speak, but I heard him talking about farmers. Was the gentleman addressing his words to the telegram that the Farm Bureau sent out, the misleading telegram they sent out?

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. I did not have any telegram in mind. I am not surprised however that the Farm Bureau is favoring this bill, if that is what the gentleman alludes to. I hope the gentleman from North Carolina will take plenty of time to develop his point of view, because I think a debate along that line will be very wholesome. The farm interests of this country are well served by this legislation. But it is not a farm bill. We would make a great mistake as conceivably we did make in the development of arguments for the Marshall Plan to rest the case upon opening markets for our farm products. I think the Marshall Plan had to be justified not because it provided a new farm market, though it did just that, but because it placed us in a position to help defend the free nations of western Europe. Without that expenditure they would not be where they are today, as the distinguished gentleman from South Carolina so effectively pointed out in his address.

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. RICHARDS. I notice the gentleman said this is not a farm bill or a farm surplus-disposal bill, and I agree with him. Neither is it a ship subsidy bill.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. That is correct. Unless we keep our eye on the target and think in terms of the security of our country, we are going to miss the central idea of this legislation. It might make it easier to convince some at home of its wisdom to emphasize its farm market aspects but we are not looking for a quiet political refuge for ourselves. We are confronting this issue honestly and I know you expected us to do that. Our chairman showed that in the direct and honest language he used in reply to the gentleman from Iowa in saying that obviously some of it is economic aid. But he made the point that that does not mean it is without military significance.

Would the gentleman from Iowa insist, for example, that it is good sense for us to put a gun in the hands of a lad who will fight with our own, if war should come, and then withhold the goods that are necessary to equip him or not to help provide the food that every army needs? You cannot separate these things. It is one problem, the problem of making strong the nations that have the same interests that we have.

I want to speak to the point made by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GAVIN] who implied that we are thinking only about helping other nations. Did he overlook the fact that his committee brought into this House yesterday a bill that was approved by all

but two Members of the House involving an expenditure of $636 million outside continental United States? It involved expenditures in Iceland, the Caribbean, Okinawa and countries around the globe. It was reported by his committee and we were glad to approve it because we know it would be folly for us to construct defenses only on these shores. If we are to defend ourselves against an enemy who has aggression always in mind, then we must have allies with us who are able to help us stop him when he starts.

If we do not recognize our identity of interests then we are pursuing a disastrous course. As I have already indicated, it is not because this appeals to me by temperament. I think the gentleman knows me well enough to realize that I would much prefer to rely on the processes of reason and good will. But as the Foreign Minister of Great Britain, Mr. McMillan, said one day, "If those whose passions are unrestrained cannot be controlled by reason or love, then there is but one way to deter them and that is by fear or force. There is no other way."

The history of our country reveals that it was with great reluctance that we built a great Military Establishment. When we inaugurated these phases of our foreign policy in 1947 it took us into a great new realm involving the rehabilitation of Western Europe. We did that reluctantly, but it was good sense. When General Marshall announced that plan we decided then that if we were to do it at all we should do it boldly, with a charter and program that envisaged an expenditure of some $17 billion. For what purpose? To rehabilitate Europe economically, to restore a continent that was prostrate.

We knew if we were to have the benefit of her technology, her industry, her manpower, it had to be by restoring that great area with its 270 million people. If Russia should take it, it would double her coal supply, it would double her steel. So, we determined under a program, well planned, to strengthen our allies. What did we spend? Not $17 billion but $12 billion in that particular project, and in the years that we have been pursuing this policy $6 billion has gone to the farmers of the United States to send across the ocean the farm surpluses that our allies needed. So, I point out in passing that this has provided markets and in providing markets has greatly strengthened people who believe as we do—no, not in all details, for their culture is not ours, but essentially as we do, in freedom. And, if I did not believe it, I would not vote for a single dollar contained in this authorization bill.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman spoke of the military security that we have bought, or effectively that. I have searched through the hearings with a fine-tooth comb to find out how many combat-ready divisions, exclusive ready divisions, we have in NATO today. Will the gentleman tell me that?

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. No; I will not.

Mr. GROSS. Why not?

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. I will not divulge classified information. Now, there are some things that we are all entitled to know, and I will, before the debate is concluded, try to find figures in the hearings that throw light on the question.

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. RICHARDS. Let me say this to the gentleman. He raised that point once before, and he claimed that some of the information here is being withheld. But, I would call to the attention of the gentleman that this information is not classified by the Committee on Foreign Affairs, even though we had executive sessions on the subject. So far as I am concerned, I wish we could give it all, but the Department of Defense and the State Department classified it, and we have to honor that classification.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. The chairman has stated my position.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Arkansas has expired.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 2 additional minutes.

Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. VORYS. I would like to make this comment, that while these figures this year are classified—and, of course, the figures are improving—I believe that last year we were authorized to state that it involved 175 divisions, 1,500 craft, and I think over 100 squadrons of aircraft. I will check last year's debate and correct these figures in the record if I am wrong. But, those were the estimates that were given during the debate last year. This year the figures are classified. For instance, last year we gave the amount of military aid to certain countries. This year those amounts have been classified. Two years ago I was authorized to give the figure that there were 4.9 million servicemen who were supported in part by this program.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman does not want to let the figure of 175 divisions stand for NATO, does he?

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. GAVIN. I will say to the gentleman that we were proud of that authorization bill that we brought from the Committee on Armed Services.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. So was I.

Mr. GAVIN. I want to see this great Nation of ours build the greatest national defense that we have ever had.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. No one who knows the gentleman could question that.

Mr. GAVIN. And never again let down our guard in a critical and chaotic world. But the point I was trying to make in the 2 minutes allotted to me was the fact that we should be just as much concerned about the distressed areas of our own country as we are in the other sections of the world. But we cannot get any consideration. In my great State of Pennsylvania we have 10 million people in distressed areas, thousands of miners out of work, destitute, poverty stricken. So the point that I was trying to bring to the attention of the Members of the House is that we should be just as considerate about our own unfortunate people in this country as we are in any other distressed areas of the world, but we are not.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. Now, Mr. Chairman, I was glad to yield to my friend for that purpose, and I want to address myself to it for just a moment. I am glad that the gentleman brought out this point. If I have developed any conviction as a result of the studies that we have made in the Committee on Foreign Affairs it is that in this program we serve all of our people. The people the gentleman refers to, his unemployed, are served when we protect that which is basic to our Nation's safety. And that is what this is. It would be a great mistake for us to set one interest against the other. I have constituents in Arkansas who are unemployed and some who are underemployed. There is just not the opportunity at their doorstep that I think we ought to have for them. But I can go back home and say in all honesty in voting funds to equip those allied with us in this global struggle that I am serving their interest.

The gentleman and I are not in disagreement as to helping people at home. He feels that not enough has been done for Pennsylvania and he will always find me responsive in practical ways of helping them. He knows that.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Is it the gentleman's viewpoint that these are various military assistance groups who are really the outposts of the American defense system?

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. That is a very good way to put it.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. In various parts of the world; in Formosa, in Indochina, in Malaya, in Siam, and around the Mediterranean.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. That is right.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. They are just the fringes of our defense. And if we do not have them, when trouble comes, we will have to send American boys over to man those outposts.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. I am indebted to the gentleman from California [Mr. JOHNSON] for putting it that way. They are outposts.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Is it the gentleman's view that they are paying big dividends in protection of the United States of America?

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. It is, exactly. This country has already decided that. We had a choice. I join in the tributes that have been paid to Mr. Hensel, and he stated that we had these two choices. We can continue this program—and that is what it is; it is not a new program—we can continue this program and do as the gentleman from California [Mr. JOHNSON] suggests, have those strong outposts who stand between us and the enemy, or we can retreat to Fortress America, which would be a ridiculous policy. We have already made that decision.

Mr. CHIPERFIELD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. CHIPERFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I should like to call attention to these figures. During the last 5½ years the NATO nations in Europe have spent approximately $43 billion from their own budgets in the creation of military strength. During the same period we have spent only $7.8 billion on NATO. So the European nations are doing a great deal for themselves.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. JUDD. Following up the excellent statement the gentleman made a moment ago, yesterday the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services in presenting the bill for the construction of our own military installations around the world, made the point very emphatically that our radar and various other installations necessary for our own national security right in Pennsylvania and Arkansas and Minnesota, had to be placed long distances away to be effective. How are we going to put them out there where the gentleman from Pennsylvania's committee think they ought to be if we are not on the best of terms with those countries?

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. I think that is an excellent addition to our discussion.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. FULTON. Following up the point with regard to bases, by keeping these bases in friendly countries, are we not able to strike at a possible enemy in half the time, and over half the distance than if we tried to strike the enemy from our own good country? It does give us a tremendous strategic advantage, even though we may never use it.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. I agree with the gentleman.

Mr. DORN of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. DORN of South Carolina. I should like to make an observation and perhaps the gentleman would like to comment on this. With reference to the point the gentleman made about $40 billion having been spent in the last 5 years by our NATO friends, when I was in Rome and Paris I asked this specific question. I asked them if they did not do a whole lot more in 1938 than they are doing today. I pointed out when I was in Rome that they had 7 million men under arms in 1938; they had the third largest navy in the world and the third largest air force. At the same conference they turned around and pointed out that their agricultural production was 45 percent greater than it was in 1938 and their industrial production was 50 or 55 percent greater. Yet they could not put in the field one-fortieth of what they had in 1938.

I ran into the same problem in Paris. I asked them this question—and I commend the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HAYS] because he has always been fair. But I asked them this. I said, "How much of your income tax levy are you collecting in Italy and in France?" And they said, "Oh, about 35 percent." I told them the American people were having to pay from 95 to 100 percent or go to jail. They told me, "Well, they have two sets of books here, one for the tax collector and one for their own personal use. They generally give the tax collector a case of champagne or something and he goes on his merry way." I do not think that is fair to the American taxpayers or to the American people.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Arkansas has expired.

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 additional minutes to the gentleman from Arkansas, and suggest he let the gentleman ask him a question.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. I must ask the gentleman to bring it to a close, but I will try to be liberal.

Mr. DORN of South Carolina. That was a preface to my question. Why do not we as the custodians of the American taxpayers' money demand of England and France and some of these other countries that they collect their taxes, that they put their own house in order, and that they put at least 1/5 as much into the field as they did in 1938 and 1939?

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. I think the gentleman has put his finger on a very difficult problem, and I wish to speak to this point, but I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina now.

Mr. RICHARDS. The gentleman from Iowa and the gentleman from Pennsylvania have been talking about what we have done, what we have accomplished. Some of the information about where our airfields are situated, and what kind of planes we have, and how much is going to a particular country, is classified.

Mr. GAVIN. That was the gentleman from Iowa, not I.

Mr. RICHARDS. The gentleman from Iowa, then.

I would like to refer to the testimony of General Gruenther before our committee. He said:

> Our forces have developed to a degree that even the most optimistic of us did not believe possible 4 years ago.
>
> Since 1951 when our military effort was first initiated, our divisional strength has increased to a point where we now have between 90 and 100 divisions, roughly 3 to 4 times what we had originally. The divisions we have today are, of course, at varying stages of effectiveness, but the scale of what has been accomplished is apparent. In the air, at the time that Allied Command Europe was organized, there were fewer than 2,000 military aircraft available to the NATO effort in Europe. Please note that I have simply referred to military aircraft. I could not, by even the most generous of definitions, arrive at anywhere near that number if I talked in terms of effective or modern aircraft. However, from that pitifully inadequate beginning we have increased until today we have over 6,000 aircraft available, and I am now talking in terms of modern fighting airplanes. The naval forces of Allied Command Europe have shown similar growth, and we have today several times the naval effectiveness that we had when our buildup started some 4 years ago.
>
> Talking simply in terms of numbers, as encouraging as that may appear, does not do our effort full justice. In addition to the quantitative increase, the forces of all three services have undergone major reequipping programs and are now equipped with effective and modern weapons and are being trained to function as an efficient modern fighting force. To all of this must be added what we have realized as a result of the NATO infrastructure program; we have well over 130 airfields available for use today which we owe to that program; we have new communications systems; we have provision for a pipeline system for the distribution of jet fuel. Finally, we will have a substantial augmentation of our strength because of the forces which the Federal Republic of Western Germany will furnish. All of this adds up to a very substantial military capability.

Mr. GROSS. Exclusive of the United States contribution to NATO, how many combat-ready divisions of NATO are there today ready to take the field?

Mr. RICHARDS. It was testified that some of these divisions had been just on paper, paper tigers, if you want to call them that. They are now fully equipped and at fighting strength and ready to go. That makes the difference.

Mr. GROSS. How many of them are there?

Mr. JUDD. Was it not made clear to us that the key thing is not the number, it is the quality and fighting capacity of the divisions? Our major effort for 3 years has been to build up first-rate divisions not just more divisions.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. May I say to the gentleman from Iowa that I wish to apologize to him for having said so bluntly that I would not give him the information. Of course he is entitled to the information but he realizes there are limitations upon the discussions here.

Now, as to the question raised by the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. DORN], there is ample evidence that there are great exertions by the NATO countries, and a good index to use is the gross national product. Yugoslavia is devoting 15 percent of her gross national product to defense. France and the other countries in NATO are devoting an average of about 10 percent, and we are devoting about 12 percent. That gives you some idea of the relative effort. You may say, "Well, should not they come up to our exertion? Why should we devote 12 percent and they devote 10 percent?" But you see our gross national product per capita is much more than theirs. If England can devote 10 percent of her $941 per capita, then that looks pretty good compared with our 12 percent of $2,200. It is what you have left that counts, when you are measuring exertions. I would like to generalize to this extent. I do not think anyone can say that Great Britain, for example, is not exerting herself, and that she has not called for the same sacrifices from her people that we have. There are tax problems in Europe, in some countries, such as the gentleman from South Carolina referred to, that we have tried to help work out. In Germany, you find it in their constitutional difficulties, and I

think they will work it out. We are counseling with France and Italy and they are getting some results in straightening out their tax system, but we also have that at home.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. I yield.

Mr. SPRINGER. I would like to ask the gentleman from Arkansas this one question. I believe he has gone into it a little bit, but has not developed it. Over the period of the last 6 or 7 years, we have developed a policy in which we have said that in these various countries lie defense interests of the United States; is that not correct?

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. That is correct.

Mr. SPRINGER. Thus, instrumentalities have been brought into effect by virtue of NATO and the extension of NATO and actually, I believe the gentleman from Iowa supported the Formosa resolution, that was one point in this year in which we said to the world that we have defensive interests in the maintenance of Formosa independently from Communist China. Now we come today, is it not true, to the question: How are we going to implement that policy which we have already established over the last 6 or 7 years, and which we have been following all those years? This is merely a way in which the policy which has already been made is to be implemented; is that not true?

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. That is correct.

Mr. SPRINGER. Therefore, these expenditures follow that line; is that not correct?

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. Exactly.

In view of the fact that an effort will be made to restrict some of the authorizations to 100 percent loans, I wish to discuss that feature of the bill. Under the Mutual Security Act of 1954 there are three mandatory provisions referring to loans. Section 505 provides that of all funds made available pursuant to the act and foreign currencies generated under the sales of agricultural surpluses under section 402, the equivalent of not less than $200 million shall be available only for the furnishing of assistance on a loan basis. Section 201 provides that 30 percent of funds appropriated for development assistance shall be available only for furnishing assistance on a loan basis. Section 501 provides that 30 percent of funds transferred from other titles into the development assistance category shall be available only for furnishing aid on a loan basis.

I understand that no serious difficulty has been encountered in carrying out these provisions. Approximately $215 million of assistance furnished with funds already appropriated will be on a loan basis, and the 30-percent minimum for loans in connection with development assistance will have been exceeded. Let me quote one of the FOA officials:

> Although these mandatory provisions have not proved unworkable, the executive branch requests that the Congress not place any floor or ceiling on loan requirements for fiscal year 1956. This request does not imply any slackening of effort on the part of the executive branch toward furnishing a maximum amount of assistance on a loan basis. On the contrary, we are on record as attempting to increase both in absolute amounts and percentages the amount of assistance which it will furnish in the future on a loan basis. The request for removal of dollar amounts and percentages from the Mutual Security Act of 1955 was made in order to provide an amount of flexibility in negotiating with recipient countries which we believe will result in more loans, rather than less loans. The fact that the current legislation states a percentage of 30 percent, for example, has led countries to believe that this should be a ceiling upon the percentage of loans which they should be expected to absorb. Although such an interpretation has no legal substance, it has nonetheless made the negotiating problem that much more difficult.

The Senate bill which we are now considering provides that at least 50 percent of the Presidential Development Fund for Asia should be provided on a loan basis, and the administration insists that this provision can be complied with without embarrassment or harm to the program. With respect to other funds, however, I believe that a mandatory percentage or dollar figure would not produce the desired result; namely, to place a maximum amount of assistance on a loan basis.

It is estimated that certain countries, such as India and Iran, can absorb considerably more than 30 percent of their assistance on a loan basis. Other countries, however, including some who have the greatest need for aid, cannot be expected to assume a high percentage of loans.

In Egypt, in an important area for example, we are providing $40 million of development assistance during the current fiscal year, and $7.5 million of that assistance is on a loan basis. Next year, it is anticipated that development assistance should be continued to Egypt, but no basis is seen for assumption by that country of a substantially higher percentage of loans. Egypt is one of the few countries in the world where per capita national income is going down rather than up, and the country is committed to the construction of a number of expensive projects which are the only hope for the development of the country.

The ability of other countries in the Near East to absorb loans varies. Countries such as Lebanon and Syria should be able to absorb a high percentage, if not all of their development assistance on a loan basis. I am told that others, such as Jordan and Libya, have neither the immediate prospect nor the long-range prospect of repaying loans on their development projects.

In Latin America, where the majority of the remaining development assistance funds are to be provided, there are similar problems. It is now estimated that some $15 million of development assistance may be necessary for Guatemala. This country is suffering a severe economic crisis at this time, and they must concentrate on projects which will reduce the serious unemployment problem in the country, largely in the field of road building. Their prospects for the repayment of additional loans are not good. Bolivia is in at least as bad shape economically. The country is completely out of reserves, and is in serious balance of payments difficulties. Haiti, another possible recipient of development assistance, is in similar straits, and the credit worthiness of that country, which is still struggling to rebuild after the devastation of Hurricane Hazel, will be used up to the limit in servicing Export-Import Bank loans now under consideration. The United States obviously has a stake in the development of the economies of these countries.

The foregoing cases are cited to indicate the inadvisability of a mandatory provision for a high percentage of loans with respect to development assistance. However, we are assured that the administration intends to exceed by a good margin the 30 percent requirement which was contained in the 1954 legislation. Considering the wide variance in the absorption capacity for loans among individual countries, it seems that the mandatory percentage provision creates many more problems than it solves for those who have to negotiate these agreements. I think in other words, that we must not put the negotiating officials in a straitjacket.

It has been pointed out that loans made under the Mutual Security Act need not conform with the standard criteria for bankability applied by lending institutions. The act has been administered on a basis quite different from the normal lending practices of these institutions. Loans made under the mutual security program have been made on a 30 to 40 year basis, with an option of repayment either in local currencies or in dollars, and at very low interest rates—4 percent for repayment in local currencies and 3 percent for repayment in dollars. Moreover, the loan agreements provide for a 3-year moratorium on the payment of both principal and interest. Any terms softer than these would tend to make loans inadvisable from a policy point of view. Even the Hoover Commission recommends that where assistance is necessary and there is no prospect of repayment of a loan, such assistance should be in the form of an outright grant.

Now, Mr. Chairman, may I revert to the questions asked by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS]. I read the following from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 100, part 7, page 9082 from a speech by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VORYS]:

> Let us talk about the economy involved. United States forces are now 3,046,000 men; 17 divisions-plus; 115 air wings now, and a navy, and the cost this year, in the bill we passed the other day, is $28 billion. This present bill will furnish arms and training and support for 175 divisions spread all over the earth; 220 Air Force squadrons; 1,500 naval aircraft, and considerable naval forces, and the cost will be about $3 billion.
>
> It costs to maintain one American serviceman overseas $5,866 a year, without a weapon in his hand. Look at page 156 of our hearings. It costs to maintain one European serviceman $1,112 a year with no weapon in his hand. By this bill we spend about $700 per man for these 175 divisions scattered all over the earth, to put weapons in their hands and to contribute partially toward their maintenance.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Arkansas has expired.

Mr. SELDEN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. SELDEN. Mr. Chairman, I think it is well to remind ourselves that the measure now before us for consideration merely authorizes the funds to carry out the mutual security program for the coming fiscal year. This legislation authorizes the maximum, not the minimum, amount that can be spent.

The Congress, as you know, will have an opportunity later to actually appropriate the funds for this program and, if history repeats itself, the appropriation will be less than the authorization.

Therefore, in supporting this authorization, I do not feel that one estops himself from voting for a reduction in the Mutual Security Appropriation bill when it reaches this body for consideration.

The authorization bill does, however, set up certain broad policies that are usually followed, and these policies should certainly be considered carefully before one votes on this legislation.

After a study of our foreign aid program, the Randall Commission recommended the adoption of a policy whereby our trade would be increased and economic aid on a grant basis would be decreased wherever possible. The President, in a message to Congress last year, endorsed these Randall Commission recommendations. The Congress has also followed many of the Randall Commission's trade recommendations and last year made a start in connection with the recommendations dealing with foreign economic aid.

I refer specifically to the 1954 Mutual Security Act in which Congress provided that development assistance should be terminated by June 30, 1955. Also, it placed certain minimum loan requirements in the 1954 act. Yet, despite this noteworthy start, the measure now before us indicates we are slipping backward rather than moving ahead in our efforts to decrease these economic aid grants. To be specific, more economic aid grants will be authorized by this legislation in its present form than were appropriated by the Congress last year.

The view that our economic aid program should emphasize loans instead of grants whenever possible has, I believe, much merit, and I feel that certain amendments to the legislation now under consideration should be adopted if we are to strengthen rather than weaken that policy.

Our Government has loaned substantial sums to foreign governments since World War II and the record indicates that none of these loans are in default. Of the $14,147,769,000 made in loans, the sum of $3,176,216,000 has already been repaid and interest in the amount of $1,331,284,000 has been collected. In other words, the taxpayers of this country are more than $4.5 billion better off today than they would have been had this aid been in the form of grants rather than loans.

In the bill now before us, we find an item of $182 million listed as development assistance. Also, we find listed the amount of $200 million in the President's Fund for Asian Economic Development. Both of these items, a total of $382 million, consist primarily of economic aid in the form of grants that will be made to nations, most of whom have no mutual defense agreements with us.

The broad purpose of this development assistance is, as I understand it, to help undeveloped free countries raise their standards of living and develop their resources. Among the resources of some of these nations are large amounts of critical and strategic materials which cannot be found in sufficient amounts in this country. For example, the United States relies on foreign countries for 100 percent of our natural rubber, 100 percent of our tin, 99 percent of our chromite, 95 percent of our manganese, 72 percent of our tungsten, and for a large proportion of many other commodities essential to our military strength and economic well-being.

If we furnish development assistance to foreign countries in loans that are repayable, then it may be possible in years to come for those same countries to repay us in the very raw materials that were developed with our loans. There is, of course, always the possibility that some or all of these loans may never be repaid. Yet, if this development assistance is left as a gift instead of being placed on a loan basis, you can be certain those funds will be gone forever.

It is my belief, therefore, that Congress should at this time adopt a firm policy whereby economic aid of this type will be made in the form of loans rather than grants, and it is my intention to support all amendments that will strengthen such a policy. I trust a majority of the Members of the House will do likewise.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Chairman, I should like to record myself as in favor of those programs advocated by the President which are necessary to the security and well-being of the American people, faced as we are with the constant threat of Communist aggression. In the past, I have unhesitatingly supported all such programs and am proud to say that my voting record is 100 percent favorable to such programs.

The mutual-security program which we now have before us, in principle, deserves the unwavering support of this House. I have made a very careful examination of this act and I find only one part which does not advance the security and welfare of the American people. That section I refer to has to do with aid to Tito's Yuogslavia.

On June 17 I had the privilege of appearing before the House Foreign Affairs Committee to present my views with respect to giving either military or economic assistance to Tito's Yugoslavia. I reminded the committee members that last year when the mutual-security appropriation bill was before the House, I offered an amendment to that section which authorized the use of $70 million, which I was informed would, in part, be used to support the tyranny of Tito, which read as follows:

Provided, That no part of these funds shall be used for or on behalf of Yugoslavia.

I also repeated to the committee the same arguments in support of this position which I presented on the floor on July 27, 1954, when we were considering appropriations for an almost identical act to the one we have before us today. I believe those reasons are more valid today than they were in 1954 and consequently I would like to bring them to the attention of the House at this time.

First, Tito has never really broken with his Russian-Communist friends. As a matter of fact, keen students of the Yugoslav problem question whether the present dictator of Yugoslavia is really Josip Broz. It is quite possible that the present-day Tito is just another Russian boy trying to make good in a big way for his mentors in the Kremlin.

Second, present-day Yugoslavia under Tito will never fight on the side of the United States in the event of a conflict with the Russian Communists. In the event of war, the Yugoslav people, under Tito, will move in one or two directions. The most likely is that they will take advantage of war to liquidate Tito and all his followers, thus causing widespread internal revolution. The second possibility is that the people of Yugoslavia, the Croats, the Serbs, the Slovenes, and the Montenegrans, will be forced to fight against the West with Russian machineguns at their back.

Third, the present-day Tito under the cover of "national communism" has been able to penetrate important segments of the organized defense community of the free world which has been created to prevent further Communist aggression. The North Atlantic Treaty Organization has been publicized as the symbol of western unity against atheistic communism. Tito's Yugoslavia would not be eligible for admission into NATO because admitting Tito to NATO would immediately destroy the symbolism which has been built up. So to prevent this question from being raised, the Department of State took the initiative in creating a small entente with our gallant and proven allies, Turkey and Greece, being put in the same bed with Tito which opens a special back door for Tito into the NATO community. The false cover of national communism also permits Tito to place his agents in many strategic positions and in general permits him the opportunity to carry out an intense campaign of "neutralizing" the free world so that it will be paralyzed in the event the Russian Communists make a sneak attack on the United States.

Fourth, Tito has never proven that he is a steadfast friend of the West. Unfortunately, we have never put him to any real test to determine where he stands on the critical issue of the United States against Russian communism. In the hysteria created by some of our striped-pants negotiators, we have deserted some of our best friends and strangely have now accepted as our supposed friends, proven advocates of world socialism. I suppose it is impolite to remind the Members of Congress that Marshal Tito has just reestablished diplomatic relations with Moscow and that it is common gossip along the highways and byways of Europe that the relationship between the Russian Communists and Tito Communists has always been on a most friendly and cordial basis.

Fifth, in any case, the people of Yugoslavia under the Tito brand of communism, will never be united behind anything Tito stands for. As a good example of my point, let us look at what Tito's brand of communism has done to the traditional food-producing capacity of the people of Yugoslavia. Before World War II Yugoslavia was a surplus food area of Europe, always in a position to export millions of dollars worth of food each year. Today, under Tito, the enslaved people of Yugoslavia, the Croats, the Serbs, the Slovenes, the Montenegrins, are hungry. The United States has been required on at least two occasions to bail Tito out and to keep him in power by sending some of our surplus agricultural commodities to Yugoslavia in order to prevent open rebellion against Tito's regime.

Sixth, there is the practical possibility that the arms and other strategic material which we made available to Tito may later find their way behind the Iron Curtain, where the Communist stooges of the Kremlin who are responsible for the enslavement of those once free nations, will store these arms and other important strategic materials for future aggressions against the free world. I am certain that a real investigation of this matter would reveal some startling evidence.

I then urged upon the committee the need for the Foreign Affairs Committee itself to make an on-the-spot investigation of the situation obtaining with reference to Yugoslavia. I did so because I am firmly convinced that any objective investigation would substantiate in full the observations I have outlined for you this afternoon.

It is a well-known fact that, despite the fact we have given abundantly to Tito, both in terms of economic aid and military assistance, we have not been able to obtain the right to inspection over the use of those funds and military end items despite the fact the law requires it. The hard cold facts are that we do not know what Tito does with all the military and economic aid he has inveigled from the United States. It is quite possible that military equipment received from the United States has been filtered into Albania,, or to Hungary, Rumania, or Bulgaria by Tito and his henchmen. Moreover, since we do not have the right to inspect all military installations, depots, roads, or railroads in Yugoslavia having to do with military defense, we are not even in a position to determine whether Tito receives more aid from Moscow than he receives from Washington.

I am very happy to note that the committee report which accompanies Senate bill 2090 completely concurs in my statement that we do not have inspection authority in Yugoslavia over our economic or military assistance programs. I should like to read for you from that report the section dealing with aid to Yugoslavia which bears upon that point:

AID TO YUGOSLAVIA

The committee gave special consideration to the situation in Yugoslavia and explored carefully the question of continuing assistance to that country. The committee reached the conclusion that no specific limitations should be imposed on the supplying of aid to that country. Testimony disclosed, however, that the Yugoslav Government has not been fully cooperative in carrying out the requirement of the Mutual Security Act that United States representatives be permitted "continuous observation and review" of the use made of equipment supplied by the United States.

The provisions of the law are clear in this respect, and the committee believes that United States officials responsible for the administration of the mutual assistance program have not been sufficiently insistent that the Government of Yugoslavia live up to the terms of its agreements. The committee has refrained from including in the bill legislative restrictions on further assistance to Yugoslavia only because it is confident that henceforth the letter and the spirit of the law will be carefully observed.

Now, surely ample reason has been demonstrated for the need of the House Foreign Affairs Committee to make an on-the-spot investigation before any additional aid whatsoever is given to Tito.

Under the 5-minute rule, I will offer an amendment to the act which will require a full inspection of all the military installations, depots, roads, and railroads in Yugoslavia, and a favorable report thereon to the effect that our assistance has been put to the advantage of the cause of human freedom before any additional funds or assistance can be given to Tito. Only a few weeks ago the Russian Communist leaders, Khrushchev and Bulganin, visited their buddy, Tito, in Belgrade. Some may call this little more than a part of the Russian diplomatic campaign to isolate the United States. But on the facts this was clearly a public demonstration of the unbroken bond between Tito and the Russians.

It is most significant that when the love feast came to an end the joint communique held these demands to be common both to Tito and the Russian Communists.

(a) That Red China be admitted to the United Nations.

(b) That the use of nuclear weapons be outlawed and permanently banned—under the infamous Russian formula.

Now, examining these two demands we immediately see that they are directly opposed to the basic foreign policy position of the United States. Any schoolchild knows that our superiority in nuclear weapons and our certain capability to deliver them has been the only practical deterrent to Russia occupying all of the Eurasian Continent. Now Tito wants to take from us the only sure means we have of preventing world war III or worse still preparing the way for our abject surrender to the Russian despots.

As to Red China—who can ever forget the treacherous part she played in the Korean war, how she now holds so many of our citizens in dungeons without cause and how she has been beating the drums of war and further aggression in South Asia. But Tito sees no evil in this—he wants Red China admitted to the U. N. in order to legalize a criminal regime, give the Russians another vote in the Security Council, cause us to desert more of our friends and thereby generally advance their objective of Communist world domain.

It is also significant that the agreement signed by the Russian Communists and Tito contains a section on the exchange of populations. This agreement calls for the repatriation of all Russians living in Yugoslavia—and this includes Russians who left Russia after the 1918 revolution and have been legal residents of Yugoslavia. It also includes people who elected to remain in Yugoslavia after the so-called Cominform split of 1948—the ones who opposed the Cominform—you can guess what will happen to them.

Similarly, there are Yugoslav Communists living the the U. S. S. R. Those are the ones who stayed with Moscow when the so-called Cominform break was made by Tito in 1948. They are 100 percent pro-Russian and 100 percent anti-American. These people will return to Yugoslavia to help ease world tensions and to tighten the chains of slavery on the good people of Yugoslavia.

The agreement does not specify that this exchange of population will be voluntary. That means it will be forced—in typical Communist fashion.

It is also interesting to recall that before Khrushchev and Bulganin arrived in Belgrade the Russian secret police arrived well in advance and made a roundup of about 160 people and had them put in jail. The Russian secret police provided a list and required that all the people on that list be put behind bars. Tito, of course, promptly compiled with this request. What sort of independence of action does this indicate?

On the subject of neutralizing the enemies of Moscow, which I charged Tito with being dedicated to, it is important to note that Moscow recently called for a campaign to neutralize all the countries on the borders of the Russian-Communist empire. In particular: A neutralized Austria, Germany, Turkey, Greece, India, Indonesia, and Japan. That, my friends, is known as the global strategy of neutralism. It intends to create a neutral belt between Moscow and what is left of the free world. That neutral belt will be most fertile soil for the Trojan-horse methods of Moscow. It will be only a matter of a few years before the so-called neutral belt is firmly attached to the ever-expanding Russian-Communist empire.

Tito is the main cog in the Russian geopolitical strategy of creating a global neutral belt around their empire. Right after their visit to Belgrade the Russians visited Hungary and Rumania and publicly announced their plan to establish better relations with Turkey and Greece. This means they are going to go all out to neutralize them. In this maneuver Tito is their key. Recall that there is a small alliance between Greece, Turkey, and Yugoslavia created largely on the initiative of the State Department of the United States.

I also would like to draw attention to a peculiar situation in which our proven allies Turkey and Greece must allow complete inspection of our military and economic aid programs. I say it is peculiar, because we do not get the same quid pro quo from Tito. Turkey provided over 40,000 men for the fight for freedom in Korea, and Greece contributed proportionately of her best trained soldiers. We will never forget how they fought side by side with our sons in that Moscow-created war. Tito sat on the sidelines for that one.

Now by comparison we are treating Turkey and Greece with suspicion and at the same time have embraced Tito as a proven and stanch friend. Don't misunderstand my point. I am in favor of complete inspection powers over all forms of military and economic aid we give. My point is, Why do we excuse Tito from complete inspection over our aid and then demand it for our stanch and proven friends? The House of Representatives would do well to get an answer to that question.

Only yesterday we were informed that Tito would soon visit his buddies in the Kremlin to resume the love feast which was so well demonstrated in their joint meeting at Belgrade. Tito feels absolutely safe in visiting the Russians on their home ground. This is indeed a peculiar situation when one considers that Tito has been described by the Kremlin itself as the archenemy of what they describe as the "people's democracy." It is also a well-known fact that if Tito was not absolutely certain that he would not be picked up by the Russian MVD, he would not dare to make his "good will" trip to Moscow. The reason I have cited this is that we are told over and over again that Tito is a friend of the West and an enemy of the Russian Communists. How strange therefore, that the status of Tito has been changed by the Russian Communists themselves into one of a close and endearing friend when we are still referring to Tito as an enemy of Russian communism.

Mr. Chairman, I feel strongly that not one single penny should be given to Tito from funds collected from the taxpayers of the United States. I held this position right from the beginning on the mutual-security programs. I repeat, last year I offered an amendment, the objective of which was to prevent the use of any of our taxpayers' money by Tito, but I want to do everything possible to make easy the way of our Secretary of State in his difficult task of building a free world alliance which can bring about the ultimate defeat of the international Communist conspiracy. Therefore, rather than offering an amendment barring any aid to Tito, I will propose an amendment which requires the Foreign Affairs Committee to make an on-the-spot investigation of how our former assistance to Yugoslavia has been used, and whether such assistance supports the security and well-being of the United States.

Mr. LONG. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count.

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. COOPER, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (S. 2090) to amend the Mutual Security Act of 1954, and for other purposes, directed him to report it had come to no resolution thereon.

REVISING 1946 TRADE AGREEMENTS WITH THE PHILIPPINES

Mr. MADDEN, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 289, Rept. No. 988) 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. 6059) to authorize the President of the United States to enter into an agreement with the President of the Republic of the Philippines to revise the 1946 trade agreement between the United States of America and the Republic of the Philippines, and all points of order against said bill are hereby waived. That 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 Ways and Means, the bill shall be considered as having been read for amendment. No amendment shall be in order to said bill except amendments offered by direction of the Committee on Ways and Means, and said amendments shall be in order, any rule of the House to the contrary notwithstanding. Amendments offered by direction of the Committee on Ways and Means may be offered to any section of the bill at the conclusion of the general debate, but said amendments shall not be subject to amendment. 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.

WAR-RISK HAZARD AND DETENTION BENEFITS

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 6871) to continue the effectiveness of the act of December 2, 1942, as amended, and the act of July 28, 1945, as amended, relating to war-risk hazard and detention benefits until July 1, 1956.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 201 of the act of December 2, 1942 (ch. 668, 56 Stat. 1033), as amended, is further amended by deleting the words "July 1, 1955" and inserting in lieu thereof "July 1, 1956."

SEC. 2. Section 5 (b) of the act of July 28, 1945 (ch. 328, 59 Stat. 505), as amended, is further amended by deleting the words "July 1, 1955" and inserting in lieu thereof "July 1, 1956."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDMENTS TO RESERVE OFFICER PERSONNEL ACT, 1954

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 1718) to provide certain clarifying and technical amendments to the Reserve Officer Personnel Act of 1954.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That (a) the second sentence of section 201 of the Reserve Officer Personnel Act of 1954 is amended by striking out the word "two" and substituting in lieu thereof the word "three."

(b) Section 205 of such act is amended by inserting at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(c) (1) A Reserve officer serving on active duty who, on the date he would otherwise be removed from active status under sections 325, 327, 411, 522, 524, or 611 of this act, is within 2 years of qualifying for retirement under either title II of the Army-Air Force Vitalization and Retirement Equalization Act of 1948 (32 Stat. 1084), or section 6 of Public Law 305, of the 79th Congress (60 Stat. 27), may, in the discretion of the Secretary, be retained on active duty for a period not to exceed 2 years if he will then be entitled to the benefits of such provisions of law and will not earlier attain the maximum age at which transfer from an active status or discharge is required by this act. He shall not be removed from an active duty status so long as he remains on active duty.

"(2) The term 'maximum age' as used in this section shall, in the case of any officer covered by sections 325 and 327 hereof, be the age authorized by the first paragraph of section 326 (a) of this act."

(c) Section 339 (c) of such act is hereby repealed.

SEC. 2. Section 333 of the Reserve Officer Personnel Act of 1954 is amended (1) by striking out "A Reserve" and inserting in lieu thereof "(a) Except as provided in subsection (b) hereof, a Reserve", and (2) by inserting at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(b) A Reserve office on active duty who has not completed his period of required active duty as a member of a Reserve component under any provision of law or regulations, and who is recommended or found qualified for promotion, may not be promoted until he completes that period of required active duty, or until he is temporarily promoted to that higher grade. Upon completing that period of required active duty or upon being temporarily promoted to that higher grade, he shall, if he applies therefor, be promoted, be subject to subsection (a), and be credited with the amount of promotion service in the higher grade that he would have had if he had been promoted but for the provisions of this subsection."

SEC. 3. (a) Section 402 (d) of the Reserve Officer Personnel Act of 1954 is amended by striking out the period at the end thereof and inserting a comma and the following: "except that until July 1, 1960, each such number authorized in this section for each grade may, if necessary, be increased by not to exceed 10 percent by the Secretary to permit promotions under this title."

(b) Section 403 of such act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following sentence: "Within the number to be selected which the Secretary may furnish to a selection board considering Naval Reserve line officers in any grade, the Secretary may further specify numbers of officers of stated qualifications and experience who are required to meet mobilization needs in the next higher grade."

(c) The second sentence of section 405 (b) of such act is amended by striking out "ineligible" and inserting in lieu thereof "eligible."

(d) Section 405 (d) of such act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sentence: "An officer whose name is so withheld from consideration from two selection boards for promotion to the same next higher grade shall be deemed to have failed twice of selection. An officer who has

met all requirements for eligibility for consideration but whose name is omitted by administrative error from the list of officers furnished a selection board, shall be considered not to have failed of selection by that board and if selected by the next selection board to consider for promotion officers of the same grade he shall be entitled to the same date of rank and to pay and allowances of the higher grade for duty performed from the same date as if he had been selected by the board from which his name was withheld by error."

(e) Title IV of such act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"SEC. 414. Officers who prior to July 1, 1955, were selected for promotion under appropriate Naval and Marine Corps regulations promulgated pursuant to subsection 216 (a) of the Armed Forces Reserve Act of 1952, as amended, may be promoted under the authority of this act with precedence and entitlement to pay and allowances as prescribed by this act."

SEC. 4. (a) Section 501 (b) (1) of the Reserve Officer Personnel Act of 1954 is amended to read as follows:

"(1) 'Promotion service' means—

"(A) service in an active status in current grade; and

"(B) all service in an active status subsequent to June 25, 1950, and prior to the effective date of this act (i) during which an officer was eligible for permanent promotion on the basis of service in a higher temporary grade, (ii) in an equivalent or higher permanent grade in the same or another service, including service in a federally recognized commissioned status in the Army and Air National Guard, except that any such service authorized under this subparagraph shall be counted but once for promotion purposes."

(b) Section 502 of such act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(d) To carry out the provisions of this title a promotion may be made effective before, on, or after the date accomplished, and the officer shall be entitled to pay, allowance, and benefits authorized by law for the higher grade from such effective date unless expressly provided otherwise in this act."

(c) Section 504 (a) (2) (B) of such act is amended by striking out "longest service as a commissioned officer (including service in the federally recognized National Guard or in a federally recognized status therein prior to 1933)" and inserting in lieu thereof "greatest number of total years of service."

(d) Section 506 of such act is amended (1) by striking out subsection (a) thereof, and (2) by striking out "(b)" and inserting in lieu thereof "(a)."

(e) The last sentence of section 508 (c) of such act is amended by inserting after the word "sections" the following: "502 (d), 511 (c)."

(f) Section 509 of such act is amended (1) by striking out in subsection (a) thereof "subsection (b)" and inserting in lieu thereof "subsections (b) and (c)," and (2) by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(c) Whenever the Secretary determines that there are vacancies in the permanent grade of first lieutenant, Reserve officers in the grade of second lieutenant under regulations prescribed by the Secretary, may be promoted to the permanent grade of first lieutenant before completion of 3 years of promotion service."

(g) Section 510 (b) of such act is amended by striking the period at the end of paragraph 2 thereof and inserting a semicolon and the following: "and

"(3) only those Reserve officers of the Air National Guard of the United States who must be considered at that time in accordance with the provisions of subsection (a) of this section."

(h) Section 511 of such act is amended by striking out subsection (b) and inserting in lieu thereof the following new subsections:

"(b) Except as provided in subsection (c) hereof, a Reserve officer on active duty who is promoted to a grade higher than that in which he is serving shall continue to serve on active duty in the grade in which he was serving immediately before that promotion, and may be appointed in a temporary grade which is equal to that lower grade. An officer who is so appointed in a temporary grade is considered to have accepted the appointment upon the date of the orders announcing it unless he expressly declines it, and need not take a new oath of office upon being so appointed. However, he may decline the appointment within 6 months after the date of the order announcing it, and shall be released from active duty.

"(c) A Reserve officer on active duty who has not completed his period of required active duty as a member of a Reserve component under any provision of law or regulations, and who is recommended or found qualified for promotion, may not be promoted until he completes that period of required active duty, or until he is temporarily promoted to that higher grade. Upon completing that period of required active duty or upon being temporarily promoted to that higher grade, he shall, if he applies therefor, be promoted, be subject to subsection (b), and be credited with the amount of promotion service in the higher grade that he would have had if he had been promoted but for the provisions of this subsection.

"(d) A Reserve officer who, while he is serving on active duty, is promoted to a grade higher than the grade in which he is serving, may not serve on active duty in the grade to which promoted, or be entitled while on that period of active duty to the rank, pay, and allowances of that higher grade unless he is ordered to serve on active duty in that higher grade or is temporarily promoted to that higher grade."

(i) Section 523 of such act is amended (1) by striking out in subsections (a), (b), and (c), the words "date upon" wherever they appear therein and inserting in lieu thereof the words "last day of the month in", and (2) by striking out in the first sentence of subsection (d) the word "Each" and inserting in lieu thereof "Effective 5 years after the effective date of this act, each."

(j) Section 524 of such act is amended (1) by striking out in subsection (a) thereof "two years" and inserting in lieu thereof "five years", and (2) by striking out in the first sentence of subsections (b), (c), (d) (1), and (d) (2) thereof the word "Each" and inserting in lieu thereof "Effective five years after the effective date of this act, each."

(k) Title 5 of such act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sections:

"SEC. 527. Notwithstanding any other provision of this act, a Reserve officer who becomes a civilian employee of the Air National Guard prior to the effective date of this act may not, before attaining age 60, while so employed and without his consent, be removed from active status by reason of any mandatory promotion provisions contained herein, except for cause, physical disability, or by reason of being twice passed over for promotion to the grade of captain, major, or lieutenant colonel.

"SEC. 528. Notwithstanding section 701 of this act, the Secretary is authorized to take, prior to the effective date of this act, such administrative actions, including the convening of appropriate selection boards, as may be necessary to insure that the act may be implemented upon its effective date."

SEC. 5. (a) Section 606 (b) of the Reserve Officer Personnel Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"(4) If a running mate is retarded in rate of promotion or has attained the highest rank to which he may be promoted, the new running mate shall be the officer of the Regular Coast Guard who is next senior to the old running mate, exclusive of extra numbers, or if there be no such Regular officer then the Regular officer of the same grade who is next eligible for promotion. An officer shall be considered to have been retarded when another officer in his grade junior to him is eligible for promotion ahead of him. If subsequently the old running mate is promoted and is restored to the precedence he would have held but for the retardation, he shall be reassigned as the running mate of the Reserve officer concerned."

(b) Section 608 of such act is amended by striking out "and shall be allowed the pay and allowances of the higher grade for duty performed from the date his running mate became entitled to such pay and allowances" and insert in lieu thereof "and a Reserve officer so promoted shall be allowed pay and allowances of the higher grade for duty performed from the date of his appointment thereto."

(c) Title 6 of such act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"SEC. 619. Officers who, prior to July 1, 1955, were selected for promotion under appropriate regulations may be promoted under the authority of this act with precedence and entitlement to pay and allowances as prescribed by this act."

With the following committee amendments:

Page 3, line 11, strike out all of section 3 (a) and insert:

"SEC. 3. (a) The first sentence of section 402 (c) is amended by changing the period at the end of the sentence to a colon and adding the following: '*Provided*, That until July 1, 1960, the percent in the grade of major may be 22 percent, in the grade of captain, 45 percent, and in the combined grades of first and second lieutenant, 25 percent, if, in the opinion of the Secretary, such increased percentages are required to permit promotions under this title'."

Page 11, line 15, insert:

"SEC. 6. Subsection 302 (f) (1) is amended to read as follows:

"'(f) "Promotion service" means the aggregate of the following:

"'(1) Any period an officer has held, or is credited by the Secretary with having held, a permanent appointment in his current grade in the Army or, in the discretion of the Secretary any other armed force of the United States while—

"'(A) in an active status; or

"'(B) on an active list of a Regular component;

"'(2) For an officer who was on active duty prior to September 3, 1945, any period served on active duty prior to January 1, 1949, in the Army or, in the discretion of the Secretary, any other armed force of the United States while in a temporary grade equal to or higher than his current grade; and

"'(3) Any period credited under section 305 (b).

No period may be counted twice as promotion service. For a person credited with service under section 201 or subsection 305 (c) or (d), no period prior to appointment or transfer may be counted under (1) or (2) as promotion services.'

"SEC. 7. Section 303 is amended by adding the following new subsections:

"'(f) The promotion of a Reserve officer under investigation or against whom proceedings of a court-martial or board of officers are pending may be delayed by the Secretary until such investigation or proceedings are completed.

"'(g) Based on the results of an investigation or the proceedings of a court-martial or board of officers, the Secretary may remove from the recommended list the name of any officer who in his opinion is not qualified for promotion. A nonunit officer so removed from a recommended list shall, for the purposes of section 311 be deemed to have been considered and not recommended for promotion.'

"SEC. 8. Section 314 is amended by inserting the words 'other than the Judge Advocate General's Corps' after the words 'special branch' appearing in subsection (a) and by substituting 'sections 303, 311, or 333' for 'section 311' appearing in subsection (d).

"SEC. 9. Section 325 is amended by inserting a colon after the words 'Retired Reserve', by deleting that portion of the section following such colon, and by adding the following new subsections:

"'(a) If not on active duty, within 90 days after the second selection board submits its report to the convening authority; or

"'(b) If on active duty, 120 days after being notified of his second nonselection.'

"SEC. 10. Section 333 is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 333. (a) A Reserve officer on active duty who is promoted to a grade higher than that in which he is serving shall continue to serve on active duty in the grade in which he was serving immediately before that promotion and shall, unless he expressly declines such promotion, be deemed to have accepted, effective on the date of such promotion, a temporary appointment in the grade in which serving. If he does not desire to continue on active duty in the grade in which serving, he may, except as provided in subsection (b) hereof, elect to be relieved from active duty and shall be promoted on the day subsequent to such relief or on the day he would have been promoted had he remained on active duty, whichever is the later. If his relief from active duty occurs subsequent to the date he would have been promoted had he remained on active duty, he shall be credited with the amount of promotion service that he would have had if he had remained on active duty and been promoted.

"'(b) A Reserve officer on active duty who is recommended or found qualified for promotion and who has not completed his period of required active duty as a member of a Reserve component under any provision of law or regulation shall not have the election of relief from active duty as provided in subsection (a) hereof but may decline a promotion if he does not desire to serve on active duty in a grade lower than his permanent grade. A person who so declines a promotion shall, if he applies therefor, be promoted upon being temporarily promoted to that higher grade or, subject to subsection (a), upon completing his period of required active duty.'

"SEC. 11. Section 337 of such act is hereby repealed."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be read the third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, these are all technical amendments, and I ask permission to file a statement gotten up by our counsel, telling exactly what these amendments do.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, S. 1718 is a bill to provide certain clarifying and technical amendments to the Reserve Officer Personnel Act of 1954. This law was enacted during the 83d Congress, and goes into effect on July 1 of this year. Since its enactment, several amendments have become necessary in order to provide clarification of various provisions of the law, and to correct certain errors which were made when the bill was written.

Most of these amendments are technical and clarifying, but I will point out four which are substantive.

The first provides that a qualified Reserve officer who has served on continuous active duty for a period of 18 years will be given the opportunity to remain on active duty until qualified for retirement under title II of Public Law 810, provided he will not exceed the maximum age for officers of his rank, and provided that the period during which he remains on active duty does not exceed 2 years. As a matter of fact, all of the military departments are doing this administratively at the present time. This merely writes into law a policy which is now in effect.

There are three amendments contained in the bill which will validate the actions of selection boards who have completed their findings prior to June 30, the day before the law goes into effect. The reason for these amendments is that the selection boards have met during the past year and have announced their selections for promotion but, in many cases, the promotions will not be made until after the effective date of the act. Legal opinions have been rendered which hold that if these amendments are not adopted, all of the promotions based on the selection boards which have not been consummated prior to the effective date of the act will not be valid, and the selection boards will again have to meet to reconsider the individuals previously selected.

Such a procedure would be unsatisfactory, because, inasmuch as the selections have been made and announced—although the promotions have not been made—there is a possibility that a new board might not select the same officers. Furthermore, it is obviously a waste of time and effort to require the departments to go through the selection procedure a second time.

Another amendment protects pilots within the Air National Guard squadrons from being promoted out of their billets due to any accelerated promotion program. There are provisions of the Reserve Officer Personnel Act which allow for an accelerated promotion program when vacancies exist. Although the Air National Guard is most desirous of seeing their officers promoted on time, it wishes to make certain that the promotions do not accelerate to the point where there are no vacancies in the Air National Guard squadrons and, consequently, pilots would be promoted out of a squadron billet. This amendment is peculiar to the Air National Guard and does not affect the other services by its adoption, but it will correct a situation which might become harmful to the Air Guard.

The other substantive amendments are peculiar to the Air Force, inasmuch as the other services are not affected under their titles of the law. There are provisions of the Reserve Officer Personnel Act which deal with forced attrition, and provide that after an officer has served a certain length of time, he is transferred to the Retired Reserve, if he so requests, or is discharged. It has now been discovered that a large number of Reserve officers who are well qualified will be forced off active duty on July 1 of this year unless these provisions of law are modified.

Consequently, the amendments would defer these provisions from going into effect for 5 years. As a matter of fact, this amendment will bring the Air Force into line with the other military services and will allow it to retain these officers on active duty and, in most cases, the officers can qualify for retirement by continuing in the active service.

Mr. Speaker, those are the substantive amendments to the law, and the balance of the amendments are corrections of typographical errors, language changes, and clarification of existing provisions.

The committee amended the bill in several respects. Again, many of the amendments were clarifying, but I will point out one committee amendment which changes the authorized percentages in grade for the various ranks in the Marine Corps.

Since the enactment of the law, the Marine Corps has discovered that they have a hump in the ranks of captain and major that, if the mandatory percentages in those ranks are not increased, it will be unable to promote officers in these ranks. Of course, one of the primary purposes of the Reserve Officer Personnel Act is to maintain a steady flow of promotions for Reserve officers. Consequently, the committee was of the opinion that for a period of 5 years the percentages in the lower ranks of the Marine Corps officers should be increased so that promotions could be made in these ranks.

Another committee amendment would give the Secretary of the Army authority to withhold the promotion of an officer who is under investigation or against whom there are court-martial proceedings in process. This is done in the Regular services, but there is no authority to do so for Reserve officers.

This will place Reserve officers on the same basis as Regulars in this respect.

SMALL BUSINESS ACT OF 1953, DEFENSE PRODUCTION ACT OF 1950

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the resolution (S. J. Res. 85) to extend for temporary periods certain housing programs, the Small Business Act of 1953, and the Defense Production Act of 1950.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

Mr. VORYS. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, has that been checked?

Mr. McCORMACK. Yes. That has been cleared.

This is to extend for a short period of time three activities that expire on June 30. They have been cleared with the leadership on the gentleman's side.

Mr. GAMBLE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VORYS. I yield.

Mr. GAMBLE. What is the length of the extension?

Mr. McCORMACK. One is extended from June 30 to July 31 and two are extended from June 30 to August 31 of this year.

Mr. GAMBLE. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, etc., That the National Housing Act, as amended, is hereby amended—

(1) by striking "July 1, 1955" in section 2 (a) and inserting "August 1, 1955"; and

(2) by striking "June 30, 1955" in section 803 (a) and inserting "July 31, 1955."

SEC. 2. The second sentence of section 104 of the Defense Housing and Community Facilities and Services Act of 1951, as amended, is hereby amended by striking "July 1, 1955" both times it appears therein and inserting "August 1, 1955."

SEC. 3. The United States Housing Act of 1937, as amended, is hereby amended by striking the words "fiscal year 1955" in subsection 10 (i) thereof and substituting the following therefor: "period from June 30, 1954, to August 1, 1955."

SEC. 4. Subsection (a) of section 221 of the Small Business Act of 1953 is amended by striking "June 30, 1955" and inserting "July 31, 1955."

SEC. 5. The first sentence of subsection (a) of section 717 of the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, is hereby amended by striking "June 30, 1955" and inserting "July 31, 1955."

The Senate joint resolution was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time and passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CONVEYANCE OF OLD COLONY PROJECT TO THE BOSTON HOUSING AUTHORITY

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (H. R. 6980) providing for the conveyance of the Old Colony project to the Boston Housing Authority.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, notwithstanding the provisions of any other law, the Housing and Home Finance Administrator is authorized and directed to sell and convey all right, title, and interest of the United States (including any off-site easements) at fair market value, as determined by him on the basis of an appraisal made by an independent real-estate expert selected by him in and to War Housing Project MASS-19051, known as Old Colony project, containing 873 dwelling units and nondwelling facilities, on approximately 18 acres of land in Boston, Mass., to the Boston Housing Authority, for use as a relocation project under applicable local law. The sale pursuant to this act shall be on such terms and conditions as the Administrator shall determine: *Provided*, That full payment to the United States shall be required within a period of not to exceed 30 years with interest on the unpaid balance not to exceed 5 percent per annum: *Provided further*, That the provisions of this act shall be effective only if the sale is consummated within 6 months after the time of approval of this action: *And provided further*, That the Administrator may extend the time for the consummation of the sale for such additional period or periods of time as he may deem advisable.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, this is a bill I introduced providing for the conveyance of the Old Colony project to the Boston Housing Authority. The purpose is to enable negotiations to be made between the Administrator of the Federal Housing and Finance Agency and the officials of the city of Boston in connection with the possible sale of a housing project in Boston.

The necessity for this legislation is to take advantage of certain preferences under existing law so these negotiations can take place.

Mr. Speaker, I offer two technical amendments.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. McCORMACK: Page 1, line 9, after the word "him" insert a comma.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. McCORMACK: Page 2, line 11, strike out the word "action" and insert in lieu thereof the word "act."

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

STUDY OF GOVERNMENTAL PRINTING NEEDS BY THE COMMITTEE ON HOUSE ADMINISTRATION

Mr. THORNBERRY, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 262, Rept. No. 989), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Whereas Federal printing facilities are presently operating at near excess of their manpower, machinery, and storage capacities; and

Whereas there are increasing evidences of costly and unnecessary duplication of printed matter which has little or no demand, thus creating vast stores of unused and outmoded publications; and

Whereas greater economies can be effected with a view to securing increased services for all branches of Government by elimination of said needless duplication and extraneous publications; and by the elimination of unnecessary paperwork: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the House Subcommittee on Printing is authorized and directed to conduct a full investigation and study of the operations of federally operated printing services with particular reference to the administration, by rule, regulation, or otherwise of the provisions of law to Government printing, binding, reproduction, and distribution services, the sale and distribution of Government publications and Government paperwork in general. For the purpose of carrying out this resolution the subcommittee is authorized to sit and act during the present Congress at such times and places in the United States whether 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 under the signature of the chairman of the subcommittee or any member of the subcommittee designated by him, and may be served by any person designated by such chairman or member.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out the preamble and all after "Resolved" and insert the following: "That the Committee on House Administration, or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized to conduct a full investigation and study of the operations of federally operated printing services with particular reference to the administration, by rule, regulation, or otherwise of the provisions of law to Government printing, binding, reproduction, and distribution services, the sale and distribution of Government publications, and Government paperwork in general. For the purpose 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 in the United States whether 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 under the signature of the chairman of the committee or any member of the committee designated by such chairman, and may be served by any person designated by such chairman or member."

Amend the title so as to read: "Resolution to authorize the Committee on House Administration to make studies and inquiries relative to unnecessary Government printing and paperwork."

EXPLANATION OF ABSENCE OF CERTAIN MEMBERS OF THE COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE FROM SESSIONS OF THE HOUSE

Mr. THOMPSON of Texas. 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.

Mr. THOMPSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, on yesterday, and over the preceding weekend, the two subcommittees of the Committee on Agriculture were absent from the city on official committee business.

The members were assured, within reasonable limits, that there would be no record votes on Monday.

I note from reading the RECORD today that 2 votes were recorded, as well as 1 quorum call.

I invite to the attention of the House that it was only with the assurance of no record vote that the following were absent from the floor on yesterday: E. C. GATHINGS, of Arkansas; PAUL C. JONES of Missouri; HARLAN HAGEN, of California; CHARLES B. HOEVEN, of Iowa; HAROLD O. LOVRE, of South Dakota; ROBERT D. HARRISON of Nebraska; LESTER R. JOHNSON of Wisconsin; and CLARK W. THOMPSON of Texas.

Also accompanying the committee were two Members from cotton-producing districts of Texas: Hon. OLIN E. TEAGUE and Hon. JOHN DOWDY.

DISTRESS CONDITIONS IN THE COAL-PRODUCING AREAS

The SPEAKER. Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KELLEY] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, it is hardly necessary for me to call attention to the depressed conditions in the coal areas of this country. During debate on the bill to extend the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act, Congress received complete statistics on the alarming number of unemployed persons in the coal-producing States. Last month we who are directly concerned with the welfare of the miners and their families took the floor of the House to call your attention to the need for making a wider variety of foodstuffs available to our hungry people. I remind you that more than a million persons in Pennsylvania are depending upon surplus commodities for subsistence, as are many more of our citizens in West Virginia, Virginia, Kentucky, Illinois, and other coal-producing States.

The executive branch of our Government has also been alerted to depressed conditions in the coal industry. Time and again Members have asked the White House that unfair competitive hindrances be removed in order that the coal industry might have an opportunity to regain some of its lost markets. The President's Advisory Council on Energy Supplies and Resources Policy unequivocally declared that the coal industry must maintain a level of operation which will make possible rapid expansion in output in the event of an emergency. This report was apparently accepted as a fuels standard by the White House; at least, some of the Members who are close to the President gave that impression during debate in the other body on H. R. 1.

The report offered several recommendations for maintaining coal production to meet mobilization base requirements. One recommendation was in reference to establishment of a sensible Government fuel-purchasing policy. It stated:

> Prior to the purchase of any fuel by a Federal Government agency having a large annual use of fuel, that agency should request advice from the Office of Defense Mobilization as to how this purchase can contribute to the maintenance of a strong mobilization base within the fuels industry.

Unfortunately, it appears that the White House report has apparently not reached all Government agencies, or else it is being ignored by responsible authorities in the same manner that recommendations of Congress are being ignored.

Despite the fact that the national welfare and security demand greater markets for coal, the tendency is to favor natural gas or oil over coal even when the latter fuel would be more acceptable from an overall cost standpoint. Perhaps the most glaring examples in this regard are offered by the Veterans' Administration, whose fuel buying policy has generally become directly contradictory to the plan outlined in the White House report.

My distinguished colleague the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALTER] is making a detailed study of what appears to be an all-out program to shift away from coal consumption at VA facilities, and I am sure that he will soon be ready with a positive program to discourage the VA from continuing on this course. Meanwhile, I want it known by the Veterans' Administration and other Government agencies that Members of Congress from coal-producing States are deeply resentful of this attitude toward the coal industry at a time when it is so hard hit by lost markets and when the international picture requires that all basic industries remain in vigorous condition.

I am not certain what is behind the VA's fuel purchasing program, but I am hopeful that the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania who is looking into the matter will come up with the answer in a short time. It is difficult to ascertain whether incompetent engineering personnel, pressure from the powerful natural gas and oil industries, or complete ignorance of the Nation's fuel problems is responsible for VA's apparent determination to shift away from our most economical and dependable source of energy.

Not long ago it was learned that the veterans' hospital at Indianapolis was contemplating removal of its coal-burning equipment. Combustion engineers who looked into the situation informed authorities at the hospital that the plan was ill-advised and would actually result in higher cost for providing heat and power in that Government-owned facility. Some of Indiana's mines are within 50 miles of Indianapolis, and every ton of coal under the soil in the State is not more than 150 miles away from that city. In all there are some 25 billion tons of recoverable coal reserves in Indiana, enough to last more than 1,000 years at present rates of production. With such a dependable fuel supply so close at hand, what justification would there be for the VA decision to dispense with this native fuel?

The customary excuse for throwing coal out of Veterans' Administration facilities is that smoke and fly ash constitute a menace to surrounding neighborhoods. Indianapolis was no exception. The fact remains, however, that with proper combustion equipment the coal supplied from Indiana mines would not contribute seriously to air pollution. Unnecessary smoke can be eliminated if coal is burned in correctly designed and engineered plants. Such equipment should, of course, be provided for in the original plant design; in cases where combustion equipment already in use proves to be obsolete or unadaptable, the VA, or whatever other Government facility is involved, should utilize the services of qualified combustion engineers to plan the necessary repairs or replacements. Under no circumstances should authorities summarily decide to discontinue using coal without competent engineering counsel. I therefore feel that the decision on the part of VA officials in the Indianapolis project should not be accepted as adequate reason for the switch from coal.

It is a sound principle of engineering not to use a high-grade fuel for low-grade use. America, however, has been so richly endowed with energy resources that this principle has been disregarded by the habitual profligacy of these resources. The fact is that natural gas and petroleum together constitute less than 2 percent of our conventional energy resources. In contrast, coal comprises 92 percent of our resources, with oil shale making up the remainder.

Thus to use natural gas and oil extravagantly, when coal can serve as well, is a violation both of economic standards and engineering principle. It is also a serious infraction of our inheritance inasmuch as it will deprive succeeding generations of the benefits of the short-term fuels which we are now using without regard to conservation practices.

I might add that testimony before the Joint Committee on the Economic Report disclosed the fact that if we had to have an all-out mobilization we would be in a coal economy overnight. I can testify that is true from our past experience. The wars which we had, beginning with World War I, World War II and the Korean affair, have proven that we were in desperate straits for coal in the beginning of those conflicts.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. BAILEY. The fact that the gentleman himself is engaged in the production of coal as an operator prompts me to ask this question: Is it not true that if a coal mine is abandoned for a period of 6 months to a year you practically have to reopen a new mine? You cannot go back and rehabilitate it in case we had another war emergency come on. Those mines have to be kept in perfect condition. In my State of West Virginia over 61 percent of the coal operation has closed down.

Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania. That is true. I can say to the gentleman if the coal is mined for any period of time and it is necessary to reopen you will have to spend a great deal of money and in many instances where the natural conditions of the strata and where water are problems, those mines may not be opened at all.

Mr. BAILEY. Would the coal industry be in position to make the tremendous outlay that would be necessary to meet an emergency?

Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania. In my opinion, no, not immediately, not for months.

Mr. BAILEY. That means a drain on the Government to put the mines back into operation?

Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania. Yes.

Mr. BAILEY. And we could lose the war while we were doing that.

Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania. Yes. It is a very important source of energy. It is the greatest source of energy which we have.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman again yield?

Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania. I yield.

Mr. BAILEY. To what extent is this conversion taking place in areas where coal is the major fuel?

Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania. I could not tell the gentleman what number, but I am informed that quite a number of them are contemplating changing from coal to gas or oil.

Mr. BAILEY. It is hardly conceivable that a veteran's operation, say in western New York, would use southwest gas coming from Texas or Louisiana and that they would convert when they are within a reasonable distance of coal production. I hear that repeatedly.

Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania. New York would be within 80 or 100 miles from the anthracite fields, and they are within 200 or 250 miles from the bituminous fields. So, there is no excuse for it.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. I want to congratulate the gentleman on his remarks and also the observations made by the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. BAILEY]. There is a very serious problem involved here concerning millions of Americans and it should be solved in the most effective way possible. I want the gentleman and those he represents, as well as other people in coal areas, to know that we from other sections of the country appreciate the situation and within our limitations are only too glad to contribute to the maximum extent possible.

Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania. I might say to the gentleman that we appreciate that Members from other sections of the United States are well aware of the difficulties that confront us with regard to this fuel problem. As I pointed out in my statement, it is a problem of the future. Oil and gas are limited; they may last 20 years, perhaps even 50 years. But coal will last almost indefinitely in this country, all grades of coal taken together.

There is no reason why we should use oil and gas for the generation of steam. That is a low grade use while those are high grade fuels. We have plenty of coal to do that.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. PERKINS. I wish to compliment my colleague on the splendid statement that he has made today on behalf of the coal industry.

Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania. I thank the gentleman very much.

PROGRAM FOR THE BALANCE OF THE WEEK

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, I do this in order to get the program for tomorrow and the balance of the week. Would the majority leader be good enough to inform me?

Mr. McCORMACK. I shall be glad to do that. Tomorrow we meet at 12 o'clock. I want to serve notice that we will probably meet earlier on Thursday and perhaps on Friday; but in any event and in all probability earlier on Thursday, perhaps 10 o'clock.

Tomorrow there will be the District of Columbia judges conference report and also a conference report on the Commerce Department appropriation bill.

Mr. MARTIN. Those, of course, will precede the bill now before the House.

Mr. McCORMACK. Yes; as conference reports come in we shall consider them as quickly as we possibly can, perhaps even interrupting the consideration of other bills, if necessary; particularly appropriation bills as we have in mind that the end of the fiscal year is only a few days off.

After the bill now before the House has been disposed of, the military manpower bill will be the next order of business.

Mr. MARTIN. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARTIN. I yield.

Mr. BAILEY. I am wondering whether the session on Thursday, which the gentleman from Massachusetts suggests may start at 10 o'clock will conclude by perhaps 5 or 6 o'clock, as the West Virginia delegation has its annual Jefferson-Day dinner at Charleston, which we all want to attend. I know we are going to have some very important legislation under consideration on Thursday.

Mr. McCORMACK. I am hopeful that the situation will be such that the delegation from West Virginia will be able to be accommodated along the lines indicated. Of course, that cannot be guaranteed.

Mr. BAILEY. There is no assurance that a vote on the reserve bill may go over until Friday?

Mr. McCORMACK. I should not want to be held to a commitment on that because once I make a commitment, I keep it, no matter how embarrassing it might be.

Mr. MARTIN. It might be embarrassing to others who have already planned for a vote on Thursday.

Mr. McCORMACK. Exactly so. If my friend will rest upon the inquiry he has made and the answers I have given, that would be better all around.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARTIN. I yield.

Mr. GROSS. We start with a totally new bill in connection with military manpower, do we not?

Mr. McCORMACK. That is so.

AMENDMENT OF THE SOCIAL SECURITY ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. PERKINS] is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, I am particularly concerned about the social-security legislation pending before the Ways and Means Committee at the present time. Early this year, I introduced H. R. 2172, a bill to amend the Social Security Act to reduce, for purposes of old-age and survivors insurance benefits, the age requirement from 65 to 60. I also introduced H. R. 6415, a bill to amend the Social Security Act to provide disability insurance benefits for totally disabled individuals, and for other purposes.

When the Ways and Means Committee went into executive session to consider social-security legislation recently, I wrote the following letter to Hon. JERE COOPER, chairman of that committee:

JUNE 22, 1955.

Hon. JERE COOPER,
Chairman, Committee on Ways and Means, House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: The improvement of the social-security program beginning with the 1939 amendments has gone far toward making this a successful family insurance program. However, experience has shown certain weaknesses remain. Your past release of June 17 points out the outstanding ones.

The retirement age was set at 65 on the theory that this represented a time in life after which the average worker would be unable to hold a job. It is recognized that in some fields a worker may well be able to continue working years beyond this retirement age, while at the same time those in other occupations would not be able to remain on the job after attaining the age of 55 or 60 years.

It is obvious that this retirement age does not have to be the same for both men and women. Experience also shows that all workers will not retire or even a majority of workers will not retire when they attain retirement age if their occupation is such that they are able to continue working beyond this age. The lowering of the retirement age to 60 would not mean that all workers would retire at age 60, but rather only those workers in occupations where the physical requirements are severe would retire at 60, while those others would continue so long as their physical condition allowed them to earn a living wage. The fact that the average retirement age is now 69 clearly indicates that few workers retire so long as they retain their physical ability to continue earning regular wages.

It is my considered opinion that the Social Security Retirement Provisions are being accepted as was intended in the original act to pay retirement benefits to those who no longer retain their ability to earn a living. The age of 65 was assumed to mean disability for work. It would be more realistic if the program included a provision to initiate retirement payments to any worker who becomes physically or mentally disabled regardless of their age.

In this connection, a provision of the Social Security Act requires that a disabled worker must have both six quarters of coverage during the last 13, and 20 quarters of coverage during the last 40.

This dual requirement in the disability provisions in the Act should be changed so that a worker may be eligible for more benefits with 6 quarters of coverage in the last 13, or 20 quarters of coverage in the last 40. The fact that a person becomes disabled too often means that their health has not been good during the 10 preceding years and, while not being totally disabled, their working time is curtailed to an extent that this dual eligibility requirement may not be met. This should be corrected.

Another inequity which you have pointed out is the failure of the act to recognize the fact that disabled dependents are not recognized as such if they are more than 18 years of age. This should be corrected and such dependents should be placed on the same basis as the dependents in other Government programs, such as the Veterans' program. At the same time, consideration should be given to provide increases for retired workers in line with the wage increases now being given to both governmental and industrial employees.

It is hardly fair for a worker who retired in recent years and now receives a monthly social-security payment of $65, which, under the present law, he will continue to receive through 1960, at which time one of his coworkers will be retired from the same job with a monthly payment of $85, or even in some cases, $108.50.

The act should be amended to provide increases in retirement payments which equalize, in part at least, the increased wages now being given to those workers who have not retired.

There are numerous other phases of this program that should be given consideration. Coverage should include self-employed workers such as dentists, attorneys, and other professional workers.

The cost of these changes will not be great and there is a real probability that the above changes can be made without any increases in the tax rates, other than those that the act now provides for through 1974.

Sincerely yours,

CARL D. PERKINS,
Member of Congress.

Mr. Speaker, today I again want to urge the membership of this body to support amendments to the social security law which will provide social security benefits for those Americans who have been forced to retire from their jobs because of a severe disability; lower the eligibility age for retirement benefits from age 65 to 60; and entitle permanently handicapped children to continue to receive their dependent's benefits after the age of 18. These are improvements in the social security system which have been close to my heart for many years, and they are badly needed.

During my first term in Congress, I had the privilege of voting for amendments which would have provided benefits for the totally and permanently disabled workers of this land, regardless of their age. This provision, as you know, was passed by the House but lost out in the Senate and in conference. During each Congress since that time I have introduced bills which would add such disability benefits to the protection now given to the working man and woman through their social security system. I have also been greatly concerned with lowering the retirement age to 60 years, and have repeatedly introduced bills which would take this important step.

I certainly wish to commend the House Ways and Means Committee for considering this all-important legislation during this session. I hope we have reached the point where we will be able to make considerable progress toward writing these vital improvements in our social security system without further delay. Within recent years we have made other very important changes in the social security system.

In 1939 it was substantially strengthened in one area. For in that year were added the benefits for dependents—for the surviving widow, the wife of the retired worker, and for widowed mothers and their children under 18. But no significant changes had been made in the coverage of the system or the amount of the benefits it provided. Only 3 out of 5 of the workers of the country were covered by the plan, and the benefits it paid averaged around $27 per month. Up until 1948 the system was practically the same as it had been in the original act way back in 1935 except the improvement in 1939 just mentioned.

I am proud of the fact that I have had the opportunity during my tenure in Congress to vote for an extended coverage so that now practically all the people earning their living in this country—or 9 out of 10—have social security protection.

As a result of the 1950 amendments some 9.2 million Americans have been added to the social security rolls. Included in that number were practically all self-employed people except farmers—such as merchants, barbers, businessmen and salesmen—as well as full-time farmworkers, regular household workers and, on a voluntary basis, those employees of State and local governments who did not have their own retirement systems, and persons working in nonprofit institutions.

In the 1954 amendments, which went into effect last January, we covered another 8 million jobs. At this time, self-employed farmers were covered for the first time. So were professional engineers, accountants, architects, and funeral directors. Household workers and hired farmworkers who work only part-time for one employer were also covered as well as those employees of State and local government who now have a retirement system and vote for coverage.

I believe that all Americans who work to support themselves and their families should have such protection, including those who were left out of last year's amendments, such as dentists, lawyers, and certain part-time agricultural workers.

I am also proud of the fact that I have been able to participate in the substantial increases which have been made in the amount of the benefits. Back in 1948 the maximum primary benefit—and I emphasize, maximum—was $45 per month. The present maximum for the retired worker is $108.50 per month, and the family maximum is $200 per month. I know something of what these increases have meant to those retired workers who have been able to qualify for substantial benefits. I know, too, that because the coverage of the system is now practically complete, most Americans will be covered for all of their working life and the amount of benefits they receive will substantially increase in the coming years.

The story of what these improvements have meant to my own State of Kentucky illustrates how much the amendments made since 1948 have meant. For in 1948, the average social-security benefit in Kentucky was just $16.46 per month and only 33,900 Kentuckians were receiving benefits. Six years later, as of last December—the latest date for which such figures are available—the amount of the average benefit was $42.30—or more than three times the 1948 figure.

In December 1948 the total amount of benefits paid to all Kentuckians was just $558,000. But by December 1954 that total was greater by more than $4 million, for it stood at $4,644,670. This simply means that the social-security system has added more than $4 million to the income and purchasing power of the people of Kentucky in a 6-year period.

I could wish that more of the people in the district which I represent could have shared in this improvement. For I am acutely aware of the fact that many of them—farmers and most agricultural workers, as well as schoolteachers, employees of State and local governments, most domestic workers, and certain self-employed professional people were excluded from social security until January 1 of this year. The fact that they are now covered will mean that, in the near future, most of the people in the district which I represent will be entitled to social-security benefits when they retire, and will thus be spared the ignominy of submitting to the need test of public assistance, under which they must be practically destitute before any aid can be given.

I am glad that Congress has seen fit since 1949 to extend coverage in order to narrow the gap in the future of those people dependent upon old-age assistance. The chief reason why fewer people must ask for such assistance is, of course, that many more have been able to qualify for social-security benefits which are paid with no questions asked. The saving to the taxpayers of Kentucky is obvious since social security is entirely self-financing and requires none of the State or local tax funds used in assistance programs. But even more important, in my mind, are the gains in human dignity which arise because these social-security benefits are paid as a matter of right, in recognition of a lifetime of productive work and of a regular contribution on the part of each worker, while he is employed, toward his future security.

The principles of our social-security system have demonstrated their soundness, then, and the pattern has been set. We have made progress. But, as I have said, still further improvements are urgently needed.

One of the most vital adjustments to our times, in my opinion, is the lowering of the retirement age. I am convinced that we should lower it to age 60.

First of all, I call your attention to the fact that no change has been made in the eligibility age for retirement benefits since the system was first established away back in the depression days of 1935. Since that time we have substantially shortened the workweek, but no change has been made in our social security system to allow for the shortened work life which is one of the results of the tremendous change in our productive capacity per man-hour. This change is illustrated by experience in the coal industry. The average miner in Kentucky can produce 8 tons of coal per day, in an 8-hour shift.

The result is that the gap between the time when a workingman is retired from his job and the time when he is eligible for his social-security benefit is widening. And, as a result, millions of our older citizens are being told that they must get along some way—any way—for a period of 3, or 4, or 5 years until they reach their 65th birthday. We have in effect set up a period of "endurance," then, which says to our older Americans that if they can manage to exist during this period they will be entitled to benefits when they reach age 65. Too many of them, I am afraid, will not reach that 65th birthday and therefore will receive no benefits at all, in return for their lifetime of contributions, beyond the lump-sum death benefit.

These, then, are some of the factors we must bear in mind when we are considering this legislation. I know that the argument will be made that lowering the retirement age to 60 will cost money. But, Mr. Speaker, I say to you that the cold hard figures, the actuarial estimates, the bland assumptions as to what people should do, overlook the cost to the human spirit of waiting, and struggling to get along on a pittance during this period of endurance. I submit that this is not a matter for cold calculation, or for further oratory by experts. I believe that we should hear from the American people on this subject. For it is, after all, their social-security system, and it is supported by their contributions.

For this reason, I propose to read into the RECORD some of the letters I have received from the people in the district that I represent on this question.

A 61-year-old retired worker writes:

What is going to become of the old one? If something is not done very soon, a lot of us who own our homes, if we can't get work, we will be forced to sell our homes to pay taxes and buy groceries to live on until we get to be 65.

A widow in her late fifties writes me:

It seems unfair for a woman who has no breadwinner to have to wait until she is 65 to draw this, and my husband paid into it for so many years.

Another elderly widow writes:

I think having to deed our homes away to get to draw the old-age pension is not right. I feel deep down in my heart that it is not right.

A retired worker writes:

We can leave our homes and families and go away to industrial cities to seek employment, and we are turned down if we have passed the age of 35 or 45 at the outside. Us mountain people have to depend upon our labor for a living. We have raised our families, and hardly any of us laboring people have saved enough money to live on for 15 or 25 years without employment before we can draw our social security.

From Local Union No. 6095 of the United Mine Workers in Argo, Ky., came a resolution which reads as follows:

Be it resolved, That due to the increasing unemployment of young men and women, that you use your wisdom and influence in securing an amendment to the social security law lowering the age limit from 65 years of age to 60 for retirement; and be it further

Resolved, That by lowering the age limit and removing old men and ladies out of employment and replacing them with younger employees, that we will be contributing much to solve or lessen the amount of crime committed by our young people due to pressing economic problems.

Mr. Speaker, these letters speak for themselves, and for millions of Americans in similar circumstances. What will be our answer to them?

I believe we must begin to understand that our unemployment insurance system—which pays benefits for only a few months of unemployment—is providing almost no protection for those older workers whose periods of unemployment are measured not in months but in years. Statistics show us that 1 out of 3 applicants for work are over age 45, but that only 1 out of 7 placements can be made in this age group.

The logical thing to do—the humane thing to do—is to recognize these facts of our time and lower the retirement age for social security to 60 years of age.

The second improvement which we must make without further delay is to provide benefits for those workers who are retired from the labor force by a crippling disability at any age. The need for such protection has long been recognized.

In connection with the 1950 amendments to the Social Security Act, the report of the Ways and Means Committee reads as follows on this subject:

The old-age and survivors insurance system does not now meet the needs of those who become disabled before they reach the normal age of retirement * * *. Diseases of the heart and arteries, cancer, rheumatism, arthritis, kidney diseases, and other chronic ailments have become the major causes of permanent disability and death. The addition of permanent and total disability benefits will inject more realism into the retirement concept.

This, then, is from the record. Here are some opinions from Kentucky. A veteran of the coal mines writes:

Now we are disabled and can't work so we must wait until we reach 65 and in so waiting our social security payments are being reduced because we are not making the quarterly payments that we might receive the maximum benefits.

Another miner writes:

I have been laid off at age 58 because of a disability. Many men who have been laid off like myself will not live to be 65.

From Crown, Ky., comes another letter which reads:

The ones that was drawing social security they got a raise. But what was done about social security for the crippled and disabled? They got nothing. They have been forgotten. They have been put aside with nothing to live on. A man and his wife are entitled to live.

And I would like to add that this fine man's 15-year-old granddaughter, whom he has cared for since childhood, was forced to discontinue her school work because of the lack of any income in this family.

A citizen of Garrett, Ky., writes:

We the total disabled are still waiting and watching for something to turn up that will help us to draw our social security at any age while we live. There is nothing available for them who become disabled like myself at an early age.

A father's letter reads:

I was injured in the mine and am totally disabled to work and I need help. I have 6 kids and 4 in school, and there are hundreds of others in need like this.

Mr. Speaker, how much security is our social security system providing for these people? How long can we continue to debate this matter while human suffering and want continue to grow? The only fair and the only proper answer to the millions of Americans in similar circumstances is to enact this bill into law as speedily as possible so that these conditions can be remedied.

It is true, of course, that the Congress established a "disability freeze" provision in last year's amendments so that disabled men and women would no longer be penalized in the amount they receive when they reach age 65. But, in the meantime, no benefit was provided. Under our present system, then, we are able to tell a man whether or not he is totally and permanently disabled. But we can't pay him his social security benefit at that time. He and his family must wait—and wait—and wait until he gets to be 65 years old before the benefit can be paid.

Moreover, in that "disability freeze" provision, the 83d Congress set up a number of requirements. The law reads that, in order to be entitled to a "disability freeze"—no disability benefit, mind you—a worker must have been in covered employment for 20 of the last 40 and 6 of the last 13 quarters preceding his disability. I have in my files a form letter from the Social Security Administration to one of my constituents which illustrates how this works. My constituent was clearly disabled, they decided. Moreover, he had worked 10—4 more than the required 6—of the 13 quarters immediately preceding his disablement. But he did not qualify for the "freeze" because he had not met the other requirement. He had worked 19—instead of 20 quarters before he was disabled. If he could have worked another month—or perhaps another week, depending upon his wages—he would have qualified for the "freeze". But the form letter informed him that he was disqualified.

Mr. Speaker, is our social security system to become a sort of numbers game, in which you qualify if you land on the right numbers? This is the reason why my bill to provide for disability benefits would pay them to "currently insured"—that is, they have worked 6 of the last 13 quarters in covered employment—as well as for those who meet the longer requirement. We pay benefits under these circumstances to the surviving family of workers who die. Why should we deny them to the worker who manages to survive the tragedy of being totally disabled, which befalls him through no fault of his own?

It is not enough to merely lower the retirement age for women who become widows after 55 by making them eligible for benefits when they reach 60.

Any legislation prohibiting disabled workers from participating in social security benefits until they reach the age of 50 would be discriminatory against

hundreds of thousands of workers who have become totally and permanently disabled in their late 20's, 30's, and 40's after they have contributed to the social security fund in many instances for years. Age should not be a requirement in order to qualify for social security benefits under the disability provision.

I hope that the Congress of the United States will act expeditiously to modernize our social security system in these important respects. These are not new proposals. We have held hearings on them repeatedly. We have all the facts and figures at our fingertips. We have considered these matters at length. The time has come, Mr. Speaker, to act on these matters so that we can bring our social security system up to date, and give more and better security to the working man and woman in America.

NATURAL GAS INDUSTRY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. STAGGERS] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HARRIS] and the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WOLVERTON] have introduced resolutions in the House proposing investigations of various phases of operations of the natural gas industry. I think their proposals are indicative of the great concern of the American people in the natural gas industry and its ability to serve them. I say that, truly, any legislation to amend the Natural Gas Act of 1938 is of the widest national interest and of the greatest importance to every American.

When the House approved the Natural Gas Act of 1938, it clothed the production and distribution of this fuel with a public interest. We said then that—

> It is hereby declared that the business of transporting and selling natural gas for ultimate distribution to the public is affected with a public interest, and that Federal regulation in matters relating to the transportation of natural gas and the sale thereof and foreign commerce is necessary in the public interest.

That statement of national policy is even more true today. Since 1938, natural-gas sales have increased 660 percent. Under the sponsorship and paternal encouragement of the Federal Power Commission, a network of natural-gas pipelines laces most of continental United States—north, south, east, and west. Millions of Americans have installed costly gas equipment in their homes—at an average cost of about $1,000 per family, I would guess—in the expectation that this industry and our national policy will always assure them of a steady supply of this fuel.

I now ask: Can they be sure of a steady supply? Do we have the natural-gas resources to continue our present rate of consumption? Have we not reached a "peril point" in natural-gas reserve below which it is folly to go?

As you know, this question of a continuing supply of natural gas to meet present consumption rates was raised by the producers and gatherers of natural gas. They have petitioned Congress to pass legislation to overthrow the Supreme Court's decision in the Phillips Petroleum Co. case and exempt independent producers from Federal Power Commission jurisdiction over wellhead prices. They have told the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce that unless such exemption is granted, our supply of natural gas will dry up.

As a member of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, I sat through the long weeks of hearings which have only recently been concluded. I heard the producers state their case. I heard other interested parties dispute their contentions. But there is one fact which was brought out and which was never disputed, either by the producers who first raised this question of sufficient supplies, or by anyone else. I want the House to know this.

The single undisputed fact made in our hearings on Natural Gas Act amendments was this: The reserve life index of natural gas has declined to 22½ years.

This index was computed by the American Gas Association. It showed a decline of 10 years since 1946. Even if the Federal Power Commission refused to certificate any further requests for additional natural-gas service, we probably could not reverse the trend toward exhaustion of our natural-gas reserves. I want to emphasize that this exhaustion of our reserves occurred during a period of complete freedom from Federal regulation. Producers and gatherers have been completely free all the time this index was declining to discover all the new supplies they could.

The undisputed testimony is that they failed to discover enough new reserves to offset the enormous increase in consumption of the past few years to avert a decline in the reserve life index. This failure ought to be a red flag of warning, an alarm signal, for this House to investigate thoroughly what has happened to our precious resources of natural gas—and what will happen when they are exhausted.

If the natural-gas industry continues its present reckless course, encouraged by a Federal Power Commission without conservation standards to guide it, there will be customers, pipelines—but no natural gas. And if this House permits the present policies and practices to continue, we will be guilty of negligence against the American people.

Therefore, I urge that any investigation of natural-gas operations be broad enough to look into this matter of the effect of our present policies on our future supply. I am convinced that the results will show a need for the kind of legislation I have introduced directing the Federal Power Commission to enforce a national policy of conservation of our scarce natural-gas resources. Conservation of natural gas for those superior uses for which it is best suited is in the best interest of the pipelines, gas distributors, the banks and insurance companies which have invested so heavily in them, the industries competitive with gas, American labor, and, above all, the millions of our people who are depending upon a continuing supply of this fuel.

I intend to sponsor an amendment to the Harris bill, or a substitute bill, which will exempt all small producers in the United States, and certainly all producers in the State of West Virginia will be exempted.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. CELLAR.

Mr. ASHLEY in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. FLOOD and to include a statement.

Mr. OSTERTAG and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. BONNER, and to include a reply to a telegram sent out by the American Farm Bureau in regard to the 50–50 provision in the existing act.

Mr. BONNER, and to include a resolution of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries with respect to the 50–50 provision in this bill.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. RABAUT (at the request of Mr. ALBERT) and include extraneous matter.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey (at the request of Mr. ALBERT) in four instances, in each to include extraneous matter.

Mr. GARMATZ (at the request of Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania) and include therein his testimony before the Banking and Currency Committee on housing legislation.

Mr. KLEIN (at the request of Mr. McCORMACK and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. MINSHALL.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows to:

Mr. MOULDER (at the request of Mr. JONES of Missouri), on account of official business.

Mr. HOLT (at the request of Mr. HINSHAW), from Wednesday, June 22, until Wednesday, June 29, on account of a serious illness of his mother.

Mr. JACKSON (at the request of Mr. HALLECK), for 2 weeks, on account of official business.

SENATE BILLS REFERRED

Bills and a concurrent resolution of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 288. An act to provide for the reimbursement of Meadow School District No. 29, Upham, N. Dak., for loss of revenue resulting from the acquisition of certain lands within such school district by the Department of the Interior; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 501. An act for the relief of Ki Young Kwan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 578. An act for the relief of Edmund Lowe and Richard Lowe; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 871. An act for the relief of Dominic Gaetano Morin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1159. An act for the relief of Wilma Ann Schilling and her daughter, Ingertraud Rosalita Schilling; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1522. An act for the relief of Lieselotte Brodzinski Gettman; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. Con. Res. 42. Concurrent resolution favoring the suspension of deportation in the case of certain aliens; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

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. 880. An act for the relief of Paul Y. Loong;

H. R. 935. An act for the relief of Mrs. Marion Josephine Monnell;

H. R. 943. An act for the relief of Luzie Biondo (Luzie M. Schmidt);

H. R. 968. An act for the relief of Max Kozlowski;

H. R. 973. An act for the relief of Mrs. Elizabeth Dowds;

H. R. 977. An act for the relief of Mrs. Ellen Hillier;

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

H. R. 995. An act for the relief of Frieda Quiring and Tina Quiring;

H. R. 997. An act for the relief of Irmgard Emilie Krepps;

H. R. 998. An act for the relief of Meiko Shikibu;

H. R. 1028. An act for the relief of Melina Bonton;

H. R. 1047. An act for the relief of Armenouhi Assadour Artinian;

H. R. 1083. An act for the relief of Robert Shen-yen Hou-ming Lieu;

H. R. 1157. An act for the relief of Milad S. Isaac;

H. R. 1158. An act for the relief of Emanuel Frangeskos;

H. R. 1205. An act for the relief of Cynthia Jacob;

H. R. 1299. An act for the relief of Miss Toshiko Hozaka and her child, Roger;

H. R. 1300. An act for the relief of Luther Rose;

H. R. 1337. An act for the relief of Victorine May Donaldson;

H. R. 2973. An act to provide for the conveyance of all right, title, and interest of the United States in a certain tract of land in Macon County, Ga., to the Georgia State Board of Education;

H. R. 3005. An act to further amend the Universal Military Training and Service Act by extending the authority to induct certain individuals and by extending the authority to require the special registration, classification, and induction of certain medical, dental, and allied specialist categories, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 4549. An act for the relief of John J. Braund.

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 666. An act to extend the period of authorization of appropriations for the hospital center and facilities in the District of Columbia;

S. 1582. An act to amend Public Law 727, 83d Congress, so as to extend the period for the making of emergency loans for agricultural purposes; and

S. 1755. An act to amend the act of April 6, 1949, as amended, and the act of August 31, 1954, so as to provide that the rate of interest on certain loans made under such acts shall not exceed 3 percent per annum.

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. 880. An act for the relief of Paul Y. Loong;

H. R. 935. An act for the relief of Mrs. Marion Josephine Monnell;

H. R. 943. An act for the relief of Luzie Biondo (Luzie M. Schmidt);

H. R. 973. An act for the relief of Elizabeth Dowds;

H. R. 977. An act for the relief of Ellen Hillier;

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

H. R. 995. An act for the relief of Frieda Quiring and Tina Quiring;

H. R. 997. An act for the relief of Irmgard Emilie Krepps;

H. R. 998. An act for the relief of Meiko Shikibu;

H. R. 1028. An act for the relief of Melina Bonton;

H. R. 1047. An act for the relief of Armenouhi Assadour Artinian;

H. R. 1083. An act for the relief of Robert Shen-yen Hou-ming Lieu;

H. R. 1142. An act for the relief of Capt. Moses Aaron Rudy;

H. R. 1157. An act for the relief of Milad S. Isaac;

H. R. 1158. An act for the relief of Emanuel Frangeskos;

H. R. 1205. An act for the relief of Cynthia Jacob;

H. R. 1299. An act for the relief of Miss Toshiko Hozaka and her child, Roger;

H. R. 1300. An act for the relief of Luther Rose;

H. R. 1337. An act for the relief of Victorine May Donaldson;

H. R. 1825. An act creating a Federal commission to formulate plans for the construction in the District of Columbia of a civic auditorium, including an Inaugural Hall of Presidents and a music, fine arts, and mass communications center;

H. R. 2973. An act to provide for the conveyance of all right, title, and interest of the United States in a certain tract of land in Macon County, Ga., to the Georgia State Board of Education;

H. R. 3659. An act to increase criminal penalties under the Sherman Antitrust Act.

H. R. 4221. An act to amend section 4004, title 18, United States Code, relating to administering oaths and taking acknowledgments by officials of Federal penal and correctional institutions;

H. R. 4954. An act to amend the Clayton Act by granting a right of action to the United States to recover damages under the antitrust laws, establishing a uniform statute of limitations, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 6499. An act 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.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. BOYLE. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 11 minutes p. m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, June 29, 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:

934. A letter from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting the semiannual report of the Secretary of Defense, together with those of the Secretaries of the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force, for the 6-month period from July 1 to December 31, 1954, pursuant to section 202 (d) of the National Security Act of 1947, as amended; to the Committee on Armed Services.

935. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend section 212 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, to authorize research and experimental work with vessels, vessel propulsion and equipment, port facilities, planning, and operation and cargo handling on ships and at ports"; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

936. A letter from the Chairman, United States Commission for the Celebration in 1955, of the 200th Anniversary of the Birth of John Marshall, transmitting a report by the United States Commission for the Celebration of the 200th Anniversary of the Birth of John Marshall, pursuant to section 3 of the joint resolution of August 13, 1954 (Public Law 581, 83d Cong.); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

937. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a proposed indefinite appropriation and draft of proposed provisions pertaining to increased pay costs for the fiscal year 1955 (H. Doc. No. 197); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

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. KILDAY: Committee on Armed Services. H. R. 6277. A bill to amend subsection 303 (c) of the Career Compensation Act of 1949 relating to transportation and storage of household goods of military personnel on permanent change of station; without amendment (Rept. No. 966). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. KILDAY: Committee on Armed Services. 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; with amendment (Rept. No. 967). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. CARLYLE: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. S. 928. An act to provide research and technical assistance relating to air pollution control; with amendment (Rept. No. 968). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. KLEIN: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H. R. 5222. A bill to amend the Flammable Fabrics Act to exempt from its application scarves which do not present an unusual hazard; without amendment (Rept. No. 969). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. WILLIS: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 7049. A bill to revise, codify, and enact into law title 10 of the United States Code entitled "Armed Forces" and title 32 of the United States Code, entitled "National

Guard"; without amendment (Rept. No. 970). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 6248. A bill to provide for the maintenance of a roster of retired judges available for special judicial duty and for their assignment to such duty by the Chief Justice of the United States; without amendment (Rept. No. 971). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. ENGLE: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H. R. 65. A bill to amend the act of August 23, 1954 (Public Law 632, 83d Cong.); with amendment (Rept. No. 984). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 4792. A bill to amend section 372 of title 28, United States Code; without amendment (Rept. No. 985). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. ENGLE: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H. R. 6573. A bill to authorize renewals of a lease of the Annette Island Airport to the United States; without amendment (Rept. No. 986). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana: Committee on Armed Services. H. R. 7000. A bill to provide for strengthening of the Reserve Forces, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 987). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MADDEN: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 289. Resolution for consideration of H. R. 6059, a bill to authorize the President of the United States to enter into an agreement with the President of the Republic of the Philippines to revise the 1946 trade agreement between the United States of America and the Republic of the Philippines; without amendment (Rept. No. 988). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. THORNBERRY: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 262. Resolution to authorize the Subcommittee on Printing to make studies and inquiries relative to unnecessary Government printing and paperwork; with amendment (Rept. No. 989). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. ENGLE: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H. R. 605. A bill to provide for the abolition of the 80-rod reserved spaces between claims on shore waters in Alaska; with amendment (Rept. No. 990). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. ENGLE: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H. R. 6331. A bill authorizing the Territory of Hawaii, through its duly designated officers and boards, to negotiate a compromise agreement, exchange with, sell or lease to the owners of certain shorelands, certain tidelands, both in the Territory of Hawaii, and to make covenants with such owners, in settlement of certain damage claims and for a conveyance of littoral rights; without amendment (Rept. No. 991). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. PRIEST: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H. R. 6645. A bill to amend the Natural Gas Act, as amended; without amendment (Rept. No. 992). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. HARDY: Select Committee on Survivor Benefits. H. R. 7089. A bill to provide benefits for the survivors of servicemen and veterans and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 993, Pts. I and II). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. PRESTON: Committee of conference. H. R. 6367. A bill making appropriations for the Department of Commerce and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations (Rept. No. 994). Ordered to be printed.

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. BURDICK: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1172. A bill for the relief of Allison B. Clemens; with amendment (Rept. No. 935). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. DONOHUE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 3728. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Hannah Mae Powell; without amendment (Rept. No. 936). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 3979. A bill for the relief of Pasquale Gentile; with amendment (Rept. No. 937). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 4410. A bill for the relief of William E. Ryan; without amendment (Rept. No. 938). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 5282. A bill for the relief of Mario Botoshansky; with amendment (Rept. No. 939). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 6706. A bill for the relief of Gay Street Corp., Baltimore, Md.; without amendment (Rept. No. 940). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 42. An act for the relief of Selma Rivlin; without amendment (Rept. No. 941). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 88. An act for the relief of Maximilian Karl Manjura; without amendment (Rept. No. 942). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 90. An act for the relief of Nejibe El-Sousse Slyman; without amendment (Rept. No. 943). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 94. An act for the relief of Esther Cornelius, Arthur Alexander Cornelius, and Frank Thomas Cornelius; without amendment (Rept. No. 944). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 95. An act for the relief of Peter Charles Bethel (Peter Charles Peters); without amendment (Rept. No. 945). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 99. An act for the relief of Xanthi Georges Komporozou; without amendment (Rept. No. 946). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 118. An act for the relief of Leon J. de Szethofer and Blanche Hrdinova de Szethofer; without amendment (Rept. No. 947). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 323. An act for the relief of Luigi Orlando; without amendment (Rept. No. 948). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 378. An act for the relief of Giuseppina Latina Mozzicato and Giovanni Mozzicato (John Mozzicato); without amendment (Rept. No. 949). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 429. An act for the relief of Franciszek Janicki and his wife, Stefania Janicki; without amendment (Rept. No. 950). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER; Committee on the Judiciary. S. 467. An act for the relief of Dr. Luciano A. Legiardi-Laura; with amendment (Rept. No. 951). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 481. An act for the relief of Gerard Lucien Dandurand; without amendment (Rept. No. 952). Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 502. An act for the relief of Elsa Lederer; without amendment (Rept. No. 953). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CHELF: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 938. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Elena Apostolescu Bustiuc; without amendment (Rept. No. 954). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 939. A bill for the relief of Laura Safir; without amendment (Rept. No. 955). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. HYDE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1019. A bill for the relief of Casimir Krzyzanowski; with amendment (Rept. No. 956). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1185. A bill for the relief of Jose Domingo Quintanar; with amendment (Rept. No. 957). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Miss THOMPSON of Michigan: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1191. A bill for the relief of Marcel Duvivier; without amendment (Rept. No. 958). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. HYDE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1423. A bill for the relief of Raymonde Rouxel Williams; with amendment (Rept. No. 959). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Miss THOMPSON of Michigan: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1752. A bill for the relief of Johanna Juresic Grgurich; with amendment (Rept. No. 960). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FEIGHAN: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1878. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Gertrud Maria Schurhoff; without amendment (Rept. No. 961). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1958. A bill for the relief of Ingeborg Luise Fischer; without amendment (Rept. No. 962). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 2494. A bill for the relief of Maria del Pilar Valcarcel Calderon Armistead; with amendment (Rept. No. 963). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FEIGHAN: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 2738. A bill for the relief of Teresa Jurjevic; without amendment (Rept. No. 964). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Miss THOMPSON of Michigan: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 6617. A bill for the relief of Boris Kowerda; without amendment (Rept. No. 965). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1078. A bill for the relief of Dr. Robert C. Jalbuena; without amendment (Rept. No. 972). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CHELF: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1667. A bill for the relief of Lieselotte Boehme; without amendment (Rept. No. 973). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CHELF: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 2078. A bill for the relief of Salvatore Cannizzo; without amendment (Rept. No. 974). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FEIGHAN: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 2296. A bill for the relief of Simone Gilliland; without amendment (Rept. No. 975). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Miss THOMPSON of Michigan: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 3726. A bill for the relief of Mr. Gino Evangelista; without amendment (Rept. 976). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FEIGHAN: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 4147. A bill for the relief of Angelo DeVito; without amendment (Rept. 977). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. HYDE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 4468. A bill for the relief of Margarethe Bock; without amendment (Rept. 978). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. ENGLE: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H. R. 904. A bill to provide preference right to certain land in Alaska to Bert Arthur Paraday of Anchor Point, Alaska, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 979). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. ENGLE: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H. R. 897. A bill to provide preference right to certain land in Alaska to Robert Henry Soyk, of Kenai, Alaska, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 980). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. ENGLE: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H. R. 896. A bill to provide preference right to certain land in Alaska to Joseph Booth of Anchorage, Alaska, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 981). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. ENGLE: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H. R. 902. A bill to provide preference right to certain land in Alaska to Patrick Harold Johnson of Anchor Point, Alaska, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 982). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. ENGLE: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H. R. 905. A bill to provide preference right to certain land in Alaska to Carl E. Robinson, of Anchor Point, Alaska, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 983). 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. WILLIS:

H. R. 7049. A bill to revise, codify, and enact into law, title 10 of the United States Code, entitled "Armed Forces," and title 32 of the United States Code, entitled "National Guard"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. REES of Kansas:

H. R. 7050. A bill to amend the act of October 15, 1949, with respect to the rate of compensation of the Chairman of the Council of Economic Advisers; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. ALGER:

H. R. 7051. A bill to establish general policies for mobilization purposes governing industrial properties of the United States; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 7052. A bill to repeal section 601 of Public Law 155, 82d Congress; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 7053. A bill to add a new title relating to real property management to the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. BAKER:

H. R. 7054. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1939 to provide a credit against the estate tax for Federal estate taxes paid on certain prior transfers; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BARTLETT:

H. R. 7055. A bill to grant the Territory of Alaska title to certain lands beneath navigable waters within the boundaries of the Territory of Alaska; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BURDICK:

H. R. 7056. A bill to protect the integrity and independence of national banks by strengthening the laws relating to ownership of stock in such banks; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. CURTIS of Missouri:

H. R. 7057. A bill relating to income-tax treatment where taxpayer recovers a substantial amount held by another under claim of right; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. FARRINGTON:

H. R. 7058. A bill to amend the Hawaiian Organic Act in respect of the compensation of supreme court justices and circuit court judges; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. HERLONG:

H. R. 7059. A bill to exempt certain additional foreign travel from the tax on the transportation of persons; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 7060. A bill to amend section 4141 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 for the purpose of repealing the manufacturers' excise tax on phonograph records; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HYDE:

H. R. 7061. A bill to authorize the Board of Education of the District of Columbia to borrow motor vehicles for use in a motor vehicle driver education and training course in the public schools of the District of Columbia, to excuse the owners of vehicles loaned to public, private, or parochial schools for driver training purposes from the payment of certain fees and taxes during the period of such loan, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. MAGNUSON:

H. R. 7062. A bill providing for payment to the State of Washington by the United States for the cost of replacing and relocating a portion of secondary highway of such State which was condemned and taken by the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 7063. A bill to provide for the creation of an 11th judicial circuit to be comprised of Alaska, Idaho, Montana, Oregon, and Washington, and for the circuit judges constituting the 9th and 11th circuits; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MILLS:

H. R. 7064. A bill to amend section 421 (a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to extend the period for exercise of restricted stock options after termination of employment; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TAYLOR:

H. R. 7065. A bill to provide for the issuance of a postage stamp in commemoration of the 200th anniversary of the founding of Whitehall, Washington County, N. Y.; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. FLOOD:

H. R. 7066. A bill to provide for the conservation of anthracite-coal resources through measures of flood control and anthracite-mine drainage, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MACDONALD:

H. R. 7067. A bill to require certain vessels to have a two-way radio; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. McCARTHY:

H. R. 7068. A bill to extend the period during which claims for floor-stocks refunds may be filed with respect to certain manufacturers' excise taxes which were reduced by the Excise Tax Reduction Act of 1954; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MULTER:

H. R. 7069. A bill to amend the Small Business Act of 1953, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. RODINO:

H. R. 7070. A bill to require any attorney at law practicing before a Federal court, or appearing before a congressional committee as counsel for a witness testifying before such committee, or appearing as counsel before any department or agency in the executive branch of the Government of the United States, to file a non-Communist affidavit; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SPENCE:

H. R. 7071. A bill to extend the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. FALLON:

H. R. 7072. A bill to amend and supplement the Federal Aid Road Act approved July 11, 1916 (39 Stat. 355), as amended and supplemented, to authorize appropriations for continuing the construction of highways, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. HARDY:

H. R. 7073. A bill to authorize the conveyance of certain war housing projects to the city of Norfolk, Va.; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. HARDY, from the Select Committee on Survivor Benefits:

H. R. 7089. A bill to provide benefits for the survivors of servicemen and veterans, and for other purposes.

By Mr. COUDERT:

H. J. Res. 361. Joint resolution to establish a Commission on Immigration and Naturalization Policy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. NELSON:

H. J. Res. 362. 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. THOMPSON of New Jersey:

H. J. Res. 363. Joint resolution to establish a Commission on Immigration and Naturalization Policy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FOGARTY:

H. Con. Res. 179. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that certain countries should be granted membership in the United Nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. O'BRIEN of New York:

H. Con. Res. 180. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that certain countries should be granted membership in the United Nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By Mr. PRESTON: Resolution of the Georgia House of Representatives relative to Federal appropriations for the construction of dams, locks, and basins in Georgia and other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By the Speaker: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, memorializing the President and the Congress of the

United States relative to providing Santa Clara, San Benito, and Santa Cruz Counties with a supply of water from the Central Valley project; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to the construction of proposed National Forest Highway Route 74; to the Committee on Public Works.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BENNETT of Florida:

H. R. 7074. A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Charles H. Page; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BOSCH:

H. R. 7075. A bill for the relief of Bunge Corp., New York, N. Y.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COOLEY:

H. R. 7076. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Maria Lonyay Bagley; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DELANEY:

H. R. 7077. A bill for the relief of Serafino Tercovich; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 7078. A bill for the relief of Rodolfo Nacinovich; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 7079. A bill for the relief of Libero Mihaich; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. FARRINGTON:

H. R. 7080. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Liu Cha Tsung Tsai, alias Mary Lau; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GRANAHAN:

H. R. 7081. A bill for the relief of Alexander Golubintsev; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KLEIN:

H. R. 7082. A bill for the relief of Pavol Jozef Olas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LANKFORD:

H. R. 7083. A bill for the relief of Eftalia G. Stathis and Ariadni Vassiliki G. Stathis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'NEILL:

H. R. 7084. A bill for the relief of Dr. Lucy Lee; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky:

H. R. 7085. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Frank O. Taafel; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. ROOSEVELT:

H. R. 7086. A bill for the relief of Joseph Kirschner, Theresa Kirschner, Frank Kirschner, and Mary Kirschner; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TEAGUE of California:

H. R. 7087. A bill for the relief of Pedro Diaz (Ramirez); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ZELENKO:

H. R. 7088. A bill for the relief of Juliette Rose Lee; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LANE:

H. Res. 290. Resolution providing that the bill, H. R. 6987, and all accompanying papers shall be referred to the United States Court of Claims; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

338. By Mr. DIGGS: Petition of the board of supervisors of the county of Wayne, Mich., requesting that the Detroit-Wayne Major Airport be utilized exclusively for commercial air transport and other commercial air activities, and that this board recommends that the Willow Run Airport be utilized by all of the armed services; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

339. By Mr. HOEVEN: Petition of 41 members of Chapter 277, National Association of Retired Civil Employees, Sioux City, Iowa, urging immediate hearings on legislation to increase annuities for retired civil employees; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

340. Also, petition of 73 saleswomen of Younker-Davidson's Department Store, Sioux City, Iowa, urging amendments to the Social Security Act to lower the benefit age for women; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

341. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the president, Kenosha Chapter American Lithuanian Council, Kenosha, Wis., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to reaffirming their loyalty to the principles of American democracy, and pledging their support of the administration and the Congress of the United States of America in their efforts to bring about a lasting peace, freedom, and justice in the world; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Kamp and Americanism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ARTHUR G. KLEIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 28, 1955

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include herewith a statement made by our colleague, Mr. EBERHARTER, of Pennsylvania, with regard to Joseph P. Kamp.

I personally think the most effective way to handle a rabble-rouser such as this individual would be to disregard him completely. The only possible way to explain this character and others of his ilk is to assume that the venom which they spew is the result of a psychotic personality. However, some of my colleagues who have met up with him feel that his activities should be exposed.

I am happy to insert Representative EBERHARTER's remarks and emphasize that I agree with him wholeheartedly:

KAMP AND AMERICANISM

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, I feel it my duty to speak out in opposition to what I consider one of the most vicious and unpatriotic attacks I have ever heard on leading Jewish organizations. I refer to the recent April issue of a pamphlet circulated under the title of "Headlines." This scurrilous sheet is dominated and disseminated by one Joseph P. Kamp, a leading hate monger in the United States. In an article entitled "Cowards in the United States Congress," he not only attacks the House Un-American Activities Committee in such a manner as to put him in contempt of Congress, but he also scurrilously attacks the Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith, an organization which all of us know has a long and meritorious record in the fight against communism and other dictatorships.

Although Mr. Kamp denies that he is anti-Semitic, I would like to quote a statement by him attacking the great Jewish organization, B'nai B'rith:

"Pro-Communists professionals have been in control of the Anti-Defamation League for many years. It has sponsored Communist-line speakers, its literature has been authored by Communist-fronters, and its spy and smear network has continually harassed and persecuted anti-Communists, while maintaining a 'phony' pose of anti-Communism."

I think it might be interesting to Members of the House for me to briefly review the record of this man, Joseph Kamp, who apparently believes he is qualified to judge the patriotism of an organization such as B'nai B'rith, and so blatantly proclaims his judgments. This is a man, Mr. Speaker, who has for years tried by various means to engender bigotry, hate, and intolerance in this country—all the characteristics which are prevalent in totalitarian countries and so abhorrent to all real Americans.

In the fall of 1933, he organized a pro-Fascist newspaper entitled "The Awakener." Until 1937, he was listed as the editor of this sheet, and on his staff was the known Fascist propagandist, Harold Lord Barney, and also the notorious Lawrence Dennis, who authored "The Coming American Fascism." When "The Awakener" suspended publication, Joe Kamp wrote to a follower: "The work will be carried on by the Constitutional Educational League." Of Kamp and the Constitutional Educational League the American Legion has this to say: "The Constitutional Educational League's main activity is pamphleteering. Pamphlets issued by the group try to create religious hostility. In its accusations of Communist infiltration, it makes malicious and irresponsible charges against responsible and respected groups and individuals who are working to strengthen and improve our democracy. The league is a personal vehicle of Kamp's which sells its pamphlets at profiteering prices in order to insure a good living for him." (Sunday Herald, Bridgeport, Conn., April 22, 1951.)

While head of the Constitutional Educational League, Mr. Kamp published a pamphlet entitled "The Fifth Column in Washington," a copy of which was sent to every Member of the House and Senate. This publication seems to have enjoyed brisk sale at meetings held under the auspices of the German-American Bund and the Christian Front. According to Kamp, the real fifth column apparently was an insidious band of Government employees, ranging from Attorney General Jackson (later United States Supreme Court Justice) and Secretary of the Interior Harold Ickes to a charwoman employed in the Capitol Building, all of whom Mr. Kamp designated as Communists or practically Communists.

In the spring of 1933, while on a so-called lecture tour and in the course of one of Kamp's speeches, he made statements about our Government that were apparently even too un-American for the Constitutional League. As a result he was told he could not talk politics under the auspices of the league. Thereupon connections with the league were discontinued, but this severance only lasted until 1937.

Some of the titles of publications by Mr. Kamp are an indication of his views, such as "Join the CIO and Help Built a Soviet

America" (1937), "Vote CIO and Get a Soviet America" (1944), "To Hell With GI Joe" (1944).

He has twice been cited for contempt of Congress—first in 1944 for his refusal to answer questions of the House Campaign Expenditures Committee. He faced further possible contempt proceedings for having refused to name his financial backers when he appeared before the Special House Lobby Investigating Committee in June 1950. After he first refused to testify voluntarily, he appeared after being subpoenaed. On August 30, 1950, Congress voted to cite Mr. Kamp for defying the House Lobby Activities Committee in refusing to produce records, and on November 27, 1950, a Federal grand jury in Washington, D. C., indicted him for contempt of Congress.

Mr. Speaker, here is a man who for years has been agitating and advocating what most of us think are undemocratic and totalitarian ideas, and who is still continuing unwarranted and disgraceful attacks on organizations and groups which stand for the very principles upon which America was builded and has become great.

Report of the Commission on Intergovernmental Relations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD C. OSTERTAG

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 28, 1955

Mr. OSTERTAG. Mr. Speaker, the Commission on Intergovernmental Relations, which has just submitted its report to the President, has had a remarkable and unique opportunity to make a telescopic and also a microscopic examination of our country and our Government. Our assignment, as embodied in Public Law 109, was "to study the proper role of the Federal Government in relation to the State and their political subdivisions to the end that these relations may be clearly defined, and the functions concerned may be allotted to their proper jurisdictions."

This was a large assignment. It necessitated a journey through history to the beginnings of our Republic, and the reassessment of government activities today at national, State, and local levels, as a prelude to laying down some guidelines for the future.

The result is a 300-page report which takes cognizance of the immutable principles of the Constitution, but is keyed to the realities of our times. It says, in many ways, that the basic strength of our country is in our people and our communities. It says that "a fundamental objective of our system of Government should be to keep centralization to a minimum and State-local responsibility to a maximum."

It says that, if we are to realize that objective, State and local government must be strengthened, while the national Government needs a discriminating sense of "when not to act."

Because there is so much of far-reaching value in the report to students, legislators, and the general public, Mr. Speaker, I ask leave to include in the RECORD a series of excerpts from it, which I shall insert in the coming days, of which the first is taken from the introduction:

EXCERPT FROM THE REPORT OF THE COMMISSION ON INTERGOVERNMENTAL RELATIONS

Out of the trying events of this past quarter-century, and out of the accompanying doubts and fears, has come a deeper understanding of what is required to maintain a proper division of activities between the National Government and the States. As with all governmental institutions in our society, the basic purpose of the division of powers is to provide a climate that favors growth of the individual's material and spiritual potential. Power will not long rest with any government that cannot or will not make proper use of it for that end. Our system of Federal government can be in proper balance, therefore, only when each level is effective and responsible.

Responsibility implies restraint as well as action. The States have responsibilities not only to do efficiently what lies within their competence, but also to refrain from action injurious to the Nation; the National Government has responsibilities not only to perform, within the limits of its constitutional authority, those public functions the States cannot perform, but also to refrain from doing those things the States and their subdivisions are willing and able to do.

People in the United States, as elsewhere, have looked more and more to government for assistance in solving their social and economic problems. The National Government has sometimes responded more readily than have the State and local governments. The Commission does not deal with the issue of whether or not governments rather than individuals should satisfy these needs. What it faces is the fact that the National Government has gradually undertaken some new activities which are susceptible of a larger measure of State and local handling. The Commission does not essay a judgment as to whether unreadiness on the part of the States and localities or overzealousness on the part of the National Government, or both, may have caused the existing division of activities. It merely emphasizes the fact that the more effectively our State and local governmental structures, procedures, and policies can be adapted to present-day governmental objectives, the less occasion there will be for bypassing State action in the future.

Far from weakening the National Government, the strengthening of State and local government would increase its effectiveness. The responsibilities that unavoidably must fall on the National Government are formidable. The fullest possible utilization of the resources of the State and local governments is desirable both to supplement national action where national action is necessary, and to relieve the National Government of having to divert its resources and energies to activities that could be handled as well or better by the States and their subdivisions.

The National Government has therefore an interest, as well as a responsibility, in scrutinizing with the greatest care the degree of national participation in existing or proposed programs. It is not enough to ascertain that the contemplated activity is within the constitutional competence of the National Government and that there is a national interest in having the activity performed. In the light of recent Supreme Court decisions, and in our present highly interdependent society, there are few activities of Government indeed in which there is not some degree of national interest, and in which the National Government is without constitutional authority to participate in some manner.

The degree and limits of national participation must therefore be determined by the exercise of balanced judgment. In addition to appraising carefully in each instance the need for national participation, the National Government should hold essential participation to the minimum required for attaining its objective. In all of its actions the National Government should be concerned with their effects on State and local governments.

The preservation and strengthening of our Federal system depend in the last analysis on the self-restraint and responsibility, as well as the wisdom, of our actions as citizens. If we are not willing to leave some room for diversity of policy, to tolerate some lack of uniformity in standards, even in many matters which are of national concern and about which we may feel strongly, the essence of federalism, even if not the legal fiction, will have been lost. We must also realize that it can be lost, or its vitality sapped, by nonuse of State and local initiative as well as by overuse of national authority. We have therefore as citizens a responsibility to see to it that those legitimate needs of society that could be met by timely State and local action do not by default have to be met by the National Government.

Precise divisions of governmental activities need always to be considered in the light of varied and shifting circumstances; they need also to be viewed in the light of principles rooted in our history. Assuming efficient and responsible government at all levels, national, State, and local—we should seek to divide our civic responsibilities so that we:

Leave to private initiative all the functions that citizens can perform privately; use the level of government closest to the community for all public functions it can handle; utilize cooperative intergovernmental arrangements where appropriate to attain economic performance and popular approval; reserve national action for residual participation where State and local governments are not fully adequate, and for the continuing responsibilities that only the National Government can undertake.

Ninth District Ohioans Answer Poll On National Issues

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS L. ASHLEY

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 28, 1955

Mr. ASHLEY. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I ask to have reprinted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a tabulation of the answers I have received in response to my questionnaire on current national issues published last month in the Toledo Blade. Replies were returned by 1,152 persons, all but 30 of them residents of my district, which includes the city of Toledo and the rest of Lucas County, Ohio.

The purpose of the poll was simply to provide me with a cross section of opinion from our district on matters of importance to the entire country. I think most people agree that their Representatives should be guided by the facts available to him, rather than by public opinion alone. However, people are entitled to know why their Representative votes as he does, particularly if it appears to be contrary to the majority views.

Results of the poll are as follows:

1. Do you favor direct Federal grants to States to help build schools? Yes, 722; no, 408; no answer, 22.

2. Do you favor extension of the low-rent public-housing program which would provide 35,000 public-housing units during each of the next 2 years? Yes, 696; no, 427; no answer, 29.

3. Do you approve of universal military training as a means of meeting the defense needs of the Nation? Yes, 691; no, 415; no answer, 46.

4. Do you favor an Armed Forces Reserve program as a means of building a civilian-military reserve? Yes, 880; no, 190; no answer, 82.

5. Do you believe the present minimum wage should be raised to: 90 cents an hour, 214; $1 an hour, 290; $1.25 an hour, 528; no answer, 82; no raise, 38.

6. Do you favor continued United States support of the health, educational, and technical assistance program of the United States? Yes, 799; no, 302; no answer, 51.

7. Do you favor continued United States economic assistance to Europe? Yes, 602; no, 454; no answer, 96. To Asia? Yes, 559; no, 449; no answer, 144.

8. Are you in favor of granting statehood to Alaska? Yes, 850; no, 254; no answer, 48. To Hawaii? Yes, 831; no, 266; no answer, 55.

9. Do you favor amending our present immigration law to allow more equal entry of immigrants to the United States from the various geographical areas of the world? Yes, 538; no, 571; no answer, 43.

10. Do you feel that top Government sources are keeping the American people accurately informed on the conduct of the United States foreign policy? Yes, 341; no, 744; no answer, 67.

I am frankly disturbed that so many people indicated that they do not feel that the present administration is keeping the American people adequately informed on the conduct of the foreign policy of the United States. However, I am pleased with the healthy response to the questionnaire as a whole and I hope again to use this method of giving my constituents an opportunity to express their views.

Reply to a Telegram of the American Farm Bureau Regarding the 50-50 Shipping Provisions of the Existing Mutual Security Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERBERT C. BONNER

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 28, 1955

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, I understand the Farm Bureau Federation is sending telegrams to all Congressmen, reading substantially as follows:

Urge your support Burleson amendment, Mutual Security Act. Cargo preference clause now in effect forces farmers subsidize United States shipping industry and places them at competitive disadvantage farmers others countries having advantage lower rates.

The above contains the incorrect statements:

First. The 50–50 "forces farmers subsidize United States shipping industry."

Second. That 50–50 places United States farmers "at competitive disadvantage [to] farmers [in] other countries."

Third. That foreign farmers have "advantage lower [shipping] rates."

First. United States farmers of course do not subsidize United States shipping when the United States Government places a portion of cargoes generated by and paid for by the Government, in American ships. Indeed, in the case of cargo liners where there is no differential between foreign-flag and American-flag rates, not even the United States Government absorbs any difference in cost as between foreign-flag and American-flag transportation. In the case of United States tramp ships, where a differential generally does exist in favor of the low-cost foreign tramp ships, the Government, not American farmers, absorbs a differential which generally does not exceed 10 to 15 percent. In no case does the United States farmer bear any part of this differential, which prevails only in the case of tramp shipping. Tramp ships carry only from 20 to 30 percent of agricultural cargoes as a whole.

Second. The 50–50 shipping provision cannot place United States farmers at a competitive disadvantage to foreign farmers because it is applicable only to Government, not private, shipments. Under the agriculture disposal program American farmers make no sales. The sales are all made by our Government pursuant to Government-to-Government arrangements. Although the Government uses private channels of trade, the sales in all cases are for the account of the Government, that is, American taxpayers. It is true the United States Government sells the commodities, but not below world market prices, and even then it sells the agricultural products only for foreign currencies, not dollars. Since the agricultural surplus disposal programs are solely Government, not private, transactions, the United States farmer cannot be placed at any disadvantage by reason of the 50/50 shipping provision.

Third. Foreign farmers do not have the advantage of lower shipping rates insofar as surplus agricultural products are concerned. This is because under the programs the importing country is not required to deposit foreign currency in any amount above world foreign-flag shipping rates. Thus, even the purchasing country itself is at no disadvantage because of the 50–50 shipping provision since, under the programs, it never pays more than the world foreign-flag shipping rates. Whatever differential may exist as between foreign-flag tramp rates and United States-flag tramp rates, is absorbed not by the importing country nor by the American farmer, but only by the United States Government. Furthermore, the importing countries, under the shipping arrangements of the Department of Agriculture, do not pay dollars where, as is true in most cases, dollar freights are charged by foreign-flag lines—as well as American lines—on all movements outbound from the United States. Instead, the United States Government pays United States dollars to the foreign-flag lines concerned, and accepts reimbursement from the importing country in its own foreign currency. Therefore, the shipping arrangements under the surplus agriculture disposal programs are, in effect, a dollar subsidy payable to foreign-flag liners to the extent that they charge dollar freights payable to the importing country. Accordingly, there is no basis whatsoever for the statement or implication by the Farm Bureau Federation that foreign farmers have any advantage of lower shipping rates, since in all cases and under all circumstances the importing country pays no more than the prevailing worldwide foreign-flag shipping rates.

The net effect of the so-called Burleson amendments would be to make the United States Government pay a substantially increased dollar subsidy to foreign-flag lines. This is because in the absence of the 50–50 shipping provision, foreign-flag lines would carry substantially all of the exported commodities—instead of only 50 percent—would charge dollar freights for most of such commodities, and would be paid dollar freights by the United States Government for such shipments. The Burleson amendments would therefore amount to a further American subsidy of competing foreign-flag steamship lines and at the same time would effectively deprive our own American industry of the opportunity of carrying a fair and reasonable proportion of these cargoes, generated and paid for by American taxpayers.

Moses Cleveland Grabs a Whale by the Tail

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM E. MINSHALL

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 28, 1955

Mr. MINSHALL. Mr. Speaker, on June 23 the German freighter *Nady* came into the Cleveland Stevedore Co. docks with the first boatload of crude sperm oil ever imported into Port Cleveland.

On hand for this historic occasion were representatives of the city of Cleveland, the Cleveland Chamber of Commerce, the Cleveland Junior Chamber of Commerce, the Cleveland Port Authority, and the Werner G. Smith, Inc., of Cleveland, who were responsible for bringing the cargo, and, of course, scores of onlookers anxious to see this epic event which brought ocean shipping to this Lake Erie metropolis.

The sperm oil was produced in the Antarctic on board giant floating factory whaling ships and rendered from hundreds of whales caught this spring. The shipment then moved from the Antarctic through the St. Lawrence Seaway directly to Port Cleveland as an experiment to learn the advantages of through-shipload delivery to Great Lakes ports.

The experiment worked, Mr. Speaker, and this historic boatload will be the forerunner of other boatloads of sperm oil unloading this summer in Cleveland.

Through-ocean shipping has proved its value, and this industrial event in Cleveland heralds a new era of progress and prosperity in the Great Lakes area, for with the advent of St. Lawrence Seaway, ocean-lake shipping will open even greater worldwide channels for peaceful commerce.

Werner G. Smith, Inc., is to be lauded as a pioneer in Great Lakes progress. Their courage and foresight is in the true American tradition.

Regulating the Price of Gas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS L. ASHLEY

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 28, 1955

Mr. ASHLEY. Mr. Speaker, I wish to place in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an excellent letter sent to the editor of the Washington Post and Times-Herald by my colleague from Massachusetts, Mr. MACDONALD. This letter clearly sets forth why the Harris compromise proposal to amend the Natural Gas Act does not give adequate protection to gas consumers. I am happy to endorse the position set forth in this letter and to commend it to the attention of our colleagues.

The letter follows:

REGULATING THE PRICE OF GAS

I feel that your editorial endorsement of June 14 of the Harris compromise proposal to amend the Natural Gas Act, which cleared the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee by a 16 to 15 vote, requires further analysis. You infer that the compromise bill affords a substantial measure of consumer protection, but this demonstrably is not so. The powers attributed in the editorial to the Federal Power Commission to "set maximum prices in the various fields" and to "invalidate rate increases under escalator clauses" do not exist under the compromise in such form as to provide any effective consumer protection.

The issue before the Congress is whether the producers of natural gas should be subject to Federal regulation with respect to their sales in interstate commerce. The Supreme Court a year ago, in the now famous Phillips case, expressly held that the interstate sales by producers are subject to regulation under the Natural Gas Act. Thus comprehensive regulation of the natural gas industry presently exists. The Federal Government has the power through the Federal Power Commission to regulate the interstate aspects of the industry and the States have the power to regulate local distribution at retail.

The objective of the Harris bill is to exempt producers from Federal regulation, and, in effect, overturn the Supreme Court's decision in the Phillips case. Having encountered strong opposition to the bill as originally drafted, the proponents of exemption have in the compromise proposal altered the form, but not the substance, of the objective. The definitions of "transportation of natural gas in interstate commerce" and "sale in interstate commerce of natural gas for resale" clearly reverse the Phillips decision.

The real vice in the compromise proposal is that it affords no greater measure of consumer protection against the continuing sharp increases in the field price of gas than did the original Harris bill. It cannot be too strongly emphasized that the bill does not give the Federal Power Commission power to "set maximum prices in the various fields." The bill does not expressly or inferentially provide power for such a purpose.

One alleged consumer protection of the compromise is based on the theory that the Federal Power Commission can lawfully deny pipeline companies the recovery through rates of any payments made to producers under new or renegotiated contracts which exceed the "reasonable market price" of the gas. Aside from the dubious constitutionality of such form of indirect regulation, the "reasonable market price" standard in and of itself would make any regulatory effort an exercise in futility. This high-sounding phrase is entirely misleading because it gives the impression that there is a balanced market which, in the absence of regulation, will provide stability in prices.

Market prices depend upon the supply-demand relationship. Natural gas has been in short supply for several years and no evidence is at hand that this situation will improve in the future. The resource is exhaustible and the only feasible means of transportation is by pipeline. Producers are, naturally, taking advantage of the seller's market they presently enjoy and are charging whatever the traffic will bear.

Thus, if the Commission is compelled to use the market price standard, no relief from higher gas rates can be expected. Moreover, the pipeline companies owning natural-gas reserves would receive tremendous increases in their profits above a fair return, as the Commission would be compelled to use the same standard in regulating pipeline company rates. In this respect, the compromise is simply the Moore-Rizley bill of the 80th Congress in a new dress.

The reasonable market price standard is misleading for still another reason. The words of limitation on this standard set forth in the compromise proposal are designed to make certain that the reasonable market prices will continually advance to higher levels. The bill expressly provides that the determinants of reasonable market price are (1) "whether such price has been competitively arrived at," (2) "the effect of the contract upon the assurance of supply," and (3) "the reasonableness of the provisions of the contract as they relate to existing or future prices."

As thus restricted, reasonable market price does not afford any restraint on the upward trend of field gas prices, but actually gives legislative sanction to the acceleration of the rate of increase which currently characterizes the industry.

Your editorial endorsement also was based on the conclusion that the compromise bill empowers the Federal Power Commission to invalidate rate increases under escalator clauses. However, it is quite clear from a mere reading of section 3 (d) of the compromise bill that no effective control is provided for escalator and favored nation clauses, since the prices brought about by the operation of such clauses only need meet the reasonable market price standard set forth above.

Another legal boobytrap is concealed in section 3 (e) of the bill which purportedly relieves a pipeline company of its obligation to pay a producer the contract price if the Federal Power Commission finds such price to exceed the reasonable market price. However, the very sales transaction referred to is defined in section 2 of the bill as not being in interstate commerce. Thus Congress would be subjecting to regulation under the commerce clause a transaction which it has defined as not being in interstate commerce.

The editorial recognizes the importance of the actual cost of production as an element in determining reasonable price, but fails to recognize, in my opinion, that under the reasonable market price standard as defined in the bill neither the producer's cost of production nor his profits can be taken into account. Thereby, the regulatory standard set up in the bill is contrary to the whole philosophy of utility regulation as developed in this country which is opposed to the use of market price as a regulatory standard.

I am confident that the 15 members of the committee who voted against the compromise are not in favor of regulation of natural gas producers unless it is absolutely necessary in the public interest. I know I am of that mind. We feel some regulation of producers' prices is in the public interest. We feel, I am sure, that the Harris compromise does not afford adequate protection to gas consumers.

The questions which Mr. HARRIS asks concerning the large spread between the price of gas in the field and the rate at the consumer's meter have already been answered in the testimony of witnesses before both the House and Senate committees. The makeup of the cost of transmission and distribution of natural gas are contained in the published reports of these utilities and in sworn reports to regulatory commissions. I would not hesitate to predict that the investigation, if ever made, will not disclose the existence of exorbitant profits derived from the transmission and distribution of natural gas at the present time.

The increasing cost of gas in the field and at the city gate in the last few years has squeezed out most of such profits. Undoubtedly a few companies have earned excessive returns in recent years, but many more will be found that are distributing natural gas at rates which yield the utility less than what is normally considered a fair return.

I trust that after the majority and minority reports of the House committee are available the Washington Post and Times Herald will reappraise the Harris compromise bill and will reconsider its present endorsement of that measure.

TORBERT H. MACDONALD,
Member of Congress from Massachusetts.

Vidovdan: A Tribute to Serbians

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 28, 1955

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following commemorative statement made by me on the occasion of Vidovdan, or feast day of St. Vitus, a day on which Serbians pay homage and rededicate themselves to their great national traditions and rich history:

Among Serbians, Vidovdan is a day of national dedication. It is a day on which all Serbs commemorate not a victory but a defeat for their nation. More than that, it is a day on which all the great national traditions of the Serbian people are commemorated with all the honor and respect they so richly deserve.

Centuries ago an empire of the first order emerged in the Balkans, and at the head of this Serbian Empire was Stephen Dushan. In the past disunity had plagued Serbia, and with the decline of the Byzantine Empire, the Balkan Peninsula was further exposed to the Turkish invaders. Realizing this menace to Serbia, Dushan, a name of endearment among Serbians meaning "the soul,"

tried to counterbalance Turkish power by replacing the declining Byzantine empire with a Serbo-Greek empire. Gradually Dushan extended his domain throughout the Balkan Peninsula until 1345 at which time he proclaimed himself "emperor of the Serbs and the Greeks." On Easter of the following year he was crowned.

Furthermore, Dushan began the codification of all Serbian laws which were finally published in 1345. Historically, Dushan's codification was a clear indication of the substantial advancement of Serbia among the nations of Europe.

However, Dushan met an untimely death in the campaign of 1355 to strengthen the unity of his empire as a defensive measure against the Turks. Subsequently Serbian princes carried on the general foreign policies laid down by the former Serbian ruler, but with limited success. At Maritza in 1371 the Serbs were badly defeated by the Turks, a somber foreboding of the great and tragic defeat that was to come at Kosovo. Serbia's political position was substantially weakened by this defeat. Moreover, the lack of unity that prevailed in the empire after Dushan was an added factor contributing to the weakness of the Serbian empire.

Serbia was, however, fortunate in having Lazar Hrebelyanovich elected as its ruler in 1374. To prevent the further disruption of the empire and to organize a Christian League against the Turks were the primary objectives of the new Serbian rulers. The Turkish Sultan could not, however, permit these Serbian policies to succeed, and thus in 1389 the Turks launched a campaign which ultimately led not only to the subjugation of the Bulgarians but the defeat of the Serbs as well.

It was on the plains of Kosovo on Vidovdan, the feast day of St. Vitus, on June 28, 1389, when the armies of the Turkish Sultan Murad I and the Serbian Lazar met in mortal conflict. Serbs, Bulgars, Albanians, Croats, and even Roumanians fought with the armies of Lazar, while the Sultan in addition to his Turkish forces even had Christian vassals under his command.

The Serbian defeat at Kosovo was an important event in Serbian history. Indeed, it was a decisive battle in European history because the defeat of the Serbs prepared the way for the Turkish conquests of the Balkan Peninsula, a conquest that was to last until the 19th century. The Serbian forces fought with great courage and resourcefulness to stop the onrushing Turks, but victory was not to be theirs. Both commanders of the contending forces were killed; the Turks won the battle, and with that victory the hope of continued Serbian independence and empire vanished. For the Serbian people Vidovdan—June 28, 1389—was a day of national mourning and sorrow.

The consequences of the Serbian defeat at Kosovo were far-reaching. Nearly all the Serbian princes and noblemen, including the heroic Lazar, who had fought in that battle, were killed in combat or afterwards beheaded. Thus, the flower of Serbian aristocracy, the nation's leadership, was destroyed beneath the sword of the Turkish warrior. Vidovdan meant also that the Turkish Crescent fell across Serbia. Disunity and anarchy increased, and in 1459 the Serbs fell under complete Turkish domination. Subsequently, the Serbian language and all political, cultural, religious, and national traditions of the Serbian people were compelled to succumb to the despot who brought to Serbia tyranny, oppression, sorrow, and a decadent civilization which were destined to remain for the next 345 years.

Among the Serbs, Vidovdan calls to mind a day of great national humiliation; but, it also calls to mind a day when Serbian courage and heroism reached a peak seldom achieved by any nation. Vidovdan is to the Serbs a time of national dedication. It has long been the custom of Serbians to go on an annual pilgrimage to the tomb of Lazar, the fallen hero of Kosovo, resting in the monastery at New Ravanitza. That Lazar was more than a military and national hero to the Serbs is indicated by his canonization by the Serbian Orthodox Church. In poetry, literature, and in music this great battle of Kosovo became for Serbians a theme of great national importance. Even Goethe, the great German poet, compared many of the Serbian epic poems depicting the tragedy of Kosovo with the Iliad and the Odyssey.

Thus, among the Serbian people Vidovdan is a day of national dedication—dedication to the joy and sorrow of a great historic event. Vidovdan has taken on a broader meaning, however, than originally conceived. To Serbs the world over Vidovdan is a day of prayer and commemoration of all the glorious traditions of the Serbian past. In a sense Vidovdan, a religious feast day and a national holiday, represents the spiritual and historic fusion of all the ideals and traditions of the Serbian people.

On this occasion, therefore, commemorating Vidovdan all America takes cognizance of the great national traditions of Serbia, and to Serbians everywhere may this Vidovdan serve as a source of renewed inspiration for the future.

Progress of Soviet Union in Airpower

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY M. JACKSON

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, June 28, 1955

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, on June 27, yesterday, I directed a letter to the Secretary of Defense relating to the progress the Soviet Union is making in the field of airpower. I ask unanimous consent that the letter be printed in the RECORD.

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

JUNE 27, 1955.

The Honorable the SECRETARY OF DEFENSE.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: As a member of the Senate Armed Services Committee and as chairman of the Military Applications Subcommittee of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, I have been sorely troubled by the massive and growing evidence of the extraordinarily rapid progress the Soviet Union is making in the field of airpower.

Six years ago, American air-atomic might was incontestable. In addition to our atomic monopoly, we possessed the B-36, the world's only true intercontinental bomber and we had already flown the B-47, the world's first strategic jet bomber. Yet the Soviets broke our atomic monopoly in 1949—years before the expected date. Their first hydrogen explosion occurred in the summer of 1953—only 9 months after our own first full-scale hydrogen test.

Coupled with this, the Soviet Union has made ominous—and unexpected—strides in the development of delivery vehicles. It is no exaggeration to say that their May Day demonstration of 1954—when they first exhibited jet bombers comparable to our own medium-range B-47 and long-range B-52—caught our defense planners by surprise. Our responsible officials were likewise caught by surprise by the Moscow fly-overs of 2 months ago, when the Soviets flew both their medium- and long-range jet bombers in operational numbers, and when they also flew large numbers of a new day fighter and a new all-weather interceptor.

In the wake of these recent fly-overs, our only comfort today lies in the fact that—in certain types of planes, such as our B-47—we still appear to be ahead of the Soviets. In 1949, in short, our airpower lead was incontestable. Today, 6 years later, we find ourselves trying to keep up with Soviet progress in delivery vehicles—rather than being decisively ahead.

What concerns me even more than the existing precarious balance of airpower is my fear that if present trends continue, the Soviets will be demonstrably ahead of us in airpower—both quantitatively and qualitatively—5 years from now. We must assume that what is past is prologue. The Soviets have been narrowing the technological gap between our two nations with awesome speed. In all honesty, the ineluctable logic of present trends impels me to fear that the Soviets will be our unquestionable superiors in airpower a few short years hence, unless we do something about it now.

I am thinking not only of Russian progress in the development of manned aircraft, but—still more important—their effort in the field of ballistic missiles of intercontinental or continental range. I believe it is a simple statement of fact to say that Soviet victory in this race for discovery could turn the balance of world military power upside down.

On this score, one point particularly troubles me. If the Soviets build a ballistic missile of merely continental range—that is, 1,500 to 2,000 miles—at an early date, all of free Europe might feel itself at the mercy of Moscow, since such a weapon could blanket all the capitals, industries, and military installations of Western Europe. If this occurs, it could well cause the breakup of the free world's alliance system.

Our entire defensive effort has been predicated upon offsetting Communist superiority in conventional forces with American superiority in airpower and anvanced weapons systems. As you know, in fact, the administration has gone on record as favoring a cutback in American ground forces—which I have opposed. We have always conceded to the Communists superiority in manpower and conventional forces, and we have sought to cancel out such superiority with our trump card of technological supremacy—particularly in the air-atomic field. What troubles me now is that the Soviets may be setting the stage to take this trump card out of our hands. Should this happen, military disaster could well result.

Accordingly, I would greatly appreciate receiving from you, in written form, your personal answers to the following questions. Permit me to express the hope that your reply will be as explicit and categorical as possible, since the very survival of our Nation may hinge upon remaining decisively and unquestionably ahead of the Soviets in this field.

1. Is it accurate to say that the Soviets may now be quantitatively equal to us in the production of long-range jet bombers?

2. Is it accurate to say that, even with the proposed 35 percent accelertation in B-52's, the Soviets may have more long-range jet bombers in their air force by 1958 than we will?

3. Is it accurate to say that the new day fighter and all-weather interceptors recently unveiled over Moscow in operational numbers are better planes, performance-wise, than any comparable aircraft we now have in squadron service?

4. Is it accurate to say that, in terms of numbers of advanced fighters in operational service, the Soviets are now overwhelmingly ahead of us?

5. Is it accurate to say that the Soviets have produced and flown jet engines with greater thrust than we ourselves have?

6. Is it accurate to say that our defense planners underestimated the date on which the first Soviet long-range jet bomber was flown?

7. Is it accurate to say that our defense planners underestimated, by a very considerable margin, the date on which the Soviets would fly operational numbers of their long-range jet bombers?

8. Is it accurate to say that the Soviets have been able to tool up for mass production of aircraft more quickly than we have—in other words, that their lead time from the design of prototype aircraft to mass production models is shorter than ours?

9. Is it accurate to say that, by 1960, the Soviets will probably have more scientists and engineers working in the airpower field than we ourselves will have?

10. Is it accurate to say that, if present trends continue, the Soviets may be ahead of us in airpower—both quantitatively and qualitatively—by 1960?

11. Is it accurate to say that the Soviets may achieve a continental ballistic missile—one with a 1,500 to 2,000 mile range—before we will? If so, what degree of likelihood do you attach to this possibility?

12. Is it accurate to say that the Soviets may achieve an intercontinental ballistic missile before we do? If so, what degree of likelihood do you attach to this possibility?

Since I am sure that the members of the Military Applications Subcommittee will wish to study your answers to these questions before the adjournment of the Congress, I would greatly appreciate receiving a reply by the earliest possible date.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Sincerely yours,

HENRY M. JACKSON,
Chairman, Military Applications Subcommittee.

Resolution of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries Concerning Mutual Security Act Amendments

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HERBERT C. BONNER

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 28, 1955

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution:

RESOLUTION OF COMMITTEE ON MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES CONCERNING MUTUAL SECURITY ACT AMENDMENTS, S. 2090

Whereas Public Law 664 (83d Cong., 2d sess.), the Cargo Preference Act was enacted after full hearings and most careful consideration by the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries; and

Whereas the Cargo Preference Act amended the Merchant Marine Act of 1936 so as to adopt as permanent legislation the principle that at least 50 percent of all Government-generated cargoes, including agricultural surpluses which are financed directly or indirectly by the public funds of the United States Government, shall move on United States-flag vessels to the extent that they are available at fair and reasonable rates; and

Whereas in February 1955 the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries held extensive hearings on the administration of the Cargo Preference Act, finding among other things that there is no basis in fact for charges that shipments to foreign countries of surplus agricultural commodities are being, or can be, delayed by reason of the provisions of the act; and

Whereas the Mutual Security Act of 1955, S. 2090, has been reported to the House with amendments which would eliminate the 50-50 shipping requirement from the transport of agricultural commodities not only under the Mutual Security Act, but also under Public Law 480, the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, thus in effect repealing in large part the Cargo Preference Act; and

Whereas members of the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee were not invited nor given opportunity to testify on the amendments in question and in fact the indications are that no testimony was taken on this subject from persons understanding merchant marine matters; Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That it is the sense of the members of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries that the following provisions of S. 2090 should be stricken from the bill when it is considered in the House:

On page 17, lines 2 and 3, strike out the words "insert '(except surplus agricultural commodities)' after 'commodities', and."

On page 19, strike out lines 7 through 16, inclusive.

Monsignor of the Shoeshine Boys

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 28, 1955

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, on Christmas Eve of 1944 an Irish priest walked through the war-damaged streets of Naples and saw the thousands of homeless youngsters who were sleeping out on that bitterly cold night.

When he returned to Rome, Msgr. John Patrick Carroll-Abbing asked Pope Pius XII to relieve him of some of his duties in the Vatican service so that he could dedicate his life to the cause of these homeless youngsters.

He rapidly became known as the Monsignor of the Shoeshine Boys because of the centers that he set up to give a home and a chance in life to these poor vagrants whom many people already called "juvenile delinquents." Monsignor Carroll had faith in these boys.

Today, Monsignor Carroll is in the United States trying to spread the wonderful story of his Boys' Towns of Italy. Ten years ago he had 1 bombed-out villa, $20, and 2 sacks of flour. Today he has built 8 beautiful Boys' Towns equipped with their own farms, their schools, their factories, and trade centers. He has also founded a home for emotionally disturbed boys and, only a few weeks ago, opened his first Girls' Town. In addition to these imposing institutions, he has erected 27 day-care centers in the poverty-stricken areas of southern Italy, where communism has been taking advantage of the great misery in order to win over the people. The Boys' Towns of Italy have been called bulwarks of American democracy overseas, not only because they were made possible because of the contributions of men and women in the United States, but also because they have trained thousands of young boys in social living and in democracy in action. Thousands of young men, who have now left the Boys' Towns, look to America as the country that gave them a chance in life. Monsignor Carroll, who told the wonderful story of Italy's lost children of the war in his book, A Chance in Life, has now written a second book, a novel, Journey to Somewhere.

It is easy to imagine what the story is: It tells of one of the thousands of Italy's war orphans who experienced every handship, but eventually began his Journey to Somewhere when he was given a chance.

Americans of every national origin and of every creed are proud of the Boys' Towns in Italy. They are the outstanding examples of what a voluntary foreign-aid program should be. They are direct manifestations of good will from the people of the United States to the people—and particularly the children—of Italy; the effort is nationwide in America, the results are nationwide in Italy; the contributors have seen the immediate and easily identifiable results of their own personal gift or the gift of their community. In New Jersey we are all very happy to be sharing in this great work.

In a world where so much of the news makes men pessimistic regarding the future of the human race, the message of the Italian Boys' Towns is like a ray of light and of hope shining in the darkness and indicating the way to a better world, one which is built on brotherhood and kindness.

On Saturday, May 14 of this year, I was privileged to attend the Union County, N. J., committee's benefit dinner and dance for the Boys' Towns of Italy. It was truly an inspiring occasion and I want to commend the president of the committee, Mr. Arthur Venneri, and all the committee members for their outstanding contribution to this most worthwhile cause.

In recognition of their great campaign, I ask that Mr. Venneri's greeting to the friends of Boys' Towns of Italy be included in the RECORD:

We are tonight again assembled in unity to express our enthusiasm and continuing confidence in the youth of Italy. We are earnestly carrying the torch handed to us by our inspirational leader, Monsignor John Patrick Carroll-Abbing.

Because of your traditional and sympathetic understanding, Boys' Towns in Italy today abound in good, wholesome living for hundreds of otherwise homeless boys.

This year, Monsignor Carroll has inaugurated the first Girls' Town of Italy—certainly a necessary and worthy development to our project.

The child centers and nurseries multiply in ever-increasing numbers—fulfilling a need among those in need.

This great humanitarian work continues largely because of your wholehearted support and loyalty evidenced in many cases by your willingness to defer a luxury to give a child a necessity.

May I thank you personally, and in behalf of the little ones we are privileged to help, and may God continue to bless you for your fine efforts.

Library of Congress Requests Authorization for 3-Year Study of Archaic Copyright Law of 1909—I

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK THOMPSON, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 28, 1955

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, on January 20, 1955, I introduced a bill, H. R. 2677, creating a Federal commission to study the copyright laws and to make recommendations for their revision.

On June 7, 1955, Dr. L. Quincy Mumford, Librarian of Congress, and Arthur Fisher, Register of Copyrights, in testimony before the Subcommittee on Legislative Appropriations, described the Copyright Act of 1909 as "archaic" and requested the creation of a number of new positions in the Copyright Office to undertake a 3-year study looking toward revision of the domestic law. Excerpts from that important testimony are presented here:

COPYRIGHT OFFICE

Mr. NORRELL. We will go on to the next item which is the "Copyright Office" on page 90 of the bill. The estimate for 1956 is $1,195,284 and in 1955 you had $1,100,000. An increase is desired this coming year of $95,284. We will insert page 26 of the justifications in the record at this point.

(The matter referred to is as follows:)

Salaries and expenses, Copyright Office

1955 regular bill	$1,100,000
1956 estimate	1,195,284
Net increase	+95,284

ANALYSIS OF INCREASES REQUESTED

1. Federal employees group life insurance	+$3,386
The cost of Federal employees group life insurance, which is being absorbed during 1955, is specifically requested for 1956 as an item of increased cost. The estimate is based on experience during 1955 which indicates a cost of about ⅓ of 1 percent of the total requirement for personal services.	
2. Ingrade increases	+16,818
Increases in salary costs of staff subject to such increases in 1956 over 1955 due to periodic ingrade increases.	
3. New positions requested	+75,080
The annual cost of 21 new positions requested as follows:	
Studies relating to the revision of the copyright law:	
7 GS-7	$29,435
3 GS-4	9,525
Workload—Increased volume of business:	
7 GS-5	23,870
1 GS-4	3,175
2 GS-3	5,900
Compliance activity:	
1 GS-4	3,175
Total positions (21)	75,080
Total increase	+95,284

Mr. NORRELL. Will you give us a short statement regarding your item for the Copyright Office? Will you describe especially the need for the 21 new positions which are proposed in 1956?

Dr. MUMFORD. Yes, sir. May I mention that in the case of the first two items, "Federal employees group life insurance," and the "ingrade increases," the same principle prevails here as mentioned in respect to the other appropriation.

REVISION OF THE COPYRIGHT LAW

Then, proceeding to the "New positions," the request for the 10 new positions is for the revision of the copyright law for a special 3-year program. This is intended to provide 7 attorneys to participate in studies relating to revising and redrafting the copyright law or to relieve experienced attorneys on the Copyright Office staff to do this work, and 3 clerk-stenographers to perform clerical duties in connection with this work.

The present copyright law of the United States, title 17 of the United States Code, as codified and enacted into positive law by the act of July 30, 1947, and amended by subsequent acts is basically and substantively the act of March 4, 1909.

Now, Mr. Fisher, the Register of Copyrights is here, and I would be glad to have him elaborate upon the need for this assistance for the proposed revision of the copyright law.

Mr. NORRELL. I think we would be glad to hear him for a few minutes. State your name and how long you have been in this kind of work.

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Chairman, and gentlemen of the committee, my name is Arthur Fisher. I have been either Register, Acting Register, or Associate Register of Copyrights for about 7 years.

I appreciate very much the opportunity to appear before the subcommittee to explain the problems and the needs of the Copyright Office.

REVISION OF THE COPYRIGHT LAW

Now, the third item is for the revision of the law, the item under discussion as I came in.

May I say just a word about the general problem of the revision of the law. As the Librarian just said, the act we operate under is really the act of 1909. There have been minor revisions, and the codification of the act brought about just as I came to the Office, but there have been no revisions of the fundamental provisions of the law.

Since the law of 1909 was enacted there have been tremendous technical and organizational changes, which can even be said to be revolutionary. For example, there was no radio or television industry at that time. The motion-picture industry was just a fragment. The recording industry had not developed. Many modern methods of mass reproduction were still unknown.

So the copyright law of 1909, under which we operate in the United States, is out of date, archaic, and this is generally so recognized. The several committees of the American Bar Association and the other associations concerned with copyrights have urged a general revision of the law for many years. In the past three American Bar administrations I have dealt directly with personnel of those committees.

We have taken the position for the last 6 years that we were engaged in a very difficult international problem of securing better protection for American works abroad. I might say parenthetically that the motion-picture industry, for example, out of a total annual business of that industry running about $1½ billion, with something less than half of that dollar volume in the producing companies, 42 percent of that production company business is overseas. That is a very large amount of business, and is very important in the representation of American interests abroad.

We gave the foreign situation a priority. After 6 years of work we have secured the adoption of the Universal Copyright Convention, which required certain changes in domestic law and is going into effect in the next few weeks. A short waiting period is provided for.

We heard yesterday that Germany has completed its ratification and the United States has also, so we now have ratification of 11 countries out of the 12 necessary.

We took the position over these last 6 or 7 years that we should not deal with the domestic revision of the law beyond the minimum extent necessary in connection with the universal convention and the foreign situation. We were successful in doing that. If we had taken on the general revision, we never would have gotten through with the universal convention.

That leaves us with the problem of the proposals made with respect to the domestic American law, both on the west coast and New York. We have persuaded people submitting such amendments to postpone them until there could be a comprehensive revision. We have now come to the point where we should deal with that.

We have had a number of detailed changes. In talking to the members of the Judiciary Committee, who have worked very closely on all amendments to the copyright law, I have noted that some of them express the view that we should not do this piecemeal, as an uncoordinated revision, but that we need to accomplish a fundamental revision.

We feel that for this task the Copyright Office has the staff and the experience. It is very difficult to find impartial people competent both in these industries and in copyright problems. What we should do in the domestic field is the same as was done in the foreign field, namely, do the spade work on the facts, analyze these very complicated problems, present alternatives, and follow procedures where the Congress itself can decide policy questions.

We will have to use our most experienced examiners and attorneys in order to do this. However, in order to release them and still keep current, we need to recruit a small group of new examiners. Our requirements are very small, compared either to our total staff or the Patent Office. We estimate we should have 7 additional juniors to do the current examining work, the current routine technical work, plus 3 clerical people; with these we can keep up to date in our normal work and really do a good job on this long-overdue revision of the law.

In summary, we are only asking for $95,000 increase. In comparison with this sum the total of cash turned over to the Treasury, plus the value of deposits, is very much in excess of the amount I come before you to request.

SUMMARY OF NEEDS AND PROBLEMS OF COPYRIGHT OFFICE

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Chairman, I have prepared a brief summary of what I have said. Could that be given to you for inclusion in the record?

Mr. NORRELL. All right. We will place this in the record.

(The statement is as follows:)

"As Register of Copyrights, I appreciate the opportunity to summarize the needs and problems of the Copyright Office.

"Piecemeal revision expensive and undesirable

"Many individual administrative and other changes have been found necessary in the law. To accomplish these piecemeal is an expensive and unsatisfactory procedure. For the past several years subcommittees of the American Bar Association and other associations concerned with copyright have been established to seek a general revision of our copyright law.

"Domestic law revision postponed for 6 years

"In view of the effort to draft and secure United States adherence to the Universal Copyright Convention, now successfully achieved, these efforts for a general revision of the domestic copyright law were discouraged during the past 6 years. It was felt necessary, if the universal convention was to be completed on schedule, that changes in the domestic law should be limited to those essential to the approval of that convention.

"Assurances, however, were given to those who urged the importance of revision of the domestic law that such a revision in the domestic law would be undertaken as soon as the changes related to the international convention were accomplished.

"The matters of domestic revision, therefore, is overdue and should now be promptly undertaken. The first step, if the same success is to be achieved in the domestic field as in the foreign, is to make factual studies, careful analyses of existing law, with presentation of alternative solutions.

"Copyright Office to make factual and analytical studies, final policy decisions by Congress

"The final determination of policy will, of course, rest with the appropriate committees of Congress. No matter what form any bill takes or the detailed procedure adopted, the Copyright Office will be looked to, to do the impartial spadework and analyze the alternatives.

"Fundamental revision of domestic law now needed

"The matter is not merely one of codification but of fundamental revision. Several of the most competent personnel and attorneys experienced in the work of the Office and the administration of the law would devote themselves to this task. They cannot be spared from current activities unless replaced at least temporarily by other examiners. A minimum of 7 attorneys and 3 supporting clerical staff is estimated as needed for this purpose."

Dr. MUMFORD. Finally, I should like to emphasize, Mr. Chairman that the proposal for the revision of the law is for only a 3-year project.

Mr. NORRELL. All right.

Library of Congress Requests Authorization for 3-year Study of Archaic Copyright Law of 1909—II

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK THOMPSON, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 28, 1955

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, great interest has been expressed in a study prepared for me by the American Law Division of the Library of Congress of the major attempts to modernize the copyright law of 1909. Among those expressing interest in this study have been representatives of the National Broadcasting Co., the firm of Covington & Burling, the American Society of Composers, Authors, and Publishers, and the Government of Switzerland. An excerpt from this historic study is included here:

V. RESPITE

In the 70th Congress the bill for the general revision of the copyright laws was again introduced by Mr. Vestal as H. R. 8912. This bill was the same as H. R. 10434 of the 69th Congress. No hearings were held by the committee on H. R. 8912, and no action was taken with respect to a major revision throughout the entire Congress.

VI. THE VESTAL BILL OF 1930

The Vestal bill was again introduced in the 71st Congress as H. R. 6990. Hearings were held by the Committee on Patents on April 3, 4, and 11, 1930. At the beginning of the hearings, the chairman, Mr. Vestal stated with respect to design copyrights and mechanical reproductions that separate hearings had been held upon bills dealing with those subjects and that therefore the witnesses should touch lightly upon them, but with respect to the rest of the bill the committee would like to have a thorough discussion.[1]

Those in favor of the bill were:

Will Irwin, Authors League, American Center of the P. E. N. Club.

Marc Connelly, dramatist, Authors League.

Elmer Davis, writer, Authors League.

Miss Thyra Samter Winslow, Authors' League.

Chester Crowell, Authors League.

John Paine, American Society of Composers, Authors, and Publishers.

Frederick Melcher, editor of Publishers' Weekly, the National Association of Book Publishers.

Frederick A. Stokes, chairman, Copyright Committee, the National Association of Book Publishers.

John Benbow, Longman's, Green & Co.

J. W. Lippincott, publisher.

Cass Canfield, executive vice president, Harper Bros.

Lynham B. Sturgis, the Century Co.

George P. Brett, Jr., treasurer and general manager, the Macmillan Publishing Co.

Edward H. Hart, husband of Mrs. Hart, writer.

Hon. Sol Bloom, Representative in Congress from New York.

Mrs. William Atherton Dupuy, the League of American Pen Women, Dramatist Guild, the Authors' League.

Austin Strong, dramatist.

Joseph P. Bickerton, Jr., representing various theatrical producing managers, dramatists, and magazines.

John Golden, the John Golden Theater, New York.

Arthur McKeough, editor, Good Housekeeping.

Lyman Beecher Stowe, grandson of Harriett Beecher Stowe, author of Uncle Tom's Cabin.

Fred G. Cooper, illustrator.

John J. A. Murphy, Guild of Free Lance Artists.

Charles Scribner, Jr., Charles Scribner's son.

John Macrae, president, E. P. Dutton & Co.

Carl Cannon, the American Library Association.

Arthur Guiterman, poet.

Miss Marguerite Widdemer, poet.

Karl W. Kirchwey, the Hurst Organization.

Mrs. Mateel Howe Farnhan, novelist.

Mrs. Gladys Shaw Erskine, novelist and poet.

Mrs. Elizabeth Newport Hepburn, the Pen and Brush Club of New York.

William H. Osborne, the Authors' League.

William O. Tufts, the map publishers.

C. Augustus Norwood, the Christian Science publishing interest.

Arthur W. Weil, Motion Picture Producers and Distributors of America.

Louis Swarts, Paramount Famous, Lasky Corp.

W. D. Wiechmann.

Louise M. Sillcox.

R. R. Bowker, president, R. R. Bowker Co., magazine publishers.

Those who testified against the bill or certain features of the bill were:

Prof. Henry G. Doyle, George Washington University, the American Association of University Professors.

George C. Lucas, executive secretary, National Publishers' Association.

William B. Warner, National Publishers' Association.

Elisha Hanson, American Newspaper Publishers' Association.

William Klein, attorney, the Shubert Theater Corp.

Lee Shubert.

Al H. Woods.

William L. Brown, Assistant Register of Copyrights, Library of Congress.

John W. Ziegler, vice president, the John C. Winston Co.

Wallace McClure, Assistant Chief, Treaty Division, United States State Department.

Jean Monk, manager, National Fellowship Club, Inc., Washington, D. C.

M. L. Raney, American Association for the Advancement of Science.

O. R. Barnett, attorney.

After all the testimony was in, a new committee bill, H. R. 12549 was introduced by Mr. Vestal, the chairman. In reporting the committee bill the House Committee on Patents stated:

"H. R. 6990, introduced in the House of Representatives during the first session of the 71st Congress, is in general revision of the national copyright law. A similar bill was introduced in the year 1926 and has been before the patents committee ever since its introduction in that year; and there have been many hearings upon it before the committee, a large amount of testimony taken and a multitude of conferences between various interests held. The committee has successfully reconciled the differences. The context of the bill has been changed in various particulars from time to time to meet valid suggestions on the part of one interest or another and the present bill, H. R. 12549, combines the results of all hearings and all conferences.

"It has been found that practically all the industries and all the authors have united in support of this revision. The authors, playwrights, screen writers, composers, and artists support it. The book publishers, the motion-picture producers, the newspapers and magazines, the allied printing trades unions, the librarians, the majority of the theatrical managers, all of these have appeared at the hearings and have supported the principles of the bill.

"This general revision of the copyright law provides for—

"(1) Automatic copyright by which the copyright is conferred upon the author upon creation of his work, a right so limited by various provisions of the bill as to be made a privilege;

"(2) Divisible copyright, which permits the assignee, grantee, or licensee to protect and enforce any right which he acquires from an author without the complications incident to the old law;

"(3) International copyright, which enables American authors merely by complying with the provisions of this act, to secure copyright throughout all the important countries of the world without further formalities."[2]

---

[1] U. S. Congress, House Committee on Patents, hearings on H. R. 6990, pp. 14–15.

[2] House Rept. No. 1689, 71st Cong., 2d sess.

Library of Congress Requests Authorization for 3-Year Study of Archaic Copyright Law of 1909—III

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK THOMPSON, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 28, 1955

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I am including the concluding portion of section 5 of the study prepared for me by the American Law Division of the Library of Congress of the major attempts to modernize the copyright law of 1909. I do this because of the great interest which has been expressed in this study:

However, things did not go as smoothly as the committee report seemed to indicate. The report itself contained a minority report which was an attack upon the bill with respect to divisibility of copyrights.

The bill was recommitted twice before it was debated.[3] The first recommittal was for compliance with the Ramseyer rule, House rule XII, section II (a). Thereafter the bill was again reported out (H. Rept. 1898, 71st Cong.). The second recommittal was on request of the committee chairman due to the discovery of an irregularity in the adoption of the report (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 72, p. 11994). The bill was reported out the third and last time as House Report No. 2016, 71st Congress.

After being debated the bill passed the House[4] on January 5, 1931, and was referred to the Senate Committee on Patents. This committee also held hearings. At the hearings it was evident that opposition was developing. The chairman, in opening the hearings, stated:

"I may say to those assembled here at this hearing that today and tomorrow have been set aside by the committee to have a hearing upon this bill, H. R. 12549. This hearing was called at the instance of opponents of the bill as a whole or as opponents to some specific portion of the bill. It is the purpose of the committee today to allow all of today, if necessary, to those opposing the bill either as a whole or in part. If there are people here who have had their day before the House committee we do not care to spend time in hearing them repeat what they said before the House committee. We can read that. However, if they spoke before the House committee and they have some new proposition that reaches beyond what they said at the House hearing, of course we shall be glad to hear them."

"After the opponents of the bill or parts of it have been heard, we will then listen to those first who approve the bill in its present form and, second, those who approve the bill generally, who have some minor amendments to suggest. We desire those who oppose this bill or who will direct their energies to opposition to specific portions of it, to arrange this hearing in their own way and to select their own speaker or speakers, giving to the committee the name and address of the person or persons who are to address the committee. We do not want people called here to talk to us over the same matters that have been talked of in the House and I think we will discover pretty soon whether or not the speaker is keeping within that limitation or whether he is not. We want to get through with this bill. We want to give you a full hearing, as full as is necessary, but we do want you to pin your statements right down to the specific things that appear in the bill as it is before the Senate, and we want your statements to go to the things that you object to. We want to know in a concise way why you object, and, if you have an amendment which you propose on the general theory that some legislation is to pass, we request that you have your amendment prepared and put it up to us in order that we can have the benefit of it. In other words, you cannot be too concise, too direct, in your criticism, nor too specific."[5]

The lineup at these hearings was as follows. Those in favor of the bill were:

William H. Osborne, Council of the Authors' League.

Chester T. Crowell, the Authors' League.

Gene Buck, American Society of Composers, Authors, and Publishers.

Otto C. Wierum, the Bar Association of the City of New York.

Frederick G. Melcher, vice president, R. R. Bowker Co., National Association of Book Publishers.

Louis D. Fraelich, American Society of Composers, Authors, and Publishers.

Wallace McClure, Assistant Chief, Treaty Division, United States State Department.

M. J. Flynn, America's Wage Earners Protective Conference.

George C. Lucas, executive secretary, National Publishers' Association.

McDonald De Witt, attorney, Conde Nast Publishing Co.

Carl Cannon, American Library Association.

Arthur W. Weil, Motion Picture Producers and Distributors of America.

Louis E. Swarts, Motion Picture Producers and Distributors of America.

Walter G. Wiechmann, National Association of Book Publishers.

Those opposed to the bill or certain features of the bill were:

Karl Fenning, attorney, Washington, D. C.

Oswald F. Schuette, Radio Protective Association.

Eugene C. Brokmeyer, National Association of Retail Druggists.

H. E. Capehart, representing Manufacturers of Slot Machines and Automatic Phonographs.

William S. Hedges, National Association of Broadcasters.

Louis G. Caldwell, National Association of Broadcasters.

William A. Brady, theatrical producer.

Thorvald Solberg, Register of Copyrights, Library of Congress.

William L. Brown, Assistant Register of Copyrights, Library of Congress.

J. H. McCracken, The American Council of Education.

Herman H. B. Meyer, Library of Congress.

M. L. Raney, representing 21 national organizations such as the American Chemical Society, the American Council of Learned Societies, etc.

Frank D. Scott.

John W. Ziegler, vice president, John C. Winston Co., publishers.

A. Julian Brylawski, the Motion Picture Theater Owners of America.

F. J. Rembusch.

Senator Bronson Cutting, of New Mexico.

William Neidel, secretary, Funk & Wagnalls Co.

Hearings on the bill closed on January 29, 1931. The committee, however, did not report the bill until February 23. In its report it stated:

"Bills not unlike the one under consideration have been before the House of Representatives since the year 1926. Many hearings have been had and a large volume of testimony adduced before members of the Committee on Patents of that body, as well as to your committee during its consideration of the measure now under review. It will be noted that notwithstanding the extended consideration given to this and other measures by committees of the House of Representatives, your committee has seen fit to modify the bill as it came from the House of Representatives in many respects. The bill as now presented to the Senate is the result of all this extensive study and consideration. It is safe to say that practically all of the industries and all of the authors and composers have united in support of this measure. The authors, playwrights, composers, and artists are in favor of its enactment. The book publishers, the motion-picture producers, the publishers of newspapers and magazines, the allied printing-trade unions, the librarians, a majority of the theater managers—all of these have appeared at one or another of the several hearings and have expressed their approval of the principles of the bill, as well as most of its provisions.

"MAJOR AMENDMENTS PROVIDED BY H. R. 12549

"What might be called the major amendments to the existing copyright law that are provided in this bill may be summarized under three heads as follows:

"(1) Automatic copyright, by which a copyright is conferred upon the author immediately he creates a work.

"(2) Divisible copyright, which permits the author to dispose of his several rights which he has in his creation and to enable his assignee, grantee, or licensee to protect any such right which he acquires, and this without the many complications arising under existing law.

"(3) International copyright, which guarantees to American authors the copyright of their works throughout all the important countries of the world without compliance with any formalities."[6]

Intermittent debate in the Senate started on February 26 and continued until the early morning hours of March 2, 1931. From a reading of the debate[7] it is evident that strong opposition had developed. As a matter of fact the situation in the dying hours of this Congress was such to cause Senator Reed to state:[8]

"If it has taken 6 hours to do 9 pages, it is going to take about 40 hours to do the remaining 40 pages. There are only about 34½ hours left of this Congress."

After numerous efforts to recess, the hour then being later than 1 o'clock in the morning (a. m.), the Senate finally recessed with no vote on final passage of the bill. Thereafter, the bill was never taken up again and, of course, died with the adjournment of the 71st Congress.

Testimony on H. R. 377, Garmatz Public Housing Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD A. GARMATZ

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 28, 1955

Mr. GARMATZ. Mr. Speaker, I am disappointed that the Committee on

[3] CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 72, pp. 10595, 11549.

[4] CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 72, pp. 11994, 11996, 12018, 12473, 12474; vol. 74, pp. 2006, 2019, 2022, 2037, 2080, 2081.

[5] U. S. Congress. Senate. Committee on Patents. 71st Cong., hearings on H. R. 12549, pp. 1–2.

[6] S. Rept. No. 1732, 71st Cong., pp. 19–20.

[7] CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 74, pp. 6102, 6234, 6237, 6244, 6449, 6458, 6463, 6470, 6474, 6480, 6486, 6640, 6654, 6706, 6709, 6712, 6717, 6721, 6722, 6727, 6906 (Mr. Jones).

[8] Op. cit., p. 6719.

Banking and Currency reported out a bill which provided for only 35,000 public housing units a year. I had introduced H. R. 377 which would have restored the program to the one that was adopted in 1949, for 135,000 units per year average and a maximum of 200,000 per year. The bill approved by the Senate carried out the recommendations made in my bill, H. R. 377, in this respect. However, when the housing bill comes before the House, I certainly will support any amendment to substitute the Senate bill's provisions on public housing, or otherwise increase the number of units authorized from this very inadequate figure of 35,000.

My reasons are contained in the following statement which I gave to the Banking and Currency Committee on my bill, H. R. 377:

TESTIMONY BY HON. EDWARD A. GARMATZ, DEMOCRAT, OF MARYLAND, BEFORE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY ON HOUSING LEGISLATION

Chairman SPENCE and members of the committee, I am appearing here today primarily as the sponsor of H. R. 377, which I introduced on the opening day of this session of the Congress, to repeal the various restrictions adopted in recent years to cripple public housing. The evidence before this committee is clear that public housing construction has come to a standstill, and to all intents and purposes is dead and buried as a program of Government.

While my testimony will be devoted largely to my own bill on this one phase of housing—that is, the public housing program—I want to say at the start that I am very much in accord with other measures before you to expand and accelerate the urban redevelopment work which has been so successful in the larger cities of the country. Baltimore has been one of the leaders in urban renewal as well as in public housing and in the rehabilitation of existing housing, and so we are naturally very much interested in seeing the basic authority for all of these programs continually kept up to date with current needs.

Before going into the details of H. R. 377, I will tell you first what it is I would like to see accomplished. It is this: I would like to see this committee restore the public housing program—that is, the legislative authority for public housing—to the dimensions provided for in the Housing Act of 1949. This act, which the late Senator Taft helped to write—and I mention that to show that we Democrats are not the only ones to favor an effective public housing program—the 1949 act, I repeat, provided a standard of 135,000 public housing units a year. It permitted as many as 200,000 in any 1 year.

That is what I would like to see it go back to. If this committee and the Congress should adopt that objective of H. R. 377, it would not mean, of course, that the Government would have to build that many units each year. The President would have a wide amount of discretion—in fact he would have complete discretion—in putting the program into effect each year at the levels he thought commensurable with the need and with the economic situation generally.

That is a very important point that is often lost sight of. When President Eisenhower says he is willing to settle for 35,000 units a year for just a few years, my bill would not force him to construct more than that during his term. It would allow him, however, to look at the whole problem of public housing not from the standpoint of what he thought he might be able to wheedle out of a reluctant Congress in any one year but rather from the standpoint of what the country needed.

I think it is pretty clear that even the limited authority which now rests in the administration to build public housing has not been used in the past year or two with any degree of effectiveness or even interest. If you go through the construction statistics you find public construction of residential building hitting what appears to be new lows, with public housing starts during 1954 and half of those of 1953, which, in turn, were only about half of the number in 1951. Instead of a monthly average of 3,000 or more public-housing units which we were still reaching in 1953 on the basis of previous commitments, the record since the adoption of the Housing Act of 1954 shows monthly totals of 200 units, 300 units, 700 units, 900, and so on, with few months showing more than 1,000. So obviously we are not making any kind of production record on public housing; we are not even holding our own—not coming anywhere near building the number of units authorized by the restrictive legislation now in effect.

Nevertheless, I think we can now acknowledge the mistakes of last year, admit that they have resulted in the virtual death of public housing, and go on from there.

The bill which I have introduced attempts not only to correct the mistakes and restrictions of last year's bill but to go back to other legislative roadblocks beginning with the Independent Offices Appropriation Act of 1953.

Thus H. R. 377 would repeal this language of the 1953 Appropriation Act:

"Notwithstanding the provisions of the United States Housing Act of 1937, as amended, the Public Housing Administration shall not, with respect to projects initiated after March 1, 1949 * * * (2) after the date of approval of this Act, enter into any agreement, contract, or other arrangement which will bind the Public Housing Administration with respect to loans, annual contributions, or authorizations for commencement of construction, for dwelling units aggregating in excess of 35,000 to be authorized for commencement of construction during any one fiscal year subsequent to the fiscal year 1953, unless a greater number of units is hereafter authorized by the Congress."

Now this, of course, was, at the time, a serious blow for public housing and was one of the first big victories since 1949 for the group which has been opposing public housing so vigorously. As the members of this Committee know, President Truman's budget provided for only 75,000 public housing units a year while the Korean war was in progress, but when this rider to the appropriation bill for the 1952-53 year reduced that further to 35,000 units, the program kept going, and it kept going to the full limit of that authorization.

The following year, however, the 83d Congress, in the first Independent Offices Appropriation Act for the 1953 fiscal year starting July 1, 1953 contained this further restriction:

"Notwithstanding the provisions of the United States Housing Act of 1937, as amended, the Public Housing Administration shall not, with respect to projects initiated after March 1, 1949 * * * (2) after the date of approval of this Act, enter into any new agreements, contracts, or other arrangements, preliminary or otherwise, which will ultimately bind the Public Housing Administration during fiscal year 1954 or for any future years with respect to loans or annual contributions for any additional dwelling units or projects unless hereafter authorized by the Congress to do so."

Now this, of course, completed the hatchet job on public housing through riders on appropriation bills. From 35,000 units a year—a cut in half from the Truman budget—we then went down to no units—no new units—as the law of the land.

H. R. 377, therefore, repeals the continuing prohibitions on public housing from both the 1953 and 1954 appropriation acts.

The third legislative provision on public housing which H. R. 377 would repeal is section 401 (I), Housing Act of 1954:

"Notwithstanding the provisions of any other law, the Public Housing Administration may, with respect to low-rent housing projects initiated after March 1, 1949, enter into new contracts, agreements, or other arrangements during the fiscal year 1955 for loans and annual contributions pursuant to the United States Housing Act of 1937, as amended, with respect to not exceeding 35,000 additional units: *Provided,* That no such new contract, agreement, or other arrangement shall be made except with respect to low-rent housing projects to be undertaken in a community in which there is being carried out a slum clearance and urban redevelopment project, or a slum clearance and urban renewal project, assisted under title I of the Housing Act of 1949, as amended, and the local governing body of the community undertaking such slum clearance and urban redevelopment project, or slum clearance and urban renewal project, certifies that such low-rent housing project is necessary to assist in meeting the relocation requirements of section 105 (c) of title I of the Housing Act of 1949, as amended: *And provided further,* That the total number of dwelling units in low-rent housing projects covered by such new contracts, agreements, or other arrangements shall not exceed the total number of such dwelling units which the Administrator determines to be needed for the relocation of families to be displaced as a result of Federal, State, or local governmental action in such community."

This provision gives the impression that we have a public-housing program but as a practical matter we know that virtually none of the 35,000 units it purports to authorize has actually been approved for construction. Many of us warned last year that it would build no housing and, of course, it has built no housing. It should be repealed in toto.

And rather than settle for this very inadequate number of 35,000 units a year recommended by the President, I urge you to go back to the 1949 act, as my bill would do, and let us have once again a public housing program that builds public housing, that builds enough public housing to make at least a dent in the serious needs of our cities. As the spokesman for the American Municipal Association, Mayor Clerk, of Philadelphia, told you earlier in these hearings, Philadelphia alone needed 70,000 new units all by itself as of 1950. In the case of Baltimore we have been working steadily at the problem of expanding our housing facilities and our housing authority, which is one of the best, has had a number of projects waiting in line for authorizations and for construction commitments, projects which have been held up because of the restrictions in the 1954 act.

The red tape, the statistical analyses, the studies and surveys required under the 1954 act before a community could get any part of the 35,000 units which were supposed to have been authorized by the act have made a frightful and chaotic situation out of public housing everywhere. Even a city like Baltimore which has been on top of this whole problem over a period of years and which has had certainly one of the best "workable programs" in the country has been put to tremendous work tied up in the most elaborate kind of red tape.

For these and other reasons well known to this committee, I urge you with all the emphasis I can command to repeal these bad mistakes which Congress has made on public housing in the last 2 years and, as I said, give us a real program, a workable program,

and effective program which will help get people out of slums and into decent accommodations at rents they can afford. Bring sunlight into the lives of people living in dark alleys.

Four Chaplains' Memorial Fountain To Be Dedicated on September 25, 1955, at 2 p. m., at National Memorial Park, Falls Church, Va.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 28, 1955

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, it was a decade ago, during World War II, that four chaplains of the United States Army, Lts. John Patrick Washington, a Catholic priest, from Newark, N. J.; Alexander D. Goode, a Jewish Rabbi, from Temple Beth Israel, York, Pa.; Clark V. Poling, a Baptist minister from Schenectady, N. Y., and George L. Fox, a Methodist minister from Vermont, in a spirit of unity and sacrifice, gave up their lifejackets and went down on the torpedoed steamship *Dorchester*.

On September 25, 1955, at 2 p. m., the first large permanent memorial in the Washington area to these four brave men of God—the Four Chaplains' Memorial Fountain—will be dedicated, with appropriate ceremonies, at National Memorial Park, Lee Highway, Falls Church, Va.

Commissioned 3 years ago by Mr. Robert F. Marlowe, president of National Memorial Park, at a cost of $50,000, the Four Chaplains' Memorial Fountain was designed and created by the well-known sculptor, Constantino Nivola, of New York, and the prominent Washington architect, Walter Marlowe.

Set against dense green trees, the Four Chaplains' Memorial Fountain consists of a great ship, 22 by 24 feet, of reinforced white concrete, arising as if in its final moment from a large four-pointed, star-shaped pool. Twenty-four jets of water pour from the keel of the vessel into the large pool, cascading as if a whirlpool into a smaller oval pool below. Hovering an inch above the water are four panels, joined at right angles, each portraying a significant facet of each of the four men's faiths.

The dedication of the Four Chaplains' Memorial Fountain is under the auspices of the National Conference of Christians and Jews and the Reserve Officers Association of the United States, and has the active cooperation and participation of the armed services, veterans' organizations, religious groups, and many other community organizations. The United States Army Band will present a concert and Dr. Daniel A. Poling, prominent churchman, will speak.

A highlight of the program will be the presentation of the four chaplains' award to a chaplain of the Navy and Air Force who best exemplifies the spirit of the service. This is an annual award presented by the Reserve Officers Association of the United States.

The united strength of all faiths, the devotion and sacrifice of men of God, whose leadership has made our country strong, symbolized in the Four Chaplains' Memorial Fountain at National Memorial Park, deserves the complete endorsement of the community.

As is inscribed on the Four Chaplains' Memorial Fountain—

The four chaplains have not gone, for they won immortality through the simple dignity of faith. Their courage is its own poet, its own praise.

Greater love hath no man than this, that a man lay down his life for his friends. (John 15: 13.)

Senator Kennedy's Proposal for Bipartisan, High-Level Commission on Immigration and Naturalization Should Be Supported

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK THOMPSON, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 28, 1955

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, for some time the Immigration and Naturalization Acts have been the center of controversy. Almost everyone interested in the subject has admitted that changes are desirable and necessary. For example, on May 27, 1955, the President submitted certain recommendations to the Congress which he said were vital to the administration of the acts. At that time he pointed out that "the purposes of the act—the Refugee Relief Act—are not being achieved as swiftly as we had all hoped." Numerous bills have been introduced to affect changes in our laws relating to this subject both in the Senate and the House. I, myself, have introduced 2 bills which, if passed, would clarify many of the more confused sections of the law on this subject and would bring the immigration policy of the United States into line once more with the traditional attitudes of the American people on this matter.

I am introducing today a companion measure to Senate Joint Resolution 84, introduced in the Senate yesterday by Senator JOHN F. KENNEDY, of Massachusetts. Because the subject is both controversial and vitally important to our Nation, the creation of a blue-ribbon investigative body seems to me to be the most workable approach to the problem. We are a Nation dedicated to the idea of providing a land of opportunity for the oppressed of other lands. This has been one of the cornerstones of our democracy and it has helped to make us the great Nation that we are. Today, however, because of the Communist conspiracy, we must examine our immigration policies in the light of a serious security problem. The conflict between our traditional desires and security has created the legislative impasse which now exists. A nonpolitical commission composed of men of unimpeachable reputation should find it possible to take both sides of this controversy into account and report legislation designed to establish a workable policy in both respects. Without such a balanced study our security complex is likely to destroy both our traditions and the high esteem in which we are held by the peoples of other nations because of our traditions. I sincerely hope the Congress will see fit to pass this resolution promptly. The text of my proposal follows:

Joint resolution to establish a Commission on Immigration and Naturalization Policy

Resolved, etc.,

DECLARATION OF POLICY

SECTION 1. It is hereby declared to be the policy of the Congress to maintain a program of sound and orderly immigration and naturalization of desirable immigrants on a basis consistent with the best interests of our national security and national economy, and consistent with basic American ideals; to promote effective, vigorous, and efficient administration and enforcement of such a program; and to provide for a reexamination periodically of such a program and its actual operation in order to achieve these ends.

ESTABLISHMENT OF THE COMMISSION ON IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION POLICY

SEC. 2. (a) For the purpose of carrying out the policy set forth in section 1 of this joint resolution, there is hereby established a commission to be known as the Commission on Immigration and Naturalization Policy (hereinafter referred to as the "Commission").

(b) The Commission shall be composed of 12 members as follows:

(1) Four members appointed by the President of the United States, two from the executive branch of the Government, and two from private life;

(2) Four members appointed by the President of the Senate, two from the Senate, and two from private life; and

(3) Four members appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives, two from the House of Representatives and two from private life.

(c) Of the members appointed to the Commission not more than two shall be appointed by the President of the United States, or the President of the Senate, or the Speaker of the House of Representatives from the same political party.

(d) Any vacancy in the Commission shall not affect its powers, but such vacancy shall be filled in the same manner in which the original appointment was made.

(e) Service of an individual as a member of the Commission or employment of an individual by the Commission as an attorney or expert in any business or professional field, on a part-time or full-time basis, with or without compensation, shall not be considered as service or employment bringing such individual within the provisions of section 281, 283, 284, 434, or 1914 of title 18 of the United States Code, or section 190 of the Revised Statutes (5 U. S. C. 99).

(f) The Commission shall elect a Chairman and a Vice Chairman from among its members.

(g) Seven members of the Commission shall constitute a quorum.

COMPENSATION OF MEMBERS OF THE COMMISSION

SEC. 3. (a) Members of the Congress who are members of the Commission shall serve without compensation in addition to that received for their services as Members of Congress; but they shall be reimbursed for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred by them in the performance of the duties vested in the Commission.

(b) The members of the Commission who are in the executive branch of the Government shall serve without compensation in addition to that received for their services in the executive branch, but they shall be

reimbursed for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred by them in the performance of the duties vested in the Commission.

(c) The members of the Commission from private life shall each receive $50 per diem when engaged in the actual performance of duties vested in the Commission, plus reimbursement for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred by them in the performance of such duties.

STAFF OF THE COMMISSION

SEC. 4 (a) (1) The Commission shall have power to appoint and fix the compensation of such personnel as it deems advisable, without regard to the provisions of the civil-service laws and the Classification Act of 1949, as amended.

(2) The Commission may procure, without regard to the civil-service laws and the Classification Act of 1949, temporary and intermittent services to the same extent as is authorized for the departments by section 15 of the act of August 2, 1946 (60 Stat 810), but at rates not to exceed $50 per diem for individuals.

(b) All employees of the Commission shall be investigated by the Federal Bureau of Investigation as to character, associations, and loyalty and a report of each such investigation shall be furnished to the Commission.

EXPENSES OF THE COMMISSION

SEC. 5. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this joint resolution.

DUTIES OF THE COMMISSION

SEC. 6. The Commission shall study and investigate—

(1) the administration of the existing immigration and naturalization laws and their effect on the national security, the foreign policy, the economy, and the social welfare of the United States; and

(2) such conditions within or without the United States which, in the opinion of the Commission, might have any bearing on the immigration and naturalization policy of the United States.

POWERS OF THE COMMISSION

SEC. 7. (a) The Commission or, on the authorization of the Commission, any subcommittee or member thereof, may, for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this joint resolution, hold such hearings and sit and act at such times and places, administer such oaths, and require, by subpena or otherwise, the attendance and testimony of such witnesses and the production of such books, records, correspondence, memorandums, papers, and documents as the Commission or such subcommittee or member may deem advisable. Subpenas may be issued under the signature of the Chairman of the Commission, of such subcommittee, or any duly designated member, and may be served by any person designated by such Chairman or member. The provisions of sections 102 to 104, inclusive, of the Revised Statutes (2 U. S. C. secs. 192–194), shall apply in the case of any failure of any witness to comply with any subpena or to testify when summoned under authority of this section.

(b) The Commission is authorized to secure directly from any executive department, bureau, agency, board, commission, office, independent establishment, or instrumentality information, suggestions, estimates, and statistics for the purposes of this joint resolution, and each such department, bureau, agency, board, commission, office, establishment, or instrumentality is authorized and directed to furnish such information, suggestions, estimates, and statistics directly to the Commission, upon request made by the Chairman or Vice Chairman.

REPORTS

SEC. 8. The Commission shall submit interim reports to the Congress and the President at such time or times as it deems advisable, and shall submit its final report to the Congress and the President not later than April 30, 1956. The final report of the Commission may propose such legislative enactments and administrative actions as in its judgment are necessary to carry out its recommendations.

TERMINATION OF THE COMMISSION

SEC. 9. Ninety days after the transmittal to the Congress of the final report provided for in section 8 of this act, the Commission shall cease to exist.

Will the Voices of the Baltic Peoples Be Heard at the Summit?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LOUIS C. RABAUT

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 28, 1955

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, with prayerful expectation the world awaits the much-heralded meeting at the summit, that nether, nether land habitated by the titular heads of powerful states—some the elected representatives of their peoples, others the self-appointed managers of their people's fates. Whatever their sovereign status the fact still remains that the lives of countless millions will weigh heavily in the balance of their decisions. But what of the great multitude of people who will not have voice or representation on this hallowed summit? Who is to decide their case? Who is to give voice to their feeble cries for freedom? Their erstwhile protectors will see to it that the embarrassing questions about inhumane and criminal treatment that is foisted upon them will never appear before this world forum.

The freedom-hungry peoples that I refer to are the Estonians, Latvians, and Lithuanians; sometimes referred to as the Baltic States. Their incorporation into the Soviet Union was itself a miscarriage of national justice, if there be such a legal entity; but the mass deportation of these peoples to the mining and slave-labor camps of Russia will take its place among the irremovable blights upon the conscience of all humanity. I ask my colleagues to take cognizance of these inhumanities and to join me in denouncing the inhuman acts of its perpetrators.

I should like to include with my remarks a letter which accompanied the resolution that was drawn by the Baltic Nations Committee of Detroit on the occasion of their commemoration of the mass deportations that took place in their countries on June 12, 1941. My Michigan colleague, the Honorable JOHN D. DINGELL, previously published the resolution which appears in the July 27 RECORD. The letter follows:

THE BALTIC NATIONS
COMMITTEE OF DETROIT,
Highland Park, Mich., June 12, 1955.

The Honorable LOUIS C. RABAUT,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

SIR: On the occasion of the 14th anniversary of mass deportations from Baltic States by the Communists and on the 15th anniversary of the incorporation of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania into the Soviet Union, commemorated by Estonians, Latvians, and Lithuanians in Detroit area on June 12, 1955, the enclosed resolution was adopted which we would respectfully call to your attention.

Since national freedom and independence are dear to all freedom-loving people, our nations look to the leaders of the free world for help in restoring freedom to the enslaved people of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania.

Any assistance that you, as honorable Member of the House of Representatives of the United States, could give to restore the freedom of our beloved countries will be forever appreciated by the people of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania.

Very truly yours,

THE BALTIC NATIONS COMMITTEE OF DETROIT,
SIGURDS RUDZITIS,
Chairman; President of the Latvian Association in Detroit.

SENATE

WEDNESDAY, JUNE 29, 1955

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

Eternal God, in whose peace our restless spirits are quieted, quicken our understanding; take Thou the dimness of our souls away; help Thy servants in this Chamber of governance to lift the difficult decisions of the public service into Thy holy light. Flood our darkness with the radiance of the Eternal. Grant us inner greatness of spirit, purity of heart, and clearness of vision, to meet and match the vast designs of this changing, demanding day, that we may keep step with the drumbeat of Thy truth, which even across this shaken earth is marching on to its coronation in the affairs of men.

We ask it in the dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF BILLS

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, and he announced that on June 28, 1955, the President had approved and signed the following acts and joint resolution:

S. 67. An act to adjust the rates of basic compensation of certain officers and employees of the Federal Government, and for other purposes;