immediately went with Eastman Kodak Co. in Rochester, from which company he resigned as treasurer and director to join the Eisenhower administration as Under Secretary of the Treasury in 1953. While with the Eastman Kodak Co., Mr. Folsom was a major participant in the development and operations of the company's employee benefit program.

In addition to helping draft the original Social Security Act, Mr. Folsom served on the Federal Advisory Council appointed jointly by the Senate Finance Committee and the Social Security Board in 1937–38, and the Social Security Advisory Council to the Senate Finance Committee in 1948. Both councils studied operations of the social-security system and made recommendations to the Congress. Mr. Folsom worked with the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare on the Eisenhower administration's plan which resulted in the 1954 congressional amendments to extend the coverage and benefits under the social-security system.

Mr. Folsom was principally responsible for the development of the group life insurance program for Federal employees which was voted by the Congress and put into effect for nearly 2 million Federal employees in August 1954. Several years earlier he had helped organize the group medical care insurance plan in Rochester.

Mr. Folsom was also staff director of the House of Representatives Special—Colmer—Committee on Post War Economic Policy and Planning of the 78th and 79th Congresses. The Colmer committee reports led to enactment of contract renegotiation legislation and many other postwar measures which were put into effect in the years immediately after World War II ended. He was a division executive of the National Advisory Defense Commission from 1940 to 1941, and was on the National Advisory Board for Mobilization Policy in 1951–52. He has been a member of the Business Advisory Council, Department of Commerce, since 1936.

In the civic field Mr. Folsom was one of the original trustees for the Committee for Economic Development, which was formed in 1942, and resigned as chairman to come to the Treasury in 1953. In his home city of Rochester he served for three years as president of the Rochester Council of Social Agencies and on the boards of several charitable organizations.

Mr. Folsom is an overseer of Harvard College and a trustee of the University of Rochester. Prior to 1953 he was a director of several financial institutions including the Federal Reserve Bank of New York.

Mr. Folsom served as a captain in the United States Army in World War I and was overseas with the 26th Division. He is married and has two children, Marion B. and Frances.

The new Secretary is an outstanding type of appointment of the right man for the right place, which is typical of the Eisenhower administration.

SENATE

TUESDAY, JULY 26, 1955

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

O God, our help in ages past, our hope for years to come: We pause for this still moment vividly conscious of how quickly ebbs out life's little day. A cloud of witnesses brings to our grateful remembrance those who once toiled in the glare of public office and who now rest from their labors. To Thee, Master of all good workmen, we would render our hearty thanks this day for the life and labors of a public servant—one of the most outstanding of this turbulent generation—whose flag-draped mortal form this very morning lay in honor in the great cathedral where, with the triumphant affirmation of the faith, he was laid to rest. His works do follow him and are his memorial.

We would bear witness that in both bodies of the Congress and in his long direction of foreign affairs he was an apostle of peace and understanding; a believer in the partnership of nations, of fairness in trade, of true neighborliness between peoples. We remember that while his patience and gentleness made him great he had also the capacity for a volcanic wrath like unto Thy prophets of old. The career of Thy servant, Cordell Hull, reminds us that the place in our America from which greatness may emerge is as unpredictable as the Bethlehem where man's best Man was born.

As stalwart forms disappear from our sight and side and potent voices are stilled, we pray that the mantle of those who have fought the good fight and finished the course may fall upon the shoulders of those who are striving in the most difficult days of the Republic to make our free land as great in virtue and truth as she is mighty in power. We ask it in the dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. CLEMENTS, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, July 25, 1955, was dispensed with.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, its reading clerk, announced that the House had passed, without amendment, the bill (S. 2592) to increase the mileage allowance of United States marshals and their deputies from 7 cents per mile to 10 cents per mile.

The message also announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 665) to revive section 3 of the District of Columbia Public School Food Services Act, with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message further announced that the House passed the bill (S. 1093) to fix and regulate the salaries of teachers, school officers, and other employees of the Board of Education of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes, with amendments, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6980) providing for the conveyance of the Old Colony project to the Boston Housing Authority.

The message further announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2851) to make agricultural commodities owned by the Commodity Credit Corporation available to persons in need in areas of acute distress; asked a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. COOLEY, Mr. POAGE, Mr. GRANT, Mr. JENNINGS, Mr. HOPE, Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN, and Mr. HILL were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message also announced that the House had disagreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3822) to amend title V of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended; asked a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. COOLEY, Mr. POAGE, Mr. GATHINGS, Mr. GRANT, Mr. HOPE, Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN, and Mr. HILL were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message further announced that the House had agreed 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. 7000) to provide for strengthening of the Reserve Forces, and for other purposes.

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

H. R. 6263. An act to amend section 1233 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954;

H. R. 6728. An act to provide for carryback and carryover of foreign tax credit;

H. R. 6775. An act to provide for the regulation of the business of making loans of $600 or less in the District of Columbia, to regulate the pawnbroking business, and for other purposes;

H. R. 6886. An act to amend the act of October 19, 1949, entitled "An act to assist States in collecting sales and use taxes on cigarettes";

H. R. 6999. An act to amend section 1321 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954;

H. R. 7024. An act to remove the manufacturers' excise tax from the sales of certain component parts for use in other manufactured articles, and to confine to entertainment-type equipment the tax on radio and television apparatus; and

H. R. 7061. An act 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.

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

The message further announced that the House had agreed to a concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 193) extending the felicitations of Congress to the Commonwealth of Massachusetts on the 175th anniversary of the establishment of its constitution, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

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. 473. An act to authorize an investigation and report on the advisability of a national monument in Brooklyn, N. Y.;

H. R. 605. An act to provide for the abolition of the 80-rod reserved spaces between claims on shore waters in Alaska, and for other purposes;

H. R. 914. An act for the relief of Erika Marie Dietl and her two children, Caroline Dietl and Robert Dietl;

H. R. 932. An act for the relief of Ludwika Hedy Hancock (nee Nikolajewicz);

H. R. 1180. An act for the relief of Kimiko Sueta Thompson;

H. R. 1185. An act for the relief of Jose Domingo Quintanar;

H. R. 1302. An act for the relief of Adelheid Walla Spring;

H. R. 1304. An act for the relief of Mother Amata (Maria Cartiglia), Sister Ottavia (Concetta Zisa), Sister Giovina (Rosina Vitale), and Sister Olga (Calogera Zeffro);

H. R. 1435. An act for the relief of Paul Compagnino;

H. R. 1436. An act for the relief of Ervin Benedikt;

H. R. 1439. An act for the relief of Menachem Hersz Kalisz;

H. R. 1458. An act for the relief of Rosa Edith Manns Monroe;

H. R. 1486. An act for the relief of Anna Anita Hildegard Sparwasser;

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

H. R. 1537. An act for the relief of Rogerio Santana de Franca;

H. R. 1668. An act for the relief of Frank Budman;

H. R. 1698. An act for the relief of Anne Cheng;

H. R. 1911. An act for the relief of Charlotte Schwaim;

H. R. 1927. An act for the relief of Ralph Michael Owens;

H. R. 1987. An act for the relief of Kimie Hayashi Crandall;

H. R. 1997. An act for the relief of Linda Beryl San Filippo;

H. R. 2059. An act for the relief of Edward Patrick Cloonan;

H. R. 2070. An act for the relief of Dr. Carlos Recio and his wife, Francisca Marco Palomero de Recio;

H. R. 2078. An act for the relief of Salvatore Cannizzo;

H. R. 2241. An act for the relief of Amalia Bertolino Querio;

H. R. 2242. An act for the relief of Kim Joong Yoon;

H. R. 2259. An act for the relief of Alessandra Barile Altobelli;

H. R. 2306. An act for the relief of Maria de Rehbinder;

H. R. 2307. An act for the relief of Julius, Ilona, and Henry Flehner;

H. R. 2313. An act for the relief of Mrs. Agnethe Gundhil Sundby;

H. R. 2315. An act for the relief of Antonio (Orejel) Cardenas;

H. R. 2735. An act for the relief of Inako Yokoo and her minor child;

H. R. 2738. An act for the relief of Teresa Jurjevic; and

H. R. 2749. An act for the relief of George Risto Divitkos.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED

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

H. R. 6263. An act to amend section 1233 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954;

H. R. 6728. An act to provide for carryback and carryover of foreign tax credit;

H. R. 6886. An act to amend the act of October 19, 1949, entitled "An act to assist States in collecting sales and use taxes on cigarettes";

H. R. 6999. An act to amend section 1321 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954; and

H. R. 7024. An act to remove the manufacturers' excise tax from the sales of certain component parts for use in other manufactured articles, and to confine to entertainment-type equipment the tax on radio and television apparatus; to the Committee on Finance.

H. R. 6775. An act to provide for the regulation of the business of making loans of $600 or less in the District of Columbia, to regulate the pawnbroking business, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 7061. An act 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 loans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the Committee on the District of Columbia and its Subcommittees on Judiciary and Business and Commerce, and the Subcommittee on Labor of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare were authorized to meet today during the session of the Senate.

On request of Mr. MCCLELLAN, and by unanimous consent, the Permanent Investigations Subcommittee of the Committee on Government Operations was authorized to meet this afternoon during the session of the Senate.

LIMITATION OF DEBATE DURING MORNING HOUR

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, since the Senate met today following an adjournment, there will be a regular morning hour for the presentation of petitions and memorials, the introduction of bills, and the transaction of other routine matters. I ask unanimous consent that statements made in connection therewith be limited to 2 minutes.

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

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

PROPOSED SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS, DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE (S. DOC. NO. 79)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting proposed supplemental appropriations, for the Department of Agriculture, in the amount of $898,000, for the fiscal year 1956 (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

PROPOSED SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION, DEPARTMENT OF STATE (S. DOC. NO. 76)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a proposed supplemental appropriation, for the Department of State, in the amount of $1,500,000, for the fiscal year 1956 (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

PROPOSED SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION, DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE—CIVIL FUNCTIONS (S. DOC. NO. 77)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a proposed supplemental appropriation, for the Department of Defense, Civil Functions, in the amount of $6 million, for the fiscal year 1956 (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

PROPOSED SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION, DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR (S. DOC. NO. 78)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a proposed supplemental appropriation, for the Department of the Interior, in the amount of $5 million, for the fiscal year 1956 (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

PROPOSED SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS, DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE (S. DOC. NO. 74)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting proposed supplemental appropriations, for the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, in the amount of $8,168,700, for the fiscal year 1956, and proposed provisions for the fiscal year 1955 (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

PROPOSED PROVISION, POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT (S. DOC. NO. 73)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a proposed provision, for the Post Office Department, in the amount of $10,000, for the fiscal year 1947 (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

PROPOSED SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION, BOSTON NATIONAL HISTORIC SITES COMMISSION (S. DOC. NO. 80)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a proposed supplemental appropriation, for the Boston National Historic Sites Commission, in the amount of $40,000, for the fiscal year 1956 (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

PROPOSED SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS, AND DRAFT OF A PROPOSED PROVISION, DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE (S. DOC. NO. 81)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting proposed supplemental appropriations, Department of Commerce, in the amount of $113,930,000, and a draft of a proposed provision, for the fiscal year 1956 (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

PROPOSED SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS AND INCREASES IN LIMITATIONS, HOUSING AND HOME FINANCE AGENCY (S. DOC. NO. 72)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting proposed supplemental appropriations, for the fiscal year 1956, in the amount of $6,430,000, and increases in limitations in the amount of $5,840,000, for the Housing and Home Finance Agency (with an accompanying

paper); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

PROPOSED SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION FOR PAYMENT OF CERTAIN CLAIMS AND JUDGMENT (S. DOC. NO. 75)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a proposed supplemental appropriation to pay claims for damages, audited claims, and judgments rendered against the United States, as provided by various laws, in the amount of $2,773,655, together with such amounts as may be necessary to pay indefinite interest and costs and to cover increases in rates of exchange as may be necessary to pay claims in foreign currency (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

AUDIT REPORT ON THE ALASKA RAILROAD

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, an audit report on the Alaska Railroad, Department of the Interior, for the fiscal years ended June 30, 1953 and 1954 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

PROPOSED AWARD OF CONCESSION PERMIT, COULEE DAM NATIONAL RECREATION AREA, WASHINGTON

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a proposed award of a concession permit in the Kettle Falls area of Coulee Dam national recreation area, Washington (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

PUBLICATIONS OF FEDERAL POWER COMMISSION

A letter from the Chairman, Federal Power Commission, transmitting, for the information of the Senate, copies of that Commission's publications entitled "Typical Electric Bills, 1955," and "Statistics of Electric Utilities in the United States, Publicly Owned, 1953" (with accompanying documents); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

REPORT OF TORT CLAIMS PAID BY UNITED STATES INFORMATION AGENCY

A letter from the Director, United States Information Agency, Washington, D. C., reporting, pursuant to law on tort claims paid by that agency during the fiscal year 1955; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITION

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a letter in the nature of a petition from George Blumenauer, of Kansas City, Mo., relating to the mental-health bill, which, with an accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

IMPORTATION OF OIL—RESOLUTION

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, the importation of oil is of great importance to the economy of the United States. The keeping up of our reserves within the United States depends upon a healthy and expanding economy. The defense of the United States depends upon keeping an adequate reserve within our own borders.

Some of the companies are retarding importation, while others are ignoring the situation.

On June 18 the Interstate Oil Compact Commission adopted a resolution on this subject. I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be printed in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks, and appropriately referred.

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

RESOLUTION OF INTERSTATE OIL COMPACT COMMISSION

Excessive imports of foreign oil retard the development of our domestic resources, and interfere with the conservation program of the oil-producing States. Most important of all, our national defense can be endangered by undue reliance on foreign sources of supply.

Several of the larger importing companies have announced their intent to reduce their total imports of petroleum and its products for the remainder of this year. We feel that these companies should be commended for reducing their imports and we also feel that all the other companies importing petroleum and its products should also follow the lead of these companies so that domestic production will not be damaged by imports supplanting, rather than supplementing, domestic production: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Interstate Oil Compact Commission in meeting duly assembled this 18th day of June 1955, at Denver, Colo., that the companies which have reduced their imports be commended and urged to further reduce the importation of petroleum and its products; be it further

Resolved, That the companies which have not yet followed the leadership of those who announced reductions take notice of their action and follow the pattern established by them so that the domestic industry will not be further damaged by the excessive importation of petroleum and its products and so that the oil-producing States can more effectively carry out their conservation programs; be it further

Resolved, That if the imports of foreign oil are not voluntarily reduced the situation demands prompt and affirmative action on the part of the Congress and the President of the United States to bring about a reduction in the imports of oil.

HELLS CANYON DAM, JOHN DAY DAM, ETC.—RESOLUTIONS AND LETTERS

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD certain material which I now describe:

First. A resolution received from the Aluminum Workers International Union, A. F. of L., of New Orleans, La., in support of the high Hells Canyon Dam.

Second. A resolution of the Port of Umatilla Commission, urging planning funds for the John Day Dam.

Third. A letter, accompanied by a resolution, from the Oregon Rural Electric Cooperative Association, the resolution having been passed at the association meeting on January 21, 1955, dealing with a series of subjects, such as partnership in the John Day Dam, upstream storage, Dixon-Yates, Snake River development, Bonneville Power Association wheeling, and Idaho Power Co. policies.

Fourth. A letter from the master of the Oregon State Grange, accompanied by a resolution on a series of legislative subjects, passed at the Oregon State Grange Convention on June 6 to 10, 1955.

Fifth. A resolution from the Oregon State Grange in support of the high dam at Hells Canyon.

There being no objection, the resolutions, communications, and other matters referred to were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ALUMINUM WORKERS INTERNATIONAL UNION, LOCAL NO. 225,
New Orleans, La., July 15, 1955.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: The high Hells Canyon Dam is an absolute necessity to further the completion of the Columbia River development program. The completion of this phase of this development would tend to make available a greater and steadier flow of electrical power to the northwestern area. The greater availability of electrical power and a steadier flow of electrical power throughout the year are major factors in the production of aluminum and will determine whether or not the existing aluminum industry in this area can continue to operate in fair competition with the foreign competitors. The successful completion of this phase of the Columbia River program can and will go a long way toward eliminating power shortages during certain times of the year, thereby assuring employees in the aluminum industry of a year-round income in addition to avoiding the expensive necessity of temporarily closing these plants down because of power shortages.

The Aluminum Workers International Union, Local 225, of New Orleans, La., goes on record (by unanimous vote of the membership) as favoring the immediate authorization of construction of the high Hells Canyon Dam.

Sincerely yours,

F. S. LAUER,
Business Agent.

RESOLUTION NO. 5 OF PORT OF UMATILLA COMMISSION

FURTHER EXPEDITING CONSTRUCTION OF THE JOHN DAY DAM

Whereas the Government of the United States and other public agencies have spent many hundreds of millions of dollars on the development of the Columbia River to develop hydroelectric power, to provide for safer and improved navigation, to prevent catastrophic floods, and to insure additional water for irrigation purposes in the Pacific Northwest, all of which add to the growth and security of the United States; and

Whereas the electrical, navigation, and irrigation needs of the Pacific Northwest have increased so rapidly that the failure to provide additional Columbia River projects immediately, keeping in step with such growth, would be a serious blow to the economic development of the Pacific Northwest; and

Whereas the Federal Government has provided on the Columbia River at Bonneville, Oreg.; McNary, Oreg.; and now building at The Dalles, Oreg.; dams and facilities which accomplish in part the above-mentioned purposes but leave unimproved, untamed, a 70-mile stretch of dangerous water on the Columbia River between the mouth of the John Day River and the McNary Dam, a bottleneck of treacherous water that will effectively retard further development of river navigation enterprise by limiting the size of the barges that move up and down the river; and

Whereas oceangoing barges even after completion of the Dalles Dam during a good portion of the year must unload their coastwise cargo into smaller barges for further water transportation upriver, further impedes the development of Oregon and Washington State ports on the upper Columbia River, and the economical movement of traffic between the inland empire of the Pacific Northwest and Pacific coast ports; and

Whereas the John Day Dam completes slack-water navigation from the Pacific

Ocean to the mouth of the Snake River, permitting use of smaller, more economical tugs; larger, more economical barges with resultant lower freight rates, all of which gives impetus to the development of the upper Columbia River area, including the inland empire, products of which, if to be sold on world markets must move by the most economical means, namely, water transportation, to salt water ports for export; and

Whereas the Federal Government promoting and encouraging dispersal of industry is unable through its agency, the Bonneville Power Administration, to provide at this time additional electrical power to industries which might desire to locate in the port district of the port of Umatilla at the McNary Dam; and

Whereas the development, especially the industrial development, of the upper Columbia River is being retarded by the shortage of electrical power; and

Whereas the Commission of the Port of Umatilla is unable to build certain port facilities on the Columbia River below the McNary Dam until the water level is established by completion of the John Day Dam: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Commission of the Port of Umatilla, a municipal corporation of the State of Oregon, That this Board hereby urges the Congress of the United States to appropriate immediately planning funds for the John Day Dam; and be it further

Resolved by the Port of Umatilla Commission, That this board urges the Congress of the United States to take immediate action to insure construction of the John Day Dam in the immediate future; and be it further

Resolved, That the manager of the port of Umatilla is hereby authorized to send copies of this resolution to Members of Congress from Oregon, and members of the Public Works Subcommittee of the House of Representatives.

IRVIN MANN, Jr.,
President.
JENS JERJESON,
Vice President.
ROGER J. BOUNDS,
Secretary.
DALE TUCKER,
Treasurer.
ORVAL MCCORMMACH,
Commissioner.
GORDON ROWE,
Manager.

OREGON RURAL ELECTRIC
COOPERATIVE ASSOCIATION,
Corvallis, Oreg., July 13, 1955.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: We are enclosing a copy of the resolutions adopted by the Oregon Rural Electric Cooperative Association at their business meeting on June 21, 1955.

We are confident that you will give earnest consideration to each of the items resolved.

Very truly yours,

B. R. LITTLE,
Secretary-Treasurer.

RESOLUTIONS ADOPTED JUNE 21, 1955, BY THE OREGON RURAL ELECTRIC COOPERATIVE ASSOCIATION

COLUMBIA INTERSTATE COMPACT

Whereas the Columbia Interstate Compact Commission on May 26, 1955, refused to remedy the numerous deficiencies in the 1954 compact draft and decided instead to sponsor a seven State publicity drive to sell the 1954 draft: Now, therefore be it

Resolved, That we reaffirm our opposition to any interstate compact which proposes to allocate or control electric power.

PARTNERSHIP

Whereas the evidence is overwhelming that the partnership plan of development of our rivers will result in turning them over to private power monopolies, to destruction of the people's preference in access to the power from such rivers and to the loss of the concept of full development of the rivers for the benefit of the Northwest: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we recognize the partnership idea for what it is and condemn it as a scheme to turn over the rivers of the Northwest to private monopoly so that the people and the region cannot enjoy abundant and cheap power.

JOHN DAY DAM

Whereas the Corps of Engineers is preparing final plans for construction of John Day Dam with a view to permitting actual construction to start in 1956; and

Whereas the Army has virtually no other dams ready or about to be ready for early construction; and

Whereas Congressman COON has again introduced a bill to de-authorize John Day Dam and turn the project over to private utilities for partnership development with about 40 percent of the financing to be provided by the Federal Government; and

Whereas such partnership proposal will result in higher cost power, the loss of the preference clause, and the removal from the region to the FPC in Washington of decisions on power allocation, and in establishment of preference for private utilities: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we urge Federal development of John Day Dam, with retention of the preference clause, and that we do not endorse the Coon partnership bill.

UPSTREAM STORAGE

Whereas we went on record last year in opposition to Senate bill 3434 which would have amended section 10f of the Federal Power Act to require downstream Federal dams such as Bonneville Dam to pay upstream storage charges to proposed private upstream dams such as Bruces Eddy Dam on the Clearwater River; and

Whereas Senate bill 1574 now proposes to provide the same type of subsidy from Federal dams to private dams but to do so through the Secretary of Interior instead of amending the Federal Power Act: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we urge retention of section 10f of the Federal Power Act and that we oppose Senate bill 1574 or any similar scheme for public subsidies to private electric corporations.

SNAKE RIVER DEVELOPMENT

Whereas several electric corporations propose to build the Pleasant Valley Dam and Mountain Sheep Dam which would develop only about 60 percent as much power as would be created by the Nez Perce Dam as recommended in the Army's 308 Review Report; and

Whereas these smaller dams would permanently result in underdevelopment of this reach of the Snake River and is contrary to the principles of comprehensive multiple purpose river development: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we endorse the ultimate development of the Nez Perce dam site by construction of the Army's proposed Nez Perce Dam and that we oppose construction of any conflicting dams in the Nez Perce Reservoir.

DIXON-YATES

Be it resolved, That we reaffirm our previous opposition to the Dixon-Yates deal.

HELLS CANYON

Whereas the FPC trial examiner has found that the proposed high dam at Hells Canyon offers the most feasible and best development of the Snake River; and

Whereas Congresswoman EDITH GREEN and our two Senators, WAYNE MORSE and RICHARD NEUBERGER, are actively supporting the building of Hells Canyon Dam: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we go on record in support of the high dam at Hells Canyon, and notify Mrs. EDITH GREEN, WAYNE MORSE, and RICHARD NEUBERGER that we stand behind them in their fight to preserve and develop our rivers for the benefit of the people of the Northwest.

BPA WHEELING

Whereas BPA is considering entering into agreements with non-Federal agencies for wheeling electric energy on a common-carrier basis: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we request the BPA Administrator to provide public notice, adequate time for study and opportunity for public hearings on the proposed wheeling rates and arrangements.

IDAHO POWER CO. INTERTIE

Whereas the Bonneville Power Administration has granted a 20-year power exchange contract to the Idaho Power Co. whereby BPA furnishes energy to carry the Idaho Power Co.'s August peak load; and

Whereas this valuable peaking energy is handled in the exchange account as if it were dump power; and

Whereas such depreciation of the value of peaking power is contrary to good utility practice, results in a subsidy to the Idaho Power Co., diminishes the revenue on the Columbia River power system and constitutes poor business practice: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That although we endorse the principle of power exchange between Bonneville Power Administration and connecting systems, we believe that the public interest requires the adoption of accepted utility business standards in aiming at the fair and equitable value of power.

ABOLITION OF REA

Whereas the Hoover Commission has issued a report on Federal lending agencies which recommends abolishing the Rural Electrification Administration and transferring its jurisdiction to a Federal corporation which would obtain its funds from private financial sources; and

Whereas the carrying out of these recommendations would increase interest rates on REA loans from 2 percent to something like 4 percent: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we deplore the recommendations of the Hoover Commission and that we urge Congress to reject these recommendations and urge that the lending agencies of the executive departments go on record against the report, particularly that the Department of Agriculture do so.

POWER SUPPLY FOR SOUTHEASTERN OREGON

Whereas most of the remaining unelectrified farms of Oregon are concentrated in the Donner-Blitzen Valley, near Burns, Oreg.; and

Whereas these people have created the Harney Electric Cooperative and have applied for an REA loan and for a BPA transmission line; and

Whereas the Surprise Valley Electric Cooperative has applied to the Bonneville Power Administration for a power supply in order to provide better electric service to some 400 consumers in the Lakeview, Oreg., area; and

Whereas the Bonneville Power Administration has not made a comprehensive load forecast and transmission requirement study for these areas in southeastern Oregon: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we request the Bonneville Administrator to make a study of power needs in southeastern Oregon, together with a determination of economic feasibility, and, if feasible, to request transmission lines in the next budget request.

BPA POWER RATES

Whereas the Bonneville Power Administration has employed Ford, Bacon & Davis, an eastern firm of consulting engineers, to study existing BPA rates and recommend new rate schedules: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we request the BPA Administrator to provide public notice and opportunity for thorough public hearings within the Pacific Northwest of the proposed rate schedules before such schedules are submitted by the Administrator.

OREGON STATE GRANGE,
Portland, Oreg., July 19, 1955.

Senator WAYNE L. MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: The 1955 session of the Oregon State Grange, in convention in Klamath Falls, June 6 to 10, passed the enclosed resolutions, which I am sending to you for your consideration.

Thank you for your attention.

Very truly yours,

ELMER MCCLURE,
Master.

Whereas there are large acreages of dry land in the Klamath district that can be irrigated provided power is made available at a cost low enough to economically operate the pumps; and

Whereas there is now water available to irrigate these acreages, and bring them into full production, provided we get action in the near future, otherwise we will lose it forever to more progressive and water-hungry districts down the river; and

Whereas it has been the experience of other cities that when two or three mill power becomes available population increases rapidly, due to the demand for labor by the many new industries attracted to the city and by the many employees needed by the expanding business district; and

Whereas the Bonneville Administration, recognizing the need in the Klamath district for their life-giving power, built a hi-line southward to satisfy that need, and when the line had almost reached the city limits it was taken over without moral or legal right, by the California Oregon Power Co., thus nullifying the reason for its existence and thus blighting the whole Klamath basin with the burden of costly electric power: Therefore be it

Resolved, That we urge our Senators and Representatives in the Congress to do everything in their power to secure the return of the hi-line to the Bonneville Administration to the end that it may fulfill the purpose it was intended to accomplish; and be it further

Resolved, That we urge all citizens and organizations interested to bend their energies to accomplish this most desired result.

WHEAT CERTIFICATE PLAN

Whereas our national economy and well-being depend on a prosperous agriculture; and

Whereas wheat is a basic agricultural product; and

Whereas the production of wheat was regulated as a war measure and a surplus built up for a backlog of food during the Korean conflict; and

Whereas parity price represents a reasonable price relative to cost of production; no business can be expected to survive at 90 percent of a reasonable price; and certainly cannot at 82 percent or 75 percent; and

Whereas we as farmers do not favor subsidies unless in emergency and feel that each product should pay its own way when possible; and

Whereas we feel that the American farmer is entitled to his home market at a parity price, and also should have free access to other markets on a supply and demand basis in order to make his own adjustments, without further large Federal expenditures; and

Whereas the wheat certificate price plan formulated by the Oregon Wheat League comes much nearer meeting these requirements than rigid or flexible support programs and other plans that have been proposed: Therefore be it

Resolved, That we endorse the wheat certificate plan advocated by the Wheat League; that we urge our Representatives and Senators to work for its enactment and ask our Secretary of Agriculture to take note of our views.

SOCIAL-SECURITY BENEFITS

Whereas the present law limiting the amount ($1,200 in any year) which a wage-earner or self-employed person may receive through gainful occupations, and still be eligible for social-security benefits, places a premium on idleness and deprives the industrious persons who do work from receiving the insurance benefits for which they have paid, and reduces them to a substandard living: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Oregon State Grange go on record as opposing any such limitation on individual earnings and ask the Congress to repeal such provisions; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to the National Grange and to our Senators and Representatives in Congress.

OREGON STATE GRANGE,
Portland, Oreg., July 20, 1955.

Senator WAYNE L. MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: The Hells Canyon Dam resolution adopted by the 1955 session of the Oregon State Grange which I sent you some time ago and which you wrote me about, was 1 of 3 resolutions on this subject passed at this session. Today, I am sending the other two for your consideration.

I hope they will help a little in the very valiant fight you and Senator NEUBERGER are making to stop the Hells Canyon giveaway.

Best wishes for your continued success.

Sincerely,

ELMER MCCLURE,
Master.

DEVELOPMENT OF SNAKE RIVER

Whereas the Federal Power Commission has granted a preliminary permit for the survey for Mountain Sheep and Pleasant Valley dam sites on the stretch of the Snake River below Hells Canyon and above Nez Perce dam sites as contained in the Engineers 308 Report on Comprehensive River Development: Therefore be it

Resolved, That we do hereby oppose any action that will hinder full development of the Snake River.

HELLS CANYON DAM

Whereas the three proposed low-head dams are to be located in the area which would be the reservoir site of the Hells Canyon Dam, as located by the Army engineers and the Federal Reclamation Service; and

Whereas the sites for the three low-head dams are requested by private utility companies; and

Whereas the granting of these sites to the private companies would shut off construction of Hells Canyon Dam without bargaining with the private companies for the return of the sites; and

Whereas low-head dams make no provision for flood control, while Hells Canyon Dam would provide an exceptionally large reservoir in an ideal primitive area for water storage; and

Whereas low-head dams require water rights to assure sufficient river flow for maximum development of power, while Hells Canyon Dam would store great quantities of surplus water during the spring runoff, thus holding it from flooding the lower area and also providing power development even during the long dry periods, not only at the dam site, but to river-flow dams below, only becoming a low-head dam when the stored water is used down to the river flow: Therefore be it

Resolved, That this Grange stand definitely for the construction of the Hells Canyon Dam and opposed to giving away the three sites in the Snake River which would obstruct the construction of the Hells Canyon Dam; and therefore be it further

Resolved, That we want the Hells Canyon Dam constructed and owned by the Federal Government.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. PAYNE (for Mr. BARRETT), from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

S. 1917. A bill to authorize the construction within Grand Teton National Park of an alternate route to United States Highway 89, also numbered U. S. 187 and U. S. 26, and the conveyance thereof to the State of Wyoming, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1141).

By Mr. O'MAHONEY (for Mr. MURRAY), from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

H. R. 100. A bill to permit the mining development, and utilization of the mineral resources of all public lands withdrawn or reserved for power development, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 1150).

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

H. R. 727. A bill to authorize the conveyance of certain land to the Pecwan Union School District for use as the site of a school; without amendment (Rept. No. 1151).

By Mr. BYRD, from the Committee on Finance, without amendment:

H. R. 291. A bill to extend the retirement income tax credit to members of the Armed Forces (Rept. No. 1142);

H. R. 542. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code (Rept. No. 1143);

H. R. 3437. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide for a maximum manufacturers' excise tax on the leases of certain automobile utility trailers (Rept. No. 1144);

H. R. 3712. A bill to extend the period during which claims for floor stocks refunds may be filed with respect to certain manufacturer's excise taxes which were reduced by the Excise Tax Reduction Act of 1954 (Rept. No. 1145);

H. R. 5936. A bill to provide wage credits under title II of the Social Security Act for military service before April 1956, and to permit application for lump-sum benefits under such title to be made within 2 years after interment or reinterment in the case of servicemen dying overseas before April 1956 (Rept. No. 1146);

H. R. 6886. A bill to amend the act of October 19, 1949, entitled "An act to assist States in collecting sales and use taxes on cigarettes" (Rept. No. 1147); and

H. R. 7148. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code so as to provide a personal exemption with respect to certain dependents in the Republic of the Philippines (Rept. No. 1148).

By Mr. BYRD, from the Committee on Finance, with amendments:

H. R. 6887. A bill to extend for 1 year the application of section 108 (b) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to income of a railroad corporation from discharge of indebtedness) (Rept. No. 1149).

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

S. 2576. A bill to amend the joint resolution entitled "Joint resolution to authorize the merger of street-railway corporations operating in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes," approved January 14, 1933, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 1152).

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

As in executive session,

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. BYRD, from the Committee on Finance:

Craig S. Atkins, of Maryland, to be a judge of the Tax Court of the United States, vice Charles R. Arundell; and

Arthur C. Carmichael, of California, to be Superintendent of the Mint at San Francisco, Calif., vice Ross P. Buell.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

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

By Mr. POTTER:

S. 2631. A bill for the relief of Lydia Elizabeth Leitner Bruns; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEFAUVER (for himself and Mr. LANGER):

S. 2632. A bill to direct the Secretary of Commerce to conduct a particular survey in order to assist in promoting the economic welfare of Indians living on Indian reservations in the United States; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

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

By Mr. BENDER:

S. 2633. A bill for the relief of Jane Edith Thomas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CARLSON:

S. 2634. A bill relating to the transportation of mail by highway post-office service, and for other purposes;

S. 2635. A bill to authorize and direct the Postmaster General to estimate for each fiscal year certain expenses incurred by, and losses in revenues to, the Post Office Department, and for other purposes;

S. 2636. A bill to restore the authority of the Postmaster General to adjust postage rates for air parcel-post service, and for other purposes; and

S. 2637. A bill to provide that appointments to the position of Deputy Maritime Administrator shall be made by the Secretary of Commerce under civil-service laws, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

S. 2638. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Fides Candamo von Hassel; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MAGNUSON:

S. 2639. A bill to increase the rates of compensation of members of certain independent boards and commissions; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

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

By Mr. CLEMENTS:

S. 2640. A bill to revive and extend the authority of the Housing and Home Finance Administrator to make loans or grants, or other payments for the construction of certain hospitals; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. HOLLAND (for himself and Mr. SMATHERS):

S. 2641. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to exclude certain lands and waters, located in and off the coast of Florida, from the maximum area which was authorized by Congress to be acquired for the purpose of establishing the Everglades National Park; and

S. 2642. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to acquire on behalf of the United States lands and waters, within a certain area, located in and off the coast of Florida, and to provide that when title to such lands and waters is acquired by the United States they shall become a part of the Everglades National Park; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. POTTER:

S. J. Res. 95. Joint resolution to authorize the American Battle Monuments Commission to prepare plans and estimates for the erection of a suitable memorial to Gen. John J. Pershing; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

PROMOTION OF ECONOMIC WELFARE OF INDIANS LIVING ON INDIAN RESERVATIONS

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] and myself, I introduce for appropriate reference, a bill to direct the Secretary of Commerce to conduct a particular survey in order to assist in promoting the economic welfare of Indians living on Indian Reservations in the United States. I ask unanimous consent that a brief statement in explanation of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

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

The bill (S. 2632) to direct the Secretary of Commerce to conduct a particular survey in order to assist in promoting the economic welfare of Indians living on Indian reservations, in the United States, introduced by Mr. KEFAUVER (for himself and Mr. LANGER), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

The statement presented by Mr. KEFAUVER is as follows:

Senator LANGER and I are introducing a bill to direct the Secretary of Commerce to conduct a particular survey in order to assist in promoting the economic welfare of Indians living on Indian reservations in the United States.

As part of the program of the United States Senate Juvenile Delinquency Subcommittee this past year or so, hearings were held on or near Indian reservations in North Dakota, New Mexico, Arizona, California, Colorado, Utah, and Nevada. Aside from these hearings, we were able to obtain information from the other Indian reservations in the 26 States throughout the United States. One of the glaring needs that was brought out in these hearings and inquiries was the need for steady employment for the Indian people.

My colleague, the Senator from North Dakota, was instrumental in bringing to Rolla, N. Dak., the ball-bearing plant which brought employment to numerous Indians living on the Turtle Mountain Indian Reservation. I believe it would be wise if the Secretary of Commerce could make a survey to determine if other industrial plants could be induced to erect plants adjacent to Indian reservations wherever feasible. If we could aid the Indians in obtaining steady employment, many of the problems that are presented to Congress year in and year out would be solved.

INCREASED COMPENSATION OF MEMBERS OF CERTAIN INDEPENDENT BOARDS AND COMMISSIONS

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, as chairman of the Senate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce I have felt concerned because Congress in granting well-earned pay raises to our loyal Government and legislative employees has overlooked a small group of loyal and hard-working workers we have on the Government payrolls.

These, Mr. President, are the members of the boards and commissions which are under the jurisdiction of the Senate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce who direct the operations of these agencies, which are arms of Congress.

I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill designed to remedy this situation and give financial recognition to these members. It will affect only 36 persons, all of whom deserve the increases. It will affect 3 members of the Federal Maritime Board, 5 members of the Civil Aeronautics Board, 7 members of the Federal Communications Commission, 5 members of the Federal Power Commission, 5 members of the Federal Trade Commission, and 11 members of the Interstate Commerce Commission.

I hope this bill can win congressional approval before adjournment, and be signed by the President, so that the 36 will begin receiving their increases within the next month.

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

The bill (S. 2639) to increase the rates of compensation of members of certain independent boards and commissions, introduced by Mr. Magnuson, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

PRINTING OF REVIEW OF REPORTS ON ROCKLAND HARBOR, MAINE (S. DOC. NO. 82)

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, on behalf of the distinguished Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], I present a letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a report dated June 22, 1955, from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, together with accompanying papers and illustrations, on a review of reports on the Rockland Harbor, Maine, requested by a resolution of the Committee on Public Works of September 14, 1954. I ask unanimous consent that the report be printed as a Senate document, with illustrations, and referred to the Committee on Public Works.

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

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

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

By Mr. KEFAUVER:

Statement made by him on July 25, 1955, before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, in regard to Senate Concurrent Resolution 12, inviting the other democracies sponsoring the North Atlantic Treaty to name delegates to a convention to explore means of further unity among the democracies.

REGULATION OF ELECTION OF DELEGATES OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA TO NATIONAL POLITICAL CONVENTIONS

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 191) to regulate the election of delegates representing the District of Columbia to national political conventions, and for other purposes, and requesting a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

Mr. MORSE. I move that the Senate insist upon its amendment, agree to the request of the House for a conference, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Vice President appointed Mr. MORSE, Mr. BIBLE, and Mr. HRUSKA conferees on the part of the Senate.

DONATION OF CERTAIN AGRICULTURAL COMMODITIES TO PERSONS IN DISTRESSED AREAS

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2851) to make agricultural commodities owned by the Commodity Credit Corporation available to persons in need in areas of acute distress, and requesting a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

Mr. ELLENDER. I move that the Senate insist upon its amendments, agree to the request of the House for a conference, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Vice President appointed Mr. ELLENDER, Mr. HOLLAND, Mr. ANDERSON, Mr. AIKEN, and Mr. WILLIAMS conferees on the part of the Senate.

AMENDMENT OF TITLE V OF THE AGRICULTURAL ACT OF 1949

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3822) to amend title V of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, and requesting a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

Mr. ELLENDER. I move that the Senate insist upon its amendment, agree to the request of the House for a conference, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Vice President appointed Mr. ELLENDER, Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, Mr. HOLLAND, Mr. AIKEN, and Mr. YOUNG conferees on the part of the Senate.

PURCHASE OF BONDS TO COVER CERTAIN EMPLOYEES OF POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4778) to provide for the purchase of bonds to cover postmasters, officers, and employees of the Post Office Department and mail clerks of the Armed Forces, and for other purposes, and requesting a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I move that the Senate insist upon its amendments, agree to the request of the House for a conference, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Vice President appointed Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, Mr. NEELY, and Mr. CARLSON conferees on the part of the Senate.

LEADERSHIP DISPLAYED BY PRESIDENT EISENHOWER AT THE GENEVA CONFERENCE

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, once again, President Eisenhower has displayed his capacity for leadership by seizing the diplomatic initiative from the Soviets and restoring it to the free world.

In an atmosphere tense with suspicion and fear, the President remained conciliatory and calm. He did not go to Geneva to make deals and he did not attempt to do so. He made none.

When the Soviets manifested their usual truculent attitude, the President was neither discouraged nor dismayed. Knowing these people, he anticipated their behavior and was prepared to act accordingly.

With superb timing, omitting catchy phrases or meaningless slogans, he ultimately presented a forthright proposal for the exchange of military blueprints and mutual access for aerial inspection of defense establishments.

At the same time, he solemnly stated the alternatives, namely, that the United States was prepared to maintain, and if necessary increase, its armed strength for as long a period as is necessary to safeguard peace and to maintain our security.

The sincerity of the United States in the search for peace was thus forcibly presented to the world. The Soviets have no answer.

No one can evaluate the accomplishments of the Geneva Conference at this time. Our President went to Geneva with the extremely limited objective of seeking new approaches to old problems. There can be no doubt that he accomplished that objective and possibly more. Furthermore, despite the misgivings of some, he met with the Russians without appeasing them or in any way jeopardizing the existing reliable safeguards for the security of the United States and its friends and allies.

The real story of Geneva can be told only when we observe the Soviet reaction to our proposal. The possibility exists that the obvious honesty and integrity of the President must cause serious reflective thought in the Kremlin, with an eventual genuine attempt on the part of the Russians to resolve the present world tension.

If, in subsequent months, they move toward implementing President Eisenhower's plans, a giant stride toward peace may have been taken. If not, we shall have at least made our aspirations clear to the world.

In any event, a favorable setting has been established for the forthcoming October meeting of the Foreign Ministers, when the difficult problems of German unity and European security are to be discussed.

We are fortunate that, at this crucial phase of human history, the American people have the benefit of the inspiring and imaginative leadership of President Eisenhower.

The President has successfully completed a difficult assignment. He has created an atmosphere of sincere, calm reassurance in a world fraught with tension. A grateful Nation thus welcomes him home.

ILLNESS OF SENATOR JOHNSON OF TEXAS

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, one of the finest of the many editorials which have come to my attention concerning the majority leader, the distinguished Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON], was published recently in the Waterbury (Conn.) Republican. I think the editor who wrote this editorial has formed a very excellent picture of the majority leader. I am very much impressed with the fact that he has formed such a good picture at such a distance from this very remarkable man.

As one of the many friends of the distinguished majority leader who have the deepest sympathy for him in his present plight, I take great pleasure in asking unanimous consent that this fine editorial be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

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

SENATOR JOHNSON STRICKEN

It must have given a mental shock to innumerable readers of the news from Washington to learn, in the course of the weekend, that Senator LYNDON B. JOHNSON of Texas, floor leader of the Democratic majority in the more select chamber of Congress, had been stricken with a severe heart attack. He is in the prime of life, and had appeared to be endowed with extraordinary powers of physical vigor and stamina, as well as intellectual resourcefulness. Indeed, he must have been richly supplied with all of those qualities, to have been able to

withstand for so long the strain of such efforts as he constantly applied to the performance of his official tasks.

Close observers of Congress in action had commonly noted that Senator JOHNSON was one of the most zealous and efficient majority leaders his own or the Republican Party had ever assigned to his position. To begin with, he undoubtedly had a natural talent for his responsibilities, and a skillfully cultivated knowledge of how to apply it with the utmost possible success. Even so, it obviously took a vast amount of continuous exertion besides, to achieve the impressive parliamentary feats that Washington newswriters have given him credit for.

It has been is some degree reassuring to read that, while he probably will not be able to resume his post before the present session of Congress is adjourned, the Senator apparently may be expected to recover in plenty of time for the next. Even so, it is to be supposed, and also hoped, that he never again will spend his energy so extravagantly as he had done this year, up to the time when he was stricken. He has been such an exceptionally competent and admirable legislator that the national community would be loath to hear of his withdrawal from public life.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Best Wishes, Senator JOHNSON," which was published in a recent edition of the Nashville Banner.

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

BEST WISHES, SENATOR JOHNSON

Senator LYNDON JOHNSON's serious illness is a matter of deep concern to all who know him personally, or who know him simply by name as the Senate majority leader.

An important responsibility passed to him when congressional control shifted last year to his party's hands. For the most part, he has exercised that role as a balance wheel—neither unresponsive to the dictates of conservatism as embodied by respected southern Senators, nor amenable to the legislative demands of wild-eyed liberals in their partisan handiwork.

Quite a calendar of unfinished business remains at this time, with hurdles to be cleared without undue delay if Congress is to adjourn on the indicated date, July 31. The Nation is concerned about that. It looks to Senator EARL CLEMENTS, as majority leader pro tempore, to skillfully use the reins of that driver's seat.

America's best wishes go to Senator JOHNSON for a speedy and complete recovery.

BEAVER MARSH PROJECT

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, my constituents in the State of Oregon are the victims of a political run-around from Secretary McKay and the Interior Department.

Conservationists in Oregon are objecting to a proposed power project on the scenic reaches of the upper McKenzie River, known as the Beaver Marsh project, because they fear it would destroy scenery and fish life, and otherwise impair recreational values.

The Interior Department, speaking through Assistant Secretary Fred G. Aandahl, has indicated to the Federal Power Commission that it has no objection to the granting of a license to the Eugene Water Board for construction of the Beaver Marsh project. This report is dated December 16, 1954.

But Secretary of the Interior Douglas McKay, in a letter to me dated July 15, 1955, has declared himself against the Beaver Marsh project.

What utter nonsense is this, Mr. President? Is Douglas McKay the Secretary of the Interior or is he not? Is he trying to straddle the fence by letting his Department ratify the Beaver Marsh project, while he himself tries to satisfy conservationists by opposing it? If this is the case, let me say that Oregon conservationists will not be fooled. They know that, while Secretary McKay may give them fine words and rhetoric, he is permitting his Department to approve a project which will damage fisheries, marvelous waterfalls, and wildlife in the watershed of the McKenzie River.

This is the old political shell game—giving one side the words and the other side the decision.

Let me read to the Senate an amazing quotation from Secretary McKay's letter to me of last week. He writes:

> While the bureaus in the Department of the Interior would not be adversely affected by this project, I personally am very definitely opposed to it.

Imagine what would happen, Mr. President, if every level of government followed this incredible line of procedure. We would have the Treasury Department advocating a balanced budget, while Secretary Humphrey would write letters to Senators saying "I personally am very definitely opposed to it."

We would have the Department of Agriculture proposing flexible price supports for farm products, while Secretary Benson would write letters to Senators saying "I personally am very definitely opposed to it."

We would have the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare suggesting Federal aid to school construction, while Secretary Folsom would write letters to Senators saying "I personally am very definitely opposed to it."

What does it mean to be a Cabinet officer in this administration, Mr. President? Does it mean that his department does one thing while he urges a different course? Is the office of Secretary of the Interior purely titular, or does it carry with it authority over the various agencies of the Interior Department?

I have been wondering, for example, why the Interior Department, under Secretary McKay, was proposing expenditures of $1,659 million on the upper Colorado River while at the same time it insists that the Federal budget cannot stand the strain of $308 million in expenditures at Hells Canyon, in Mr. McKay's own Pacific Northwest region.

I call to the attention of Pacific Northwest conservationists the undeniable fact that the Interior Department, under Assistant Secretary Fred G. Aandahl, has ratified the Beaver Marsh project, while Secretary of the Interior McKay says he is opposed to that project. In other words, the conservationists get the phrases; the Eugene Water Board gets the departmental decision. This is about as logical as a judge telling a felon: "The jury having found you innocent, I sentence you to be hanged."

Mr. President, unlike Secretary McKay, I have only one position on the Beaver Marsh project—I am opposed to it. I ask unanimous consent to include in the RECORD with these remarks my letter of July 18, 1955, to the Federal Power Commission expressing opposition to the Beaver Marsh project, because of its adverse effect on scenery, waterfalls, fisheries, and the McKenzie drainage basin generally.

I also ask unanimous consent to include the Interior Department report from Assistant Secretary Aandahl of December 16, 1954, approving the project, and Secretary McKay's letter to me of July 15, 1955, opposing the project.

I call attention to the fact that Secretary McKay claims he will continue to oppose it—Beaver Marsh project.

This will be most heartening to Oregon conservationists, I am sure. The Secretary of the Interior will continue to oppose the project while the Department of the Interior, presumably, will continue to approve the project.

This Jekyll-and-Hyde performance may be good politics, Mr. President, but I submit that it definitely is not good government.

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

UNITED STATES SENATE
COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND
INSULAR AFFAIRS,
July 18, 1955.

HON. JEROME K. KUYKENDALL,
Chairman, the Federal Power Commission, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. KUYKENDALL: As a Senator from Oregon, I should like to exress my unequivocal opposition to any licensing of either a publicly owned system or a private power company for hydroelectric development in the Beaver Marsh area of the upper McKenzie River. This question is now before an examiner (Francis Hall) of the FPC for decision.

I base my opposition on one major premise. It is my firm conviction that any power production to result from such a project would not justify the loss in scenic, wildlife, and recreational values on one of the most picturesque streams in North America. I disagree with the letter of the Interior Department to you from Assistant Secretary Aandahl, claiming that conservation interests would not be adversely affected by the Beaver Marsh development.

Although a comparatively short river, the McKenzie is unparalleled in what it offers people who love the outdoors. I doubt if the Beaver Marsh power project can be undertaken without substantially impairing the McKenzie's recreational attractions. The marvelous waterfalls at Koosah and Sahalie will be vastly reduced in volume. The unique fish population of Clear Lake, a part of the McKenzie watershed, will be hard put to survive if the lake is tapped for waterpower production. The food for all aquatic life is certain to be imperiled as the water level of the McKenzie system is altered.

When we consider the enormous amounts of energy still to be generated at major sites in the Columbia River Basin—sites such as Hells Canyon and John Day—it is obvious to me that the comparatively small amount of power to be generated by the Beaver Marsh project would not warrant the damage to be done to the McKenzie and its waterfalls and fish life. Furthermore, from the standpoint of power consumers, I believe that additional kilowatts generated on the main stem of the Columbia and the Snake will be far cheaper than any energy to be produced on the upper McKenzie. The entire Beaver Marsh project would yield only

30,000 kilowatts of power. This is less than one generator at a plant like Grand Coulee, Hells Canyon, or John Day.

For all these reasons, I urge the Federal Power Commission not to grant a license either to a public or private electrical system for the development of the Beaver Marsh project on the upper McKenzie River in Oregon. I am convinced that this realm can more meritoriously be used for the enjoyment of outdoor recreation than for the manufacture of hydroelectric power.

With good wishes, I am,

Sincerely,

RICHARD L. NEUBERGER,
United States Senator.

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
Washington, D. C., December 16, 1954.

Hon. JEROME K. KUYKENDALL,
Chairman, Federal Power Commission,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. KUYKENDALL: This is in reply to your letter of September 16, transmitting for our comments application for license by the city of Eugene, Oreg., for waterpower project No. 2059, which would be located on the McKenzie River in Lane and Linn Counties, Oreg. The proposed project would affect public lands and lands of the United States within Willamette National Forest.

The proposed project would consist of an earth and rock-fill dam about 51 feet high across a portion of Fish Lake creating a reservoir containing 3,200 acre-feet of useful storage with normal pool at elevation 3,174 feet; a low diversion dam at the outlet of Clear Lake for maintaining the surface elevation of the lake; a conduit comprising a tunnel about 8,400 feet long with intake on Clear Lake, a surge tank, a penstock about 610 feet long; a powerhouse (Beaver Marsh) containing two 23,500-horsepower turbines each connected to a 15,000-kilovolt-ampere generator; a substation at Beaver Marsh powerhouse; a low earth-fill dike about 3,100 feet long with a rockfill crib spillway creating a reregulating reservoir below Beaver Marsh plant, with normal pondage of about 220 acre-feet; a 115-kilovolt transmission line from Beaver Marsh substation to Leaburg switchyard, a distance of 46 miles; a switchyard at Leaburg; and appurtenant facilities.

In its application the municipality states that operation of the project on the river below Beaver Marsh will be negligible. Fish Lake, it reports, is a shallow seasonal lake ordinarily going dry in July. The proposed reservoir would be held full during the summer recreation season and would create a desirable fishing lake of approximately 110 acres. Releases from the reservoir would ordinarily start in October and continue as required by peak demands and natural streamflow up to the limit of the storage. The total storage would be approximately 3,500 acre-feet, of which 3,200 acre-feet would be live storage. Approximately 300 acre-feet of dead storage will be held as a minimum pool for fish protection.

Clear Lake, the municipality states, has considerable attraction as a fishing lake. The natural supply of trout is augmented by plantings made by the Oregon State Game Commission. During the recreation season, from the first of May through September, the lake would be used for daily pondage only and the resulting fluctuation in the lake would never exceed 2 feet. During the ordinary winter season the lake would be used for weekly pondage with a normal drawdown in the median water year of approximately 8 feet. Drawdowns in excess of approximately 8 feet would not be made until the available storage in Fish Lake was exhausted.

During the May through September recreation season releases from Clear Lake to the natural river channel would be distributed in a manner considered desirable by recreational authorities. During the winter season no releases from the lake to the river channel would be made.

Beaver Marsh Reservoir will reregulate the peaking flows from the Beaver Marsh plant and keep fluctuations in the river immediately downstream within acceptable limits. The company proposes that the daily variation, due to plant operation, of the river level immediately below the reservoir will not exceed 1 foot and the changes in flow will be at a rate not to exceed 4 inches per hour. The normal daily fluctuation in the reservoir would be approximately 4 feet.

During the period of the preliminary permit and following filing of application for license, representatives of the Fish and Wildlife Service met with representatives of the Oregon State Fish and Game Commissions, the United States Forest Service, and officials of the company to devise means and measures for conserving fishery resources. As a result of these conferences, the following provisions were developed and are recommended for inclusion in any license issued for this project. The applicant has agreed, without reservation, to 5 of these provisions. The other two, items 3 and 6, have been accepted in principle by the applicant, though with certain reservations.

1. A barrier screen, electrical or otherwise, satisfactory to the Oregon State Game Commission, shall be installed at the intake for the Clear Lake diversion.

2. The foundation for a fish ladder shall be included in both Clear Lake diversion dam and Beaver Marsh Dam. The licensee shall install a fish ladder at either or both dams at such time as may be ordered by the Federal Power Commission upon a demonstration of need.

3. Steps shall be taken by the licensee to prevent winter kill of trout in the pool behind Fish Lake Dam.

4. The time and rate of accomplishing drawdowns at Clear Lake in excess of 8 feet shall be by mutual agreement between the Oregon State Game Commisison, the Fish and Wildlife Service, the Forest Service, and the licensee.

5. Releases to the river channel from Clear Lake from May through September shall be not less than 40 acre-feet per day in a manner satisfactory to the Oregon State Game Commission.

6. The licensee shall bear the costs of fish salvage work resulting from construction and operation of the project and of annual operation and maintenance expenses of fish facilities.

7. All possible means shall be employed to reduce or avoid siltation of the McKenzie River during construction of the project.

The Fish and Wildlife Service advises that the affected area provides a moderate number of deer for hunters and a few black bear. Fur-bearing animals are present in moderate numbers; waterfowl are uncommon. The project will have a minor effect on wildlife and no facilities or required methods of operation are needed to protect these values.

In addition to the standard terms and conditions affecting public lands, as provided in the Commission's Form L-2, the Bureau of Land Management requests that the license provide that 30 days before entering any revested O. and C. Railroad land or vacant public land, the city of Eugene notify the district forester, Eugene, Oreg., in order that any timber to be cut, used, or destroyed in the construction of the proposed project may be cruised and appraised. Further, the City of Eugene, Oregon, shall pay to the Bureau of Land Management in advance of construction the value of such timber to be removed or destroyed.

The records of the Geological Survey indicate that the construction and use of the project will not affect adversely any deposits of coal or other minerals, lands within the known geologic structure of a producing oil or gas field, or the purpose of any withdrawal or classification recommended by the Survey.

Construction of the proposed project would not affect Indian lands or interests.

Other interests of the Department would not be adversely affected by the issuance of a license.

We appreciate the opportunity of reviewing this application.

Sincerely yours,

FRED G. AANDAHL,
Assistant Secretary of the Interior.

THE SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR,
Washington, July 15, 1955.

The Honorable RICHARD L. NEUBERGER,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR NEUBERGER: As requested in your letter of July 13, I am enclosing a copy of Interior's report to the Federal Power Commission in respect to the application by the city of Eugene, Oreg., for a license for water power project No. 2059. This report, by Assistant Secretary Aandahl, covers the bureaus in the Department of the Interior that might be affected by this project.

While the bureaus in the Department of the Interior would not be adversely affected by this project, I personally am very definitely opposed to it.

You may recall that while I was Governor I created the Governors' Natural Resources Committee, which was later given a legal status by the legislature. Along about 1951 or 1952 this committee had a hearing on this project of people living in the upper McKenzie and afterward voted unanimously to opopse it and so notified the city of Eugene.

I noticed, however, in the full report that the Oregon Fish and Game Commission is not now opposed to the project. I personally shall continue to oppose it as I believe that the McKenzie and the Rogue River areas should be preserved as nearly as possible in their natural state because of their outstanding recreational value.

Very truly yours,

DOUGLAS MCKAY,
Secretary of the Interior.

OPPOSITION BY UNITED IRISH COUNTIES ASSOCIATION TO PROPOSAL TO MAKE WINSTON CHURCHILL AN HONORARY CITIZEN OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, in connection with the resolution of the junior Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS], proposing to make Winston Churchill an honorary citizen of the United States, I hold in my hand a petition, in the form of a telegram, from the United Irish Counties Association of New York, Inc., signed by John W. Duffy, president, and Sean P. Keating, chairman of public relations. The telegram reads as follows:

The United Irish Counties Association of New York representing 250,000 Irish-Americans in the metropolitan area is appalled at your suggestion to confer honorary United States citizenship on Winston Churchill. Our members cherish highly the rights and privileges of that citizenship and resent any proposal to distribute them lightly to those who do not deserve them.

Churchill's failure to permit adequate British participation in the Korean battles cost the lives of thousands of American soldiers and his attempt to promote extensive trade with Red China and to have her admitted to the United Nations are not good reasons for bestowing on him the most coveted honor in the world.

AMERICANS HELD AS PRISONERS BY THE COMMUNISTS—LETTER FROM THE OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY OF DEFENSE

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD a letter I have received from the Office of the Secretary of Defense, in answer to certain inquiries of mine regarding Americans being held as prisoners by the Communists.

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

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY OF DEFENSE,
Washington, D. C., July 21, 1955.

Hon. WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND,
United States Senate.

DEAR SENATOR KNOWLAND: In reply to your letter of June 25, we have screened our records of personnel missing or captured in order that a complete record can be provided you. The nature of handling of our personnel by the Communists creates many problems in accountability. The evidence is sparse and undependable in most cases.

At the end of the Korean war the North Koreans and the Chinese Communists failed to account for 944 United States Armed Forces personnel. In demanding an accounting on this 944, the U. N. command did not state, nor did it intend to imply, that it considered all of these 944 to be alive and held against their will by the Communists. Rather, it was an attempt to force the Communists to abide by a provision of the armistice agreement which stated that "each side" would render a "full accounting" of all prisoners of war of whom they had any knowledge.

Despite the fact that the Communists refused to make an accounting, through our own efforts we have accounted for 474 of the personnel on the list presented to the Communists. As to the fate of the 470 remaining missing from the Korean war, we have no evidence that they are still alive or being held by the Communists. However, it is possible that at some date in the future the Communists will admit holding in China additional United States personnel. At this time they admit to holding 11 United States Air Force personnel captured on January 13, 1953, and 2 Department of the Army civilians captured on November 29, 1952. These names are listed in the enclosure.

From time to time reports have been obtained from political prisoners released by the East European satellites and the U. S. S. R. pertaining to other prisoners identified as Americans and occasionally identified by name. Frequently these identifications have been followed by reports of the death of prisoners so identified, but in only one case has there been sufficient evidence to use in demanding the release of personnel. The case is that of Sgt. Walter S. Winters, Jr., of Philadelphia, Pa., who was apprehended by Czech border guards on June 5 of this year while photographing installations near the Czech border. The strong demarche by the State Department accomplished the release of Sergeant Winters on July 13.

From time to time demands have been made of the Soviets as well as certain of the satellite countries to account for personnel who were missing in the vicinity of these countries and who could possibly have been captured. However, the circumstances surrounding the incidence of the disappearance are such that in all cases the men could have voluntarily absented themselves without leave in the case of ground forces near the border or could have crashed at sea in the cases of the air and naval forces personnel. The efforts of the Department of Defense and State Department have been unceasing, attempting to provide additional evidence concerning the disappearance of these personnel and in demanding an accounting from the country concerned.

Sincerely yours,
WILLIAM H. GODEL,
Deputy Assistant to the Secretary of Defense.

ARNOLD CREW MEMBERS MISSING IN ACTION AS OF JANUARY 13, 1953

Col. John K. Arnold, 1212A, commander, 581st Air Resupply and Communications Wing, DOB, September 24, 1913. (Sentence, 10 years.)

Wife: Mrs. John K. Arnold, 8 National Street, Montgomery, Ala.

Brother: Dr. Robert Arnold, 8709 Sundale Drive, Silver Spring, Md.

Maj. William H. Baumer, AO-733786, instructor pilot, DOB, April 22, 1922. (Sentence, 8 years.)

Mother: Mrs. Mary E. Baumer, 124 St. Anthony Street, Lewisburg, Pa.

Sister: Alice Ion Moore, R. D. No. 1, Box 709A, Centerville Road, Lancaster, Pa.

Capt. Elmer F. Llewellyn, AO-2072360, navigator, DOB, August 19, 1925. (Sentence, 5 years.)

Wife: Mrs. Marjorie G. Llewellyn, 308 South Sixth Street East, Missoula, Mont.

Capt. Eugene J. Vaadi, AO-825008, aircraft commander, DOB, July 1, 1921. (Sentence, 6 years.)

Wife: Mrs. Mary E. Vaadi, Route No. 1, Clayton, N. Y.

1st Lt. John W. Buck, AO-787245, aircraft observer, DOB, February 21, 1919. (Sentence, 4 years.)

Parents: Mr. and Mrs. Noah A. Buck, Armathwaite, Tenn.

1st Lt. Wallace L. Brown, AO2221928, pilot, DOB, September 21, 1926. (Sentence, 5 years.)

Wife: Mrs. Boby J. Brown, 304 National Avenue, Montgomery, Ala.

T/Sgt. Howard W. Brown, AF36809947, flight engineer, DOB, December 11, 1922. (Sentence, 4 years.)

Parents: Mr. and Mrs. Frank Brown, 1712 Conway Street, St. Paul, Minn.

Airman 1st Class Steve E. Kiba, AF15426310, radio operator, DOB, February 5, 1932. (Sentence, 4 years.)

Parents: Mr. and Mrs. Steve Kiba, 659 Robin Street, Akron, Ohio.

Airman 2d Class Harry M. Benjamin, Jr., AF27345828, scanner, DOB, May 15, 1932. (Sentence, 4 years.)

Wife: Mrs. Charlene A. Benjamin, 1124 Sherwood Street, Worthington, Minn.

Airman 2d Class Daniel C. Schmidt, AF19391475, central fire control, gunner, DOB, March 28, 1932. (Sentence, 4 years.)

Wife: Mrs. Una F. Schmidt, 7346 Southeast Harrison Street, Portland, Oreg.

Airman 2d Class John W. Thompson III, AF13351709, scanner, DOB, August 15, 1931. (Sentence, 4 years.)

Parents: Mrs. John W. Thompson, Jr., 146 Caroline Street, Orange, Va.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE CIVILIAN EMPLOYEES IN COMMUNIST HANDS

John T. Downey.

Parents: Mrs. Mary V. Downey (father deceased), 43 Monroe Street, New Britain, Conn.

Richard G. Fecteau.

Parents: Mr. and Mrs. Philip D. Fecteau, 15 Wymann Street, Lynn, Mass.

THE POWER OF CONGRESS TO REQUIRE TESTIMONY, PAPERS, AND DOCUMENTS FROM THE PRESIDENT AND THE EXECUTIVE BRANCH

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD an analysis I have had made of the power of Congress to require testimony, papers, and documents from the President and the executive branch. The analysis cites a number of precedents, beginning with the time of George Washington, in cases in which the Executive has felt justified in withholding certain papers.

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

THE POWER OF CONGRESS TO REQUIRE TESTIMONY, PAPERS, AND DOCUMENTS FROM THE PRESIDENT AND THE EXECUTIVE BRANCH

SUMMARY

Congressional power to require testimony, papers, and documents from the President and heads of the executive branch has been shrouded in controversy from the beginning of the Federal Government to modern times. A great deal of this controversy developed when the President was of one political party while one or both Houses of Congress were in control of a different party. It ebbed and flowed from time to time as the power of Congress or the President gained temporary ascendency.

Some of these controversies went on further than acrimonious interchange in which Congress or its committees demanded information and papers, and the President resisted either for himself or in behalf of heads of the executive branch.

Others were carried to the courts in one form or another.

Solutions of these controversies invariably revolve around the leading principle of the Constitution which establishes the separation of powers and the general independence of the legislative, executive, and judiciary. This theme constantly recurs in congressional debates, opinions of attorney generals, court decisions, and writings of scholars on the subject of Congress and the President.

The general power of Congress to investigate and to examine witnesses and call for papers and documents is well established in law.

But when attempt is made to project this power into relations between Congress and the President and the executive branch, a twilight zone of controversy is encountered in which the precedents are neither clear nor certain.

Each instance is unique, but examination of available studies, reports, court decisions, and writings on the subject indicate that in general the following propositions can be sustained:

1. The President personally cannot be called to account by Congress except in cases of impeachment.

2. The President can successfully resist demands of Congress for information, papers, and documents in his possession which in his discretion he declares to be confidential and contrary to the public interest to disclose.

3. The President may direct heads of executive departments to withhold confidential information from congressional committees, in the public interest, and Congress cannot coerce such officials into disclosing such information. Exceptions to this proposition exist in cases where circumstances strongly point to wrongdoing of specific department officials (as in the Teapot Dome case), or when wholesale corruption is uncovered.

4. Neither Congress, nor the courts, nor any provision of existing law can override the President's discretion or decision, or that of the heads of departments acting under the President's direction, to compel the production of information, papers, and documents.

5. Statutory provisions empowering the Congress or its committees to compel attendance of witnesses, to issue subpenas, and to punish for contempt relate only to private individuals and not to the President or heads of departments in the executive branch.

The usual procedure has been for Congress to request information "if not incompatible with the public interest." In response to this request it has received much information voluntarily offered.

Where the request or demand has been resisted by the President or heads of departments acting under the direction of the President, Congress has not been able successfully to compel the disclosures and the ensuing controversy (if any) has been left to the political accountability of the President.

But Congress is not left as helpless as these conclusions seem to indicate. Its power over legislation and appropriations exerts a strong pressure on the executive branch. It can probe all around the periphery of a situation and raise enough suspicions in the public mind to make it difficult for the executive branch to remain completely silent. If the case is sufficiently flagrant, the President and the executive branch will be compelled to reconsider the political risk between further resistance to congressional demands for information and aroused public opinion. This elasticity in the give and take between Congress and the President has worked well enough for more than 150 years to withstand all attempts to alter the situation either by clarifying legislation or constitutional amendment.

Summary table: Congress and the executive branch [1]

President	Date	Type of information refused
George Washington	1796	Instructions to United States minister concerning Jay Treaty.
Thomas Jefferson	1807	Confidential information and letters relating to Burr's conspiracy.
James Monroe	1825	Documents relating to conduct of naval officers.
Andrew Jackson	1833	Copy of paper read by President to heads of departments relating to removal of bank deposits.
	1835	Copies of charges against removed public official.
		List of all appointments made without Senate's consent between 1829 and 1836, and those receiving salaries, without holding office.
John Tyler	1842	Names of Members of 26th and 27th Congs. who had applied for office.
	1843	Colonel Hitchcock's report to War Department dealing with alleged frauds practiced on Indians, and his views of personal characters of Indian delegates.
James K. Polk	1846	Evidence of payments made through State Department, on President's certificates, by prior administration.
Millard Fillmore	1852	Official information concerning proposition made by King of Sandwich Islands to transfer islands to United States.
James Buchanan	1860	Message of protest to House against resolution to investigate attempts by Executive to influence legislation.
Abraham Lincoln	1861	Dispatches of Major Anderson to the War Department concerning defense of Fort Sumter.
Ulysses S. Grant	1876	Information concerning Executive acts performed away from Capital.
Rutherford B. Hayes	1877	Secretary of Treasury refused to answer questions and to produce papers concerning reasons for nomination of Theodore Roosevelt as collector of port of New York.
Grover Cleveland	1886	Documents relating to suspension and removal of 650 Federal officials.
Theodore Roosevelt	1909	Attorney General's reasons for failure to prosecute United States Steel Corp.
		Documents of Bureau of Corporations, Department of Commerce.
Calvin Coolidge	1924	List of companies in which Secretary o. Treasury Mellon was interested.
Herbert Hoover	1930	Telegrams and letters leading up to London Naval Treaty.
	1932	Testimony and documents concerning investigation made by Treasury Department.
Franklin D. Roosevelt	1941	Federal Bureau of Investigation reports.
	1943	Director, Bureau of the Budget, refused to testify and to produce files.
		Chairman, Federal Communications Commission, and Board of War Communications refused records.
		General Counsel, Federal Communications Commission, refused to produce records.
		Secretaries of War and Navy refused to furnish documents, and permission for Army and naval officers to testify.
	1944	J. Edgar Hoover refused to give testimony and to produce President's directive.
Harry S. Truman	1945	Issued directions to heads of executive departments to permit officers and employees to give information to Pearl Harbor Committee.
		President's directive did not include any files or written material.
	1947	Civil Service Commission records concerning applicants for positions.

[1] Demands of Congressional Committees for Executive Papers, Federal Bar Journal, vol. X, No. 2 (April 1949), pp. 147-149.

SUPPORTING DATA

SOME INSTANCES IN WHICH CONGRESSIONAL INVESTIGATING COMMITTEES SOUGHT INFORMATION FROM THE PRESIDENT AND EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS

The twilight zone becomes a good deal darker, however, when Congress attempts to compel general disclosures of information from the President and the executive branch.

Following are excerpts from a paper prepared by the Legislative Reference Service, Library of Congress, for Senator ALEXANDER WILEY and the Senate Judiciary Committee:

"Congress has gone far at times in asserting its authority to investigate activities in the Executive Department; for examples, the resolution to investigate in 1792, the failure of the expedition under Major-General St. Clair (Hinds' sec. 1725) and the creation of a joint committee on the conduct of the war in 1861 (Hinds' sec. 1728).

"On the other hand, President Jackson resisted with vigor an attempt of a committee of the House to secure his assistance in an investigation of his administration (Hinds' sec. 1737). (See generally Hinds' vol. 6, secs. 404-437.)

President Washington and Congress

"In 1796 the House of Representatives requested President Washington to lay before it certain papers relating to the negotiations of the treaty with the King of Great Britain. The President refused the request, pointing out that the assent of the House is not necessary to the validity of a treaty and that the treaty exhibited in itself all the objects requiring legislative provision. He wrote: 'As it is essential to the due administration of the government that the boundaries fixed by the Constitution between the different Departments should be preserved, a just regard to the Constitution and to the duty of my office * * * forbids a compliance with your request.' (See I Richardson, J. D., Messages of the Presidents (Washington, 1896-99), p. 196.)"

President Jackson and Congress

"The House committee appointed on January 17, 1837 'to examine into the condition of the excutive departments, etc.,' had a checkered career. On January 23, it adopted a series of resolutions calling on President Jackson and heads of departments for information of various kinds. * * *"

* * * * *

"By order of the committee the chairman transmitted to the President of the United States a copy of the above resolutions. The copy transmitted in the letter of the chairman was attested by the clerk of the committee. On January 27, Mr. Andrew Jackson, Jr., Secretary of the President, entered the committee room and delivered to the chairman, Mr. Henry A. Wise, of Virginia, a letter addressed to Mr. Wise, and giving the President's reasons for not complying with the request of the committee. The President pointed out in his letter that the resolution adopted by the House authorizing the investigation cast doubt upon the statement in his annual message, that the executive departments were in excellent condition. He stated further:

" 'The first proceeding of the investigating committee is to pass a series of resolutions, which, though amended in their passage, were, as understood, introduced by you, calling on the President and the heads of departments, not to answer to any specific charge, not to explain any alleged abuse, not to give information as to any particular transaction, but assuming that they have been guilty of the charges alleged, calls upon them to furnish evidence against themselves. After the reiterated charges you have made, it was to have been expected that you would have been prepared to reduce them to specifications, and that the committee would then proceed to investigate the matters alleged. But, instead of this, you resort to generalities even more vague than your original accusations; and in open violation of the Constitution, and of that well established and wise maxim, that all men are presumed to be innocent until proven guilty; according to the established rules of law, you request myself and the heads of departments to become our own accusers, and to furnish the evidence to convict ourselves; and this call purports to be founded on the authority of that body, in which alone by the Constitution, the power of impeachment is vested. The heads of departments may answer such a request as they please, provided they do not withdraw their own time and that of the officers under their direction, from the public business to the injury thereof. * * * For myself, I shall repel all such attempts as an invasion of the principles of justice, as well as of the Constitution; and I shall esteem it my sacred duty to the people of the United States to resist them as I would the establishment of a Spanish Inquisition.' (24th Cong., 2d sess., Debates, vol. xiii, appendix, p. 202.)"

* * * * *

"This case represents one of the most successful attempts of a President of the United States to resist a congressional inquiry. Jackson's position in these proceedings was probably strengthened by the fact that he had an overwhelming majority in the House and he knew he could successfully resist an investigation for that reason, as his own

party would not take serious issue with him. The fact that the committee reported that all was well with the executive departments after this feint at an investigation shows the importance of considering the political character of the committee personnel in these investigations. Investigating committees, packed with members in sympathy with the administration, might well become vehicles of vindication for the Executive."

President Buchanan and Congress

"In direct contrast is the account of the Covode investigation during the administration of President Buchanan, also related by Eberling.

"While President Buchanan fully and cheerfully admitted that inquiries which are incident to legislative duties were highly proper and belong equally to the Senate and the House and that they were necessary in order to enable them to discover and to provide the appropriate legislative remedies for any abuse which might be ascertained, yet he protested the power given to the Covode committee to inquire 'not into any specific charge or charges, but whether the President has by money, patronage, or other improper means sought to influence not the individual action of Members of Congress but the action of the entire body itself, or any committee thereof.' Such an accusation Buchanan said, 'extended to the whole circle of legislation, to interference for or against the passage of any law appertaining to the rights of any State or Territory. Since the time of star chambers and general warrants, there has been no such proceeding in England.' He also protested because such an investigation was in violation of the rights of the coordinate executive branch of the Government, and subversive of its constitutional independence. Moreover he claimed such an investigation was a flagrant abuse of a private person's rights under the Constitution, for John Covode who accused the President, was also chairman of the committee. 'I am to appear before Mr. Covode either personally or by a substitute, to cross-examine the witnesses which he may produce to sustain his own accusations against me; and perhaps this poor boon may be denied the President.' (36th Cong., 1st sess., GLOBE, p. 1434.) (Eberling, p. 167.)"

* * * * *

"After a short debate on the President's protest his statement was referred to the Judiciary Committee with leave to report at any time. On April 9 following, Mr. John Hickman from said committee made a report (see GLOBE, 36 Cong., 1st sess., vol. iii, H. R. Rept. No. 394) accompanied by the following resolution, viz:

"'*Resolved*, That the House dissents from the doctrine of the special message of the President of the United States on March 28, 1860; that the extent of power contemplated in the adoption of the resolutions of inquiry of March 5, 1860, is necessary to the proper discharge of the constitutional duties developed upon Congress; that judicial determinations, the opinions of former Presidents, and uniform usage sanctions its use; and that to abandon it would leave the executive department of the Government without supervision or responsibility, and would be likely to lead to a concentration of power in the hands of the President which would be dangerous to the rights of a free people.'

"The resolution was eventually adopted. On June 25, the President sent another protest to the House claiming that the committee had acted as though they possessed unlimited power, and without any warrant whatever had pursued a course not merely at war with the constitutional rights of the Executive, but tending to degrade the Presidential Office itself to such a degree as to render it unworthy of the acceptance of any man or honor or principle. (36th Cong., 1st sess., GLOBE, p. 3299.) The President claimed that the committee had proceeded to investigate subjects not warranted in the resolutions; that it had taken testimony ex parte; had dragged private correspondence to light, which a truly honorable man would never have an even distant thought of divulging. Even members of the Cabinet were called upon to testify.

"'Should the proceedings of the committee be sanctioned by the House and become a precedent for future times, the balance of the Constitution will be entirely upset, and there will no longer remain the three coordinate and independent branches of the Government, legislative, executive, and judicial. Should secret committees be appointed, with unlimited authority to range over all the words and actions, and if possible the very thought of the President, with a view to discover something in his past life prejudicial to his character from parasites and informers, this would be an ordeal which scarcely any mere man since the fall could endure.' (Ibid., p. 3300.)

"This last protest of the President was referred to a select committee which made a report. There is no question that Congress was firmly convinced, and in this case the House, that the power of investigating the President, even where specific charges were not made, constitutionally belongs to the legislative department. The argument made by the Executive in this case only seemed to arouse the ire of the House the more. It is true that the President had some stanch defenders in the House, but the great majority opposed him. This is seen in the vote on the first resolution dissenting from the doctrines enunciated in his first message to the Senate, viz, 87 to 40. (36th Cong., 1st sess., GLOBE, p. 1434.) (Eberling, p. 170.)"

President Tyler and Congress

"In 1842 the House passed a resolution requesting certain information of President Tyler, namely, the names of such members, if any, of the 26th and 27th Congress as have been applicants for office with the details relating to such applications. Tyler refused on the ground that as the appointing power is vested solely in the Executive, the House could have no legitimate concern therein.

"Tyler later complied with a similar request of the House in another matter but said:

"'Nor can it be a sound position that all papers, documents, and information of every description which may happen by any means to come into the hands of the President or the heads of Departments must necessarily be subject to the call of the House of Representatives, merely because they relate to a subject of the deliberations of the House, although that subject may be within the sphere of legitimate powers. * * * The executive departments and the citizens of this country have their rights and duties as well as the House of Representatives and the maxim that the rights of one person or body are to be exercised as not to impair those of others is applicable in its fullest extent to this question.' (For view of this case see CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, 69th Cong., 1st sess., Feb. 25, 1926, p. 4548.)"

President Polk and Congress

"President Polk, in 1846, refused the request of the House for information, pointing out the confidential nature of the information although admitting that the House could obtain information in a formal proceeding for impeachment, when its power would be plenary. He said further:

"'If the House as the grand inquest of the Nation should at any time have reason to believe that there has been malversation in office by an improper use or application of the public money by a public officer, and should think proper to institute an inquiry into the matter, all the archives and pages of the executive departments, public or private, would be subject to the inspection and control of a committee of their body and every facility in the power of the executive be afforded to enable them to prosecute the investigation.' (See RECORD, 69th Cong., 1st sess., p. 4548.) (Eberling, p. 146.)"

Congressional Investigations of the War of 1861

"One of the most famous congressional investigations was that authorized in 1861 by concurrent action of the two Houses which assumed, without much question, the right to investigate the conduct of the war. On December 9, 1861, the Senate agreed to the following:

"'*Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring)*, That a joint committee of 3 Members of the Senate and 4 Members of the House of Representatives be appointed to inquire into the conduct of the present war; that they have the power to send for persons and papers, and to sit during the session of either House of Congress.' (37th Cong., 2d sess., GLOBE, p. 29.)

"In the crisis Congress apparently did not trouble itself with the reflection that inasmuch as the President is the Commander in Chief of the Army, such interference constituted a serious infringement of the executive prerogative. In the Senate the resolution passed by a vote of 33 to 3, and in the House there was not even debate or division. This investigation marks the use for the first joint investigating committee. (Dimock, p. 111.)

"The Wade committee, so constituted, went about its duties vigilantly during the entire course of the war. Their reports comprise four large volumes. In truth it may be said that this committee took over a partial control of Union operations. Practically no phase of the conflict escaped the inquisitorial eye. Battles, disloyal employees, naval stations, surrenders at sea, military and naval supplies, were summarily investigated. War contracts were inspected with special zeal. If legislative meddling could be shown to be damaging from a strategic standpoint, at least Congress was able to legislate with adequate knowledge and to hold the officials in Washington and upon the line of battle to strict accountability (p. 112)."

OTHER INSTANCES INVOLVING ATTEMPTS OF CONGRESS TO GET INFORMATION FROM THE PRESIDENT AND THE EXECUTIVE BRANCH

The Condon case

The House Committee on Un-American Acitvities, on March 1, 1948, sought to get the full text of a letter dated May 15, 1947, written by J. Edgar Hoover, Director of the FBI, addressed to W. Averell Harriman, Secretary of Commerce, relating to Dr. Edward U. Condon, Director of the Bureau of Standards.

The Secretary of Commerce refused to permit the release of the letter and other records, and also instructed the Secretary of the Loyalty Board to decline to testify concerning such letter and other documents.

Heavy reliance for the refusal to provide the information requested was placed on President Truman's directive of March 13, 1948, which among other things stated:

"The efficient and just administration of the employee-loyalty program, under Executive Order No. 9835 of March 21, 1947, requires that reports, records, and files relative to the program be preserved in strict confidence. This is necessary in the interest of our national security and welfare, to preserve the confidential character and sources of information furnished, and to protect Government personnel against the dissemination of unfounded or disproved allegations. It is necessary also in order to insure the fair and just disposition of loyalty cases.

* * * * *

"Any subpena or demand or request for information, reports, or files of the nature described, received from sources other than

those persons in the executive branch of the Government who are entitled thereto by reason of their official duties, shall be respectfully declined, on the basis of this directive, and the subpena or demand or other request shall be referred to the Office of the President for such response as the President may determine to be in the public interest in the particular case. There shall be no relaxation of the provisions of this directive except with my express authority." (See House Rept. No. 1753, 80th Cong., 2d sess., pp. 6–7.)

The loyalty orders

Many cases of refusal by the President and executive departments to give information to congressional investigating committees arose, of course, under the loyalty program.

The policy was set forth by President Truman in Executive Order 9835 issued March 21, 1947, a Presidential directive of March 13, 1948, and Executive Order 10290 issued September 24, 1951.

Under these orders disclosure of information was flatly forbidden with sole discretion centered in President Truman.

This created acrimonious controversy running over several years between President Truman and congressional committees.

Although Congress proved ingenious in gathering information from many sources, the general effect of the loyalty orders enabled the President to resist successfully the demands of Congress for this type of information.

The Teapot Dome case

The general power of Congress to investigate and to call witnesses and require papers and documents is well established in law.

But when this power is considered in relation to the Office of the President and certain executive officers of the Government, it enters a twilight area in which the precedents are neither clear nor certain. *McGrain* v. *Daugherty* (the Teapot Dome case) was the nearest approach to a flat recognition of the fitness and propriety of a congressional investigation involving the executive branch. But the Court only went so far as to declare the investigation of the Attorney General necessary and proper on the ground that the information requested was needed for the efficient exercise of the legislative function. Here the Court said:

"This becomes manifest when it is reflected that the functions of the Department of Justice, the powers and duties of the Attorney General and the duties of his assistants, are all subject to regulation by congressional legislation, and that the Department is maintained and its activities are carried on under such appropriations as in the judgment of Congress are needed from year to year."

In the Teapot Dome situation Attorney General Daugherty sought President Coolidge's aid in denying information to the congressional investigating committee. President Coolidge replied:

"THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, March 27, 1924.

"MY DEAR MR. ATTORNEY GENERAL: Since my conference with you I have examined the proposed reply you suggest making to the demand that you furnish the committee investigating the Department of Justice with files from that Department, relating to litigation and to the Bureau of Investigation. You represent to me and to the committee in your letter that it would not be compatible with the public interest to comply with the demand, and wish to conclude your letter with a statement that I approve that position. Certainly I approve the well-established principle that departments should not give out information or documents, for such a course would be detrimental to the public interest and this principle is always peculiarly applicable to your Department, which has such an intimate relation to the administration of justice. But you will readily perceive that I am unable to form an independent judgment in this instance without a long and intricate investigation of voluminous papers, which I cannot personally make, and so I should be compelled to follow the usual practice in such cases and rely upon your advice as Attorney General and head of the Department of Justice.

"But you will see at once that the committee is investigating your personal conduct, and hence you have become an interested party, and the committee wants these papers because of a claim that they disclose your personal conduct of the Department. Assuming that the request of the committee is appropriately limited to designated files, still the question will always be the same. In view of the fact that the inquiry related to your personal conduct, you are not in a position to give to me or the committee what would be disinterested advice as to the public interest. You have a personal interest in this investigation which is being made of the conduct of yourself and your office, which may be in conflict with your official interest as the Attorney General. I am not questioning your fairness or integrity. I am merely reciting the fact that you are placed in two positions, one your personal interest, the other your office of Attorney General, which may be in conflict. How can I satisfy a request for action in matters of this nature on the ground that you as Attorney General advise against it when you as the individual against whom the inquiry is directed necessarily have a personal interest in it? I do not see how you can be acting for yourself in your own defense in this matter and at the same time and on the same question acting as my adviser as Attorney General."

President Coolidge solved this dilemma by asking for the resignation of his Attorney General and the congressional investigation proceeded from there.

SOME OPINIONS OF ATTORNEY GENERALS ON THE SUBJECT

When, on April 30, 1941, the House Committee on Naval Affairs requested that it be furnised with certain reports of the FBI, Attorney General Jackson declined the request. Following are excerpts from his letter to CARL VINSON, chairman of the committee:

"It is the position of this Department, restated now with the approval of and at the direction of the President, that all investigative reports are confidential documents of the executive department of the Government, to aid in the duty laid upon the President by the Constitution to 'take care that the laws be faithfully executed,' and that congressional or public access to them would not be in the public interest" (p. 26).

In the Attorney General's opinion, disclosure of the reports would seriously prejudice law enforcement, prejudice the national defense, prejudice the future usefulness of the FBI, and do injustice to innocent individuals (p. 26).

Attorney General Jackson's letter cited many other instances in which other Attorney Generals refused to give Congress information from the files of the Justice Department.

He observed further that "since the beginning of the Government, the executive branch has from time to time been confronted with the unpleasant duty of declining to furnish to the Congress and to the courts information which it has acquired and which is necessary to it in the administration of statutes."

* * * * *

"In 1825, the House of Representatives requested President Monroe to transmit certain documents relating to the conduct of the officers of the Navy of the United States on the Pacific Ocean, and of other public agents in South America. In his reply, President Monroe refused to comply with the request, stating that to do so might subject individuals to unjust criticism; that the individuals involved should not be censured without just cause, which could not be ascertained until after a thorough and impartial investigation of their conduct; and that under those circumstances it was thought that communication of the documents would not comport with the public interest nor with what was due to the parties concerned. (See Richardson, Messages and Papers of the Presidents, vol. 2, p. 278.)

"In 1833, the Senate requested President Jackson to communicate to that body a copy of a paper purporting to have been read by him to the heads of the executive departments, dated September 18, 1833, relating to the removal of the deposits of the public money from the Bank of the United States. President Jackson declined. (See Richardson. Messages and Papers of the Presidents, vol. 3, p. 36.)

"In 1835 the Senate passed a resolution requesting President Jackson to communicate copies of the charges, if any, which might have been made to him against the official conduct of Gideon Fitz, late surveyor general south of the State of Tennessee, which caused his removal from office. In reply President Jackson again declined to comply. (See Richardson, Messages and Papers of the Presidents, vol. 3, pp. 132, 133" (p. 27).

In concluding his opinion, Attorney General Jackson cited a number of court cases tending to uphold the discretion of the President and executive branch of the Government to withhold papers and information which might be contrary to the public interest. (For the full text of Attorney General Jackson's letter, see House Rept. No. 1753, 80th Cong., 2d sess., pp. 25–28.)

IMMUNITY OF HEADS OF DEPARTMENTS

Attorney General Cushing, in an opinion entitled "Resolutions of Congress," wrote in 1854: [1]

"In a word, the authority of each head of Department is a parcel of the executive power of the President. To coerce the head of department is to coerce the President. This can be accomplished in no other way than by a law, constitutional in its nature, enacted in accordance with the forms of the Constitution.

"Of course, no separate resolution of either House can coerce a head of department, unless in some particular in which a law, duly enacted, has subjected him to the direct action of each; and in such case it is to be intended, that, by approving the law, the President has consented to the exercise of such coerciveness on the part of either House." (6 Op. A. G. 682–683.)

TEXTBOOK COMMENTARY ON THE SUBJECT

In his study on the President: Office and Powers, Prof. Edward S. Corwin states:

"President Monroe, in the last days of his Presidency, declined a call for papers from the House of Representatives on the ground that their publication might do a naval officer still at sea an injustice" (p. 136).

* * * * *

"The occasion for most Presidential interventions between Congress and executive personnel has been of the type illustrated by President Monroe in 1825. The point at issue, however, has generally been not justice to the official involved but the right of the executive department to keep its own secrets" (p. 137).

Declaring that the doctrine stated in *Marbury* v. *Madison* "is equally applicable to the case of an investigation by a congressional committee," Professor Corwin observes:

"This doctrine is that a high executive official is not bound to divulge matters regarding which he is a confidant of the President. At the same time the court impliedly claims the right to say finally whether such

[1] Federal Bar Journal, Vol. X, No. 3 (July 1949), pp. 252–253.

a plea on the part of an official is a valid one. In both these respects subsequent practice has broadened the scope of the immunity which the President can throw about a subordinate member of the executive department from judicial and legislative investigatory processes" (p. 138).

Professor Corwin cited President Jefferson's refusal to respond to a subpena in Burr's trial and his extension of his immunity to three members of his Cabinet, and then observed:

"In the many years that have rolled by since Jefferson's Presidency there have been hundreds of congressional investigations. But I know of no instance in which a head of department has testified before a congressional committee in response to a subpena, nor been held for contempt for refusal to testify. All appearances by these high officials seem to have been voluntary" (p. 139).

After citing Attorney General Jackson's letter to CARL VINSON, April 23, 1941, refusing a request for FBI material (see Section on Opinions of Attorney Generals, below), Professor Corwin declares:

"Other occurrences of like character are the following: In July 1943 the War and Navy Departments, acting on the order of President Roosevelt, refused certain information to a House committee investigating the Federal Communications Commission, on the ground that to do so would be 'contrary to the public interest.' Early in 1944 the head of FBI refused to testify before the same committee, and was supported by Attorney General Biddle in doing so" (p. 141).

"A few months later Mr. Byron Price, director of CO (Office of Censorship), declined to transmit to a Senate committee, without first being subpenaed by it, a file of intercepts, and no subpena was issued. Then in May 1947 President Truman refused to let the Senate War Investigating Committee comb the late President Roosevelt's files bearing on its Arabian oil inquiry, but at the same time requested executors of the Roosevelt estate to produce any such documents which it might uncover" (p. 142).

Professor Corwin appears to summarize the relations between Congress and the President in the following passage:

"The constitutional merits of the quarrel between the House and the administration are easily assessed. No one questions, or can question, the constitutional right of the House to inform itself through committees of inquiry on subjects which fall within its legislative competence and to hold for contempt recalcitrant witnesses before such committees, and undoubtedly the question of employee loyalty is such a subject. On the other hand, this prerogative of Congress has always been regarded as limited by the right of the President to have his subordinates refuse to testify either in court or before a committee of Congress concerning matters of confidence between them and himself" (p. 143).

To which his final observation aptly applies:

"Thus far the adustment of the two powers to one another has been effected by the give-and-take of the political process and presumably it must continue to be" (p. 145).

In an extended study on Demands of Congressional Committees for Executive Papers,[2] Herman Wolkinson, an attorney in the Department of Justice, expressing his individual views, summarized his findings as follows:

"Our study of Presidential action shows that in every instance where a President has backed the refusal of a head of a department to divulge confidential information to either of the Houses of Congress, or their committees, the papers and the information requested were not furnished. The public interest was invariably given as the reason for withholding the information. William Howard Taft thus expressed himself on this subject, following his retirement from the Presidency and prior to his appointment as Chief Justice:

" 'The President is required by the Constitution from time to time to give to Congress information on the state of the Union, and to recommend for its consideration such measures as he shall judge necessary and expedient, but this does not enable Congress or either House of Congress to elicit from him confidential information which he has acquired for the purpose of enabling him to discharge his constitutional duties, if he does not deem the disclosure of such information prudent or in the public interest.'

"Our study also shows that the head of a department is generally subject to the President's direction, and the President has the last word on the propriety of withholding the papers. Heads of departments are subject to the Constitution, to the laws passed by the Congress in pursuance of the Constitution, and to the directions of the President of the United States. They are not subject to any other directions. While they have frequently obeyed congressional demands, whether made by the use of subpena or otherwise, and have furnished papers and information to congressional committees, they have done so only in a spirit of comity and good will, and not because there has been an effective legal means to compel them to do so. Under the Constitution, heads of departments cannot be directed by a congressional committee in the exercise of their discretion concerning the propriety of furnishing papers" (pp. 104–105).

* * * * *

"The rule may be stated that the President and heads of departments are not bound to produce papers or to disclose information communicated to them, where, in their own judgment, the disclosure would, on public considerations, be inexpedient. The reason for the rule was succinctly stated by Judge Marshall in *Marbury* v. *Madison*, and has been reaffirmed in *Cunningham* v. *Neagle* and *Meyers* v. *United States*. It is as follows:

"By the Constitution, the President is invested with certain political powers. He may use his own discretion in executing those powers. He is accountable only to his country in his political character, and to his own conscience. To aid the President in performing his duties, he is authorized by law to appoint heads of the executive departments. They act by his authority; their acts are his acts. Questions which the Constitution and laws leave to the Executive, or which are in their nature political, are not for the courts to decide, and there is no power in the courts to control the President's discretion or decision with respect to such questions. Because of the intimate political relation between the President and the heads of departments, the same rule applies to them" (p. 106).

Attorney Wolkinson cited many historical cases illustrative of these findings, some of which are described elsewhere in this memorandum.

Discussing unsuccessful attempts of the Senate to get papers and documents from Presidents Cleveland and Theodore Roosevelt, Attorney Wolkinson concluded with this quote:

"Professor Willoughby, in his well-known treatise, discusses the resolution and refers to the debates in Cleveland's and Roosevelt's administrations. He concludes that the constitutionality of the positions taken by Presidents Cleveland and Roosevelt would seem to be clear. Referring to the contests between Congress and the Presidents as to the right of the former to compel the furnishing to it of information, Willoughby states that it has been established that the President may exercise full discretion as to what information he will furnish and what he will withhold" (p. 131).

The study also includes instances in the administrations of Presidents Coolidge (the Mellon papers); Hoover (confidential telegrams leading up to the London Conference and the London Treaty); Roosevelt (FBI reports) and (refusal of Harold D. Smith to produce files in the Bureau of the Budget) and others; Truman (Pearl Harbor investigation)—in all of which the President substantially resisted efforts by committees of Congress to get information, papers, and documents from the executive branch. The chief ground for refusal is that such disclosures "are not in the public interest."

[2] Federal Bar Journal, vol. X, No. 2 (April 1949), No. 3 (July 1949), and No. 4 (October 1949).

FUTURE HEARINGS ON BILLS AMENDING THE TRADING WITH THE ENEMY ACT

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, there are pending before the Judiciary Committee on the Trading With the Enemy Act, six bills, all of a major character, relating in one way or another to the Government's vesting, holding, and disposition of alien property. They relate to World War I and World War II assets. They are known as S. 854, S. 995, S. 1147, S. 1405, S. 2226, and S. 2227. Some features of the bills are interrelated, so it is felt that in the interest of economy of time and a better overall consideration of the varied and complex problems involved, public hearings should be held simultaneously on all the bills sometime after the adjournment of this session of Congress.

Preliminary to full and complete consideration of, and hearings on, these bills, the subcommittee has held executive hearings and examination, and has secured and is securing information, statistics, and other data from officials in the Office of Alien Property. This effort will be pursued, because the subcommittee will require considerable background material prior to the actual commencement of the hearings. This will aid the committee in making an intelligent approach to a solution of the problems and in determining what the ultimate policy of the Government shall be.

While no specific date for the contemplated hearings has been fixed, I shall discuss with members of the subcommittee probable dates, so that when it is most suitable after adjournment, an agreeable date will be fixed.

I wish to serve notice on the Members of the Senate of the intention of the subcommittee to hold such hearings. Ample prior notice, public and private, will be given each Member of the Senate and to all other interested parties, claimants, and so forth, when the date of the hearings shall have been determined. Estimates vary, as conditions change and as time passes, as to the amount of alien property now controlled by the Government. The total ranges between a quarter and a half billion dollars. There are now 17 going concerns operated by the Office of Alien Property. Minority stock interests are owned in other going concerns.

It is the aim of the subcommittee to reconcile the differences in the pending

bills, and to submit to the Congress proposed legislation which should be in conformity with the traditional policy of the Government in its treatment of private property owned by friendly and former enemy aliens, as distinguished from enemy government property. Foremost among our considerations will be the aim to close the Office of Alien Property as a part of the normal functions of our Government. Such functions as forever holding alien property, conducting some of it in going concerns, and the interminable delay in the settlement of claims should—somewhere along the line—come to an end. To reconcile conflicting views within the Government itself and to establish a uniform policy which will expeditiously close our handling of all alien property, present many complex problems which the subcommittee wishes to solve.

ACTIVITIES AND ACCOMPLISHMENTS OF SUBCOMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE JUVENILE DELINQUENCY

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, a few days ago the life of the Subcommittee To Investigate and Study the Problems of Juvenile Delinquency—being a subcommittee of the Judiciary Committee—was extended until January 31, 1956. At this time I desire to submit a report on the activities and accomplishments of the subcommittee to date. The subcommittee is composed of the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS], the Senator from Texas [Mr. DANIEL], and myself. The report deals with the work of the committee, the hearings which have been held, and the bills which have been introduced. I ask unanimous consent that the report be printed in the body of the RECORD.

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

I wish it were possible for me to say that we have won the fight against juvenile delinquency. We have not. I can say, however, that, judging from editorial comment, we have dispelled much of the public apathy about the problem. We have succeeded in alerting an increasing number of our citizens to the condition in their own communities. We have been able to provide them with some of the answers to their problems through our studies and reports. As our studies continue, we shall be more and more able to provide them with the information necessary to wage a successful campaign against juvenile delinquency.

The enormity of the problems involving our youth is best illustrated by the fact that last year nearly half a million children came before judges in our juvenile courts. This was a 10-percent rise in only 1 year.

This means that approximately 1,500,000 children came into conflict with the law in 1954, since it is reliably estimated that only 1 in three delinquents who have contact with the police comes before the juvenile court. The other two are handled without the final step of seeing the judge.

Recently the FBI reported that children under 21 commit 72.6 percent of all auto thefts; 62.9 percent of all burglaries; 36.1 percent of all robberies; 36.3 percent of all reported rapes. And, of all those arrested for violation of the liquor laws, 1 in 4 is a juvenile.

These statistical evaluations bear out earlier findings of the subcommittee. In certain cities, for example, we learned that juvenile drinking is definitely on the upswing. Dyer Act violations by teen-agers has caused the subcommittee particular concern, since many of the stolen cars are driven across State lines and the youths then become involved in a Federal crime.

Perhaps the truest indication of the seriousness of the juvenile delinquency picture is found on the front pages of the newspapers all over the country. It is the rare community indeed, that has not had an alarming growth of juvenile crime on its own streets. These newspaper stories dramatize another FBI finding—the nature of juvenile crime is becoming more serious. An ever-increasing number of young people are being arrested for the more serious criminal act. Psychiatrists have told the subcommittee that the crime and horror comic books and the violent television and motion-picture shows probably siphon off some abnormal aggressive tendencies, thus leaving the cause to fester unnoticed beneath the surface, a cause which may suddenly explode into a violent crime. In other words, a childish prank can be transformed into a violent crime.

There are other indications of this more violent reaction by our children. Today juvenile gangs are terrorizing our major cities. Governors and mayors in many areas are becoming so concerned with this phase of the juvenile crime problem, that special commissions have been set up to help the police combat this menace.

The terrorism which erupts onto the front pages of our newspaper is but a small indication of what is simmering within many other youngsters. We only read about the most extreme cases. The delinquency on lower levels, the steps toward the larger crime, often go unreported.

It was against this background that the Senate first commissioned the subcommittee to look into the serious threat of juvenile delinquency. At that time three goals for the study were set:

First, we were to determine the extent and character, the causes, and contributing factors of juvenile delinquency.

Second, we were to focus public attention on the problem, and

Third, we were to judge the adequacy of Federal laws to deal with juvenile delinquency and prepare legislation where necessary.

To achieve these goals, the subcommittee sought the support of qualified citizens all over the country. Top men were loaned to us. A staff of professionals was recruited to conduct the investigation. Emphasis was placed upon finding both scholars who theorized about the problem, and social workers who actually went out and put the theory into operation.

Many professional organizations and universities are now assisting the subcommittee staff to interpret its findings.

The object of our first task was to find the pattern of delinquency in this country. Hearings were held in representative communities and testimony received from those dealing with the problem on a day-to-day basis. From these hearings emerged the basic pattern and specific manifestations of juvenile delinquency. Certain problems were found to be serious in all communities. Some were peculiar to rural areas; others to border areas.

With the extension of the subcommittee this year, we immediately set to work probing into the separate problems of this nation-wide pattern.

Our first investigation was into the relationship between youth employment and juvenile delinquency. We wanted to learn how much connection there was between the inability of some teenagers to find suitable employment and the growth in juvenile misconduct.

Special attention was given to the problem of the "drop-out" student, the child who leaves school at an early age and is not able to obtain a job. This child often drifts from job to job, then to no job, and, in too many cases, sets foot on the road to delinquency.

We discovered that a proper counseling service provided either by his school or by the United States Employment Service might have kept him in school or, if he was determined to leave, found him a job compatible with his personality and ability.

We were disturbed to learn that many children fail to have their best potentialities developed because their school did not have a proper counseling and guidance program.

As a result of the hearings, information on the situation was disseminated throughout the country and programs for meeting the need of the student and in keeping with restricted school budgets were highlighted.

Through proper cooperation and planning between the school and the United States Employment Service, existing facilities can be utilized more effectively than in the past.

In our forthcoming report on youth employment, we make several recommendations which we feel will go a long way toward solving this problem. What is needed is firm Federal leadership and direction for the smaller communities which have neither the money nor the time to conduct studies of their own.

Another phase of our work concerns the impact of the mass media on youth. The first topic within this area to receive consideration was the crime and horror comic book. As a result of the subcommittee's studies, the industry appointed its own code administrator and began serious efforts to clean out the books adjudged to have a bad influence on young people.

Television was the second topic for consideration in our mass media study. At our hearings, we heard from the leaders in the television industry, their critics, and those who have conducted scholarly surveys of the mass media.

The industry, brought face to face with the problem of its influence on juvenile conduct, is already making efforts to improve its programs so that a more beneficial diet will be presented to the child turning to television for entertainment.

We asked the television broadcasters to adhere more closely to their code. We pointed out to them that many violations of their own code are occurring which could have detrimental effect on children. We then asked those not belonging to the Radio and Television Code to join, so that a united front could be presented for better programing. We were also especially interested in having those who produce films for television come under some sort of industry regulation. At present they are subject to no restrictions. Our full television report will be released in a few weeks.

In Los Angeles, we heard from those engaged in motion-picture production. This study was, in reality, an extension of our television study, for the basic principles applying to television also apply to motion pictures.

We also wanted to take a closer look at the Hollywood advertising code, which seems to have been administered far too laxly in the last few years. The predominance of crime, horror, violence, and sex portrayed in film advertisements not only transgresses upon good taste, but also constitutes a genuinely harmful influence on young people.

Both the motion-picture producers and the advertisers have finely worded codes, but too often these codes are violated. When they are violated, so are the minds and sensibilities of our children.

The predominance of brutality in both movies and television is making our Nation's youth insensitive to human suffering. They are becoming so accustomed to an overwhelming amount of crime and violence that death and pain are becoming meaningless.

In studying the mass media, we started from the very proper premise that our society frowns on censorship. We believed then, and we believe now, that American industry can so regulate itself by voluntary codes that Government control in this field should never be necessary.

Now that the industry has been presented with the very revealing facts of its influence on the mores of this country, I am sure they will be more selective in their programing. It is certainly to be hoped that the industry will police itself and not force the Federal Government to intervene.

One of the most shocking of our recent investigations revealed the extent to which pornography was reaching even our very young children, and the terrible influence such filth was having on their conduct.

After our hearings in New York, we estimated that the traffic in erotic photographs, illustrated playing cards, phonograph records, movies, slides, illustrated books and pamphlets, totaled $3 to $4 million a year.

Following our hearings in Los Angeles, however, we now believe that our original estimate was far too low. There are indications that the real traffic in pornography may run higher than half a billion dollars annually.

From testimony received by us, we know that this pornography is reaching the hands of children. In many instances, children are using their lunch and allowance money to pay for this filth.

These thoroughly nasty materials portray the abnormal as normal. They are sold to children by adults. Psychiatrists told us that much of the pornography was deliberately geared to the young and sexually inquisitive mind.

The perversion of the individuals who produce this material was brought home to us with startling emphasis when we learned that they no longer rely solely upon adults to participate in the scenes involving sex which they record on motion-picture film and still photographs. Teen-agers are being enticed into participating as well, led on, in many cases, by unscrupulous adults exploiting their innocence. In one extreme case, children as young as 4 had participated in abnormal sexual conduct before the camera. This happened within a few miles of this Chamber.

Our investigators are still at work on this situation. We have already compiled a list of pornographers unearthed by our hearings and have sent it to police chiefs through the country. As a result, raids were staged in several cities. For example, in Houston, and Minneapolis, large collections of pornographic materials were seized. In both cases, local police chiefs had followed through on specific leads furnished them by our investigators. Testimony by these particular pornographers implicates witnesses who used the fifth amendment before our subcommittee in New York.

Much of the pornography business operates because of loopholes in the Federal law. Now, thanks to the action of Congress, some of the loopholes have been closed. The subcommittee has proposed additional legislation to further tighten the Federal grip on the purveyors of filth to our children.

Delinquency among Indian children is another concern of the subcommittee. Our hearings in the Dakotas last year highlighted the shame of this Nation in the lack of care for its American Indian population. In our interim report, we made strong recommendations for assistance to these tribes. Action on these proposals will alleviate some of the terrible conditions on the Indian reservations. I am pleased that some of our recommendations resulted in executive action to improve certain situations.

This year the subcommittee studied Indian delinquency in the Southwest. While the problem there was a little less strained than in other parts of the country, it was, nevertheless, worse than it should be.

The causes of delinquency there were similar to the causes in other parts of the country—poor housing, poor schooling, poor job facilities.

You simply cannot decently raise a child in the squalor that characterizes some of our Indian reservations. Here is one area where the Federal Government can lead the fight against juvenile delinquency, for the reservations are properly the concern of the Congress.

In March, we held hearings that resulted in the restoration of law and order on the Fort Totten Reservation. A legal controversy had left this reservation without law enforcement. Without this law enforcement, we could not even begin to discuss control of juvenile delinquency.

As an aftermath of this hearing, we appeared before the Appropriations Committee and assisted the Indian Bureau in presenting its arguments for funds necessary to carry out our recommendations.

Much of today's juvenile delinquency must eventually be controlled on the local level. But in our studies, we have found many areas where the Federal Government can directly contribute to the reduction of such delinquency in this country. In all, the subcommittee has turned over to the Congress 19 measures which we feel will alleviate the pressure of juvenile crime. Many other recommendations have yet to be translated into enforcible legislation.

One of the most important measures to come from the subcommittee is S. 728 which I believe will soon be favorably presented to the Senate by the Labor Committee. Under provisions of S. 728, the Federal Government would provide leadership for a coordinated nationwide attack on juvenile delinquency.

This bill will provide the States with funds to initiate new programs for delinquency control and also provide money for training essential personnel skilled in the handling of children's problems. Trained personnel is vitally needed. Almost every community in the Nation lacks the trained people needed to effectively curb juvenile delinquency.

Under S. 959, another measure introduced by the subcommittee, minors will be prevented from crossing the border into areas where narcotics and pornographic materials are sold, and where prostitution does not come under strict control.

The minor will not be able to leave the country without the permission of his parents. This legislation was requested at our hearings in the Southwest, and many officials feel that easy passage across the border into some areas can lead to narcotic addiction and exposure to improper attitudes on sex.

When the subcommittee introduced six bills for correcting delinquency facilities in the District of Columbia, they were hailed by the local press.

Criticism of delinquency control in the District has come from States as far away as Mississippi. The Federal Government has a definite responsibility in correcting this situation, and also has a marvelous chance to demonstrate to the rest of the Nation what can be done to protect our youngsters.

As I have pointed out, our work has only been partially completed. Much important work remains to be done.

In at least 13 major areas, we must conduct further investigations, and this is a minimum figure.

1. We must go back and see if the comic book code is functioning properly.

2. Each year 200,000 children run away from home. Many end up in jail or are sentenced to institutions on charges of vagarancy. This is a serious problem area and needs immediate Federal attention and study.

3. A study of what constitutes a good juvenile court system is needed. The subcommittee feels that the Federal Government should take leadership in establishing a proper juvenile court system. The Federal court system should adopt procedures that can serve as an example for the rest of the Nation. Today the Federal system lags far behind many communities.

It is hoped that out of our hearings will come some idea of how a juvenile court can be effectively run, the size of a staff relative to the cases handled, how much time the court should spend in social study of the youthful offender before the trial, the adequacy of probation supervision, the availability of clinical services and the extent to which they are used, and the professional qualifications needed by judge and staff.

4. A study of the causes for narcotic addiction among minors must be made.

Last year the ready availability of evidence on this topic startled our subcommittee. In California, a chief probation officer frankly reported that the use of narcotics by teen-agers was on the increase. In El Paso, Tex., one reliable witness boasted that he could drive around in his car and find 15 or 20 children under the influence of narcotics. Testimony in Denver, Colo., revealed that among 1 section of the population, 80 to 90 percent of the teen-agers had used marihuana at least occasionally.

The superintendent of the Iowa State Training School for Girls testified that 25 percent of the girls coming into her institution had used marihuana.

One responsible organization estimated that 7,500 youngsters in 1 city alone were under addiction to narcotics.

The most disheartening discovery of our prehearing study is that many youngsters take to narcotics just for the thrill. Once addicted, the road back is long and the cure is uncertain. For instance, only 2 cities in the United States have followup centers for the care of cured narcotic addicts, yet some estimates of recurrence run as high as 99 percent.

5. The recruitment of juvenile delinquents for the armed services presents a series of problems based upon, (1) the increasingly trying demands presented by the volume of juvenile delinquents available for military service; (2) the negative impact that they are believed to have upon service efficiency and discipline; and (3) the expense and confusion attendant to their enlistment and subsequent discharge under the existing conflicts of applicable laws.

This does not mean that the majority of juvenile delinquents may not make good soldiers, sailors, or airmen. It does mean that we have not yet learned how to predict their success or failure in service.

The subcommittee would like to explore what the Department of Defense is doing to develop screening techniques and rehabilitative processes that will be equitable and effective.

6. Delinquency is a problem with which many people, groups, and agencies are concerned. During subcommittee hearings, it has been forcefully brought home time and time again that there is all too often a decided lack of coordination and cooperation among the agencies trying to do the job. And this is true both nationally and in local communities. Unless all efforts are brought into focus, there is bound to be duplication of effort. Worse yet, unless all of these good people and organizations work together, certain aspects of the problem are bound to be neglected or overlooked. It is anticipated

that subcommittee hearings on this topic will result in increased cooperation of these groups. The subcommittee already has helped to establish one nationwide group of civic, fraternal, and veterans organizations to coordinate their activities on juvenile delinquency.

7. Delinquency in rural areas has grown almost twice as quickly as the delinquency in the urban areas. Juvenile gangs, once thought of as merely a big-city problem, has now become a problem, too. It is essential that the subcommittee devote time to a study of delinquency in rural areas.

8. Treatment services and facilities, including detention homes and after-care services, is one area in urgent need of attention. Some people think placing a child behind four walls for a length of time is a cure for delinquency. This is just not so. Too often exactly the opposite happens—the child becomes a hardened criminal.

Every year over 100,000 children are confined in common jails. They are thrown in with hardened criminals and come under their influence for varying lengths of time. Other youngsters are confined in institutions wholely inadequate for rehabilitation. Those institutions geared to meet this problem are sorely overtaxed.

To complicate this already complex problem, there is a severe lack of trained personnel to care for the youngsters.

The lack of uniformity of professional conviction among groups that contribute to the thinking in this field leads to indecision and lack of support on the part of the public and its legislators. This slows down progress in meeting the problem. Federal investigation and assistance is needed to clear away differences and to suggest adequate means of meeting this problem with all available resources.

Specifically the subcommittee plans to:

(a) Study the Federal probation system and Federal youth-correction institutions, with an eye toward having the Federal Government provide the example for State institutions.

(b) Study State institutional handling of minors and detention facilities used by them for minors.

(c) Explore the possibility of establishing Federal forestry camps on a cooperative basis with the States.

(d) Study the type of schooling given in these institutions.

(e) Investigate the entire unexplored area of treatment and responsibility for seriously disturbed children.

9. Another problem needing immediate attention is that of mental health. The emotionally disturbed child whose problems are noted early enough can often be saved from a fearful life of crime and delinquency if treatment is promptly available. All too often, even where there are sufficient mental health facilities, treatment is often available only after months and months of waiting.

This attention to the mental health condition falls under our study of the handicapped, since we define a handicapped person as one who has developed mental problems from a physical impairment or disability. The handicap is the combined physical impairment and the psychological reactions to the impairment as it affects the total personality of the child.

Our hearings may result in legislation that that will enable two or more States to share the responsibility and the cost of a joint facility for handling these cases. The initial cost of such an institution often prohibits one State from going it alone.

10. An increasing number of serious crimes are being committed by the youthful offender—the youngster over the age of jurisdiction by the juvenile court, but still under 21.

The subcommittee hopes to conduct hearings on the extent of involvement in crime of youths between 18 and 21 years of age, and to investigate the detention facilities used on both the State and Federal level for these minors. The entire situation of the youthful offender must come under serious study if we are to reduce crime in this country and prepare all our youngsters for good citizenship.

11. Preliminary reports indicate that in a slum area, as many as 20 percent of the juvenile population gets into trouble with the police.

The subcommittee would like to investigate the adequacy of the Federal housing program in slum areas and the effect of slum areas on juvenile delinquency, in such cities as Chicago, Philadelphia, Pittsburgh, and New York.

12. Great concern to the subcommittee is the tremendous gap between the number of dollars needed for, and the number of dollars allotted to, family welfare work, education, psychiatric treatment and research, police court and probation work.

The subcommittee proposes an overall evaluation of Federal programs in the fields of employment, education, social service, law enforcement, courts, detention, and recreation. Coordination is needed so that the small amount of money devoted to this work is effectively used.

13. I have consistently said that the first line of defense against juvenile delinquency is the school. And I am not alone in my contention. Almost every authority agrees that the school can and must play a major role in juvenile delinquency prevention.

But how can the overloaded, overworked schoolteacher devote her time for personal attention to a child who is obviously headed toward delinquency?

For instance, a child who falls behind in his reading cannot receive the necessary corrective attention from the teacher. The child soon becomes frustrated and dissatisfied. He is ridiculed by his classmates. He acts up in class, so he can be the best in something, even if it is at being the worst-behaved boy in the room. Later he joins a streetcorner gang of boys for whom school has also lost its attention-holding possibilities. And soon the child is in serious trouble. This is only one of the small factors that develop within the school that can lead to delinquency.

Thus the subcommittee will investigate to what extent overcrowded and undermanned schools are actually a contributing cause to juvenile delinquency.

The main areas of consideration would be:

1. Schools which reduce delinquency.
2. Schools which may prevent delinquency.
3. How schools deal with delinquent behavior that is encountered within their walls.

The complex problem of juvenile crime in this country is not the subject for quick, piecemeal examination. Our findings are being added to the literature available on the problem and a growing number of students of juvenile delinquency are turning to the studies of the subcommittee as the only centralized source of information on the problem.

We would not do justice either to our assignment or to the Congress unless our studies were conducted in a sound, scholarly fashion. The subcommittee's approach to its work justifies our findings taking their rightful place beside the other important literature in a field of deep concern to all Americans.

Indications of the subcommittee's growing prestige is the fact that requests have come to us from Europe and Asia seeking our suggestions on juvenile delinquency. Our staff has assisted officials of Canada, New Zealand, Australia, England, and the Netherlands in helping to solve problems of delinquency. Our recommendations have received serious consideration by these authorities, just as our recommendations have received serious consideration from those active in the field in this country.

The demand for our earlier reports became so great that it was necessary for us to appeal to the Congress for an additional grant in order to reprint our major studies. Even this reprinting has not satisfied the demand, as many of you gentlemen can testify, for nearly every Member of Congress has had occasion to write to the subcommittee to request materials on this subject for their constituents.

I want to thank all Members of the Congress for their attention to the problem of juvenile delinquency. Through you, the subcommittee has been able to furnish its recommendations into the hands of the people who can extend our work on the problem to every city in the Nation.

I have spoken only briefly about the vast amount of work being done by the subcommittee. But once we know the causes of juvenile delinquency, we can prescribe some of the remedies. Already we have been able to suggest Federal remedies to alleviate some of the more outward symptoms of this national sickness.

IMPORTANCE OF THE NORMAL, ORDINARY COURSE OF THINGS

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, one of the problems in connection with news reports is that they tend to concentrate on the unusual, the ofttimes tragic, the dangerous, the fatal, the criminal, and other unfortunate developments.

To keep our perspective, it is important to remember that the great mass of what goes on in the world is not reported, because it is not by definition news. It concerns the regular, the normal, the ordinary, the pleasant course of life.

In the January 1955 issue of the noted magazine Changing Times, published by Mr. W. M. Kiplinger, there was a most excellent article regarding the normal, the ordinary course of things. It gives us a very refreshing and renewed appreciation that the world is in pretty good shape, after all; and that our country and people are in very excellent shape.

The article, witty and brief, makes as excellent reading now as it did then, and I commend it not only for the facts which it presents, but for the wholesome, optimistic, cheerful perspective it gets across.

I ask unanimous consent that it 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:

GOOD THINGS HAPPEN TOO

There are many, many things to be grateful for, but all too often only the gloomy and tragic news rates a banner headline and bold type. To correct this situation, here are some statistics that reflect the sunnier side of life in the United States of America.

There are 162,922,000 Americans who are not members of the Communist Party.

At least 162,944,424 people have not been frightened by seeing flying saucers, piloted by little green men, hurtle through the air.

Some 37,011,460 couples will stay more or less happily married during the year.

On the average, there are 63,868,000 people working to bring home the bacon.

The Internal Revenue Service will find that 43,846,154 income-tax returns for the year 1954 will be filed correctly.

Last year the scheduled airlines safely carried passengers 18,902,134,841 miles in the United States and possessions.

The railroads safely carried passengers 31,674,931,200 miles last year.

Of the 17,824,000 little boys in the country who are under the age of 10, only 6 or possibly 7 will have to go through the terrible ordeal of being President of the United States. And of the 17,100,000 little girls who are in the same age group, only 6 or possibly 7 can look forward to being first ladies of the land.

Some 162,717,890 persons will not die of cancer in 1955.

And 162,380,580 persons will be safe from fatal heart attacks.

About 629,000,000 acres of forest land will not be set on fire by careless smokers and picnic goers this year.

Approximately 33,293,000 children will sit at dinner tables every evening and remind their parents that they really are learning something at school.

Most of the time, 15,720,000 organized workers are not on strike.

P. S.: There are 83 countries in the world that have not discovered the secret of the hydrogen bomb.

THE CONSTITUTION OF THE HARVARD NEW CONSERVATIVE CLUB

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the body of the RECORD an excerpt from the constitution of the Harvard New Conservative Club. It is indeed heartwarming to one who prides himself upon being called a conservative that this great seat of learning in the United States is now nurturing conservatism among its young men. I am happy to offer for the RECORD and for the perusal of all Americans who read the RECORD this very interesting excerpt from the constitution of that new club.

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

THE CONSTITUTION OF THE HARVARD NEW CONSERVATIVE CLUB

ARTICLE II

Purpose

The purpose of this club shall be to acquire and disseminate information on conservatism and express the conservative viewpoint to the Harvard community. The club believes that viewpoint to be:

1. That the mind and heart of man dwells within the framework of divine law.

2. That society owes the individual the safeguarding of certain rights, which are best preserved by firm limitations upon governmental authority.

3. That the individual owes society certain duties, which are best guaranteed by respect for properly constituted authority.

4. That among the chief means of regulating the balance between society and the individual is a judicial system, the forms and decisions of which are scrupulously observed.

5. That provision for permitting diversity of opinion is indispensable to freedom of the individual, and therefore, to true conservatism.

6. That the right to private property is fundamental to a truly free society, which idea is best expressed today by the principles of free enterprise.

7. That the experience of history is a valuable guide for present action; and consequently, that in meeting new problems, a society should retain the spirit of the traditions and institutions which it has evolved, adapting them rather than experimenting anew, and discarding them only for grave cause.

8. That any form of totalitarianism or despotism is a complete negation of the freedom of conservatism.

9. And in summary, that moderation is the essential expression of conservatism; that positions on either the extreme right or the extreme left are incompatible with true conservatism.

CONSTRUCTION OF CERTAIN PUBLIC WORKS ON THE MISSISSIPPI RIVER

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1104, Senate bill 56.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (S. 56) authorizing the construction of certain public works on the Mississippi River for the protection of St. Louis, Mo.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Montana.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Public Works with amendments, in line 5, after the word "in", to strike out "his report dated July 26, 1954" and insert "Senate Document Numbered 57, Eighty-fourth Congress", and in line 7, after the word "of", to strike out "$112,880,000" and insert "$123,020,000", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the project for flood protection at St. Louis, Mo., is hereby authorized substantially as recommended by the Chief of Engineers in Senate Document No. 57, 84th Congress, at an estimated cost of $123,020,000.

SEC. 2. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this act.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, yesterday this bill was reached on the call of the calendar, and because of the fact that a considerable sum of money was involved, the distinguished Senator from Connecticut [Mr. PURTELL] objected to the consideration of the bill on the call of the calendar. He assured me that he had no objection to the bill itself. As I understand, there is no objection to the bill from any source.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD at this point a statement which I made before the Committee on Public Works. The bill is unanimously approved by all members of the Committee on Public Works, and I urge its passage at this time.

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

STATEMENT OF SENATOR SYMINGTON BEFORE SENATE PUBLIC WORKS SUBCOMMITTEE ON RIVERS AND HARBORS, JULY 20, 1955

Mr. Chairman, I appreciate very much the courtesy of this committee in granting a hearing to consider authorization of the St. Louis flood protection project.

Sixteen outstanding citizens of that great community, headed by our nationally known mayor, Raymond Tucker, are with my distinguished senior colleague and myself this morning to present this whole problem to the committee.

St. Louis is the Nation's eighth largest city. It is also the only major city on a navigable stream which has no flood protection.

Flood stage at St. Louis is 30 feet.

Since 1861, when the gauge was established, flood stage has been exceeded in 30 different years.

In 1947, the river reached a crest of 40.2 feet, flooding portions of the city for nearly 2 months.

In 1951, the flood crest was 40.16 feet, causing many millions of dollars of property damage.

When the flood stage reaches 35 feet there is not only extensive destruction of buildings, transportation facilities, and public utilities, but also a loss of industrial production, wages, and manufactured goods.

At a flood stage of 42 feet, the city's entire water supply would be cut off.

A 47-foot flood would cause estimated damage of approximately $186 million. This is considerably greater than the total cost of the flood control project.

In 1953, the Congress recognized these facts and authorized a study of the entire situation.

On April 29, 1954, the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors approved the plan submitted by the district engineers.

The plan has also been approved by the Honorable Phil M. Donnelly, Governor of Missouri.

On May 26, 1955, the residents of St. Louis voted overwhelmingly in favor of a bond proposal which included $7,547,000—the local funds required for the flood protection project.

On June 15, 1955, the Bureau of the Budget approved authorization of the project.

The approved plan includes two reaches, Nos. 3 and 4.

Reach No. 3 would consist of 20,207 feet of earth levees and 20,261 feet of concrete flood walls. The total first cost of this part of the project would be $79,508,000.

Reach No. 4 would consist of 13,233 feet of levees and 12,604 feet of flood walls. Total cost would be $51,479,000.

When completed these projects will not only reduce or eliminate flood damages, but also will make possible improved sanitation and health conditions in areas now subject to constant flooding; and will protect railroad facilities and industrial development in areas now unused because of possible flooding.

The plan offered by the Army engineers will provide economic benefits far in excess of the estimated cost.

In view of its importance and the benefits to be derived, in order that a future major flood disaster may be averted, I respectfully urge that this committee approve the authorization of the St. Louis flood protection project.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendments.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

RESERVE FORCES ACT OF 1955—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 amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 7000) to provide for strengthening of the Reserve Forces, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the report.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield in order that I may suggest the absence of a quorum?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield for that purpose.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

The report will be read for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read the report.

(For conference report, see House proceedings of July 25, 1955, pp. 11397–11401, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the report?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I desire to make a very brief statement on the conference report. The report deals with the strengthening of the Active Reserve Forces of the United States, both as to number and also the level of training. The measure is a very important part of the legislative program submitted to Congress by the President of the United States.

I may say at the outset that the conference report was signed by every member of the conference, on both sides.

One of the principal issues involved in the conference was whether Congress should impose upon men who have served in the Armed Forces the obligation for service in the Ready Reserve, with the requirement that they participate in not less than 48 drill periods each year and go to camp for not more than 17 days, or an equivalent program.

With respect to that issue, the conferees agreed to the Senate amendment in part, and made the obligatory provisions for Reserve service apply to those who enter the Armed Forces after the approval of the act.

The bill as passed by the Senate contained a provision for the payment of a monetary bonus to prior servicemen enlisting in the Reserves during the 2-year period before the effects of the compulsory features would become apparent, in order to induce selected prior servicemen to participate in the Ready Reserve program.

That monetary bonus feature was dropped in the conference, and a substitute was added in the nature of a time bonus.

This substitute permits men who have performed 12 months of active duty, and who are therefore fully trained, to apply for a period of duty with the Ready Reserve, with obligatory participation in drill programs and annual active duty training for a period which, when added to the period of active service, shall total 4 years. If they are accepted, they are to be released from active duty with the regular establishment, and upon termination of the prescribed period of satisfactory duty in the Ready Reserve they are eligible for transfer to the Standby Reserve.

They thus receive a reduction from the total amount of Ready Reserve service normally required of those inducted or enlisted in the armed services under present law.

There is a limitation of 150,000 men each year who can be accepted during the next 2 years under this early-release program.

Another inducement is afforded by the conference substitute providing that any man, after the enactment of the act, who concludes his tour of duty with the Regular Establishment, may discharge his Ready Reserve obligation by 1 year of service in the participating Ready Reserve. This provision likewise terminates 2 years after the enactment of the act, and it is limited to 200,000 applicants each year.

There was another difference between the two bills. The Senate amendment retained the total active-duty plus Reserve-duty obligation of 8 years now in present law. Three years of the eight could have been in the Standby Reserve for those participating in active programs, but there was no obligation to participate in such programs, with weekly drills and an annual tour of active duty of not to exceed 17 days.

This issue was settled by letting the 8-year provision continue to apply to all those who entered the service prior to the enactment of the act, but to reduce this 8-year obligation to 6 years for those who come in after the enactment of the act. That seemed to be a fair decision, inasmuch as those who come in after the enactment of the act have a responsibility for 5 years of total active duty or active participation in Ready Reserve training programs.

I believe that covers the principal issue involved in the bill.

I move the adoption of the conference report.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I wish to speak in opposition to the adoption of the conference report. I realize only too well that the Senate passed the bill last week by a vote of 83 to 1, and that I was the only Senator who voted against it. The distinguished Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] was paired against the bill.

I do not believe that the conference report is any better than the original bill which was passed by the Senate. Naturally, I was very much pleased to note that on yesterday 78 Members of the House also voted against the conference report. I was particularly pleased to learn that the distinguished Representative from North Dakota, Mr. USHER BURDICK, who has been in Congress for 20 years, and is pretty well informed as to what takes place in Washington, also voted against the bill.

This morning the Washington Post and Times Herald, on the front page, under the heading Compulsory Home Guard, analyzes the bill, and confirms many of the things I believe wrong with the bill.

The analysis in the Washington Post and Times Herald reads:

HIGHLIGHTS OF THE COMPROMISE

Every man drafted after enactment of the measure would spend 2 years on active duty and 3 years in the Ready Reserve.

A ready reservist must attend each year 48 weekly drills and a 17-day field training period, or 30 days of field training. Failure to do so would subject him to recall into active service under penalty of court-martial.

All of us will agree that is pretty drastic.

The conference report further provides, reading from the article published in the Washington Post and Times Herald:

The President may permit up to 250,000 youths to join the Reserves directly if they are not yet 18½ years of age. They would be draft-free if they remained in the Reserves until they are 28 or complete 3 to 6 months of active training and 8 years of Reserve duty.

In other words, Mr. President, it simply means, in my opinion, that a young man graduating from high school or college will be unable to plan his future according to the custom in the United States.

Reading further from the newspaper article:

The President may summon 1 million ready reservists into action in an emergency without prior congressional approval.

Older men with critical skills would be allowed to enlist in the Reserve, take 6 months of active training, and then be transferred to the Standby Reserve.

The bill also makes provision for men already in the military service who want to volunteer for Reserve duty.

Mr. President, after having voted as I did on the bill the other day, I am particularly pleased to receive a telegram from the President of the Farmers Union of the State of North Dakota, which confirms what was said upon the floor with reference to my position. As I say, Mr. President, I received this telegram after I voted against the measure. The telegram is as follows:

DEAR SENATOR LANGER: The North Dakota Farmers Union is unalterably opposed to all of the compulsory and universal features of the Compulsory Military Training and Compulsory Reserve Bill, H. R. 7000.

The provisions of this bill are bad for the farm families in North Dakota—

I might add, it is just as bad for the farm families in Montana. I believe that is one reason why the distinguished Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] was paired against the bill—

whose livelihood and general welfare necessitate the successful and efficient operation of their farms. Forty-eight drill periods annually, coupled with active duty training for 17 days annually, would seriously interfere with farm work and farm responsibilities. You know that in North Dakota farm operators reside on farms which are far beyond the bounds of reasonable commuting distance to points where weekly drill periods would be held.

That also applies to other States of the Northwest, Minnesota, North Dakota, South Dakota, Montana, Idaho, and in my opinion, to many more of the States which make up the so-called breadbasket of the world.

The telegram continues as follows:

Food and fiber are the most powerful weapons we have in the world today to win the battle for men's minds. Crop failure in Russia and floods in China multiply the importance of our own food reserves in a hungry world. The bill would accomplish

the exact reverse of what we need most to wage peace.

Our Nation needs strong Reserve forces. But, if you want a closely knit and well-trained force composed of men who are civilians for all but a few hours a week, they've got to be men who want to do what they are doing. We do not need, and we do not want, a compulsory Reserve force in the United States.

I repeat, Mr. President, that during the entire history of this country, even though we won two world wars, and the war in Korea, now, when we are talking about peace and trying to tell the Eastern World that we are for peace, we have, for the first time, this situation.

I continue reading from the telegram:

We are convinced that a volunteer Reserve and National Guard with adequate incentive and an attractive program is better than compulsion to fulfill national security objectives.

In this connection, Mr. President, I invite the attention of the Senate to the recommendations made by the Farmers Union of the State of North Dakota:

We recommend:

First, strong voluntary Regular Armed Forces buttressed when necessary by Selective Service.

Second, more support and attention given to our present Reserve components, through improved training facilities, increased pay for volunteer duty, with more training facilities and compensation for mechanical and vocational skills necessary in modern mechanized warfare.

England has learned from vastly more experience than we have had in civil defense that military personnel are inadequate for civil defense. Civil defense personnel in England are a specially trained service. We do not regard the provision in H. R. 7000 to require up to 2,900,000 young men to undergo Active and Reserve obligations for a period of from 6 to 11 years to be adequate either for military or civil defense.

We are opposed to the vast cost of the program which H. R. 7000 would establish as a waste of money. We believe our recommendations would give greater security for much less cost.

It is my understanding that it will cost this Nation $3 billion a year. I read further:

We are opposed now, as we have been in the past, to compulsory peacetime military training and particularly opposed to compulsory universal military training in time of peace. We oppose the provisions of this bill which give power to the President and to the Secretary of Defense to call military Reserves into service, and to assign volunteers to military service without action by Congress.

It is my opinion, Mr. President, that when the Constitution was adopted the warmaking powers were left to the Congress of the United States; it is the duty of the Congress to consider carefully such a measure as this. When I analyzed the bill I was unalterably opposed to it.

The telegram continues:

The Air Force, the Navy, and the Marine Corps all depend on voluntary enlistments and do not ask for conscription. Only the Army is demanding the passage of H. R. 7000, and with its compulsory peacetime features. We strongly advocate incentives for voluntary service in the Army similar to the incentives in the other three services.

As H. R. 7000 stands now, no provision is made to eliminate discrimination because of race, creed, or national origin.

That was well expressed by the distinguished Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN].

Reading further:

We urge an amendment to H. R. 7000 prohibiting discrimination in any Reserve or volunteer organizations created by the bill.

We also urge you to consider an amendment to H. R. 7000 which would require an individual to have completed his high-school education or have reached his 19th birthday before enlistment. Such a provision would guarantee a high level of intelligence among members of the Armed Forces. Further, this would guarantee that the greatest number of enlistees will have at least a basic education before interruption of their education. The facts are that a high percentage of young men, whose education is interrupted by military service, will never return to the classroom.

Sincerely yours,

NORTH DAKOTA FARMERS UNION,
GLENN J. TALBOTT, *President*.

I might add that since the passage of the bill, my friend and colleague, the junior Senator from Oregon [Mr. NEUBERGER], has introduced a bill which, I think, is very much superior to the conference report. It is a bill which I joined in sponsoring, because I believed it would be more satisfactory to the people of the United States. I compliment the junior Senator from Oregon for having introduced it.

I am not certain that there will be a yea and nay vote on the conference report. In view of the fact that there may not be one, I wish to state once more that I am unalterably opposed to the enactment of this measure and am opposed to the adoption of the conference report.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I shall not detain the Senate except to say that I commend the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services, who has devoted so much care, time, and effort to working out the difference between the Senate and the House on this very important bill.

I agree with the conference report and hope that it may be adopted. While, in some respects, it does not go as far as we should like to have it go, I trust that it will be administratively feasible and will be of great assistance in building up a Ready Reserve.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Massachusetts for his kind commendation. Without his constant, unflagging assistance, it would not have been possible to have secured a bill in the form in which it is now before the Senate. There has been no partisanship in the approach which we have made to the preparation of the bill in the Senate Committee on Armed Services.

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

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I express my appreciation to the able chairman of the Committee on Armed Services, to the ranking minority member [Mr. SALTONSTALL], and to all the other members of the committee. This has been one of the most difficult problems to solve. I think an excellent job has been done. I believe that as a result it will be possible to establish a program which will enable the young man to plan his future, so far as his training and schooling are concerned. Those factors have been great weaknesses in our program thus far.

I think an excellent bill has been prepared, and that the committee is to be commended.

Mr. RUSSELL. I thank the Senator from Alabama.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Georgia yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. GORE. I congratulate the able junior Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] and his committee upon the congressional leadership which they have provided. In this era, when so much dependence is placed upon the recommendations of the executive, it is heartening to see a display of statesmanship such as that which has been shown by the junior Senator from Georgia and his committee. They have provided, in a legislative matter, with respect to a policy which affects all the American people, the touch of representative government, that particular part of representative government which is closest to the people. I congratulate the junior Senator from Georgia.

Mr. RUSSELL. I am grateful to the distinguished Senator from Tennessee. Whether the committee and Congress have met their responsibilities in this matter, only time will tell. But under the Constitution, the responsibility very definitely is that of Congress to maintain and equip armies; it is not the responsibility of the executive branch of the Government.

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

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. NEUBERGER. I wish to comment briefly on the conference report. Such disagreement as I have is not exclusively with the conference report, which I believe probably represents a reasonable compromise between the two Houses of Congress, but is a general disagreement with H. R. 7000 itself.

I was among the 80 Senators who voted for the bill when it originally passed the Senate by a vote of 80 to 1, the senior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] being the only one to have voted in the negative. Since that time I have had an opportunity to study the 393 pages of hearings which resulted from the very exhaustive, thorough, and conscientious study which was made by the Senate committee under the chairmanship of the junior Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL].

Probably it is my fault that I did not read the hearings prior to the vote on the bill. However, I think it is a matter of record that the hearings were placed upon our desks at noon of the day when we voted upon the bill, so it would have been a superman task, if not an impossible one, to have studied them analytically during the afternoon when the bill was being debated.

Some of the things which I have read in the hearings have led me to believe that the establishment of a compulsory Reserve system at this time is not ad-

visable. To begin with, I cannot see the justification for establishing a compulsory Reserve system of this sort—or of any sort, let me add—when the Regular Army is being reduced in size by 25 percent. When the hearings on the bill opened, the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services pointed out that the compulsion in our Reserve system was necessary only to meet the demands of the Army. He indicated that compulsion was not necessary in order to meet the demands of the Marine Corps, the Navy, or the Air Force. If compulsion is necessary to meet the Reserve demands of the Army, I cannot understand the wisdom of the Pentagon in reducing the size of the Army by 25 percent.

Furthermore, the press has recently carried a statement by the Secretary of Defense that it is perhaps possible he and his associates will not use all the funds which were placed at the disposal of the Marine Corps by a very close yea-and-nay vote of the Senate some weeks ago on the amendment sponsored by the junior Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON]. I supported that amendment.

Moreover, I think that, to some extent, certainly, a moral issue is involved. Before I discuss that issue, I should like to amplify one statement which has been made by the senior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER]. In his very cogent and able remarks in opposition to the conference report, the Senator from North Dakota pointed out that I had recently risen in the Senate to say that I thought I had made a mistake in voting for the bill and had changed my position. I should like to say also that the record is clear that the junior Senator from Michigan [Mr. MCNAMARA], who is now occupying the Chair, also made some remarks in the Senate along the same line. I wish to have the RECORD show this, as we are considering the conference report.

I think a moral issue is at stake in the consideration of compulsory Reserve legislation. During the lifetime of many of the young men who will be called upon to serve in the compulsory Reserve, we have heard fine speeches about drafting money as well as men in the next war or the next military emergency. Today the United States is spending billions of dollars for defense. So far as the economy or the impact upon our fiscal system is concerned, it makes no difference whether a tank is used for war or defense. In a period in which there is no active war, the impact on profits is the same. At present, virtually all the well-known and strict limitations have been removed from armament profits.

I cited on the floor of the Senate recently a few of the things which have happened, and I wish to repeat some of them at this time for the RECORD.

With respect to the profits of the companies which are engaged in producing the weapons which the boys who will enter the compulsory Reserve will handle, in 1945, at the end of World War II, the average value of the 8 leading aircraft stocks had risen about 30 percent over their prewar level. The excess-profits tax expired on December 31, 1953. The average value of those 8 stocks for 1954 was 371.8 percent of prewar value. Last February, when the danger of war in the Pacific seemed high, the average value reached 617.8 percent of prewar value.

Among the greatest suppliers of the Government in connection with defense expenditures is General Electric, for example, whose stock has risen from a value of $37–$50 in 1945 to a high equivalent to $144 in 1954—after the excess-profits tax expired. I could continue to cite many other instances.

Certainly at this time we do not have a situation when there is equality of sacrifice, a theme about which we have talked in the United States for many years.

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

Mr. NEUBERGER. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. The Senator may remember that I offered an amendment providing for the drafting of profits or the drafting of money, and stated that if our boys were to be drafted, then money should be drafted. The amendment was rejected on the floor of the Senate.

Mr. NEUBERGER. The distinguished Senator from North Dakota refers to the amendment which he submitted on the evening the Senate voted on the Reserve bill, does he not?

Mr. LANGER. That is correct.

Mr. NEUBERGER. I believe the amendment was ruled out on a point of order.

Mr. LANGER. No. The Senate voted on the amendment. An attempt was made to rule out the amendment, but the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY] stated it was proper to vote on it, and the Senate accepted his view. We tried to get the yeas and nays ordered on the amendment, but could not, and the amendment was defeated by voice vote. I remember my distinguished friend from Oregon was one who voted for it.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Yes. I believe I took the opportunity to say that if I had had a chance to record my vote it would have been in favor of the amendment offered by the distinguished Senator from North Dakota. I thank the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. President, equality of sacrifice between the boys in the service, on the one hand, and the manufacturers of armaments, aircraft, and other weapons, on the other hand, does not exist in the United States today. Every time one looks at the financial pages of the New York Times, the Wall Street Journal, or other important papers, he will find that the profits of companies selling to the Armed Forces petroleum, aircraft, tanks, electronic equipment, or anything else are soaring to new heights. Yet at the very time that is occurring we are whittling down and curtailing the benefits which were formerly provided for the boys in service.

I think it is quite significant that in January of this year the administration let expire the schooling privileges provided in the GI bill of rights, which was the heart of the law and the feature that meant most to the boys in the Armed Forces. If there was one particular feature in the GI bill of rights which was held up by veterans' organizations and the men in service, it was the one which provided that our Government would give financial assistance to boys who had been in the service to enable them to go to college or complete their education after leaving the service. Yet the administration—and the Congress has its share of the responsibility—let die the schooling privileges of the GI bill of rights at a time when for the first time we were providing for compulsory Reserves.

While it is not so important as the schooling privileges were, I notice the free mailing privilege for our servicemen in Korea has just been eliminated. In other words, all the former sensitivities which went some little way toward equalizing the sacrifice—such as the ability of men in service to go to college, the ability of a soldier to sign a letter and drop it in the mail without a postage stamp—have been abrogated.

I have a bill on my desk, which I intend to introduce, which will restore the free mailing privilege for soldiers serving outside the continental limits of the United States. I think that would be a little token. That is the least we can do.

I realize, along with the senior Senator from North Dakota, that we will probably not have a rollcall vote on the conference report, but I want to be recorded as voting in the negative on the conference report. I feel that at a time when the Regular Forces of the United States have been arbitrarily reduced by the Pentagon—whether as a strategic measure or as an economy measure, I do not know—it does not seem justifiable to establish a compulsory Reserve. Nor do I believe we should establish a compulsory Reserve system at a time when not only has the excess profits tax law been allowed to expire, but when in the tax bill of 1954 vast concessions and great benefits have been conferred on the large corporations of the country which are producing vast numbers of weapons that the boys in the Armed Forces will be called upon to use.

Equality of sacrifice is the cornerstone of a great democracy. I do not believe that equality of sacrifice exists today, when we are about to vote on the conference report for a compulsory Reserve.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The report was agreed to.

SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS, 1956

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask the Chair to lay before the Senate the unfinished business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which is H. R. 7278.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 7278) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, and for other purposes.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague, the distinguished Senator from North Carolina [Mr. SCOTT], may be permitted to have printed in the RECORD a statement which he has prepared on the supplemental appropriation bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

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

STATEMENT BY SENATOR SCOTT

The national wildlife refuges together constitute an institution of great interest to many millions of Americans. The intrinsic value of these reserved wildlife lands must be very great. They help sustain the recreation of hunting for which more than 14 million Americans bought licenses last year. Our foremost wildlife experts agree that without this system of refuges, the wild ducks and geese of America would soon dwindle to remnant flocks of rare species.

These areas also have helped save the elk, the antelope, the bison, the big-horned sheep and other species from extinction. The little band of whooping cranes—only 23 were left alive in the world last spring, counting two crippled birds in a New Orleans zoo—would long ago have passed into the limbo of extinct wildlife had it not been for the Arkansas Wildlife Refuge in Texas, which gives the great white birds winter sanctuary.

The wildlife refuges have other social values. Many millions use them for fishing, for camping, for nature study and other forms of outdoor recreation.

The Wichita Mountains refuge, spectacular piece of native America as it is and located among the thriving cities of Texas and Oklahoma, is one of the best in this respect. Nearly a million persons used this area for recreation last year. During 1955 the visitation is expected to exceed one million.

I am opposed to transferring 10,700 acres of this valuable wildlife area for what appears now to be more of a whim of the Army than a demonstrated defense need. I make this statement advisedly.

I say the Army has not demonstrated that the proposed land acquisition is necessary because for years it has been using all types of artillery at Fort Sill for which it says it now needs the additional area. It has not demonstrated the need because the Department of the Interior has offered an alternative plan, one which would permit use of refuge lands for gun emplacements, for maneuvers, and for other operations as required by the artillery school.

If a reasonable arrangement can be worked out for Army use of the refuge lands in a manner that will not destroy the value of these lands for conservation and recreation, then I say the Army does not need to own the lands outright. If the commanding officers at Fort Sill feel they need new places to go hunting and fishing, let them find those places like other citizens, and buy the required hunting and fishing licenses like any other sportsmen.

I say it appears to be a whim of the Army because in presenting their case for transfer of the refuge lands, they have told committees of the Congress that the lands in question are inaccessible, closed to the public, and of little value for wildlife. These statements are in error and are misrepresentations of fact.

Let's tell the Army to try out the proposal made by the Department of Interior. Let's tell them to try it out honestly, in good faith, and see if they can't preserve the wildlife refuge while they continue to train the best artillerymen in the world.

JAPAN: ECONOMIC REALITIES AND PEACE

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, in recent weeks attempts have been made to work out a settlement of the situation in the Formosan Straits. As the senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] so significantly pointed out last Sunday, the Formosan Straits area still is a point of great danger. The policy of our Government seems to be one of accepting a so-called de facto cease-fire in the Formosan Straits. The United States cannot afford a policy of drift and drag in this area because of its explosive potentialities.

For some time now it has been indicated that a number of Asians, such as Nehru and Krishna Menon, of India, and U Nu, of Burma, have tried to work out ways and means of bringing about a settlement of the situation in the Formosan Straits. Yesterday, according to press reports, India and Burma arranged for meetings in backstage discussions with Red China and the United States—for ambassadorial negotiations—to begin in Geneva on August 1 between U. Alexis Johnson, United States Ambassador to Czechoslovakia, and a Chinese official of comparable rank. While this does not indicate de jure recognition of Communist China by this country, it is a step forward in de facto recognition, even though it is expressly stated that no recognition is implied in these meetings and recognition will not be discussed.

In another area in the Far East we find that the United States is reported to have agreed with France and Great Britain to bring pressure on Premier Ngo Dinh Diem of Free Vietnam to meet with the Communist Viet Minh to arrange, in accordance with the Geneva Agreement of a year ago—that is, the Geneva agreement of 1954—for next July's elections in all of Vietnam. This, too, was supposedly arranged in side talks at the Geneva Conference. I sincerely hope that the United States Government recognizes Premier Diem's position in relation to the repeated violations of the Geneva agreements by the Viet Minh in refusing to allow refugees to go south, in refusing to release French and Vietnamese prisoners of war, and in aiding and abetting the Pathet Lao in the Laotian provinces of Sam Neua and Phong Saly, and the fact that South Vietnam was not a signatory to the Geneva Agreements of 1954.

These reports indicate that at the Geneva Conference of 1955 Asian matters were the subject of some consideration, at least in informal meetings. They emphasize the need to keep our sights on the second of the two principal areas of decision in the world, namely, Japan.

The first is Germany. In remarks in the Senate on August 14, last year, I noted that—

> The tide of international affairs is flowing on in the aftermath of Geneva to new crests elsewhere on the globe to areas which in the next months may become keys of decision in the struggle to turn back the drive of totalitarian communism. These areas are Germany and Japan.

On several occasions since last August, I have returned to this subject in discussions in the Senate. By so doing, I have sought to clarify my own understanding of developments in Germany and Japan. I have also hoped to keep a focus of attention on these two areas, in order that their importance might not be lost in the dazzle of Soviet peace offensives, summit meetings, and spectacular events elsewhere. Too often in the past we have allowed more colorful sideshows to sidetrack us from the main problems. As a result, we have had a series of crises in our foreign policy; and to a large extent we have responded with a kind of crisis foreign policy. That has been true most frequently in the Far East—in Korea, in Indochina, and in Formosa.

We have done somewhat better in Europe. We have had in that region clearer objectives and a more rational pattern of policy for their achievement. Together with other free nations, we have held the initiative in Europe, with a few setbacks, ever since the days of the Marshall plan. The great test in that area, however, is now coming in Germany. It is the test of whether Germany shall remain welded to the structure of peace which Americans and other free peoples have given so much to build in the Western World. The "summit meeting" just concluded has served to emphasize that fact.

On June 23 last I discussed some of the problems that are approaching a climax in Germany. I should like, today, Mr. President, to turn briefly to the potential crisis in Japan which I reviewed at some length on March 28 in the Senate.

At this time, Japan occupies in the Far East a position similar to that of Germany in Europe. Japan, like Germany in Europe, is the key to war or peace in the Far East. There is little likelihood of a real settlement of present difficulties in that part of the world unless Japan is a party to it; nor is there likely to be in that part of the world a major war into which the Japanese will not inevitably be drawn.

If we are to avoid a crisis over Japan, as we failed to avoid crises in Korea, Indochina, and Formosa, we have got to recognize certain realities which exist in the Japanese situation, and particularly in the Japanese economic situation. In the Far East, Mr. President, all our objectives, including our self-interest, require an independent and self-supporting Japan living at peace among other independent, self-supporting Asian nations. Such a situation will permit trade and scientific and cultural relations to flourish, with consequent benefit to us, as well as to others. It will provide an atmosphere in which the concept of human freedom can survive and grow in the Far East.

What we do not want in Japan or Asia is colonialism, Soviet or any other kind. What we do not want are permanent and expensive dependencies of our own. It is one thing to give assistance to nations, to tide them through difficult times, to advance our common interests. It is another to keep them on a perpetual dole. The first builds strong ties of friendship. The second plants the seeds of enmity in both giver and receiver, even while the generosity is being bestowed and the words of gratitude are being spoken.

The objective we seek in the Far East—namely, free, self-reliant, peaceful nations—cannot be attained by purchase. It cannot be attained by talk.

It cannot be attained by bombs, atomic or otherwise. It can, I am convinced, be reached by recognizing the realities of the situation in Japan and the Far East, and by doing what we can do with reasonable prudence in our foreign policies to meet them.

The first reality is that since the end of World War II, the Japanese people have moved away from the institutions which led them into that disastrous conflict. This does not mean, however, that the Japanese people are permanently free of aggressive totalitarianism. It would be delusive for them, as well as for ourselves, to assume that they are. A new totalitarianism could be induced in Japan either by Asian communism from the mainland or by forces within Japan itself or by a strange alliance of both.

Whether the Japanese retain and strengthen their present tenuous grip on freedom depends not only on Japan, but also on what the nations which have a vital stake in that part of the world do or do not do. Neither our Nation nor any other nation can preserve freedom in Japan. That can be done only by the Japanese people themselves. But our Nation and other nations can give them the chance.

Freedom will not survive in Japan unless the basic difficulties of the Japanese economic situation are recognized and are dealt with in time. If that situation is allowed to become desperate, desperate remedies will be sought—totalitarian remedies which may well plunge the entire Pacific into a new conflict.

Japan has not yet reached the stage of desperation, but the danger is nevertheless a real one. I have said this before, as have others, but it bears repeating: The problem of the Japanese literally is that they must fish and trade abroad on a vast scale if they are to sustain themselves over the years. To put it more simply, the question the Japanese are constantly asking themselves is, in effect, "Where is our next meal coming from?"

In their islands, which equal in area the size of Montana, they simply do not have the resources to support 90 million people in a tolerable fashion in any other way. The problem, moreover, grows increasingly acute year by year as Japan's population rises.

Since the end of World War II the Japanese have been unable to either fish or trade on an adequate scale. Important fishing grounds off the northern Asia coast have been closed to them by the policies of the Communist countries and Korea. Their trade with the Chinese mainland, once a mainstay of their economy, has been reduced to insignificance, largely because of political considerations. To cite just one figure, Japanese trade with China amounted to $423 million in 1937–38; in 1954, it was $60 million. The search for satisfactory substitutes in southeast Asia and elsewhere has not been conspicuously successful.

In the past 10 years, the margin between survival and starvation in Japan has largely been provided by the United States. It has been provided in the form of gifts, aid, military expenditures, and concessions of various kinds. Mr. President, that sort of makeshift approach cannot go on indefinitely. In Japan, there are already signs of resentment against our country, stemming in large part from the dependency which these makeshift remedies imply. Moreover, on our part, the endlessness of vast expenditures for foreign aid has begun to tax more than the pocketbooks of increasing numbers of Americans can stand; it is beginning to tax their patience and faith in the policies that make them necessary.

That the Japanese are becoming restless in their present relationship with our country is indicated by a dispatch from Tokyo, by Foster Hailey, which appeared in the New York Times of July 15, 1955. According to Mr. Hailey, in Japan there is increasing opposition to the extension of United States airbases and to the continued presence of American ground forces in Japanese territories.

The Japanese have been reluctant to accept the fact that these American bases are essential, even though their defense forces are presently inadequate to the defense of the islands. They have only 160,000 personnel, armed largely with light weapons, light ships, and obsolete, propeller-driven planes. The Government of Japan has been promising to increase this force to 259,000 men, armed with modern weapons, but is moving very slowly in that direction.

In recent months, we have been moving away from one-way aid to Japan, and that is all to the good. The recent modifications in tariff schedules, for example, should permit an increase in Japanese exports to this country. That means that we shall get something for the dollars which in the past have flowed to Japan, with little or no return. The Japanese, in turn, will have an opportunity to become more self-supporting. But these tariff reductions are not going to make the difference between solvency and insolvency in Japan. No tariff concessions that are likely to be undertaken in the foreseeable future are going to make the difference. If we face the facts bluntly, we will recognize, I believe, that there are limitations in this country on how far the remedy of tariff reductions can be invoked.

And even if there were not, it is doubtful that the natural flow of Japanese trade is predominantly in the direction of this country. The natural course is toward neighboring areas—toward Korea, the Philippines, Formosa, Indonesia, and Southeast Asia. These areas have the food and other products which Japan requires, and Japan has skills and productive capacity which they can use. Thailand and Burma alone, for example, are currently supplying Japan with some 600,000 tons of rice a year, more than half her total imports.

As the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations [Mr. GEORGE] pointed out some time ago, the natural direction of Japan's trade is also toward the Asian mainland, toward China proper and the Soviet maritime provinces.

That factor, among others, explains why Japanese and Russian diplomats, headed by Ambassador Jacob A. Malik and Shunichi Matsumoto, are now meeting in London. They have under consideration the problem of ending World War II between the two countries and restoring diplomatic relations; but the possibilities of trade between the two countries also enter into these talks. Japan is an independent country, and has every right to pursue these possibilities.

I doubt, however, that trade ties between the two countries are likely to help stabilize the situation in the Far East unless certain other questions are also dealt with. If the recent Russian overtures toward Japan are sincere, they should lead to the return of Japanese war prisoners still detained on the mainland of Asia. They should lead to territorial adjustments in the vicinity of the Kurile Islands. They should lead to a restoration of fishing concessions in north Asian waters, which the Japanese people so desperately need. They should lead to Soviet support of Japan's entry into the United Nations. The Russians have an opportunity to promote stability in the Far East in the current talks with Japan, if that is what they really desire, by acting constructively on these outstanding problems.

The Japanese are also seeking increased trade with Communist China. There have been exchanges of private missions between the two countries, and other preliminaries to an expansion of commerce. Again, Japan in pursuing trade with China is acting within her rights as an independent nation. In this case, however, it is also proper for the Japanese to continue, as they have so far done, to limit themselves by the terms of the United Nations trade embargo against the Chinese Communists. That embargo, in a sentence, means no trade in strategic materials with China while the Communist aggression in Korea remains unrectified. Japanese cooperation in the embargo is fitting and essential, especially since Japan seeks membership in the United Nations and has associated herself with the action in Korea.

Beyond the embargo, however, the Japanese should not be expected to forego what trade they can develop with Communist China. The United Kingdom, West Germany, and other free nations have not done so. On the contrary, many are heavily engaged in it. Some 20 percent of Communist China's trade is carried on with countries outside the Soviet bloc.

Mr. President, if there is to be stability in the far Pacific, it is inevitable that commerce will flow between Japan on the one hand and the Russians and the Chinese mainland on the other. Nor need we deplore that fact. On the contrary, the trade could be of considerable benefit to Japan and could help to strengthen freedom in that country. It seems to me that any peaceful measures which enhance the economy of Japan at this time add to her capacity for independent existence. Trade with the Communist nations will be dangerous only if it becomes the most important factor in Japan's survival, if Japan is reduced to abject dependency on it. The Japanese

will never reach that stage of dependency, however, provided strong, mutually beneficial economic and other ties are forged between Japan and the free nations in the Far East and elsewhere.

It seems to me that the responsibility for developing such ties rests not on Japan alone, not on this country alone—but on all nations with a stake in peace and in freedom in the Far East. In discussing these questions in the Senate last March 28, I listed seven tangible ways as illustrative of the manner in which a positive American policy on Japan might help to develop these ties. Upon that occasion I said:

A positive foreign policy on our part would seek to obtain the widest possible international agreement on these points:

1. Immediate admission of Japan to the United Nations.
2. Territorial adjustments along Japan's borders.
3. Japanese participation in any international conference for the general settlement of Far Eastern problems.
4. Japanese access to fishing grounds open to them before the war, on a responsible and equitable basis.
5. Encouragement of a regional investment pool in the Far East with full Japanese participation.
6. Encouragement of the use of Japanese skills in the technical assistance programs of the Far East.
7. Convening of a series of Far Eastern conferences to deal frankly and realistically with the related problems of Japanese reparations and freer trade within the region, and similar issues, the solution of which will make possible a self-supporting Japan in a self-supporting Asia.

One point which I made then and have repeatedly urged since that time is the need for a series of special economic conferences among the nations with important interests in the Far East. There is, in my opinion, a need for such conferences to deal frankly with the problems of trade, economic and technical development in that region. To the extent that the preponderance of Japanese economic interests can be pursued in concert with the United States and other free nations, to that extent we need not fear Japanese trade with the Communist nations on the Asian mainland.

I have no doubt that there will soon be a call for a meeting at the summit in the Far East, or at least one step short of the summit. Mountain climbing exercises a strange and contagious fascination for those who indulge in it. Having scaled the peaks in Switzerland around Geneva, it is to be expected that those in the Himalayas will beckon.

Before we rush to meet these new challenges, however, let us recognize some sobering facts. In the first place, any real settlement in Asia involves more than a meeting between this country and Communist China. Perhaps, as has been suggested, such a meeting is a necessary preliminary. A lasting peace in the Far East, however, requires the participation of Japan, the free governments of Korea, Vietnam, and Nationalist China, the signatories of the SEATO pact and other Asian nations.

We have not built among these nations the strength of unity which was developed in Western Europe and made possible a satisfactory meeting at Geneva.

That is why I have joined many others in a repeated emphasis of the importance of Japan and the development of stronger ties among the free nations in the Far East.

Japan has much to contribute to the progress of Asia and the world. It is up to the Asian nations, to this country, and all countries with interests in the far Pacific to see to it that the Japanese have an opportunity to make that contribution in peace. We need to start now to provide that opportunity, before we get to the summit.

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

Mr. MANSFIELD. I am delighted to yield.

Mr. SPARKMAN. First, I wish to commend the able Senator from Montana for having made this speech on the importance of Japan, and some of the economic problems affecting Japan.

I ask the Senator from Montana if he does not consider Japan to be, in large part, the keystone to the Pacific.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I agree with the distinguished Senator. I do not believe there is any question that Japan is not only the keystone of the so-called island barrier chain, militarily speaking, but that economically she is the keystone to the Pacific as well.

When we bear in mind that the Japanese Empire is about 10,000 square miles smaller than my own State of Montana, with its population of 650,000 people; and when we keep in mind that the Japanese Empire has a population of approximately 90 million, with an annual increase of 3 million, and that not more than 16 percent of the land is arable, we begin to realize how important is the Japanese need for trade and food, and that the Japanese Empire itself presents the greatest potentially explosive area in the whole arc of the Far East.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I wonder whether the Senator would agree with me that it is of the greatest importance that Japan remain oriented to the western powers.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Absolutely.

Mr. SPARKMAN. And that she remain a part of the free world.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Yes, indeed.

Mr. SPARKMAN. The Senator from Montana is to be commended for pointing out some of the practical problems. We recognized from the very end of World War II that Japan would become a part of the democratic free world. We had a great task on our hands. As the Senator has so well pointed out, it has been pretty well taken care of heretofore by expenditures we have made in Japan in support of the Korean war and in support of many economic developments inside Japan.

The time has come for those programs to come to an end. Therefore, Japan must look to her trade with the rest of the world in order to be able to buy the food she needs to supplement the food which she grows, in order to feed her people. Is that correct?

Mr. MANSFIELD. The Senator is correct. It is also necessary that Japan build up her foreign trade in order to enable her to retain her freedom, independence, and integrity as a member of the free nations.

Mr. SPARKMAN. The Senator has remarked on some of the effects of recent tariff changes. I come from an area which is greatly interested in textile production. Our people have been greatly concerned by the threat of increased textile exports from Japan to this country. Of course, reference is often made to the low wage paid to the Japanese worker, as contrasted with the high wage paid to the American worker.

Does the Senator believe it would be possible to build a tariff wall high enough to make up for that differential?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I doubt it very much.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I would say that certainly it cannot be done. A tariff wall cannot be built sufficiently high.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The Senator from Alabama knows that I am naturally a very cautious man. I understand the Senator's feelings about the creation of a tariff wall, and I am in agreement with him. I point out that it is a coincidence that we are discussing this matter on the day on which the late great Secretary of State, Cordell Hull, is being buried at Washington Cathedral. He was one who believed in breaking down barriers and encouraging free trade among nations of the world in the interest of peace. While we are in accord with that point of view, we recognize also that if we lower our barriers, we expect other nations to do the same.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I wish to lead up to a point contained in the able Senator's very fine address. It deals with the subject of reciprocal-trade agreements. Does not the Senator believe that the solution probably lies not only in an expanded trade area, as he has so well pointed out, on the mainland of China—that is, aside from strategic materials—and in Southeast Asia, but also in the field of multilateral agreements, which would involve this country, for instance, with Indonesia, which in turn would execute an agreement with Japan and with other nations, and in that way open an expanded trade area from which Japan could benefit?

Mr. MANSFIELD. It would be worthwhile. I agree with the Senator from Alabama.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I should like to ask a few other questions of the Senator on another subject. At the beginning of his speech he made the statement that the United States was reported to have agreed at the Geneva Conference, along with France and Great Britain, to pressure South Vietnam to meet with representatives of North Vietnam with reference to elections. He had reference to the elections, he said, which were to be held in accordance with the Geneva agreement of a year ago. Then he said, "This, too, was supposedly arranged in side talks at the Geneva Conference." To which Geneva conference does the Senator refer in the latter instance?

Mr. MANSFIELD. The Geneva Conference of 1955, the conference of last week.

Mr. SPARKMAN. The one just concluded?

Mr. MANSFIELD. That is correct.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I do not recall having heard about that agreement. I do not believe it was referred to in the President's address of last night. Is the Senator well advised that there was such an agreement as that?

Mr. MANSFIELD. No; I do not believe that it was in the President's address of last night. Unfortunately I did not listen to the address. I intend to read it in detail very shortly. However, my information in that respect has come from the press coverage of the Geneva Conference, and it would appear to be reliable.

Mr. SPARKMAN. In the President's address last night, he said:

> This agenda contained German unification and European security, disarmament, and increased contacts of all kinds between the East and the West.

He lists various items—

> I can assure you of one thing. There were no secret agreements made, either understood agreements or written ones. Everything is put before you on the record.
>
> Now, outside of these conference meetings, there were numerous unofficial meetings, conversations with important members of the other delegations, and, of course, very specifically with the Soviet delegation.

Frankly, I had not heard of the agreement to which the Senator referred. I attended the session of the Committee on Foreign Relations yesterday afternoon, and I did not hear of such an agreement.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I may say that the President is very likely correct in his statement, because he was reporting, I assume, on the formal aspects of the Geneva Conference. As I tried to point out in my remarks today, these other matters were arranged in side talks, in which, I assume again, certain members of the American delegation were kept advised by Great Britain, for example, as to what the situation was vis à vis Formosa and Indochina. On that basis, supposedly, the newspaper reporters did a little digging and came up with conclusions which seem reliable.

I did not raise these questions with Mr. Dulles when he appeared before the Committee on Foreign Relations yesterday afternoon, because I wanted to discuss them today. If I had raised them and then had discussed them, a question might have been raised as to my position in this matter.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I realize that the meeting yesterday was on a confidential basis. My reason for asking these questions is that it has been a matter of considerable interest and concern to me that the elections in Vietnam have been set for next July. The Senator from Montana has visited Vietnam on different occasions. He knows something of the conditions there. Perhaps he can ease my concern. I have had the understanding that the elections, if they should be held next year, might be disastrous for the free world.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The Senator is correct, because, under the Geneva agreement of 1954, the cards were stacked in favor of the Communist Viet Minh regime. We find a state of affairs wherein Premier Ngo Dinh Diem has been having extreme difficulty in achieving the strength he needs to bring independence and freedom to his country. Now he is on the road to success. His ability, his energy, his integrity, and his honesty are at last being recognized for what they are.

Furthermore, when we consider the fact that the Premier was placed in office after the Geneva Conference of a year ago, supposedly to go down with a sinking ship, and when we consider how much he has salvaged within that time; when we consider the fact that South Vietnam was not a signatory to the agreement of a year ago, and neither was this country; when we consider the fact that the Communists of North Vietnam have constantly broken the agreement at Geneva, violated the terms of the truce, and refused to permit refugees to go south as they wanted to; when we think of the fact that they participated aggressively a few weeks ago against the Government of Laos; when we know that there are at least 10,000 Vietnamese and French Union prisoners still being held by the Viet Minh—when we think of all this, and of the things which the Premier has done, and then think of the election next year, if we go forward on that basis, the results may not be too good. But that is something which Mr. Ngo Dinh Diem himself will have to solve.

I certainly hope this country will not lend its prestige to the efforts of the French and the British who have sought to pressure the Premier to do things which he knows will not be to the best interest of his country or of the free world.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I thought that would be the attitude of the Senator from Montana; and yet in his speech, he says he understands an agreement was made at the Geneva Conference for the United States to join with England and France in putting such pressure on. Do I interpret the Senator's speech correctly?

Mr. MANSFIELD. If I may refer to that particular part of my speech again, I stated:

> We find that the United States is reported to have agreed with France and Great Britain to bring pressure on Premier Ngo Dinh Diem of free Vietnam to meet with the Communist Vietminh to arrange, in accordance with the Geneva agreement of a year ago, for next July's elections in all of Vietnam.

That was reported. It may be the report was in error. If it is, I would expect the State Department to make the matter clear in this respect. But I considered the report reliable, and, therefore, I have used it at this time, making it very clear that it was a report and not an official statement.

Mr. SPARKMAN. But, in the opinion of the able Senator from Montana, the problem in Indochina remains acute, and it is certainly something we should not shrug off indifferently.

Mr. MANSFIELD. We would shrug it off at our peril. I think we should give as much aid as we can. I do not mean American military intervention, but economic and financial assistance, in building up security forces and strengthening their economies so that the internal conditions in the States of free Vietnam, Cambodia, and Laos can be improved both politically and economically.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I thank the Senator from Montana.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I thank the Senator from Alabama.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 40) to designate the period from September 17 through September 23 as Constitution Week.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2109) to authorize permanent appointments in the United States Navy and in the United States Marine Corps.

The message further announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6382) to amend the International Claims Settlement Act of 1949, as amended, and for other purposes; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. RICHARDS, Mr. ZABLOCKI, Mr. DODD, Mr. VORYS, and Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

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

H. R. 2150. An act to further amend section 106 of the Army-Navy Nurses Act of 1947 so as to provide for certain adjustments in the dates of rank of nurses and women medical specialists of the Regular Army and Regular Air Force in the permanent grade of captain, and for other purposes;

H. R. 2755. An act for the relief of Benjamin Johnson;

H. R. 2783. An act for the relief of Andrew Wing-Huen Tsang;

H. R. 2944. An act for the relief of Franziska Lindauer Ball;

H. R. 2947. An act for the relief of Emelda Ann Schallmo;

H. R. 2949. An act for the relief of Jose Armando Quaresma;

H. R. 2972. An act to require the recordation of scrip, lieu selection, and similar rights;

H. R. 3048. An act for the relief of Assuntino Del Gobbo;

H. R. 3270. An act for the relief of Giuseppa Arsena;

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

H. R. 3504. An act for the relief of Eveline Wenk Neal;

H. R. 3624. An act for the relief of Olga I. Papadopoulou;

H. R. 3625. An act for the relief of George Vourderis;

H. R. 3629. An act for the relief of Mrs. Nika Kirihara;

H. R. 3630. An act for the relief of Mrs. Uto Ginoza;

H. R. 3726. An act for the relief of Mr. Gino Evangelista;

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

H. R. 3864. An act for the relief of Mrs. Elizabeth A. Traufield;

H. R. 3871. An act for the relief of Orville Ennis;

H. R. 4044. An act for the relief of Burgal Lyden and others;

H. R. 4106. An act to authorize the crediting, for certain purposes, of prior active Federal commissioned service performed by a person appointed as a commissioned officer under section 101 or 102 of the Army-Navy Nurses Act of 1947, as amended, and for other purposes;

H. R. 4146. An act for the relief of Adelheid (Heidi) Glessner (nee Schega);

H. R. 4147. An act for the relief of Angelo De Vito;

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

H. R. 4218. An act to authorize the Secretary of Defense to lend certain Army, Navy, and Air Force equipment, and to provide certain services to the Girl Scouts of the United States of America for use at the Girl Scout Senior Roundup Encampment, and for other purposes;

H. R. 4280. An act to direct the Secretary of Agriculture to release on behalf of the United States conditions in two deeds conveying certain submarginal lands to Clemson Agricultural College of South Carolina so as to permit such college, subject to certain conditions, to sell, lease, or otherwise dispose of such lands;

H. R. 4284. An act for the relief of Mrs. Mariannina Monaco;

H. R. 4289. An act for the relief of Vladislav Bevc;

H. R. 4455. An act for the relief of Christa Harkrader;

H. R. 4707. An act for the relief of Duncan McQuagge;

H. R. 4717. An act to provide for the release of the express condition and limitation on certain land heretofore conveyed to the trustees of the village of Sag Harbor, N. Y.;

H. R. 4727. An act to permit the issuance of a flag to a friend or associate of the deceased veteran where it is not claimed by the next of kin;

H. R. 4747. An act to provide that reversionary interests of the United States in certain lands formerly conveyed to the city of Chandler, Okla., shall be quitclaimed to such city;

H. R. 4886. An act to provide that active service in the Army and Air Force shall be included in determining the eligibility for retirement of certain commissioned officers of the Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard;

H. R. 5283. An act for the relief of Artur Swislocki or Arthur Svislotzki;

H. R. 5893. An act to amend paragraph I (a), part I, of Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a), as amended, to make its provisions applicable to active service on and after June 27, 1950, and prior to February 1, 1955, and for other purposes;

H. R. 6277. An act 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;

H. R. 6396. An act for the relief of Valerie Anne Peterson;

H. R. 6613. An act for the relief of Yuji Doi and Mrs. Matsuyo Yamaoka Doi;

H. R. 6980. An act providing for the conveyance of the Old Colony project to the Boston Housing Authority;

H. R. 7194. An act to authorize subsistence allowances to enlisted personnel; and

H. J. Res. 359. Joint resolution to authorize the designation of October 22, 1955, as National Olympic Day.

ECONOMIC STATE OF THE UNION—1955

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, under Republican principles, policies, and programs, the economic state of the Union is the best in history. With only a mild slowdown in pace, the transition from the Korean war economy to a peacetime economy was successfully completed. The prosperity this year has already topped the peak of 1953, our previous alltime high.

Employment in June reached 64 million, highest in history. The average factory worker's pay rose to $76.11 a week, an increase of $4.61 over a year ago, while plenty of overtime pay is boosting incomes to record heights. Personal income enjoyed by the American people now exceeds $300 billion a year for the first time in history.

These income gains are real because the cost of living has been kept stable for over 2 years. The Consumer Price Index varied by only one-tenth of 1 percent from December last year to May this year.

With incomes rising and prices stable, the American people have more dollars to spend and each dollar buys more.

Total national production of goods and services—the gross national product—smashed all records in the first half of this year. The previous peak annual rate was $369.3 billion, set in the second quarter of 1953. The pace in the first 3 months of 1955 was $375 billion and in the second 3 months it rose to an estimated $383 billion. There was a record output of such nondurable goods as paper, chemicals, petroleum, and rubber products. Activity in textiles, apparel, and the shoe industries approached alltime peaks. Steel mill output promises to equal or exceed the alltime peak of 1953, while automobile production had the best half year in its history. New construction, now running at an alltime high, is expected to be 11 percent above the previous peak in 1954. June retail sales were 6 percent above a year ago.

Small business in particular is profiting from the record prosperity with its high purchasing power. As further measures to help small concerns, the Republican-created Small Business Administration by May 31, 1955, had approved 2,694 loans totaling $85.6 million, and $567 million in military purchases have been earmarked for exclusive award to small companies.

Good profits and confidence in the future have led businessmen to expand plans for new plants and equipment, which create more jobs.

Prosperous Americans are buying more goods from foreign countries, and worldwide prosperity is making more customers for American products. Comparing the first 5 months of this year with the same period last year, our imports are up 6 percent and our exports are up 11 percent.

Federal Government purchases in the second quarter, on the other hand, were at a $45.3 billion rate, the lowest since 1951, indicating that today's prosperity springs from private enterprise in a peacetime atmosphere.

This prosperous state of affairs does not happen by chance. It has a direct relation to the principles and policies set in motion by President Eisenhower, strongly supported by Republicans in Congress. We have replaced the fear of war with the real hope for peace in the world. We have released the energies of private enterprise and improved the climate favorable to its expansion and progress. Controls have been ended. Government is being withdrawn from competition with its own citizens. Government spending has been reduced, and by more efficient conduct of the public business each dollar spent yields more in services. Research and inventive genius are being encouraged to develop new techniques and products which create more jobs. Depressed industries and geographical areas are being added to reach new adjustments through intelligent planning of diversified activities.

While thus developing sound measures to keep the economy healthy, the Republican administration is continuously alert for signs of excesses in prices, credit, and inventories. It keeps watch for signs of runaway inflation which in former years undermined the health of the economy. On several occasions in the past 2 years the Republican administration has courageously made financial, credit, and other economic adjustments to keep the economy on an even but sustained rise in prosperity.

These are dividends of public confidence and trust in President Eisenhower. They are dividends from Republican principles and policies under which the free economy of our Nation has resumed its long-term march to higher standards of living for all our people.

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

Mr. GOLDWATER. I yield.

Mr. SPARKMAN. It is always interesting to hear encouraging reports such as the one the junior Senator from Arizona has just made. However, as I listened to the remarks of the Senator from Arizona, I was waiting to tell about the 4-percent decline in farm income, which was announced by the Department of Agriculture only last week. I wonder what our farmers will do, as prices for the things which they must buy continue to go up, while the prices for the products which they grow continue to go down.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Did the Senator put his statement in the form of a question?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I shall be glad to do so and to have the Senator from Arizona answer it.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I do not think an answer can be fully given until there has been ample opportunity afforded to see what will happen under flexible price controls. While farm income as such has tended to decline, I am certain that the Senator from Alabama will agree with me that the individual farm income, per capita farm income, has risen, I believe, 7 percent since 1947.

In further answer to the Senator's question, because I am certain the Senator wishes my reply to be complete, I think he will agree also that the num-

ber of farmers in the United States has been constantly decreasing for many years. This is not a new phenomenon in the farm picture, because without the intervention of two wars I am certain the Senator would agree that the farm picture would have been bad long ago.

Mr. SPARKMAN. With reference to the reduction in farm population, every effort has been made by the present administration to reduce the farm population still more. It has been the philosophy of this administration that there is no place in American farming for what might be called the marginal farmer, or for what we have known throughout the years as the small, family-sized farm.

If the philosophy of those in the Department of Agriculture who have spoken on the subject were to be carried out, the average sharecropper or tenant farmer or person who barely earns a living on the small farm would be forced away from the farm. I have never understood where in the world such persons would go. I suppose they would simply crowd into the cities and towns and be placed on the relief rolls, there to become greater burdens upon the taxpayers of the United States. That has been the philosophy of those high in office in the Department of Agriculture of this administration.

It has been most interesting to note that as flexible price controls have taken hold, the farm situation has become worse and worse, and as we watch it, we may expect it to become still worse as the real functioning of the so-called flexible price program takes place.

I think that one mistake which perhaps all of us have made has been to rely too much upon some kind of support program, instead of undertaking actually to devise a farm program which would provide a healthy economy for all the farmers of the Nation, including the small family-sized farmers, upon whom our economy has so strongly depended throughout the years.

But this administration has done nothing along that line. It has fiddled while Rome has burned, so far as the small farmers are concerned.

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

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. I believe the Senator from Alabama has called attention to one of the important problems of agriculture and one of the particular reasons why farm income is low today He has pointed out, very properly, the problem of the low-income farmer.

One of our greatest troubles today lies in the fact that there are in this country 1,500,000 farmers who have an average income of less than $1,000 a year. That situation is deplorable indeed. Such a situation brings about lower prices for all farmers, because the small farmers sell to the dealers on the market for whatever price they can get. They are not in any position to take advantage of Government loans, because they usually produce in very small quantities or are entirely unorganized.

Some months ago President Eisenhower sent to Congress a message in which specific attention was paid to the low-income farmers. Such farmers have been with us for generations; we understand that. Their plight is nothing new. But President Eisenhower proposed to do something about it, and he asked Congress for legislation to enable him to expand the farm program so as to help low-income farmers, who must necessarily be treated in a manner different from the large farmers, who can take advantage of the Government support programs.

The President pointed out ways in which the low-income farmers could be helped, and he has asked for a very modest amount of money to be used in helping them. He has proposed aid in securing part-time employment for the farmer by encouraging industry to move into rural areas where there is surplus labor, or where farmers cannot make all their living on the farms.

The President has asked for funds with which to expand the Bankhead-Jones program, so that farmers may acquire economic farm units, and not try to struggle along on farms which are so small that the farmers cannot possibly earn more that $1,000 a year on them.

I had hoped that Congress would respond to the President's request. More than 1,000 counties, or about one-third of all the counties in the United States, are low-income counties; that is, counties in which farmers who are hard up live. I regret very much that after the President had made this request of Congress, the House recently eliminated every dollar of appropriation, I believe, which would have enabled the several departments which would have cooperated to have helped improve the lot of the 1½ million low-income farmers.

I am more than disappointed, upon coming to the Senate today, to learn that the Senate Committee on Appropriations also has eliminated the funds which would have helped the President to carry out his program to improve the lot of the 1½ million low-income farmers.

The President is trying to take some positive action. But, as we know, spectacular results cannot be achieved overnight. This condition has existed for a long time. Sporadically, over the last 25 years, Congress has tried to do something about it. We should continue to try to improve the lot of such farmers. Certainly the Members of Congress who are not in control of the committees concerned in the House and the Senate cannot be blamed for the action resulting in eliminating appropriations which would have made it possible for the Department of Agriculture, the Department of Commerce, and the White House to improve the lot of 1,500,000 low-income farm families, which not only do not make a decent living themselves, but by reason of having to sell for what they can get on the market, drag down the prices which all other farmers receive.

We have tried over the past years to gear our farm programs to the requirements and needs of the low-income farmers. I think we have made a mistake in trying to do that. I believe it is necessary to treat that type of farmer differently. There are in this country commercial farmers who make cost-plus in producing at 65 percent of parity. On the other hand, there are low-income farmers who could not make a living, as they are now operating, even though they were guaranteed 200 percent of parity. They must be treated differently.

I should like to join the Senator from Alabama today in trying to restore the cuts in the supplemental appropriation bill, so that we can make a start in trying to improve the lot of a million and a half low-income farmers.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Let me say I genuinely appreciate the remarks of the able Senator from Vermont. I should also like to say that I would always be willing to entrust the welfare of the farmers to the Senator from Vermont, because I know he has their welfare at heart. First let me say I shall certainly join with the Senator from Vermont in trying to restore the cuts. I presume he was referring to the $51 million for small loans.

Mr. AIKEN. Yes.

Mr. SPARKMAN. And I hope the Senator from Vermont will join with me in helping me to restore or place in the bill a provision to permit the small farmer also to participate in the housing program. Only a small amount is involved.

Mr. AIKEN. The Senator from Vermont has been ready at all times to cooperate in that respect.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I realize that. Let me say, with reference to the small farmer, that the Senator from Vermont has pointed out some of the real problems. I appreciate the program which President Eisenhower sent to the Congress, but I am sure the Senator from Vermont will recall that 2 months before the President sent that program to Congress, the Senator from Alabama had introduced a bill which included every single one of the points of the President, and more, too. As I recall, the President's program provided for the selection of 50 counties in which there would be established a technical assistance program. My bill provided for 500 counties. I think if we are going to tackle the problem, we ought to attack it in force. I recognize that there are 1,000 low farm income counties, and I thought we should tackle the problem on a broad front.

I agree with the Senator from Vermont that we ought to enact legislation on the basis that the situation of the small farmer is essentially different from that of the large farmer. Unfortunately, I do not believe those who are conducting the affairs of the Department of Agriculture make that distinction, because too many statements have been made by them to the effect that too many people are trying to make a living on farms and they ought to get off the farms. It seems to me the whole attitude of the Department is one favoring commercial farming—large-scale, profitable farming.

I do not know that it is so in the area from which the Senator from Vermont comes, but I know that in the section where I live big families live on the farms, and oftentimes if they can make a mere living on the farm, they are doing well. Farming is not merely a means of making

a living; it is a way of life. If we are to maintain vigor in American life and in the American economy, I think we should make sure that we maintain in our agricultural system the means of enabling families on small farms not only to make a living, but to maintain the American way of life.

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

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I should like to bring to the attention of the Senate a letter which I hold in my hand from the editor of one of our largest newspapers, the Pope County Tribune, of Glenwood, Minn., which is in an area of the State which has been traditionally Republican. I should like to read the final paragraph in his letter, which was sent to me last week:

We out in this section of the country don't see much of the great prosperity which the papers are raving about. There is a mortgage foreclosure running in the paper this week of a man who paid $10,000 on a farm that he agreed to pay $24,000 for. He has had it 2 years and now they are foreclosing on it. He will lose the $10,000 since farmers with their farms all paid for do not have anything left to show for their work during the year. Many small-business establishments are going under all over in this section of the country. An attorney told me recently that collections are the worst since the depression days. If nothing is done so the farmer can get a square deal, look for a recession within the next 2 years that will really rock this country.

Sincerely,

EDWARD E. BARSNESS.

Mr. Barsness is the editor and publisher of the Pope County Tribune.

At about the same date I received a telegram from another good citizen in our State, which reads:

New crop soybeans in Minnesota for November shipment now $1.88 per bushel to the farmer or 12 cents per bushel below the loan level which was recently reduced to 70 percent of parity. Price has dropped 10 cents since the Department made known its probable abstinence from oil-buying program this year. Also lard has dropped approximately 2 cents per pound. This inconspicuous but important change has already discounted next year's farm income more than $200 million or a full 2 cents per pound on 10 billion pounds edible fats. More declines likely. Suggest you inquire of certain members of the Department how bad they want things to get before acting.

I noticed that the largest bank in New York City, or at least one of the largest banks—I forget the exact name; it is either the National City Bank or the City National Bank; anyway it is one of the large banks, which issues monthly newsletters—predicts farm income will drop another 5 percent in the coming year.

Mr. President, while I have this opportunity, I should like to cite some facts which indicate the state of our prosperity. In the main, in general terms, there is prosperity, but there are some disparities and distortions in the economy which are rather apparent.

For instance, I have figures from the recent report of the Federal Reserve Board for the first quarter of 1955 as compared with 1954:

Corporations' net profits were up 16 percent.

What might be called take-home pay of average individual citizens—that is, those who are in the income bracket of $5,000 or below—was up 1 percent in the same period.

Stockholders' income was up 8 percent.

Farmers' income was down 6 percent.

Food processors' profits were up 17 percent.

I make note of the fact that the farmers' share of the consumers' food dollar was down 6 percent in one year.

Figures recently released also show that in a comparison of the first 3 months of 1955 with the first 3 months of 1954, the profits of Anaconda Copper were up 249 percent; of Pittsburgh Plate Glass, up 123 percent; of Aluminum Company of America, up 104 percent; of General Motors, up 64 percent.

The last is the company which not so long ago had a 3-way stock split, which, by the way, was not exactly a method of going broke or becoming poor.

Profits of United States Steel in the first quarter of 1955, as compared with the first quarter of 1954, were up 62 percent; du Pont, up 27 percent; Standard Oil of New Jersey, up 20 percent.

According to our own indexes made available by the Joint Committee on the Economic Report, the average weekly wage for workers of the country was up only 7 percent; farmers' income was down 6 percent; corporate net profits were up 16 percent. The gross profits of many companies were up as much as 200 percent.

I merely wish to point out that those are danger signs. Lest anyone think these are statements made for political purposes, let me say that I have in my hand a copy of Business Week for July 23, 1955. Under the subject "Trend" appears the lead editorial, which is entitled "The Too Beautiful Boom."

The editorial states, in part:

The economy has never looked brighter. Every indicator tells the same story of our extraordinary prosperity. * * *

We have always been haunted by the cyclical pattern of boom and bust. As our experience in the 1953–54 recession—

You will notice, Mr. President, it is called a recession.

Mr. SPARKMAN. They admit now there was a recession.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The editorial continues:

shows, our ability to avoid a serious downturn depends on preventing the distortions that arise when an inflationary pressure is heaped on top of an already vigorous boom.

The editorial then goes on to point out that there are danger signs on the horizon. I, for one, want the record to show that we have relatively good employment figures, even though there are 2½ million unemployed.

We have relatively good employment and we have a fairly prosperous economy. But from the record we find that the volume of time payments is growing much faster than the ability to pay is growing; that consumer credit is at an unprecedented height; that farm mortgage indebtedness is increasing at the annual rate of $1,100,000,000; and that the housing starts, in which the Senator from Alabama is so much interested, have decreased every month since last year. Those are additional reasons why we need a housing bill.

I point out these things, Mr. President, to show that when everything looks as beautiful as some persons from Madison Avenue like to paint it with an artist's brush, it does not necessarily mean that everything is perfect. There are some signs which should give us concern.

Since I have quoted from the editorial, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the entire editorial be printed at this point in the RECORD, so there cannot be any quoting out of context.

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

THE TREND—THE TOO BEAUTIFUL BOOM?

The economy has never looked brighter. Every indicator tells the same story of our extraordinary prosperity: The Federal Reserve index of industrial production has hit a new peak; gross national product for the second quarter is estimated at an annual rate of $380 billion, which tops all previous records; and personal income in May, figured at annual rates, soared over $300 billion for the first time in history.

In its current state of boom, the economy can be likened to the bride who is too beautiful. Business is good—so good that it may in the long run be too good. A growing number of economists are concerned that our phenomenal rate of growth can create maladjustments that will inevitably bring on a decline.

We have always been haunted by the cyclical pattern of boom and bust. As our experience in the 1953–54 recession shows, our ability to avoid a serious downturn depends on preventing the distortions that arise when an inflationary pressure is heaped on top of an already vigorous boom.

INTO THE STRATOSPHERE

There is reason to believe that the boom has reached a stage where it is comparatively easy to rocket up to the stratosphere of inflation. At present, costs and prices are in balance. But the auto and steel wage settlements are already bringing price hikes. As manufacturers are confronted with rising costs, they will tend to increase production and prices. This may, in turn, lead businessmen to build up inventories rapidly—something which usually becomes an excessive accumulation. This is a process we have experienced before in our economy, and the end result is always a painful morning after.

The most important weapon in combating a super boom is a restrictive credit policy. The upsurge in business to date has, by itself, tightened credit. The Federal Reserve Board has wisely refused to make credit freely available, which would have invited inflation.

TO COMBAT INFLATION

It is the duty of the Federal Reserve to use its weapons when inflation threatens. But though many businessmen see the wisdom of general restraint, they protest as soon as they themselves are pinched.

It has often been said in the postwar period that at last we have learned how to even out the swings of the business cycle—and much of the country's growing confidence is based on this belief. It probably is true that we have learned how. But whether we have developed the will power, the capacity for self-denial, to do it is another question.

The critical moment for an anticycle policy is not at the bottom of a slump but toward

the top of a boom. It is at that moment that the credit authorities have to stick to their guns. And it is at that moment that the country in general, especially the business community, has to give the authorities support to harden their nerve. As we see it, that moment is right now.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Alabama yield to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. (Mr. BIBLE in the chair). Does the Senator from Alabama yield to the Senator from Vermont?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. In pointing out that today the farmer is not receiving his fair share of the national income, the Senator from Alabama cannot start any argument at all with me, for no one knows better than I do, I believe, that today the farmer is not receiving his fair share of the national income. That situation is not due to any one reason; it is due to a combination of reasons.

I believe that today we have on hand the tools with which to strengthen both the price of soybeans and the price of lard; I do not think a law is needed in order to accomplish that result. However, I point out that the fact that soybeans are selling for less than the support price shows conclusively that farm income cannot be maintained by supports alone, and shows particularly that by that means we cannot do much for the million and one-half low-income persons who are living on farms—those to whom reference has been made by the Senator from Alabama. He is entitled to a great deal of credit for frequently pointing out that situation, and for introducing, last winter, a bill on that subject. I do not know how the bill reads in detail, and I do not know whether I would agree with all the provisions of the bill; but I know that the Senator from Alabama introduced a bill to help relieve this situation.

All of us know that the President sent to Congress a message in which he requested more tools, modest ones, with which to attack and work on this problem. I think the President asked for what he thought he reasonably could get from Congress.

The Senator from Alabama asked for more than he could get from Congress; I think that was obvious from the start. Evidently he was shooting at the ultimate objective, which cannot be realized all at once.

But I believe the House Appropriations Committee and the Senate committee as well has now thrown out even the modest increase proposed by the President over the present programs. The increase proposed by the President is modest, because in many respects the President's proposal would simply increase the programs now in existence and would use them to better advantage.

I believe it will be too bad if the Congress does not go along with the President's proposal and undertake by legislative action to afford needed relief to the million and one-half families—comprising probably 6 million or 7 million persons—who today are living on farms, but do not have the means of a decent livelihood, and in many cases do not have educational opportunities, particularly vocational education opportunities. If they leave the farms, and find work elsewhere, they cannot command high wages, because they are not trained. They are trying to make a living on farms which are so small that even if they received 300 or 400 percent of parity for the crops they produce, they still would be unable to make a decent living.

So, Mr. President, I should like to see the Senate today vote to restore the cuts in the appropriation which were made originally by the House, and subsequently agreed to by the Senate committee. Merely because there is a possibility that the House will reject such action by the Senate does not excuse the Senate from doing what it should do.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I certainly agree with the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Alabama yield to me?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, because my brief remarks relative to the current state of the economy began this delightful argument——

Mr. SPARKMAN. It began only because the Senator from Arizona omitted to mention what I consider to be a most important segment of our economy, namely, the farmers; and I wish to be sure that the farmers are given adequate consideration in connection with this subject.

Mr. GOLDWATER. The Senator from Alabama will recall that in answer to a question he asked, I made some remarks about the farmers.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Yes; the Senator from Arizona said that the per capita income of the farmers is holding its own because many of the farmers are being pushed off the farms.

Mr. GOLDWATER. No; the Senator from Alabama is mistaken, and I should like to correct his statement. I did not say anyone was pushing anyone else off anything.

Mr. SPARKMAN. No; I said that.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I agree that the Senator from Alabama said it.

Mr. SPARKMAN. But it reminds me of something which was testified before the Joint Committee on the Economic Report, in the early part of the year, when officials from the Treasury Department were before the committee, and when the national debt was being discussed. Throughout the Democratic administrations, the Republicans criticized us day after day—that was done both by our Republican colleagues across the aisle and by other Republicans all over the Nation—because of the size of the national debt. They said the national debt was a terrible thing. Of course, in 1952 the Republicans made some beautiful promises about reducing the national debt.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. And they said they would balance the budget.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Yes; they also said they would balance the budget and would give us a sound dollar and would reduce taxes. Oh, Mr. President, just consider what they said they were going to do.

But we find that, instead of reducing the national debt, since that time it has risen and risen and risen.

After the end of the war, the Democrats never had to ask to have the debt ceiling raised. But the Republicans have had to ask, every year, for a higher debt ceiling, because the national debt is pushing the old ceiling clear out of reach.

This year, when we held our hearings, the administration witnesses brought in the prettiest story anyone ever heard. They had reached the point where they were no longer afraid of an unbalanced budget. Even last year, Mr. Humphrey, when testifying before our committee, said:

> We are not going to be able to balance the budget this year, but we are going to get pretty close to a cash budget balance.

The first time I ever heard anything about a cash budget, Mr. President, was during the Democratic administration; and when that was suggested, there came from Republican orators all over the country cries that it was the most ridiculous thing ever heard of because it included social-security funds, and therefore was dishonest. But Mr. Humphrey said:

> We are going to get pretty close to a cash budget balance.

I said to him:

> Mr. Secretary, I am glad to see that, at long last, you are not afraid to talk about a cash budget. But you talk about it as if we had never had one, when, as a matter of fact, during the 7 years the Democrats were in control of the Government, following the end of the war, we had a cash balance budget 5 times, and we had an actual budget balance—an operating budget balance—3 times; and we collected an excess of $17 billion.

However, members of the present administration talk as if they never heard of those things.

This year, Mr. Humphrey has been saying he no longer is afraid of an unbalanced budget. He said that, after all an unbalanced budget does not make too much difference. Mr. President, I think perhaps in the case of the national debt they are falling back on the old doctrine—the doctrine the Republicans used to scorn so much—that, after all, we owe the debt to ourselves.

Then they brought out some beautiful charts. My friend, the Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER] remembers that; he was there, as a member of the committee. They displayed the charts, and used the same argument my friend used a few minutes ago, in referring to the farmer, namely, that the farmer's individual income is greater because there are fewer farmers, in view of the fact that many of the farmers have been pushed off the farms. That is true because under present conditions the small farmers cannot make a living any more, and therefore many of them have been pushed off the farms, and fewer of them remain on the farms; and the Senator said that although the national debt has been increased, that is not too bad, because, he said, the population is increasing at the rate of approximately 3 million a year, so the farmer's per capita debt is not getting any greater.

What an argument to present to the American people to sustain the promise that the Republicans made to the American people that they were going to reduce the national debt. That is the same kind of argument my friend from Arizona is using now with respect to per capita farm income.

Mr. President, what I know is that the farmers in my State—and from what I hear the situation is the same in every other State in the Union—are suffering. It is quite noticeable and quite significant that the Senatorial Campaign Committee on the Republican side omitted completely from the beautiful boom picture that was painted any reference whatsoever to one of the greatest segments of our economy, the farmer. I am not sure how much stress was laid on the topic, but something was said about small business. I am not sure that the situation I am about to mention is true now, but it was true not long ago. If we check the figures, we shall find that there are more bankruptcies in small businesses than ever before.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I will yield in a moment.

Of course, Mr. President, we are all happy that we have this prosperous time. I glory in it.

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

Mr. SPARKMAN. Let me add a word.

Let us join hands and bring about prosperity across the board, for the little man as well as the big man. Let us get rid of some of the disparity in rates of income. Some of the rates were read to us by the distinguished Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] from the Federal Reserve Board's own report.

Let us arrange for a share in the new prosperity for the coal miners of Alabama and other States of the Union, for the farmers, and for others who are having a hard time, such as schoolteachers and small-business men. Let us arrange things so that they will share in this great prosperity. Let us make it prosperity across the board, and not merely for the favored few.

I now yield to the Senator from Arizona.

Mr. GOLDWATER. The Senator from Alabama has made so many remarks that I am afraid I shall be unable to allude to all of them. I should like to be allowed to put him at ease——

Mr. SPARKMAN. I did not try to allude to all the statements made by the Senator from Arizona. I simply alluded to those he omitted to make.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I am grateful to the Senator from Alabama for calling to my attention what he seems to feel are omissions. Let me tell the Senator from Alabama two things.

First, I will gladly join hands with him at any time to see that this Congress, or any Congress, or any administration, be it Democratic or Republican, does all it can do to help not merely the small farmer or the big farmer, not merely big business or small business, but, as the Senator puts it, all the people of America.

I should like to refresh the Senator's recollection on one point. When he is talking to this Republican about balancing the budget, he is talking to one who still believes the budget should be balanced.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I agree with that statement. I am sure the Senator is sincere. I, too, want to see the budget balanced.

Mr. GOLDWATER. It is refreshing to hear that statement from the Senator from Alabama.

Mr. SPARKMAN. But I do not want to see it balanced at the expense of the misery of the American people.

Mr. GOLDWATER. It need not be.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Nor at the expense of our national security.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Let me say to the Senator from Alabama—and he knows this fully as well as I do, because he sat through the sessions of the Joint Committee on the Economic Report—that one of the greatest things that could happen to all the people of the country would be a balanced budget and a tax reduction, so that small business, big business, the small farmer, and the big farmer, could prosper. I do not think the Senator quarrels with that viewpoint.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Not at all.

Mr. GOLDWATER. We should not talk about continued prosperity among all segments of business unless we in Congress dedicate ourselves to the task of reducing expenditures to the point where the budget can be balanced and additional stability in the dollar created. That is one of the things which the Senator has overlooked. He has overlooked the stability which this administration has brought to the dollar since it came into power.

Mr. SPARKMAN. No; let me say to the Senator from Arizona that I have not overlooked it. The dollar has remained pretty stable. It was stable for 18 months prior to the advent of this administration. I have not checked the statistics recently, but I believe they will show that today the dollar is worth probably about the same as it was worth when the present administration came into office, or perhaps a little less. It went down a little. I am not sure whether it has swung back or not. So it has been very well stabilized. I am not quarreling on that score. I am delighted that it is stabilized.

I read in the newspapers that the administration is contemplating asking Congress for certain economic controls. I do not know whether that is true or not. I read in the newspaper on Sunday that the administration was planning to ask us for controls. I merely throw that out as a thought, because a few minutes ago the Senator from Arizona mentioned controls.

Mr. GOLDWATER. The Senator from Alabama has just expressed concern about controls. I have not read the article to which he refers.

Mr. SPARKMAN. It was published in Sunday's newspapers. It had to do specifically with housing and the home mortgage market.

Mr. GOLDWATER. With standby price control?

Mr. SPARKMAN. That is correct.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I was not aware of that article.

The Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] mentioned some figures which I know to be correct. If the Senator from Alabama will permit me to do so, I should like to comment upon them.

Mr. SPARKMAN. By all means.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I merely wish to give the entire picture.

First is the picture of overall corporate profits. I am referring to the June issue of the Economic Indicator issued by our committee. There have been other periods in recent history when corporate profits topped those of this year. This is nothing new.

In 1948 corporate profits after taxes were 0.6 of a point below what they are today. But in 1950 they were higher than they are today, and this year they are approximately 5 percent over those of last year. However, corporate taxes have likewise increased by 5 percent. So we should expect greater profits in a greater economy. There is nothing out of line in that respect. If we are operating with a gross national product of $380 billion, and a total national income of $300 billion, I think the Senator has sufficient background and experience in economics to realize that someone must make more profits out of business in an expanding economy.

Mention was made of credit. The Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] made some comments on that subject. I think that is a subject which can stand some looking into. As one who spent many years in business, I must admit that I used to be deeply concerned about the national credit, before it had passed the point of $21 billion. It passed $21 billion and nothing happened. It went to $28 billion, and nothing happened. I believe today it is running at a rate between $31 billion and $32 billion.

I agree with the Senator from Minnesota that possibly we should take a look at that situation. Certainly the present relationship between credit and money is contrary to the theory of many economists as to how much the economy can stand. I believe that in the course of the coming year we shall see some inventory adjustments, particularly in the heavy-industry fields, which might bring that figure down somewhat. However, I think possibly it will be necessary for us to take another look at that particular relationship.

Certain figures concerning earnings were mentioned; and because I mentioned that subject specifically in my discussion, I should like to mention a few specific wage increases in the past year.

In all manufacturing, wages went from $71.50 in June of 1954 to $76.11 this year. In durable-goods manufacturing, they went from $76.40 in June of last year to $82.19 this year. In non-durable-goods manufacturing, they went from $64.57 in June 1954 to $67.83 this year.

In building construction, they went from $95.72 in June of last year to $96.52 this year. In retail trade, they jumped from $57.38 last June to $58.35 this June.

I submit those figures to show that the increases have been real, with a stable dollar.

Let us get back to the problem of the farmer. I share the concern of the Senator from Alabama with respect to the farmer. We have talked about him in the joint committee time and time again. I think the Senator from Alabama—and I say this with no disparagement of the Democratic Party or the New Deal—will recall that during our discussions—and it has been brought out time and again—it was emphasized that the small farmer, the one with an annual income of less than $1,000 or $1,200, has been a problem in this country for many years, regardless of who has been in power.

Frankly, I do not believe the problem will be answered entirely in Washington. I do not know what to offer to the Senator from Alabama as a solution. I should like to see someone come up with an answer, and I should like to hear what the Government can do to help and what the free-enterprise system can do to help the small farmers, many of whom, I know, live in the South.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, may I interrupt at that point?

Mr. GOLDWATER. I should like to finish my thought first.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I wanted to say something on the point just made. I should like to recommend to the Senator from Arizona that he read a report on the low-income farmer submitted by a subcommittee of which I was the chairman. Then I would also recommend that the Senator from Arizona read a bill I introduced in February, I believe. If the Senator would like to see it, I may be able to find a copy of the statement I made at the time. I believe the Senator will agree with me that in that bill a good start is suggested toward working out the program.

Mr. GOLDWATER. The Senator from Alabama should be complimented for his constant interest in the low-income farmer, who is one of the real problems of our total economy. I believe small business will pretty much take care of itself.

Mr. SPARKMAN. If small business is given the privilege of competing in a fair competitive market, it will take care of itself. I believe the Senator from Arizona will agree with me that there is constant danger from the mergers being formed all over the country. The Senator need not take my statement about that. He can take the statement of the Chairman of the Federal Trade Commission, Mr. Howrey, an appointee of this administration. He has spoken of it many times. The Senator may take the statement of another appointee of the administration, Judge Barnes, the head of the Antitrust Division of the Department of Justice, who has spoken against mergers. Those are the developments that small business is afraid of. The Senator from Arizona is familiar with that fact. He is a member of the committee.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I am glad the Senator has brought out that point. I do not like to leave the subject of the small farmers, but I suppose we have exhausted it. I hope we have not exhausted the small farmer.

The Senator worries about small business and about fair competition. Mergers to which he has referred are not only occurring at the top. The ones at the top are not the ones which I, as a businessman, fear. What I am afraid of are the taxes which prevent the small-business man, who owes $5,000 or $10,000, from making sufficient profit to expand his business. What does he do? All of this was brought out in our hearings. He must find another man who has some capital. The two of them get together, and with their joint resources they can afford to expand the business. That is the beginning of monopoly.

I suggest to the Senator from Alabama that we need not be worried about the big corporations like General Motors or General Electric. We can watch them. They are big. Let us worry about the small communities and about small businesses, which often are gigantic businesses in small towns. Let us worry about the kind of small-business man to whom I have referred. He cannot get a loan from a bank, and the money he makes goes to the Federal Government in the form of taxes.

I say that the Senator from Alabama and the Senator from Arizona should join forces to see if they cannot bring about some economy in Congress to the end that taxes may be reduced, so that small business, which is the root of the economic strength of the Nation, can grow independently without having to combine and try to develop in that way, rather than by its own efforts.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Let me say to the Senator from Arizona that I commend to his reading the report which was made by the Small Business Committee. The study was made during the 82d Congress, but the report itself was submitted at the beginning of the 83d Congress. It deals with the tax problem. I hope the Senator will read that report. When the Senator said we should join forces, I thought he was going to say something about setting up a capital system for small business, and I was about to invite the Senator to join in the sponsorship of two bills on which the administration so far has turned thumbs down.

Mr. GOLDWATER. The Senator from Arizona disagrees with any approach that involves Federal lending.

Mr. SPARKMAN. These bills are not Federal lending measures.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Then I have not had the pleasure of reading the bills to which the Senator has referred. However, I cannot imagine the Senator from Alabama introducing a bill which does not allude in some way to that aspect. I say that with all respect, but in all sincerity.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I hope the Senator will let me make a statement. If he were to read the bills, he would get a different opinion of the Senator from Alabama.

Mr. GOLDWATER. My opinion of the Senator from Alabama is a very high one.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I mean with reference to the subject under discussion.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I have welcomed the Senator from Alabama to my State, even when he was in opposition to me.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I did not come to the Senator's State in opposition to him. I was not there during his campaign. Arizona is a great State, but I have never been there in a campaign.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Our two States stand at the top of the list alphabetically, and I believe in many other respects as well.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I appreciate the Senator's statement.

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

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. This has been a very interesting colloquy. I regret that I had to leave during a part of it to answer a call. There seems to be a desire on the part of both Senators to have a measure enacted for the benefit of the marginal farmer and also to do something for the small-business man.

While we talk about doing something, the administration plows right ahead and does something for the big corporations.

It is not only a problem of the $1,000 a year farmer. It is a problem of the farmer who has a gross income of from $4,000 to $12,000 a year, or more. Those farmers are the ones who are suffering very much today. I speak for the people of the State which I am privileged in part to represent. It is a very serious problem. That is admitted freely by the University of Minnesota, the Federal Reserve Board, the banking institutions of our State, and by the farmers themselves. I believe a reflection of that attitude is found in the congressional delegation, regardless of partisanship. All Members are very much concerned with it. I should like to point out that although a glance at the general figures would lead one to believe that all is well, the administration and Congress have set what, to express my personal opinion, I consider to be an unfortunate economic policy. For example, in the tax law most of the tax reductions go to the part of the economy which needs them the least.

The administration points out that we had a deficit in excess of $4,160,000,000. Deficit financing is a part of the last generation's traditions. We have had a long experience with it. The only difference between the Democrats and the Republicans on this point is that the Republicans told the people they were going to be able to do away with the deficit.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, may I interrupt at that point?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. SPARKMAN. The Senator apparently was not in the Chamber when I pointed out that, from the end of the war until the Republicans took over, in 3 of the 7 years the budget was actually balanced and we had a surplus of $17 billion.

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

Mr. SPARKMAN. We had a cash budget balance in 5 of those 7 years.

Mr. HUMPHREY. We had not made any campaign promise along that line,

with the exception of the one Mr. Roosevelt made in 1932, I believe, at Pittsburgh. Immediately after he assumed the Presidential office, he recognized he had made a commitment which could not be kept, and he said so. There is a deficit, and apparently it will continue to be what it is, because I read a statement in the newspapers only recently, which I put in the RECORD at the time, to the effect that Charles Wilson, the Secretary of Defense, now says that defense spending will have to go up because we have expended the moneys which were appropriated in prior years for the hardware and machinery necessary for the defense establishment.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Those are the c. o. d.'s.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes. I have one final thought on the subject.

I think what I am about to say will indicate some of our problems. I hold in my hand a review of interest rate increases on Government securities. It does not, of course, include private interest rate increases which followed the 1953 so-called tight-money policy of the Federal Government.

On long-term bonds the people of the United States over the next 30 years will be required to pay $225 million in extra interest. That, of course, will be a great help to the small farmer and the small-business man.

On short-term 1-year certificates the increase in interest rates will be $42 million.

On short-term certificates, 1-year maturity, $30 million.

On short-term, 5-year, 10 months' maturity, $1,259,000.

On GI home loans, over the next 20 years, there will be an estimated $265,939,000 increase in interest.

On non-GI home loans, $87,399,720 annually.

The administration wants to help the small farmer, so what does it do? It raises the interest rate on commodity credit loans and tries to sneak in an increase on disaster loans, raising the interest charges $14 million annually.

There are also small business administration loans with a 20 percent increase in interest.

I point out, furthermore, that if there should be a careful examination of the document which my good friend from Arizona is examining he will find that bank and investment profits are at an all-time high. While he finds them at an all-time high, he will find that independent business profits of those businesses which are doing less than $150,000 a year in gross volume are on the decline rather than in the ascendancy. These are signs which are not too good.

We build a superstructure, but the foundation gets too much sand in it for the amount of mortar and concrete used.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Since our tax structure, which goes back many years, has become so high, small business profits have been declining percentagewise. That is not a new phenomenon that happened just last week.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The best we are able to get out of our Republican friends is "We are doing no worse than you Democrats did. We were going to have all these things corrected, but now we find that, at best, we too have sinned."

There is not much redemption in that, nor will there be much joy in heaven over such a statement.

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

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I invite the Senator's attention to the fact that of the 3 years during which the budget was balanced, 2 years were under the Republican 80th Congress.

Mr. ALLOTT subsequently said: Mr. President, going back to the discussion on farming and small business, I should like to recall two or three items to my colleagues' attention, particularly items which were skipped over rather lightly.

Although it has not been my privilege to discuss these matters on the floor, the welfare of agriculture has been of great interest to me for many years. Therefore, when the statement is made upon the floor that the Department of Agriculture is paying no attention to anyone except the big boys, the large farmers, I cannot let it pass unchallenged.

With respect to the low-income farmers, representing the million and a half families to whom reference has been made, it has seemed to me only sensible that we should center our attention where it should be centered. The primary reason for the low income in this particular class arises above all else either from the farming of marginal land or the farming of units which are not economically feasible. I think the distinguished Senator from Alabama will agree with that statement.

I should like to invite his attention and the attention of the Senate to the conference called by the Secretary of Agriculture in Cheyenne this coming month, for the express purpose of starting a long-term, practical program for the proper use of land and for proper land management. This is a program which to a great extent, at least, so far as its practical and workable features are concerned, has been ignored during the past 25 years.

If we are to have a total farm population that can have an income which will bring them a decent living and working wage, we must, first of all, have a farm population which is housed and which occupies farmland which is, first, not marginal land, but land which will return them a gainful living; and second, is land of sufficient size to afford the farmer more than a marginal living.

The Secretary of Agriculture, in calling the conference on the high plains—and this meeting applies more particularly, I may say, to the high plains area and the midwestern part of the United States—has taken a great step forward in the practical accomplishment of the program.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, may I interrupt the Senator from Colorado before he leaves that subject?

Mr. ALLOTT. Certainly.

Mr. SPARKMAN. The Senator referred to the utilization of land by those who were above the marginal level. Perhaps that is not the exact terminology the Senator used.

Mr. ALLOTT. No. I was speaking of those who occupy land units which are marginal either because of the nature of the soil or because of the lack of sufficient acreage fail to produce an adequate income.

Mr. SPARKMAN. The able senior Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] pointed out a while ago that there are 1½ million such farms in the United States.

Mr. BIBLE. I believe he said farm families.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Farm families. I mean farm heads. As a matter of fact, in the study which our committee conducted in 1951, we discovered that there were 2,500,000 employable persons underemployed, which is a different way of arriving at pretty much the same result.

What will happen to the million and one-half who are marginal farmers and who do not meet that test? That is the problem which poses itself before us.

Mr. ALLOTT. I thank the able Senator for his statement, because it is what I was trying to state in my own way, which is that the program of the Government—of the Department of Agriculture—must be such that the low income farmers will not be displaced, but that the land use, the ability, perhaps, to purchase additional tracts of land in order to bring the farm up to an economic unit, and other considerations must be so implemented that the farmers can be helped to raise their own standard of living. That is what I am interested in.

I also wish to call the attention of my colleagues to an administration letter, issued by the Department of Agriculture under date of July 15, 1955, which hits the problem on the head, and for the small farmer of the United States greatly expands and implements the credit available to him. Particularly, item 3 provides not only for emergency loans, but also for refinancing in specific instances.

The Senator from Alabama may recall that during the early part of this session, I introduced a bill, S. 1912, for the implementation of farm credit to the farmers of the Nation. That was no idle gesture. It was not done for the purpose of satisfying any of my constituents back home. It was done because, after having lived with farmers for 26 years, as I have, I believed implicitly that they needed such a program. I believed that the farm program must be expanded, and that particularly what was needed in the high plains area, more than anything else, was the implementation of credit for the small farmers.

Although I have not been able to date to get a hearing upon my bill, S. 1912, I wish to offer for the RECORD at this time, as a part of my remarks, the letter of the United States Department of Agriculture, Farmers' Home Administration, dated July 15, 1955.

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

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
FARMERS' HOME ADMINISTRATION,
OFFICE OF THE ADMINISTRATOR,
Washington, July 15, 1955.

Subject: Emergency credit program—Great Plains area.

I. General:

A. This administration letter provides the policies, procedures, and authorities for the

administration of a broader emergency credit program to meet the special problems in certain counties of the Great Plains area. The objective of the lending program authorized herein is to supplement the credit now available through private and governmental sources in assisting farmers and stockmen in (1) making conversions in their operations and in otherwise developing sound farm management programs that are consistent with the long-range agriculture program for proper land use in the area, and (2) meeting operating expenses and other obligations, including the refinancing of debts, which must be met if they are to continue in business. Because of the special problems in this area, loans will be made only to applicants who agree to observe recommended land use and farm management practices.

B. Loans under this administration letter will be made under authority of section 2 (a) of Public Law 38, 81st Congress, as amended, and only in counties designated by the Secretary of Agriculture as shown on exhibit A hereto attached. In addition, this authority will replace the authority to make emergency loans in such counties pursuant to FHA instructions 445.1, 449.1, and administration letter 372 (447).

II. Development of land use and resource guides: County supervisors, in cooperation with representatives of the Soil Conservation Service, Extension Service, and other groups or organizations interested in the agricultural problems of the area, will develop minimum resource and production efficiency guides applicable to each county under their jurisdiction, incorporating the land use recommendations for the area. To the extent applicable, guides developed in connection with the production and subsistence (P. and S.) and farm ownership (FO) loan programs will be used. Such guides probably will require modifications to include not only information with respect to land use but also recommended systems of farming and conservation practices applicable to farms that are larger than family type. In addition, the guides developed will be supplemented and revised periodically on the basis of information developed through additional research and land classification programs. State directors will advise with county supervisors in the development of such guides to assure they are consistent with the long-range agricultural program for the area.

III. Relationship to other Farmers' Home Administration (FHA) programs: Loans will not be made under this authority to any applicant whose credit needs can be met with a P. and S., FO, or soil and water conservation (SW) loan, or any combination of such loans. If an eligible applicant's complete needs cannot be met with such loans, his needs will be met with an emergency loan in combination with an SW, FO, or P. and S. loan. If an eligible applicant's needs cannot be met in this manner, his needs will be met with an emergency loan. All loans made hereunder will be based on farm and home plans developed on Forms FHA-14, Farm and Home Plan, and 14A, long-time Farm and Home Plan, and will be serviced as supervised loans.

IV. Eligibility: Any farm owner, farm operator, or stockman, including a partnership or corporation, is eligible for an emergency loan under this authority if it is determined that the applicant:

A. Possesses legal capacity to contract for the loan.

B. Is an established operator with a good past record of operations under normal conditions.

C. Is primarily engaged in farming or livestock operations.

D. Is unable to obtain from commercial banks, cooperative lending agencies, or other responsible sources, or through other programs of the FHA, the credit required to meet his needs, or if the applicant is a partnership or corporation the partners or stockholders are not in a position to finance the operations involved.

E. Will own or have available under satisfactory tenure arrangements a farm suitable for carrying on successful farming operations.

F. Can be expected to carry on farming operations that are consistent with proper land use for the area and will have reasonable prospects for success with the assistance of an emergency loan.

G. Can be expected to endeavor honestly to carry out the undertakings and obligations required of him under the loan.

V. Loan purposes: Loans may be made for any agricultural purpose consistent with the objectives of the program as outlined in paragraph I, such as the following:

A. The purchase of livestock, farm equipment, farm equipment repairs, seed, fertilizer, feed, insecticides, and farm supplies. These purposes do not include the purchase of passenger automobiles.

B. The payment of cash rent for not more than 1 year in advance where no other satisfactory rental arrangements can be effected, provided (1) the applicant is obligated under a written lease to pay in advance the amount to be loaned for such purpose, and (2) the terms of the lease provide the applicant with reasonably secure and satisfactory tenure.

C. The payment of taxes and insurance premiums on real and personal property owned by the applicant essential to his farming operations. However, loan funds will not be used to pay insurance premiums or taxes, either current or delinquent, on FO, Farm Housing (FH), or SW farms.

D. To finance basic land and soil improvements as may be necessary to develop farms into economic units in accordance with approved conservation and land use practices for the area, including the reseeding of grasslands, fencing, brush removal, and soil and water erosion control measures.

E. The development and improvement of domestic and irrigation water supplies and the repair and installation of water facilities, including the purchase of stock in water companies or associations when necessary.

F. To make essential repairs and improvements to existing farm buildings or to erect new farm buildings in exceptional cases when needed in connection with a reorganization of the farm business.

G. The purchase of additional land to enable applicants owning inadequate farms to enlarge their farms so they will constitute economic family-type units, taking into consideration the conversions or adjustments to be made in the farming operations.

H. The payment of interest and principal on debts secured primarily by liens on real estate to the extent necessary to restore the applicant's real estate loan account to a current basis, when necessary for the applicant to retain possession of his property. Advances will not be made, however, for the payment of interest and principal on debts owed to the FHA.

I. The refinancing of debts, including unsecured debts incurred for essential purposes in connection with the applicant's operations and debts secured by liens on chattels and farm real estate essential to such operations.

1. Loans will be made for refinancing purposes only when the creditors involved will not permit the applicant to continue his operations and repay such debts in an orderly manner from his income.

2. When funds are advanced for the refinancing of debts, all liens securing such debts must be satisfied of record. In addition, if the amount advanced for this purpose is less than the total debts, both secured and unsecured, in connection with which refinancing is involved, the other creditors will be encouraged to cancel amounts not being refinanced. Furthermore, if the applicant does not have reasonable prospects of repaying the emergency loan and all of his remaining debts over a reasonable period, the other creditors must agree on form FHA-241, "Debt Adjustment Agreement," to an adjustment of their claims so that they will be within the repayment ability of the applicant.

J. The payment of fees and expenses incident to the making of loans which are required to be paid by the applicant.

VI. Terms of loans:

A. Interest will be charged at the rate of 3 percent per annum and will accrue from the date of the loan check on outstanding principal only.

B. Loans will be scheduled to be repaid in accordance with the borrower's reasonable repayment ability, determined by an analysis of his farm and home operations. Except as provided in paragraph VI C, installments on such loans will be scheduled for repayment from each year's income, subject to the following:

1. Advances for annual recurring expenses will be scheduled for repayment when the principal income from the year's operations normally would be received. Advances for such purposes as seeding permanent-type legumes and grasses and for basic soil treatment are not considered annual recurring expenses.

2. Advances to purchase or produce feed for productive livestock or livestock to be fed for the market will be scheduled for repayment when the principal income from the sale of such livestock or the livestock products normally can be expected.

3. Amounts advanced for other operating purposes, including the purchase of livestock and equipment, the refinancing of debts secured by liens on chattels only, or by liens on chattels with liens or real estate as additional security, and the refinancing of unsecured debts involving relatively small amounts, will be schedued for repayment over the shortest period consistent with the applicant's repayment ability but not in excess of 7 years or the useful life of the chattel security, whichever is the shorter period. In addition, amounts advanced for real estate and water facilities purposes which are to be secured by liens on crops and chattels, as authorized in paragraph VII C, will be scheduled for repayment as prescribed herein.

4. Amounts advanced for (a) land development, farm enlargement, building improvements, and other real estate purposes, (b) the refinancing of debts secured primarily by liens on real estate, (c) the payment of interest and principal installments on real estate debts, (d) the refinancing of unsecured debts, where the amount advanced for this purpose will be secured by a real estate lien, and (e) fees in connection with such advances, will be scheduled for repayment over the shortest period consistent with the applicant's repayment ability but not in excess of 20 years from the date of the advance.

(a) It is recognized that it may be necessary to schedule smaller payments during the first few years of the loan because of the larger interest payments which will be due during those years, and because several years may be required for the applicant to realize sufficient income from his farming operations as reorganized to make larger payments during those years. At the same time, it is not expected that mere token payments will be scheduled. With the authority to defer payments until the end of the second full crop year, it is expected that installments generally will be approximately equal taking into consideration the accrued interest that will be due each year.

C. When an applicant's income will be abnormally low during the first year because of the conversions and adjustments to be made in his farming operations, or because

of the drought conditions which have prevailed, and the balance available for debt payment will not be sufficient to enable the borrower to make payments on his emergency loan at the end of the first crop year, the initial payment may be scheduled for repayment at the end of the second full crop year following the date of the loan.

D. In some States original notes evidencing loans secured by liens on chattels cannot be scheduled for repayment over the entire repayment period agreed upon with the applicant because crop and chattel mortgage liens in those States are not valid for the length of time. In such States, when the repayment period agreed upon with the applicant extends beyond the period for which such security instruments are valid, form FHA-258, "Agreement to Extend Repayment Period," will be used to reflect the agreement and will serve as a basis for taking the original notes and security instruments, as well as for taking additional notes and security instruments to extend the debt and lien. In States where the use of form FHA-258 is required, the use thereof will be in accordance with State instructions which have been issued by the State director supplementing paragraph IV D of FHA instruction 441.2.

VII. Security policies: Each loan will be secured in a manner that will protect adequately the interest of the Government. In no event will the amount advanced, exclusive of funds for annual recurring expenses, exceed the applicant's equity in the real estate and chattels offered as security. The applicant's equity will be determined by deducting from the normal market value of such property any liens not to be refinanced. Subject to these policies, each loan will be secured for the full amount as follows:

A. Amounts advanced for operating purposes as outlined in paragraphs VI B 1, 2, and 3 will be secured by the following:

1. A first lien on the crops growing or to be grown by the applicant, except:

(a) When a loan is being made to a tenant, the Government's lien may be subject to the landlord's claim for a reasonable share of the crops for rent for the current year.

(b) When a loan is made to an applicant whose crops are subject to a lien contained in a purchase contract or a real-estate mortgage, the Government's lien may be taken subject to the existing lien for the current year's installment on the real-estate debt, provided the amount of such installment is reasonable when related to the normal rental charges for similar farms in the area.

(c) If a particular crop of the applicant is under lien as security for advances made by another creditor to produce that crop, or is to be financed by another creditor, the Government's lien may be subject to the lien of the other creditor, provided no advance will be made by the FHA in connection with such crops.

2. A first lien on all livestock and farm equipment purchased or refinanced with proceeds of the loan, except no lien will be taken on small tools and equipment, of negligible value.

3. A first lien on all livestock being fed for market and productive livestock, other than that to be used for subsistence purposes, when advances are made to purchase or produce feed for such livestock. When it is not possible to obtain a first lien, however, a second lien will be acceptable provided: (a) The applicant has sufficient equity in the property to justify such action, (b) prior lienholders execute form FHA-916, Agreement—Special Livestock Loan, agreeing to a definite nondisturbance period and to a division of the income to be received from the livestock which will permit the borrower to pay his loan in accordance with the policies expressed herein. When form FHA-916 is used, the words "special livestock" will be changed to "emergency" wherever it appears.

4. The best lien obtainable on as much of the livestock and farm equipment of security value owned by the applicant at the time the loan is made as is necessary to protect the interest of the Government. However, when a loan is made to a tenant, the landlord will be required to subordinate any interest or lien which he may have on such livestock and equipment that resulted from advances made for supplies, supplies furnished, or past-due rent.

5. Written assignments of the proceeds of crop insurance when borrowers have insurance on crops from which payments are expected. If such insurance is to be obtained after the loan is made, an agreement will be reached with the borrower to give an assignment when the insurance is obtained.

6. Assignments of milk income when loans are made to finance dairy enterprises from which payments are expected and assignments of water stock when loans are made for the purchase thereof. Assignments of the proceeds from the sale of other agricultural products will be required when necessary to protect the interest of the Government.

7. The best lien obtainable on real estate when there is insufficient equity in the chattels to secure the amount advanced or the loan approval official determines that such security is necessary for other reasons.

B. Except as provided in paragraph VII C, amounts advanced for land development, the refinancing of debts, or any of the other purposes outlined in paragraph VI B 4, will be secured by the following:

1. A first lien on all real estate purchased or refinanced with the proceeds of the loan, except that advances made to refinance debts secured by junior liens on real estate will be secured by liens of the same priority as those securing the debts being refinanced.

2. The best lien obtainable on all other farm real estate owned by the applicant and on any other real estate owned by the applicant when necessary to adequately secure the loan.

C. Amounts not in excess of $1,000 advanced for any of the purposes outlined in paragraph VI B 4 may be secured as prescribed in paragraph VII A if the loan approving official determines that the loan can be secured adequately in that manner.

VIII. Loan processing:

A. Applications for loans will be received and processed for consideration by county committees under the provisions of FHA instruction 410.1, except that form FHA-1.7, Application for FHA Services, will be used for both initial and subsequent loans.

B. Initial and subsequent emergency loans made pursuant to this administration letter will be defined as prescribed in paragraph XI A of FHA instruction 445.1 and will be assigned case numbers and loan codes as prescribed in paragraph XI E of that instruction, except that "7L" will be used instead of the letter "L" to identify the loan as one made pursuant to this administration letter.

C. Before a loan is approved, a soil survey of the land to be operated must have been prepared by the Soil Conservation Service and a copy of the land capability map prepared by the Soil Conservation Service, or a copy of the Soil Conservation Service map prepared by the county supervisor showing the same information with respect to land use must be available in the loan docket.

1. When a loan will be made to a tenant, the landlord must agree in writing for the farm to be operated in accordance with the land-use recommendations for the particular farm. In addition, when the loan will include funds for land development or other improvements to the real estate, the tenant must have a written lease for a sufficient period and under terms that will enable him to obtain reasonable returns on his investment. Furthermore, the lease must provide for compensating the tenant for any unexhausted value of the improvements upon termination of the lease.

D. Applications for loans which are to be secured primarily by crop and chattel mortgages, even though real-estate liens may be taken as additional security, will be processed in accordance with FHA instruction 441.3 in the same manner as adjustment production and subsistence loans, except as follows:

1. Paragraphs I, II, III A, and III B of FHA instruction 441.3 are not applicable.

2. Form FHA-910B, County Committee Certification (emergency loans — Great Plains), will be used in lieu of form FHA-49, Certifications—Production and Subsistence Loans. Before a loan is approved, the county committee must make the necessary certifications on form FHA-910B, which will be executed in an original only. When the applicant is determined to be ineligible, the county committee certification will be deleted and the word "Rejected," together with the reasons for the action, will be inserted in the space provided for comments.

3. Form FHA-203, Promissory Note, will be used instead of form FHA-31, Promissory Note, as required by paragraph III-G of FHA instruction 441.3, and any reference to form FHA-31 in that instruction will be interpreted to mean form FHA-203. Paragraph III-G of FHA instruction 441.3 is otherwise applicable except that repayments will be scheduled in accordance with paragraph VI of this administration letter. The rate of interest will be shown on form FHA-203 as 3 percent. In addition, the letters 'PE" will be typed under the title of form FHA-203 for identification purposes.

4. Paragraph III-I of FHA instruction 441.3 is not applicable. Instead, form FHA-5, Loan Authorization, will be prepared in accordance with paragraph XI D of FHA instruction 445.1, except that the letters PE-IG (initial PE loan) and PE-SG (subsequent PE loan) will be used to identify the loan as an initial or subsequent loan made pursuant to this administration letter.

5. Paragraph III-K of FHA instruction 441.3 is modified hereby to provide that loans may not be disbursed in more than 4 advances and the last advance must be disbursed not later than 12 months from the date of the first advance.

6. When a real estate lien is to be taken as security title evidence will be obtained in the same manner as outlined for SW loans in paragraph V of FHA instruction 442.2, and the lien will be taken on form FHA-76, Real Estate Mortgage, in the same manner as for other emergency loans.

7. Paragraph IV of FHA instruction 441.3 is modified to substitute form FHA-910B for the reference to form FHA-49. This paragraph is modified further to add form FHA-241.

8. Paragraph V of FHA instruction 441.3 is modified hereby to require submission of loan dockets covering loans to corporations to the representative of the Office of the General Counsel as prescribed in paragraph XI-K-2 of FHA instruction 445.1.

E. Loans made for farm enlargement, farm development, and similar purposes that will be secured only by liens on real estate will be processed in accordance with the general policies and procedures applicable to direct FO loans subject to the following:

1. Where funds are being advanced for farm-enlargement purposes options will be obtained in accordance with the provisions of FHA instruction 421.2.

2. An appraisal of the farm will be made and reported on form FHA-440, Farm Housing Appraisal Report, by an employee authorized to make appraisals. The appraisal will be made as provided in FHA instruction 422.11 except that items 3 and 4 of table 7 will not be completed. In addition, the appraiser will insert in the space provided for "Comments" the normal market value of the farm.

3. Title evidence will be obtained in the same manner as outlined for SW loans in paragraph V of FHA instruction 442.2.

4. Loan dockets will be developed in accordance with FHA instruction 443.2 except as follows:

(a) Paragraphs II through IV and paragraph V-C are not applicable.

(b) Paragraph VI-A is amended hereby by substituting form FHA-910B for form FHA-491.

(c) Paragraph VI-B 1 is not applicable.

(d) Paragraph VI-B 2 is amended to provide for the preparation of each form in accordance with the Forms Manual Insert, except that the letters PE-IG (initial PE loan) and PE-SG (subsequent PE loan) will be used on form FHA-5 and the letters PE will be used on all other forms to identify the loan as an emergency loan.

(e) Paragraph VI-D is modified to delete the references to forms FHA-596A, Supplemental Report (irrigation, drainage, levee, and minerals), FHA-596B, Map of Farm, FHA-197A, Report on Application for Loan, FHA-491, County Committee Certification (farm ownership loans), FHA-981, Farm Ownership Fund Analysis, and FHA-476, Record of Actions, and the evidence required of veterans. This paragraph is modified further to add form FHA-910B, which will be prepared in an original only for the loan docket, form FHA-203, which will be prepared as prescribed in paragraph VIII-D-3 of this administration letter, form FHA-446, Agreement With Prior Lienholder, and form FHA-241, which will be prepared in an original and 2 copies.

(f) Paragraph VII is not applicable. Instead, loans will be reviewed and acted upon by the loan-approval official in accordance with paragraph V of FHA instruction 441.3. If the loan is approved, the title evidence required will be obtained, and when it is determined that the necessary security requirements can be met, forms FHA-5 and 203 will be forwarded to the Finance Office for issuance of the loan check.

(g) Paragraph VIII is not applicable. However, when farm enlargement is involved, the option will be accepted following loan approval on form FHA-191, Acceptance of Option (Vendor to Furnish Abstract), or 191B, Acceptance of Option (Vendor to Furnish Title Insurance), whichever is applicable.

(h) Paragraph IX is not applicable unless title insurance is used.

(i) Paragraphs XIII and XIV are not applicable and paragraphs XV and XVI are not applicable unless title insurance is used, in which case only those portions of these paragraphs dealing with title insurance and closing instructions are applicable.

5. When the loan is to be secured by a first mortgage on real estate, buildings on the property will be insured in accordance with the applicable procedures for FO loans as specified in FHA instruction 426.1. When the loan is to be secured by a junior lien on real estate, buildings on property will be insured in accordance with the applicable procedures for FHA loans as specified in FHA instruction 426.11.

IX. Loan approval authority: The loan approval authority delegated pursuant to paragraph XV of FHA instruction 445.1 with respect to other emergency loans is applicable also to the approval of emergency loans made pursuant to this administration letter.

X. Servicing: Loans made under the authority of this administration letter will be serviced pursuant to FHA instructions containing the authorities, policies, and procedures for the servicing of adjustment loans under the P. & S. loan program, except that FHA instruction 456.1 is not applicable.

XI. Reports:

A. One extra copy of pages 1 and 2 of form FHA-322, Monthly County Report, prepared each month by the county office will be submitted to the State office. The State office will forward the extra copies prepared in the county office, together with the State summaries on form FHA-322 prescribed by FHA instruction 493.6, to the national office, attention: Budget and Statistics Division. In those States where monthly reports are now submitted on a county-unit basis and the special-credit program for the Great Plains area is in effect in some but not all of the counties under the jurisdiction of the county supervisor, it will be necessary for monthly reports to be submitted on an individual county basis.

B. In addition to the report required in paragraph XI-A, a report will be submitted each month to provide information regarding the purposes for which loan funds are advanced. This information will be reported on form FHA-657, Purposes for Which Emergency Loan Funds Were Advanced—Great Plains Area. As each loan is closed, the name of the borrower, the amount of the loan, and the planned use of loan funds will be entered on form FHA-657. This information will be taken from form FHA-14. At the end of each month the county office will attach this report to form FHA-322 and submit it to the State office. State offices will submit these reports to the national office, attention: Budget and Statistics Division, each month with the State summaries of form FHA-322.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I wish to compliment the Secretary of Agriculture, not only in this respect, but also upon his getting at the fundamental task of land use and soil conservation by the holding of a conference in Cheyenne during the coming month, and for considering the real reasons for some of the most serious and fundamental problems in agriculture.

I may say to the Senator from Alabama that I do not regard the welfare of the farmer as a political question. I have never so regarded it. The welfare of this country in the long run will depend upon the welfare of the farmer. Without a successful and a prosperous agriculture, we shall never eventually have a successful and prosperous business, because one is dependent upon the other.

The plight of the farmer at present lies, to a great extent, not alone in the fact that there has been some slight decrease in farm income, but also in the fact that there has been during the past 15 years, in the corresponding period of time, such an increase in the price of commodities which the farmer must purchase, such as plows, disks, harrows, and tractors, that the discrepancy and the widening gap between the things he purchases and his income constitute one of the real problems which the Senator from Alabama and I must recognize, examine, and attack intelligently in a nonpartisan spirit.

I close my remarks by saying again that I do not believe this proposal constitutes a program for big farmers. I find nothing in the regulations which would so indicate. Rather, I believe the reverse is true, that it is a program to help the small farmer and the marginal farmer.

I thank the Senator from Alabama for yielding.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I enjoyed listening to the statement of the distinguished Senator from Colorado.

Mr. President, I wish to read a brief excerpt from an article written by William M. Blair, and published in the New York Times of July 23, 1955. I shall read only the portion which relates to the lower prices:

> The Eisenhower administration was confronted today with farm troubles that, in more aggravated form, have proved the undoing of some of its predecessors. The current headache is combined of declining prices and income, and mounting surpluses and costs for storage and subsidies.
>
> In the background was a ground swell of political protest that may become louder as the next year's political campaigning nears.
>
> Of major political significance was a Department of Agriculture report that farmers' cash income had dropped 4 percent in the first 6 months of this year. This decline from last year was attributed to lower prices for farm products.
>
> * * * * *
>
> The Agriculture Department's marketing service reported that the drop in farm income showed that receipts from livestock and products were off 7 percent from the first 6 months of 1954, or down to $7,800,000,000. Prices of hogs averaged lower and receipts from meat animals were down.

AMENDMENT OF RUBBER-PRODUCING FACILITIES DISPOSAL ACT OF 1953

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I am informed that H. R. 7301, a bill to authorize the disposal of the synthetic-rubber plant at Institute, W. Va., has been passed by the House of Representatives and is now at the desk. I ask that the House bill be laid before the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the bill (H. R. 7301) to authorize the disposal of the synthetic-rubber plant at Institute, W. Va., which was read twice by its title.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, H. R. 7301 is almost identical with the Kilgore amendment to the Defense Production Act amendments of 1955. This amendment was accepted and unanimously agreed to last Tuesday.

The House of Representatives has not yet considered the Defense Production Act amendments, and probably will not do so for a few days, as the House Banking and Currency Committee has just reported a bill which differs somewhat from the bill passed by the Senate.

In the interest of ord^rly procedure, and also of expedition, I request unanimous consent that the Senate consider H. R. 7301 at this time, and that it be passed by the Senate, with amendments, to make it identical with the Kilgore amendment to the Defense Production Act.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I offer the amendments which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendments offered by the Senator from Arkansas.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 2, line 1, it is proposed to strike out "thirty-day" and insert in lieu thereof "sixty-day."

On page 2, line 9, strike out "sixty" and insert in lieu thereof "seventy-five."

On page 4, line 6, after "Notwithstanding", to insert "the provisions of

section 4 of Public Law 19, approved March 31, 1955, and notwithstanding."

On page 4, line 8, to strike out "that" and insert in lieu thereof "the latter."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendments offered by the Senator from Arkansas.

The amendments were agreed to.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill (H. R. 7301) was read the third time, and passed.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I have a brief statement about the amendments to H. R. 7301, which I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

STATEMENT BY SENATOR FULBRIGHT

The first two amendments extend the time for bidding from 30 to 60 days and the time for the Disposal Commission to negotiate with bidders from 60 to 75 days.

The 30- and 60-day periods in the Baytown disposal law were made very short in order that the report to Congress and the 30-day period for congressional disapproval might run out before the end of this session.

Because the next session of Congress will not begin until January, more than 150 days away, and the report to Congress could not therefore be filed before next January, it seems desirable to have the intervening period spent usefully, giving more time for prospective purchasers to study the plant and submit their bids, and more time for the Commission to negotiate with bidders. In addition, this would give the Commission time to obtain additional engineering and other reports, in order to review the full fair value of the plant in the light of the current flourishing rubber market and the high price obtained for the Baytown plant.

Accordingly, it can be expected that these amendments will lead to greater competition and a higher price.

The third and fourth amendments are purely technical, inserting a reference to Public Law 19 in the paragraph relating to the termination of the Commission. They were suggested by the Treasury Department, and were accepted by the Senate when the Kilgore amendment was adopted.

SALARIES OF TEACHERS, SCHOOL OFFICERS, AND EMPLOYEES OF DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA BOARD OF EDUCATION

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. NEUBERGER in the chair) laid before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 1093) to fix and regulate the salaries of teachers, school officers, and other employees of the Board of Education of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes, which were, to strike out pages 2 and 3, inclusive, and insert:

"Salary class and position	Service step 1 minimum	Service step 2	Service step 3	Service step 4	Service step 5	Service step 6	Service step 7	Service step 8	Service step 9	Service step 10	Service step 11	Service step 12	Service step 13
Class 1: Superintendent of schools:													
Bachelor's degree	$14,000												
Master's degree	16,000												
Doctor's degree	18,000												
Class 2: Deputy superintendent	11,700	$12,000	$12,300	$12,600	$12,900	$13,200	$13,500						
Class 3: Assistant superintendent; president, teachers college	10,100	10,400	10,700	11,000	11,300	11,600	11,900						
Class 4	9,500	9,700	9,900	10,100	10,300	10,500	10,700	$10,900	$11,100				
Class 5: Group B, master's degree	8,600	8,800	9,000	9,200	9,400	9,600	9,800	10,000	10,200				
Class 6:													
Group A, bachelor's degree	7,700	7,900	8,100	8,300	8,500	8,700	8,900	9,100	9,300				
Group B, master's degree	8,200	8,400	8,600	8,800	9,000	9,200	9,400	9,600	9,800				
Director, Department of Food Services													
Class 7:													
Group B, master's degree	7,700	7,900	8,100	8,300	8,500	8,700	8,900	9,100	9,300				
Chief Examiner													
Director													
Principal, senior high school													
Class 8: Professor, teachers college	7,700	7,900	8,100	8,300	8,500	8,700	8,900	9,100	9,300				
Class 9:													
Group B, master's degree	7,200	7,400	7,600	7,800	8,000	8,200	8,400	8,600	8,800				
Principal, vocational high school													
Principal, junior high school													
Principal, Americanization school													
Class 10:													
Group B, master's degree	6,800	7,000	7,200	7,400	7,600	7,800	8,000	8,200	8,400				
Director, Department of School Attendance and Work Permits													
Supervising Director													
Principal, elementary school													
Principal, laboratory school													
Class 11: Associate professor, teachers college	6,800	7,000	7,200	7,400	7,600	7,800	8,000	8,200	8,400				
Class 12:													
Group A, bachelor's degree	6,300	6,500	6,700	6,900	7,100	7,300	7,500	7,700	7,900				
Group B, master's degree	6,800	7,000	7,200	7,400	7,600	7,800	8,000	8,200	8,400				
Assistant Director, Department of Food Services													
Class 13:													
Group B, master's degree	6,100	6,300	6,500	6,700	6,900	7,100	7,300	7,500	7,700				
Assistant Director													
Principal, Capitol Page School													
Assistant principal, senior high school													
Class 14: Assistant professor, teachers college; chief librarian, teachers college	6,100	6,300	6,500	6,700	6,900	7,100	7,300	7,500	7,700				
Class 15:													
Group B, master's degree	5,900	6,100	6,300	6,500	6,700	6,900	7,100	7,300	7,500				
Assistant principal, vocational high school													
Assistant principal, junior high school													
Class 16:													
Group B, master's degree	5,700	5,900	6,100	6,300	6,500	6,700	6,900	7,100	7,300				
Class 17:													
Group B, master's degree	5,400	5,600	5,800	6,000	6,200	6,400	6,600	6,800	7,000				
Assistant													
Supervisor													
Chief attendance officer													
Class 18:													
Group A, bachelor's degree	3,900	4,060	4,220	4,380	4,540	4,700	4,860	5,020	5,180	$5,340	$5,500	$5,660	$5,800
Group B, master's degree	4,400	4,560	4,720	4,880	5,040	5,200	5,360	5,520	5,680	5,840	6,000	6,160	6,300
Instructor, teachers college													
Librarian, teachers college													
Teacher, senior high school													
Teacher, vocational high school													
Teacher, junior high school													
Teacher, elementary school													
School librarian													
Counselor													
Research assistant													
Class 19:													
Group A, bachelor's degree	3,900	4,060	4,220	4,380	4,540	4,700	4,860	5,020	5,180	5,340	5,500	5,660	5,800
Group B, master's degree	4,400	4,560	4,720	4,880	5,040	5,200	5,360	5,520	5,680	5,840	6,000	6,160	6,300"
Attendance officer													
Child labor inspector													
Census supervisor													

On page 5, strike out lines 14 through 17; on page 5, strike out line 18 over through line 6 on page 6, and insert:

(c) When used in this act, the terms "master's degree" and "doctor's degree" mean, respectively, a master's degree or a doctor's.

On page 7, line 8, strike out all after "1955" over to and including "C" in line 10, where it appears the first time; on page 7, line 16, strike out all after "group," where it appears the second time, down through and including "group" in line 19; on page 8, in the chart under "Title and class of position in Teachers' Salary Act of 1955" and in the subtitle "Instructor, teachers college" strike out "15" and insert "18"; on page 16, line 11, strike out "B, or group C," and insert "B"; on page 16, lines 14 and 15, strike out "degree or the completion of 30 credit hours beyond the master's"; and on page 16, line 18, strike out "or group C."

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, I move that the Senate disagree to the amendments of the House to Senate bill 1093, request a conference with the House thereon, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. BIBLE, Mr. GORE, and Mr. BEALL conferees on the part of the Senate.

APPEASEMENT IN THE FAR EAST

Mr. McCARTHY obtained the floor.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I was about to suggest the absence of a quorum, but I observe the junior Senator from Wisconsin is prepared to speak. Does the Senator from Wisconsin desire to have a quorum call before he speaks, or afterward?

Mr. McCARTHY. It makes no real difference; I shall be glad to yield.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, Senators are aware that it was the policy of the United States not to discuss the Far Eastern situation at the Big Four meeting. While no formal announcement was made on that point, this was the understanding of Members of Congress, prior to the conference, and it was the ostensible policy of the President and Secretary of State at Geneva. This decision can, I think, be attributed primarily to the efforts and influence of the distinguished minority leader and the distinguished chairman of the Senate Republican Policy Committee, who have consistently maintained that matters affecting the Republic of China must not be discussed without the participation of the Republic of China.

Last night the President told the Nation "there were no secret agreements made at Geneva, either understood agreements or written agreements." I would certainly like to take these assurances at their face value.

But certain very disturbing developments in the last couple of days suggest that while there may have been no secret agreements as such, there may have been secret understandings or undertakings by the Geneva participants. Specifically, I fear that the Far Eastern situation was brought up in informal discussions, and that the Communists and ourselves reached certain understanding as to the course of future negotiations. I repeat: I do not know this to be the case, and I am anxious to hear the views of those who may have specific information. I know that the minority leader and the Senator from New Hampshire have had this matter uppermost in their minds during the past weeks, and possibly they raised it at their conference with the President yesterday.

Yesterday afternoon, scarcely 2 days after the close of the Geneva talks, the Department of State announced that the United States, on August 1, would enter into direct negotiations with the Chinese Communists at the ambassadorial level on the subject of United States prisoners of war and "other practical matters now in issue."

Now, Mr. President, what is the meaning of this vague and, therefore, ominous phrase "other practical matters"? Is it too great a strain on our imagination to suppose that the "other practical matters" include the disposition of Quemoy and the Matsus? Everybody knows that the Chinese Communists are holding our prisoners of war as hostages to force concessions by the free world. They are being held as pawns for diplomatic bargaining. The Communists hope they will be able to persuade the United States to give up Quemoy and the Matsus, and maybe even Formosa itself, in return for the prisoners. They believe that American public opinion will be sufficiently placated by the return of the prisoners to accept the territorial concessions to the Communists. So what are we to think when the State Department announces that we will negotiate about the prisoners and "other practical matters"? If the territories of the Republic of China are not to be the subject of negotiations between Ambassadors, why did the State Department not plainly say so in its statement yesterday?

The other evil omen is this: Last Sunday, not 24 hours after the end of the Geneva talks, the administration spokesman on foreign affairs, the distinguished Senator from Georgia, stated that the United States should enter into talks, with the Chinese Communists, at the Foreign Ministers' level, in order to reach a settlement of the Far Eastern crisis. Senator GEORGE made no mention of the participation in such talks of the Republic of China, and indeed it would be surprising if he had—since he publicly took the position, last spring, that we should not invite the Nationalists to take part in discussions dealing with their own territories.

Was the statement of the Senator from Georgia just a trial balloon, or was it a considered move by the administration and its bipartisanship troops to prepare the American people for appeasement in the Far East. It is no longer possible, Mr. President, to interpret a statement by Senator GEORGE as the individual opinion of one Senator. Too many times in the past the Senator from Georgia has urged changes in American foreign policy on Monday, only to have the administration adopt a new policy on Tuesday. It was the Senator from Georgia who called the turn on the administration's sudden decision to have a meeting at the summit. It was he who, last April, tipped off the new United States policy to negotiate with what he now calls the Soviet Chinese without the participation of Chiang Kai-shek. The day before he made that statement the Under Secretary of State, Mr. Hoover, had reassured the Chinese Nationalists that America would not talk about Nationalist territories without Nationalist participation. But the day after the Senator from Georgia made his statement, the Secretary of State dramatically reversed administration policy, and stated that we would not insist upon Chiang's participation.

Is Senator GEORGE, this time, going out on a limb—all by himself? I wish it were so; but I cannot help but feel that the high priest of bipartisanship is not going to stray very far from the certified administration line.

Is there any evidence that the State Department's statement, on yesterday, about the ambassadorial talks and Senator GEORGE's statement on Sunday were related? I now read from this afternoon's Washington Daily News:

Senator WALTER F. GEORGE, Democrat of Georgia, said today next week's diplomatic talks with Communist China may help set up a two-nation foreign ministers conference on the Far East.

He told reporters he believes any such conference of foreign ministers should start as bilateral discussions between the United States and Red China.

So now we get a hint of what these "other practical matters" are. Does not this look like a carefully prepared plan for appeasing Red China?

I wonder whether my fears are shared, to some degree at least, by the distinguished minority leader. He has for so long been a champion of the free world's outposts in the Far East, and he has been consistently alert to any attempts to barter them away. The American people owe a great debt of gratitude to the senior Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] for his truly heroic stand against appeasement in the Far East. In the past, he has forewarned us of attempts at appeasement, and in many instances he has been successful in frustrating such attempts.

I wonder whether the Senator from California, who has such a keen nose for this sort of thing, smells appeasement in the air. Does he not detect the development of an insidious campaign to betray the Republic of China? Perhaps he would put it less strongly than this; but I wish he would state, in his own words, his feelings on the matter.

Unless we take a stand now and let our views be known, we may wake up one

morning, very soon, and find it is too late.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SPARKMAN in the chair). The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

FROM ARMSTRONG TO WENZELL: GOVERNMENT OF, BY AND FOR BIG BUSINESS

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, last Friday, I discussed the shocking conduct of the Secretary of the Air Force, Harold Talbott. Since Friday, the press has carried additional details of his behavior and misuse of his office.

The Secretary had a lapse of memory about his dealings or attempted private dealings with RCA. In a letter to Senator McCLELLAN, he admitted that he had had an attorney on his staff discuss the conflict of interest question raised by the company—not by the Secretary.

Talbott barely remembered the incident. In his memorandum to Talbott, the Air Force attorney remembered the incident, but did not remember what Talbott said. The telephone conversation took place only last January.

But the RCA attorney remembered both the incident and what was said. This is part of the RCA attorney's testimony, as reproduced in today's New York Times:

Mr. EWING. A new voice came on the wire, and the individual speaking identified himself as Secretary Talbott. He was talking quite rapidly and, among other things, he told me or listed over the phone the names of a number of other companies that he said were doing work for the Air Force that had contracts with the Mulligan company.

Mr. KENNEDY. Do you remember the names of some of those companies?

Mr. EWING. I recall a few of them. He must have mentioned 12 or 15. AVCO was one, Baldwin, I think Continental Can, General Aniline, General Foods, and those are the only ones that I happen to remember.

The CHAIRMAN. I understand that he mentioned those as companies that had contracts with the Defense Department?

Mr. EWING. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Pointing out, as I understand it, that others with contracts with the Air Force were becoming clients or had been clients of Mulligan & Co.; is that correct?

Mr. EWING. Yes, sir.

* * * * *

The CHAIRMAN. You mean he told you that Mr. Johnson, General Counsel for the Air Force, was representing him in this matter?

Mr. EWING. Yes, sir.

Mr. KENNEDY. Is that what you want to convey to this committee?

Mr. EWING. Well, it is what, unfortunately, I am compelled to convey to this committee, sir.

Mr. KENNEDY. Do you remember if I refresh your recollection of our first conversation, you stated that he said "Why is RCA acting so high and mighty?" Do you remember him using those words?

QUESTIONS RCA'S ACTIONS

Mr. EWING. You are absolutely correct. He said that if all of these other companies could take contracts with Mulligan & Co., why was RCA acting so high and mighty?

This testimony indicates that Mr. Talbott's statement, as reported in the press, that he was unaware that AVCO had Defense Department contracts was untrue.

This testimony shows that Talbott consciously and wilfully misused his office as Secretary of the Air Force.

The Investigating Subcommittee of the Government Operations Committee is continuing its investigation and hearings, for which it is to be commended.

THE EISENHOWER ADMINISTRATION PATTERN

The Talbott incident is only a symptom of what has been happening for the 2½ years since President Eisenhower took office.

The Talbott incident is not an isolated case, nor is it merely the story of an individual set upon pursuing private gain by the use, the misuse, of his official position.

No, the Talbott case is part of a pattern inherent in the nature of the big business appointments of the Eisenhower administration.

THE CABINET

Concern over the quality, character, and big business partiality of the Eisenhower administration began even before inauguration. The President's Cabinet nominations presented several direct conflict of interest problems in the Defense Department, which handles more money and contracts than any other agency of the Federal Government.

It will be recalled that of the nominees for Secretary of Defense, Deputy Secretary of Defense, Secretary of the Army, Secretary of the Air Force, and Secretary of the Navy, only the Secretary of the Navy had anticipated the obvious conflict of interest problem and taken steps in advance to remove any such problem.

Messrs. Wilson, Kyes, Stevens, and Talbott not only did not anticipate the problem, but they initially resisted divesting themselves of substantial holdings in corporations with which the Defense Department dealt. Finally, and with reluctance, they surrendered their stockholdings. Each one demonstrated callous lack of understanding of the conflict-of-interest problem.

In the hearing on Roger Kyes' nomination as Deputy Secretary, committee members expressed concern that his close relationship with General Motors would affect his impartiality in official dealings with that major Defense Department contractor. This exchange took place in the hearings:

Senator JOHNSON. Have you any plans or any agreements or agreement to return to General Motors following your Government service?

Mr. KYES. General Motors has told me, because of my record, they would be very happy to have me come back at any time. I enjoyed my association with General Motors, but there is absolutely no commitment on the part of either party with respect to the future.

I do not question the reply made by Mr. Kyes. It is important to bear in mind that the discharge of the duties of Deputy Secretary could be affected, consciously or unconsciously, by the possibility, if not the probability, of his return to General Motors.

After serving 15 months as Deputy Secretary, Kyes resigned on May 1, 1954, and returned to General Motors as a vice president.

In addition to the Defense Department nominees, other Cabinet appointments presented conflict-of-interest problems, which, though solved formally with greater ease, nevertheless raised the problem that big business and big banking would be the dominant force in the President's official family.

The Secretary of the Treasury was the head of one of the large banking and business concerns in the Nation—M. A. Hanna & Co.

The Secretary of Commerce was engaged in manufacturing, and was a director of large manufacturing companies and the First National Bank of Boston.

The Postmaster General also came from the ranks of General Motors, having had one of the largest Chevrolet dealerships in the country.

The Secretary of the Interior also had a large General Motors dealership.

The Attorney General came from one of the large New York law offices, representing large corporations.

The other Cabinet members, with the sole exception of Labor Secretary Durkin, were people who were associated with large business enterprises or possessed great wealth.

Conflict of interest aside, this almost unrelieved pattern meant, it could not help but mean, that Government was to be by, of and for big business and banking.

Although not a Cabinet member, the Director of the Bureau of the Budget wields great power. To this post the President appointed a Detroit banker, who is once again a Detroit banker.

This fitted the pattern—with what effect I shall discuss later in a little detail.

AN EARLY ATTACK UPON INDEPENDENT GOVERNMENT—ASTIN AND ADX2

Early in the administration, the big-business philosophy which dominated the major Eisenhower appointments erupted into an open attack upon independence in the discharge of governmental functions.

Assistant Secretary of Commerce Sheaffer, of the Sheaffer Pen Co., attempted to dismiss Dr. Allen Astin. What was Astin's offense? It was diligent discharge of his duty. He insisted that the scientific tests of the United States Bureau of Standards, which he directed, showed that a battery additive did not do what was claimed for it by its manufacturer.

Sheaffer contended that Astin paid insufficient attention to the standards of the marketplace. Astin refused to play dead and pretend that ADX2 was a battery cure-all.

I was among the first in Congress to protest this outrageous attempt to intimidate Government officials, to force the Bureau of Standards to sacrifice its scientific standards, to impose the marketplace standard of "let the buyer beware." The outcry of scientists and cit-

izens and the press forced a temporary retreat as Astin had his term extended briefly. When the furore died down Astin stayed on, and Sheaffer left Government several months later.

At no time did the President or Secretary of Commerce disown or rebuke Sheaffer's attempts. This, too, is an administration pattern—retreat under fire, but never reject conduct that is against the public interest.

DODGE, WENZELL AND ARMSTRONG

The sordid Dixon-Yates story is too well known to require minute repetition. But the main outlines are part of the pattern.

Banker Dodge, Director of the Budget Bureau, imported Banker Wenzell to participate in the planning of the attack upon TVA. Wenzell's firm, the First Boston Corp., had a direct interest in the Dixon-Yates combine as it was to handle financing of the scheme—without a fee, the public is now assured.

That is a very charitable gesture. Even assuming that no fee was intended for this financial service, Wenzell's corporation has an indirect interest in promoting the interests of its private utility customers at the expense of TVA—and TVA's customers. This investment banking house makes money from such transactions and is understandably eager to hem in and destroy public power agencies.

The Bureau of the Budget went so far in its private utility partisanship as to withhold information from the Congress by omitting mention of Wenzell and the conferences of Dixon-Yates in which he participated. It removed those dates from what was represented to be a complete summary and chronology of the Dixon-Yates deal.

The great Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] deserves high credit for the fine public service he has rendered in disclosing these manipulations and maneuverings on the part of the Bureau of the Budget in connection with the Dixon-Yates chronology.

Has the President, Budget Director Hughes, or any other administration official rebuked this dishonesty? Apparently not.

SECRET INTERVENTION IN QUASI-JUDICIAL PROCEEDINGS

But the deception does not end there. In an attempt to secure congressional approval of the President's request for over $6 million for a transmission line to carry Dixon-Yates power, Presidential Assistant Sherman Adams secretly contacted Chairman Armstrong of the SEC, a recent Eisenhower appointee.

He asked Armstrong to postpone a hearing at which Wenzell was to testify just at the time the House of Representatives was to consider the Dixon-Yates transmission-line appropriation. Armstrong not only discussed the matter with him—itself a breach of his quasi-judicial status—but granted the request.

Of course, in his quasi-judicial capacity, what Armstrong clearly should have said was that under no circumstances would he discuss the subject, because it involved the question of his judicial responsibility.

Armstrong says Adams told him he wanted the delay because Attorney General Brownell was out of town. Certainly the Department of Justice could have made the request in open hearing, where the parties in interest could agree or protest.

This behind-the-closed-door dealing is in marked contrast to the open, on-the-record intervention of the Departments of Agriculture and Interior before the Federal Power Commission in the Hells Canyon case during the Truman administration.

The action of Adams and Armstrong constitutes a flagrant perversion of the quasi-judicial functions of the SEC.

BEESON AND HOWREY AND LYONS

Another set of nominations submitted by the President which are disruptive of even-handed Government are those which consist of appointing men who have represented the industry or interests subject to regulation.

The most shocking examples were:

First. Beeson's appointment to the NLRB in the light of his past activities as an employer representative and his evasive testimony as to his continued affiliation with his employer.

Second. Howrey's appointment as Chairman of the Federal Trade Commission. He was one of the principal attorneys for anti-trust respondents in FTC proceedings; the subsequent weakening of the FTC has substantiated the fears expressed before his confirmation. The President's refusal to reappoint Commissioner Mead is part of the pattern of emasculating this Commission.

Third. Lyons' appointment as Director of the Bureau of Mines. The hearings disclosed that he had a pension from a major mining company, and, in addition, was opposed to the mine safety law. When it became clear that his confirmation would not be possible, the nomination was withdrawn. However, it took an active fight on the floor of the Senate to focus public attention on this very unfortunate appointment.

PACKING THE FEDERAL POWER COMMISSION

The pattern of undermining the administrative process and rigging quasi-judicial agencies is no more clear than in the case of the Federal Power Commission.

In early 1953 the President appointed Jerome Kuykendall as a new member and Chairman of the FPC. Kuykendall was the public utility commissioner of Washington State, an appointee of Governor Langlie, an outspoken foe of Hells Canyon Dam.

After Kuykendall was confirmed, Secretary of Interior McKay withdrew opposition to the Idaho Power Co. small dam application and the Idaho Power Co. amended its application. Then the long-delayed hearings got underway. Subsequent appointments to FPC have completed the roster of antipublic power commissioners.

WICKARD'S OUSTER, FAILURE TO REAPPOINT GORDON CLAPP

The tampering with nonpartisan positions included the forced withdrawal of Claude Wickard as Administrator of REA—a position which by statute is a nonpartisan one—before the end of his term.

The refusal to reappoint Gordon Clapp as Chairman of TVA was certainly within the President's prerogative. However, the subsequent attack upon TVA indicates that Clapp was considered too good and too tough to handle. His replacement, General Vogel, whose confirmation I opposed, has proved a willing colleague of the Budget Bureau in attempts to weaken TVA.

OTHER EXAMPLES

It would take too long to catalog every instance of Presidential appointments that are inconsistent with impartial government.

The attempts to turn the civil service into a Republican grab bag are part and parcel of this pattern. The invention of schedule C for so-called confidential employees has been used as a device to remove civil service protection from scores of positions.

There have been fears that certain key positions under the Railroad Retirement Board would be so transferred. The prohibition against putting those positions under schedule C is the basis for some Republican opposition to the pending railroad retirement bill.

PENDING PATTERSON NOMINATION

I am among the members of the Banking and Currency Committee who oppose the confirmation of Patterson as an SEC Commissioner.

Our principal ground of objection is that Patterson would complete the roster of Commissioners whose main contact with the regulated industry has been with the security exchanges.

This is another example of delivering an administrative agency to the regulated industry.

The administration has slipped through many objectionable and questionable appointments. As we review this sorry list the pattern of bad appointments and interferences with the administrative process has become clear.

The President has either misused or shirked his responsibility—either course amounts to irresponsibility.

The day of easy confirmations of poor appointments has come to an end. Not only the Senate, but, more importantly, the people, are aroused and demand that Government by, of and for big business be brought to an end.

SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS, 1956

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 7278) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, and for other purposes.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, the pending supplemental appropriation bill

for 1956, as it passed the House, provided for an appropriation of $224,276,628. The amount of the increase recommended by the Senate committee is $1,601,834,986. This increase is misleading, since many items of appropriations including well over a billion dollars for military construction were deleted on the floor of the House on points of order. The authorizing legislation on military construction had passed both Houses of Congress and was awaiting the signature of the President which made the appropriation subject to a point of order. Other authorizing bills were in various stages of the legislative process.

The increase of the Senate committee bill over the bill as reported to the House is $177,235,486. In this connection it should be pointed out that the Senate committee considered budget estimates in excess of the estimates considered by the House in the amount of $195,565,204.

While this is labeled a supplemental bill, I think it would be well to point out that over $1,290,000,000 is regular appropriations, rather than supplementals. Of this amount, $1,270,000,000 is for military construction for which the authorization had not been passed when the Defense Department appropriation bill was before the committee. Of the remaining $536 million in the bill, a portion of the funds requested is to carry out measures enacted during this session; in fact, about $100 million contained in the bill is contingent on final enactment of measures now pending before either the House or Senate.

Mr. President, in view of the fact that in the House of Representatives so much of the bill was stricken on points of order, I ask unanimous consent that the committee amendments be agreed to en bloc; that the bill, as thus amended, be regarded for purposes of amendment as the original text; and that no point of order shall be considered to have been waived by agreement to this request.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, if all the committee amendments are agreed to en bloc, will it be in order for me to offer an amendment to a committee amendment?

Mr. HAYDEN. Certainly.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I wish to offer an amendment on page 3. Is this the proper time to do so?

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I should like to have the committee amendments agreed to en bloc, and then have amendments offered from the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PAYNE in the chair). Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Arizona? The Chair hears none, and the committee amendments are agreed to en bloc.

The committee amendments agreed to en bloc are as follows:

Under the heading "Chapter I—Department of Agriculture," on page 2, after line 2, to insert:

"AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH SERVICE

"SALARIES AND EXPENSES

"Not to exceed $25,000 of funds appropriated under this head in the Department of Agriculture and Farm Credit Administration Appropriation Act, 1956, for research, shall be available for construction of a building at the United States Range Livestock Experiment Station, Miles City, Mont."

On page 2, after line 10, to insert:

"ANIMAL DISEASE LABORATORY FACILITIES

"For preparation of plans and specifications for construction of facilities for animal disease research and control, and for surveys to determine the cost of acquiring and altering facilities which may be made suitable for such work, including employment pursuant to the second sentence of section 706 (a) of the Organic Act of 1944 (5 U. S. C. 574), as amended by section 15 of the act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a), $500,000, to remain available until expended."

On page 2, after line 19, to strike out:

"EXTENSION SERVICE

"PAYMENTS TO STATES, HAWAII, ALASKA, AND PUERTO RICO

"For an additional amount for 'Payments to States, Hawaii, Alaska, and Puerto Rico,' $1,250,000."

At the top of page 3, to strike out:

"FEDERAL EXTENSION SERVICE

"For an additional amount for 'Federal Extension Service,' for administration and coordination, $35,000."

On page 3, after line 3, to strike out:

"SOIL CONSERVATION SERVICE

"CONSERVATION OPERATIONS

"For an additional amount for 'Conservation operations,' $150,000."

On page 3, after line 7, to strike out:

"AGRICULTURAL MARKETING SERVICE

"MARKETING RESEARCH AND SERVICE

"For an additional amount for 'Marketing research and service,' for marketing research and agricultural estimates, $250,000."

On page 3, after line 12, to insert:

"COMMODITY EXCHANGE AUTHORITY

"For an additional amount for 'Commodity Exchange Authority,' $33,000."

On page 3, after line 15, to strike out:

"FARMERS' HOME ADMINISTRATION

"SALARIES AND EXPENSES

"For an additional amount for 'Salaries and expenses,' $850,000."

On page 3, after line 19, to strike out:

"OFFICE OF THE GENERAL COUNCIL

"For an additional amount for 'Office of the General Counsel,' $36,000."

And in lieu thereof to insert:

"OFFICE OF THE GENERAL COUNSEL

"For an additional amount for 'Office of the General Counsel,' $65,000: *Provided,* That this appropriation shall be effective only upon enactment into law of H. R. 5891, 84th Congress."

On page 4, after line 3, to strike out:

"OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

"For an additional amount for 'Office of the Secretary,' $19,000."

On page 4, after line 6, to strike out:

"OFFICE OF INFORMATION

"For an additional amount for 'Office of Information,' $30,000."

On page 4, after line 9, to insert:

"AGRICULTURAL CONSERVATION PROGRAM SERVICE

"Not to exceed $5,000,000 of the appropriation under the head 'Agricultural Conservation Program Service,' in the Department of Agriculture and Farm Credit Administration Appropriation Act, 1955, shall be available for the purposes specified under the head 'Agricultural Conservation Program,' in the Second Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1955, and shall be merged with the amount provided therein."

On page 4, after line 18, to insert:

"COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION

"For the purpose of assisting the Commodity Credit Corporation in selling its agricultural commodities, the position of sales manager is hereby authorized in grade 17 of the General Schedule of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, in accordance with the standards and procedures of that act."

Under the heading "Chapter II—Department of Commerce—Civil Aeronautics Administration," on page 5, after line 3, to insert:

"OPERATION AND REGULATION

"For an additional amount for 'Operation and regulation,' $1,200,000."

On page 5, after line 14, to insert:

"MARITIME ACTIVITIES

"MARITIME TRAINING

"For an additional amount for 'Maritime training,' $115,000; and the limitation under this head in the Department of Commerce Appropriation Act, 1956, on the amount available for transfer to applicable appropriations of the Public Health Service for services rendered to the Maritime Administration is increased by $5,000."

On page 5, after line 22, to insert:

"REPAIR OF RESERVE FLEET VESSELS (LIQUIDATION OF CONTRACT AUTHORIZATION)

"The limitation under this head in the Department of Commerce and Related Agencies Appropriation Act, 1956, on the amount which may be advanced to the appropriation, 'Salaries and expenses, maritime activities,' for administrative expenses is increased from '$150,000' to '$330,000.' "

On page 6, after line 4, to insert:

"BUREAU OF PUBLIC ROADS

"INTER-AMERICAN HIGHWAY

"For an additional amount for 'Inter-American Highway,' as authorized by the act of July 1, 1955 (Public Law 129), $49,730,000, to remain available until expended."

On page 6, after line 9, to insert:

"WEATHER BUREAU

"SALARIES AND EXPENSES

"For an additional amount of 'Salaries and expenses,' $1,500,000; and the limitation under this head in the Department of Commerce and Related Agencies Appropriation Act, 1956, on the amount available for improvement and operation of hurricane, severe storm, and tornado warning services, including research and construction of related facilities, is increased from '$4,250,000' to '$5,750,000'."

On page 6, after line 18, to insert:

"SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION

"SALARIES AND EXPENSES

"For necessary expenses, not otherwise provided for, of the Small Business Administration, including expenses of attendance at meetings concerned with the purposes of this appropriation and hire of passenger motor vehicles, $2,700,000; and in addition there may be transferred to this appropriation not to exceed $2,865,000 from the Revolving Fund, Small Business Administration, and not to exceed $535,000 from the fund for liquidation of Reconstruction Finance Corporation disaster loans, Small Business Administration, for administrative expenses in connection with activities financed under said funds: *Provided,* That the amount authorized for transfer from the Revolving Fund, Small Business Administration, may be increased, with the approval of the Bureau of the Budget, by such amount as may be required to finance administrative expenses incurred in the making of disaster loans."

On page 7, after line 11, to insert:

"REVOLVING FUND

"For additional capital for the Revolving Fund authorized by the Small Business Act of 1953, as amended, to be available without fiscal year limitation, $25 million: *Provided,* That this appropriation and the appropriation to the Small Business Administration for 'Salaries and expenses', for the fiscal year 1956, shall be available only upon the

enactment into law of S. 2127, 84th Congress, 1st session, or similar legislation, continuing the Small Business Administration during the fiscal year 1956."

On page 7, after line 21, to insert:

"UNITED STATES TARIFF COMMISSION

"That part of title III of Public Law 121, 84th Congress, approved June 30, 1955, which pertains to the appropriation for the Tariff Commission for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, is hereby amended by changing the period at the end thereof to a colon and adding the following additional proviso: '*And provided further*, That that part of the foregoing appropriation which is for expenses of travel shall be available, when specifically authorized by the head of the Tariff Commission, for expenses of attendance at meetings of organizations concerned with the functions and activities of the said Commission'."

Under the heading "Chapter III," on page 8, after line 9, to insert:

"CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE AGENCY

"CONSTRUCTION

"For the preparation of detail plans and specifications of a Central Intelligence Agency headquarters installation and for other purposes as authorized by title IV of the act of July 15, 1955 (Public Law 161), to remain available until expended, $7,000,000, of which $4,000,000 shall be available for transfer to the National Capital Planning Commission and to the Department of the Interior for acquisition of land and construction to extend the George Washington Memorial Parkway: *Provided*, That if it is determined such headquarters installation will not be constructed at the Research Station of the Bureau of Public Roads at Langley, Fairfax County, Va., none of the funds shall be available for acquisition of land and construction to extend the George Washington Memorial Parkway and not to exceed $350,000 shall be available from such $4,000,000 for acquisition of land for the site of the headquarters installation."

Under the heading "Department of Defense—Military Functions," on page 9, after line 19, to insert:

"DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY

"MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, ARMY

"For acquisition, construction, installation, and equipment of temporary or permanent public works, military installations, and facilities, for the Army, as authorized by the act of September 28, 1951 (Public Law 155), the act of July 14, 1952 (Public Law 534), the act of August 7, 1953 (Public Law 209), the act of July 27, 1954 (Public Law 534), the act of September 1, 1954 (Public Law 765), and the act of July 15, 1955 (Public Law 161), without regard to sections 1136 and 3734, Revised Statutes, as amended, including hire of passenger motor vehicles; to remain available until expended, $486,427,000, to be derived by transfer from the appropriation for 'Procurement and production, Army'."

On page 10, after line 10, to insert:

"DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY

"MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, NAVY

"For an additional amount for acquisition, construction, installation, and equipment of temporary or permanent public works, naval installations, and facilities for the Navy, as authorized by the act of September 28, 1951 (Public Law 155), the act of July 14, 1952 (Public Law 534), the act of August 7, 1953 (Public Law 209), the act of July 27, 1954 (Public Law 534), the act of September 1, 1954 (Public Law 765), and the act of July 15, 1955 (Public Law 161), without regard to sections 1136 and 3734, Revised Statutes, as amended; including hire of passenger motor vehicles; furniture for public quarters; and personnel in the Bureau of Yards and Docks and other personal services necessary for the purposes of this appropriation; $443,278,300, to remain available until expended."

On page 11, after line 2, to insert:

"AUDITED CLAIMS

"Applicable current appropriations of the Department of the Navy shall be available for the payment of claims certified by the Comptroller General to be otherwise due, in the amounts stated below, from the following appropriations:

" 'Maintenance, Bureau of Supplies and Accounts,' fiscal year 1943, $171.48;

" 'Pay, subsistence, and transportation, Navy,' fiscal year 1943, $3,344.24;

" 'Maintenance, Bureau of Ships,' fiscal year 1946, $5,838.42; and

" 'Transportation of things, Navy,' fiscal year 1948, $1,359.86."

On page 11, after line 15, to insert:

"DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE

"MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, AIR FORCE

"For an additional amount for acquisition, construction, installation, and equipment of temporary or permanent public works, military installations, and facilities for the Air Force as authorized by the act of September 11, 1950 (Public Law 783), the act of September 28, 1951 (Public Law 155), the act of July 14, 1952 (Public Law 534), the act of August 7, 1953 (Public Law 209), the act of April 1, 1954 (Public Law 325), the act of July 27, 1954 (Public Law 534), the act of September 1, 1954 (Public Law 765), and of the act of July 15, 1955 (Public Law 161), without regard to sections 1136 and 3734, Revised Statutes, as amended; including hire of passenger motor vehicles, including research and development facilities at Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, Dayton, Ohio; to remain available until expended, $1,078,649,000 of which $255,000,000 shall be derived by transfer from the appropriation 'Procurement and production,' Army: *Provided*, That not to exceed $350,000 of this appropriation shall be used for the purposes authorized by section 303 of the act of July 15, 1955 (Public Law 161)."

On page 12, after line 13, to insert:

"GENERAL PROVISIONS

"SEC. 302. Funds appropriated to the military departments for military public works in prior years are hereby made available for military public works authorized for each such department by the act of July 15, 1955 (Public Law 161)."

On page 12, after line 19, to insert:

"SEC. 303. None of the funds appropriated in this chapter shall be expended for payments under a cost-plus-a-fixed-fee contract for work where cost estimates exceed $25,000 to be performed within the continental United States without the specific approval in writing of the Secretary of Defense setting forth the reasons therefor."

On page 13, after line 2, to insert:

"SEC. 304. None of the funds appropriated in this chapter shall be expended for additional costs involved in expediting construction, unless the Secretary of Defense certifies such costs to be necessary to protect the national interest and establishes a reasonable completion date for each such project, taking into consideration the urgency of the requirement, the type and location of the project, the climatic and seasonal conditions affecting the construction and the application of economical construction practices."

On page 13, after line 11, to insert:

"SEC. 305. None of the funds appropriated in this chapter shall be used for the construction, replacement, or reactivation of any bakery, laundry, or dry-cleaning facility in the United States, its Territories or possessions, as to which the Secretary of Defense does not certify, in writing, giving his reasons therefor, that the services to be furnished by such facilities are not obtainable from commercial sources at reasonable rates."

On page 13, after line 19, to insert:

"SEC. 306. Funds appropriated to the military departments for construction are hereby made available for advance planning, construction design, and architectural services, as authorized by section 504 of the act of September 28, 1951 (Public Law 155)."

Under the heading "Chapter IV," on page 14, after line 1, to insert:

"DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE—CIVIL FUNCTIONS

"DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY

"Government and relief in occupied areas

"For expenses, not otherwise provided for, necessary to meet the responsibilities and obligations of the United States in connection with the government or occupation of the Ryukyu Islands, including, subject to such authorizations and limitations as may be prescribed by the head of the department or agency concerned, tuition, travel expenses, and fees incident to instruction in the United States or elsewhere of such persons as may be required to carry out the provisions of this appropriation; travel expenses and transportation; services as authorized by section 15 of the act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a), at rates not in excess of $50 per diem for individuals not to exceed 10 in number; translation rights, photographic work, education exhibits, and dissemination of information, including preview and review expenses incident thereto; hire of passenger motor vehicles and aircraft; repair and maintenance of buildings, utilities, facilities, and appurtenances; and such supplies, commodities, and equipment as may be essential to carry out the purposes of this appropriation; $3 million, of which not to exceed $1,210,000 shall be available for administrative and information and education expenses: *Provided*, That the general provisions of the Appropriation Act for the current fiscal year for the military functions of the Department of the Army shall apply to expenditures made by that Department from this appropriation: *Provided further*, That expenditures from this appropriation may be made outside continental United States, when necessary to carry out its purposes, without regard to sections 355, 1136, 3648, and 3734, Revised Statutes, as amended, civil service or classification laws, or provisions of law prohibiting payment of any person not a citizen of the United States: *Provided further*, That expenditures from this appropriation may be made, when necessary to carry out its purposes, without regard to section 3709, Revised Statutes, as amended, and the Armed Services Procurement Act of 1947 (41 U. S. C. 151–161): *Provided further*, That expenditures may be made hereunder for the purposes of economic rehabilitation in the Ryukyu Islands in such manner as to be consistent with the general objectives of title II and III of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, and in the manner authorized by sections 505 (a) and 522 (e) thereof: *Provided further*, That funds appropriated hereunder and unexpended at the time of the termination of occupation by the United States, of any area for which such funds are made available, may be expended by the President for the procurement of such commodities and technical services, and commodities procured from funds herein or heretofore appropriated for government and relief in occupied areas and not delivered to such an area prior to the time of the termination of occupation, may be utilized by the President, as may be necessary to assist in the maintenance of the political and economic stability of such areas: *Provided further*, That before any such assistance is made available, an agreement shall be entered into between the United States and the recognized government or authority with respect to such area containing such undertakings by such government or authority as the President may determine to be necessary in

order to assure the efficient use of such assistance in furtherance of such purposes: *Provided further,* That such agreement shall, when applicable, include requirements, and undertakings corresponding to the requirements and undertakings specified in section 303 of the Mutual Security Act of 1954: *Provided further,* That funds appropriated hereunder may be used, insofar as practicable, and under such rules and regulations as may be prescribed by the head of the department or agency concerned to pay ocean transportation charges from United States ports, including territorial ports, to ports in the Ryukyus for the movement of supplies donated to, or purchased by, United States voluntary nonprofit relief agencies registered with and recommended by the Advisory Committee on Voluntary Foreign Aid or of relief packages consigned to individuals residing in such areas: *Provided further,* That under the rules and regulations to be prescribed, the head of the department or agency concerned shall fix and pay a uniform rate per pound for the ocean transportation of all relief packages of food or other general classification of commodities shipped to the Ryukyus regardless of methods of shipment and higher rates charged by particular agencies of transportation, but this proviso shall not apply to shipments made by individuals to individuals: *Provided further,* That the President may transfer to any other department or agency any function or functions provided for under this appropriation, and there shall be transferred to any such department or agency without reimbursement and without regard to the appropriation from which procured, such property as the Director of the Bureau of the Budget shall determine to relate primarily to any function or functions so transferred."

At the top of page 19, to insert:

"CHAPTER V. GENERAL GOVERNMENT MATTERS

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT

"OFFICE OF DEFENSE MOBILIZATION

"Salaries and expenses

"For an additional amount for 'Salaries and expenses,' for carrying out the provisions of section 7 of the act of June 21, 1955 (Public Law 86), $100,000."

On page 19, after line 8, to insert:

"DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA AUDITORIUM COMMISSION

"SALARIES AND EXPENSES

"For necessary expenses to carry out the provisions of the act of July 1, 1955 (Public Law 128), $25,000."

On page 19, after line 13, to insert:

"FOREIGN CLAIMS SETTLEMENT COMMISSION

"INTERNATIONAL CLAIMS

"For expenses necessary to enable the Commission to settle certain claims as authorized by the act of March 10, 1950, as amended (22 U. S. C. 1621–1627), including expenses of attendance at meetings of organizations concerned with the purpose of this appropriation; services as authorized by section 15 of the act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a), at rates not to exceed $50 per diem for individuals; and employment of aliens; $400,000: *Provided,* That this paragraph shall be effective only upon enactment into law of H. R. 6382, 84th Congress, 1st session."

At the top of page 20, to insert:

"PRESIDENT'S COMMISSION ON VETERANS' PENSIONS

"For expenses necessary for a special study of the veterans' compensation and pensions program, to be expended as the President may direct, $300,000."

On page 20, after line 4, to insert:

"SEC. 502. Appropriations contained in title I of the General Government Matters Appropriation Act, 1956, available for expenses of travel, shall be available, when specifically authorized by the head of the activity or establishment concerned, for expenses of attendance at meetings of organizations concerned with the function or activity for which the appropriation concerned is made."

In the heading on page 20, line 12, after the word "Chapter" to strike out "V" and insert "VI."

Under the heading "Independent Offices—Federal Civil Defense Administration—Operations," on page 20, line 16, after the word "Operations", to strike out "$650,000" and insert "$1,000,000."

Under the subhead "Surveys, Plans, and Research," on page 21, line 1, after "55a", to strike out "$8,000,000" and insert "$12,000,000."

On page 21, after line 2, to insert:

"SALARIES AND EXPENSES, CIVIL DEFENSE FUNCTIONS OF FEDERAL AGENCIES

"For necessary expenses to enable departments and agencies to discharge civil defense responsibilities delegated under the authority of section 201 (b) of the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950, as amended, including expenses of attendance at meetings concerned with the purposes of this appropriation, and the purchase of materials and supplies necessary thereto, $3,050,000."

On page 21, after line 11, to insert:

"GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION

"SITES AND PLANNING, PURCHASE CONTRACTS, AND PUBLIC BUILDINGS PROJECTS

"For expenses necessary in carrying out the provisions of the Public Buildings Purchase Contract Act of 1954 (68 Stat. 518), $15,000,000, to remain available until expended and to be in addition to and available for the same purposes as any unobligated balances which have been or may be made available, by any law enacted during the first session of the 84th Congress, for carrying out the purposes of said act: *Provided,* That any such unobligated balances may be consolidated with this appropriation."

On page 21, after line 23, to insert:

"The aggregate of annual payments for amortization of principal and interest thereon required by all purchase contracts entered into during the fiscal year 1956 pursuant to the Public Buildings Act of 1949 (63 Stat. 176), as amended by the Public Buildings Purchase Contract Act of 1954 (68 Stat. 518), shall not exceed $10,000,000, in addition to the unused portion of the $5,000,000 limitation applicable prior to July 1, 1955, under section 411 (a) of the said Public Buildings Act of 1949, as amended."

On page 22, after line 8, to insert:

"ACQUISITION OF LAND, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

"For expenses, not otherwise provided for, necessary for acquisition by purchase, condemnation, or otherwise of a portion of the land, including improvements thereon, in square 62, District of Columbia, $300,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided,* That the Administrator of General Services is authorized to exchange the same or a part thereof for any other land in said square on such terms and conditions as the Administrator may determine with the approval of the National Capital Planning Commission."

On page 22, after line 18, to insert:

"REPAIR, IMPROVEMENT, AND EQUIPMENT OF FEDERALLY OWNED BUILDINGS OUTSIDE THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

"For an additional amount for 'Repair, improvement, and equipment of federally owned buildings outside the District of Columbia', $1,150,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided,* That the limitation under this head in the Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1956, on the amount available for expenses of travel, is increased from '$145,000' to '$155,000'."

On page 23, after line 3, to insert:

"OPERATING EXPENSES, FEDERAL SUPPLY SERVICE

"For an additional amount for 'Operating expenses, Federal Supply Service', $200,000; and the limitation under this head in the Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1956, on the amount available for travel expenses is increased by $1,000."

On page 3, after line 9, to insert:

"EXPENSES, GENERAL SUPPLY FUND

"For an additional amount for 'Expenses, general supply fund', $1,000,000, of which $300,000 shall be for nonrecurring moving and space costs in connection with the relocation of warehouse management and other employees into office space in regional warehouses; and the limitation under this head in the Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1956, on the amount available for expenses of travel is increased by $22,500."

On page 23, after line 18, to insert:

"Survey of Government Records, Records Management, and Disposal Practices, General Services Administration: For necessary expenses, including not to exceed $50,000 for administrative expenses, in connection with conducting surveys of Government records, and records creation, maintenance, management and disposal practices in Federal agencies, pursuant to sections 505 and 506 of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, $300,000: *Provided,* That notwithstanding any other provision of said act, the Administrator shall have final authority in all matters involving the conduct of surveys and the implementation of recommendations based on such surveys: *Provided further,* That the 1 year limitation in section 208 (b) of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, shall not apply to the procurement of services in connection with the conduct of such surveys: *Provided further,* That a detailed quarterly report on the progress of each survey conducted hereunder shall be made to the Appropriations Committee of the Congress."

On page 24, after line 13, to insert:

"OPERATING EXPENSES, NATIONAL ARCHIVES AND RECORDS SERVICE

"For an additional amount for 'Operating expenses, National Archives and Records Service,' $145,000."

On page 24, after line 17, to insert:

"STRATEGIC AND CRITICAL MATERIALS

"The appropriation granted under this head in the Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1956, shall be available for necessary expenses for transportation and handling, within the United States (including charges at United States ports), storage, security, and maintenance of strategic and critical materials acquired for the supplemental stockpile pursuant to section 104 (b) of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954 (7 U. S. C. 1704 (b))."

Under the heading "Housing and Home Finance Agency", on page 25, after line 3, to insert:

"OFFICE OF THE ADMINISTRATOR

"Salaries and expenses

"For an additional amount for 'Salaries and expenses,' $170,000, and the limitation under this head in the Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1956, on the amount available for expenses of travel, is increased from '$263,700' to '$273,000'."

On page 25, after line 10, to insert:

"RESERVE OF PLANNED PUBLIC WORKS

"For an additional amount for 'Reserve of planned public works,' $5,500,000."

On page 25, after line 17, to insert:

"ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES

"For an additional amount for 'Administrative expenses,' $1,060,000."

On page 25, after line 20, to insert:

"CORPORATIONS

"Office of the Administrator, housing loan for educational institutions: The amount made available under this head in the Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1956, for administrative expenses, is increased by $200,000."

At the top of page 26, to insert:

"Office of the Administrator, public facility loans: Not to exceed $250,000 of the revolving fund established pursuant to the Housing Amendments of 1955 (S. 2126, 84th Cong.) shall be available for administrative expenses: *Provided*, That the revolving fund established pursuant to section 108 of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation Liquidation Act (67 Stat. 230), as amended, shall be merged with the revolving fund for public facility loans established pursuant to said Housing Amendments of 1955 (S. 2126, 84th Cong.)."

On page 26, after line 10, to insert:

"Federal Housing Administration: The amount made available under this head in title II of the Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1956 (Public Law 112), is increased from $5,900,000 to $7,000,000 and the limitation on the amount available for expenses of travel is increased from $300,000 to $464,000: *Provided*, That the limitation under said head on the amounts available for certain nonadministrative expenses of said Administration is increased from $33,000,000 to $37,600,000."

On page 26, after line 19, to insert:

"Public Housing Administration: The amount made available under this head in title II of the Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1956, for administrative expenses of the Public Housing Administration in carrying out duties imposed by law, is increased from '$8,200,000' to '$9,260,000', and the limitation under said head on the amount available for expenses of travel is increased from '$530,000' to '$600,000'."

On page 27, after line 2, to insert:

"Appropriations and authorizations contained in this act for the Housing and Home Finance Agency (except $730,000 of the increase in the amount made available for administrative expenses of the Federal Housing Administration and the amount available for expenses of travel; $2,600,000 of the increase in the limitation on certain nonadministrative expenses of said Administration; the additional amount appropriated for 'Annual contributions' and $60,000 of the increase in amounts for administrative expenses of the Public Housing Administration) shall be effective only upon the enactment into law of the Housing Amendments of 1955 (S. 2126, 84th Cong.)."

On page 27, after line 14, to insert:

"NATIONAL SECURITY TRAINING COMMISSION

"SALARIES AND EXPENSES

"For necessary expenses of the National Security Training Commission, including services as authorized by section 15 of the act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a), at rates for individuals not in excess of $50 per diem, and contracts with temporary or part-time employees may be renewed annually; and expenses of attendance at meetings concerned with the purposes of this appropriation; $80,000: *Provided*, That this paragraph shall be effective only upon enactment into law, during the first session of the 84th Congress, of H. R. 7000, or similar legislation: *Provided further*, That this appropriation may be used to reimburse the appropriation 'Special Projects, Executive Office of the President', for obligations incurred against said appropriation, prior to the enactment of this act, for expenses of the Commission."

On page 28, after line 5, to insert:

"SELECTIVE SERVICE SYSTEM

"SALARIES AND EXPENSES

"The amount made available under this head in the Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1956, for registration, classification, and induction activities of local boards, shall also be available during the current fiscal year for expenses of the National Advisory Committee on the Selection of Physicians, Dentists, and Allied Specialists, including not to exceed $30,000 for expenses of travel."

In the heading, on page 28, line 15, after the word "Chapter" to strike out "VI" and insert "VII."

Under the heading, "Department of the Interior—Bureau of Indian Affairs," on page 29, after line 3, to insert:

"TRIBAL FUNDS

"For an additional amount for 'Tribal funds,' $200,000, from funds to the credit of the Indians of California as defined and enrolled under the act of May 18, 1928 (45 Stat. 602), as amended, the successors in interest to claims against the United States as therein provided, for payment of expenses, other than attorney fees, heretofore or hereafter incurred by attorneys prosecuting the claims of the Indians of California before the Indian Claims Commission under contracts approved by the Secretary of the Interior."

Under the subhead "Bureau of Mines—Conservation and Development of Mineral Resources," on page 29, line 18, after the word "resources", to strike out "$625,000" and insert "$1,450,000."

On page 29, after line 18, to insert:

"DRAINAGE OF ANTHRACITE MINES

"For contributions as authorized by the act 'To provide for the conservation of anthracite coal resources through measures of flood control and anthracite mine drainage, and for other purposes' (Public Law 162, approved July 15, 1955), $8,500,000, to remain available until expended."

Under the subhead "Fish and Wildlife Service—Construction," on page 30, line 6, after the word "Construction," to strike out "$325,000" and insert "$786,000, of which $455,000 shall be available for the construction of fish-cultural facilities below Norfolk Dam, Arkansas."

On page 30, after line 9, to insert:

"DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

"FOREST SERVICE—SALARIES AND EXPENSES

"For an additional amount for 'Salaries and expenses,' for national forest protection and management, $300,000: *Provided*, That this appropriation shall be effective only upon enactment into law of H. R. 5891, 84th Congress."

On page 30, after line 15, to insert:

"ALEXANDER HAMILTON BICENTENNIAL COMMISSION

"For an additional amount for 'Alexander Hamilton Bicentennial Commission,' $112,162, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That this appropriation shall become effective only upon the enactment into law of S. 1395."

At the top of page 31, to insert:

"BOSTON NATIONAL HISTORIC SITES COMMISSION

"For expenses necessary to carry out the provisions of the act of June 16, 1955 (69 Stat. 136, 137, 138), $40,000, to remain available until June 30, 1957."

On page 31, after line 5, to insert:

"JOHN MARSHALL BICENTENNIAL CELEBRATION COMMISSION

"For an additional amount for 'John Marshall Bicentennial Celebration Commission' for carrying out the provisions of the act of August 13, 1954 (68 Stat. 702), including entertainment, $82,500, to remain available until December 31, 1955."

On page 31, after line 12, to insert:

"NATIONAL CAPITAL PLANNING COMMISSION

"SALARIES AND EXPENSES

"For an additional amount for 'Salaries and expenses', $57,000."

On page 31, after line 16, to insert:

"SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION

"MUSEUM OF HISTORY AND TECHNOLOGY

"For necessary expenses of construction of a building for the Museum of History and Technology, as authorized by the act of June 28, 1955 (Public Law 106), including the preparation of plans and specifications, not to exceed $75,000 for services as authorized by section 15 of the act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a), at rates not to exceed $100 per diem for individuals, and incidental expenses of the Regents of the Smithsonian Institution and of the Joint Congressional Committee established by said act, $2,288,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That the expenses of the Joint Congressional Committee shall be paid upon certification of the Chairman of said Committee."

On page 32, after line 9, to insert:

"SOO LOCKS CENTENNIAL CELEBRATION COMMISSION

"Funds appropriated for the Soo Locks Centennial Celebration Commission in the Second Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1955 (Public Law 24, 84th Congress), shall be available for expenses of official entertainment."

In the heading, on page 32, line 16, after the word "Chapter", to strike out "VII" and insert "VIII."

Under the heading "Department of Labor—Office of the Solicitor—Salaries and Expenses", on page 32, at the beginning of line 21, to strike out "$110,000" and insert "$303,800."

At the top of page 33, to insert:

"BUREAU OF EMPLOYMENT SECURITY

"SALARIES AND EXPENSES, MEXICAN FARM LABOR PROGRAM

"For an additional amount for 'Salaries and expenses, Mexican farm labor program,' $650,000: *Provided*, That this amount shall be available only upon enactment into law of H. R. 3822, 84th Congress, or similar legislation, extending authority for the importation of Mexican agricultural workers."

On page 33, after line 9, to insert:

"WAGE AND HOUR DIVISION

"SALARIES AND EXPENSES

"For an additional amount for 'Salaries and expenses,' $2,185,000: *Provided*, That this amount and the amount appropriated in this act for 'Salaries and expenses, Office of the Solicitor,' shall be available only upon enactment into law of S. 2168, 84th Congress, or similar legislation, increasing the minimum wage."

Under the heading "Department of Health, Education, and Welfare," on page 34, after line 2, to insert:

"GALLAUDET COLLEGE

"SALARIES AND EXPENSES

"For an additional amount for 'Salaries and expenses,' fiscal year 1955, for payment of retroactive pay increases granted by administrative action, comparable to those authorized by the Federal Employees Salary Increase Act of 1955 (69 Stat. 172), $5,400, to be derived by transfer from the appropriation 'Grants to States for public assistance,' Social Security Administration, fiscal year 1955."

On page 34, after line 11, to insert:

"For an additional amount for 'Salaries and expenses,' for payment of pay increases granted by administrative action comparable

to those authorized by the Federal Employees Salary Increase Act of 1955 (69 Stat. 172), $8,700."

On page 34, after line 15, to insert:

"HOWARD UNIVERSITY

"SALARIES AND EXPENSES

"For an additional amount for 'Salaries and expenses,' fiscal year 1955, for payment of retroactive pay increases granted by administrative action, comparable to those authorized by the Federal Employees Salary Increase Act of 1955 (69 Stat. 172), $76,000, to be derived by transfer from the appropriation 'Grants to States for public assistance,' Social Security Administration, fiscal year 1955."

At the top of page 35, to insert:

"For an additional amount for 'Salaries and expenses', for payment of pay increases granted by administrative action comparable to those authorized by the Federal Employees Salary Increase Act of 1955 (69 Stat. 172), $220,000."

Under the subhead "Office of Education—Salaries and Expenses, White House Conference on Education", on page 35, line 9, after the word "Education", to strike out "$50,000" and insert "$238,000."

Under the subhead "Public Health Service", on page 35, after line 11, to insert:

"For additional amounts for appropriation to the Public Health Service, as follows:

" 'Assistance to States, general', $98,900;

" 'Venereal diseases', $31,100;

" 'Tuberculosis', $25,200;

" 'Communicable diseases', $116,800;

" 'Sanitary engineering activities', $107,000;

" 'Disease and sanitation investigations and control, Territory of Alaska', $13,000;

" 'Salaries and expenses, hospital construction services', $16,200;

" 'Hospital and medical care', $454,500;

" 'Foreign quarantine service', $32,300;

" 'Indian health activities', $32,200;

" 'National Cancer Institute', $57,600;

" 'Mental health activities', $39,500;

" 'National Heart Institute', $56,600;

" 'Dental health activities', $39,700;

" 'Arthritis and metabolic activities', $36,300;

" 'Microbiology activities', $54,300;

" 'Neurology and blindness activities', $7,800;

" 'Retired pay of commissioned officers', $141,000; and

" 'Salaries and expenses', $15,000."

On page 36, after line 15, to insert:

"SANITARY ENGINEERING ACTIVITIES

"For an additional amount for 'Sanitary engineering activities,' $1,190,000, to remain available only until June 30, 1956, for the purposes of the act of July 14, 1955 (Public Law 159)."

On page 36, after line 20, to insert:

"MENTAL HEALTH ACTIVITIES

"For an additional amount for 'Mental health activities,' $250,000: *Provided*, That this appropriation shall be available only upon the enactment into law during the first session of the 84th Congress of House Joint Resolution 256."

At the top of page 37, to insert:

"GRANTS TO STATES FOR POLIOMYELITIS VACCINATION

"For grants to States for carrying out the purposes of the Poliomyelitis Vaccination Assistance Act of 1955, $60 million: *Provided*, That this appropriation shall become effective only upon the enactment into law of H. R. 7126 or S. 2501, 84th Congress."

Under the subhead "Construction of Housing Facilities for Animals", on page 37, line 10, after the word "specifications", to strike out "$400,000" and insert "$685,280."

In the heading, on page 37, line 12, after the word "Chapter", to strike out "VIII" and insert "IX."

Under the heading "Public Works—Atomic Energy Commission—Plant and Equipment", on page 37, at the beginning of line 25, to strike out "$163,577,000" and insert "$270,800,000"; on page 38, line 3, after the name "Tennessee", to strike out the colon and "*Provided*, That only $37,400,000 shall be available prior to the enactment into law of H. R. 6795, 84th Congress", and in line 5, after the amendment just above stated, to insert a colon and "*Provided*, That, in addition to transfers otherwise authorized by law, $101 million of unexpended balances available under this head shall be transferred to the appropriation "Operating expenses, Atomic Energy Commission."

On Page 38, after line 9, to insert:

"DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

"BONNEVILLE POWER ADMINISTRATION

"Construction

"For an additional amount for 'Construction', $2,038,000, to remain available until expended."

On page 38, after line 14, to insert:

"BUREAU OF RECLAMATION

"CONSTRUCTION AND REHABILITATION

"For an additional amount for 'Construction and rehabilitation', $5 million, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That this appropriation shall be effective only upon enactment into law during the 84th Congress of H. R. 3383 or S. 500."

At the top of page 39, to insert:

"DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE—CIVIL FUNCTIONS, DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY

"RIVERS AND HARBORS AND FLOOD CONTROL

"Construction, general

"For an additional amount for 'Construction, general', $5,551,014."

In the heading, on page 39, line 7, after the word "Chapter", to strike out "IX" and insert "X."

Under the heading "Department of State—Salaries and Expenses", on page 39, at the beginning of line 11, to strike out "$1,820,000" and insert "$2,120,000."

On page 39, after line 15, to insert:

"EXTENSION AND REMODELING, STATE DEPARTMENT BUILDING

"For expenses necessary for planning the extension and remodeling, under the supervision of the General Services Administration, of the State Department Building, Washington, D. C., to remain available until expended, $2,500,000, to be transferred to the General Services Administration."

On page 40, after line 2, to insert:

"PAYMENT TO THE REPUBLIC OF PANAMA

"After the exchange of ratifications of the Treaty of Mutual Understanding and Cooperation, signed January 25, 1955, by the United States of America and the Republic of Panama (Senate Executive F, 84th Cong., 1st sess.; ratification advised by the Senate), the Secretary of the Treasury shall cause to be paid annually (in lieu of the annual payment provided under this head in the Department of State Appropriation Act, 1954), out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, $1,930,000 as a payment to the Republic of Panama in accordance with article I thereof."

On page 40, after line 14, to insert:

"INTERNATIONAL EDUCATIONAL EXCHANGE ACTIVITIES

"The limitation under this head in the Department of State Appropriation Act, 1956, on the amount available for administrative expenses is increased from $3,300,000 to $3,485,000."

On page 40, after line 19, to insert:

"ACQUISITION OF BUILDINGS ABROAD

"The limitation under this head in the Department of State Appropriation Act, 1956, on the amount available for administrative expenses is increased from $900,000 to $950,000."

At the top of page 41, to insert:

"INTERNATIONAL BOUNDARY AND WATER COMMISSION, UNITED STATES AND MEXICO

"SALARIES AND EXPENSES

"For an additional amount for 'Salaries and expenses,' $75,000."

Under the heading "Department of Justice—Legal Activities and General Administration," on page 41, after line 17, to insert:

"FEDERAL PRISON SYSTEM

"BUILDINGS AND FACILITIES

"For making plans, conducting surveys, and preparing site recommendations for necessary new prison facilities, $500,000."

Under the heading "United States Information Agency—Salaries and Expenses," on page 43, line 6, to strike out "$243,260" and insert "$430,000."

On page 43, after line 6, to insert:

"FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE PRESIDENT

"EMERGENCY FUND FOR INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

"For expenses necessary to enable the President to take such measures as he deems appropriate to meet extraordinary or unusual circumstances arising in the international affairs of the Government, $6,000,000, to remain available until expended, for use in the President's discretion and without regard to such provisions of law as he may specify: *Provided*, That the President shall transmit to the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and of the House of Representatives, not less often than quarterly, a full report of expenditures under this appropriation."

In the heading, on page 43, line 19, after the word "Chapter", to strike out "X" and insert "XI."

Under the heading "Treasury Department—Coast Guard—Operating Expenses," on page 44, line 4, to strike out "$5,000,000" and insert "$7,000,000."

On page 44, after line 9, to insert:

"POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT

"OFFICE OF FIRST ASSISTANT POSTMASTER GENERAL

"City delivery carriers

"For an additional amount, fiscal year 1947, for 'City delivery carriers', $10,000, to be derived by transfer from the appropriation 'Railway Mail Service', fiscal year 1947."

On page 44, after line 15, to insert:

"CORPORATION

"FEDERAL FACILITIES CORPORATION

"The amount of the Corporation's funds made available under this head in title I of the Treasury-Post Office Appropriation Act, 1956, for administrative expenses of the Corporation, is increased from $800,000 to $975,000."

In the heading, on page 45, line 1, after the word "Chapter", to strike out "XI" and insert "XII."

Under the heading "District of Columbia—Operating Expenses", on page 46, after line 14, to insert:

"SALARY INCREASES, POLICEMEN AND FIREMEN

"The provisions of title II of Public Law 123, approved June 30, 1955, shall apply also to costs in the fiscal year 1955 of pay increases granted by or pursuant to Public Law , 84th Congress: *Provided*, That this paragraph shall be effective only upon enactment into law of either S. 2428 or H. R. 7159, or similar legislation."

On page 46, after line 21, to insert:

"CAPITAL OUTLAY

"PUBLIC BUILDING CONSTRUCTION

"The appropriation for 'Capital outlay, public building construction', contained in the District of Columbia Appropriation Act, 1956, shall be available for preparation of plans and specifications for a warehouse at the Children's Center and the erection of the following structures, including the treatment of grounds: Branch library building in

Woodridge, new Metropolitan Police Women's Bureau Building (including the installation of telephones, telephone switchboard, and teletypewriter system), and new fire engine house in the vicinity of 24th and Irving Streets Southeast (including instruments for receiving alarms and connecting said house to the fire alarm system)."

On page 48, after line 6, to insert:

"CHAPTER XIII. LEGISLATIVE BRANCH

"SENATE

"Contingent expenses of the Senate

"Miscellaneous items: For an additional amount for Miscellaneous items, exclusive of labor, fiscal year 1955, $185,835."

On page 48, after line 13, to insert:

"GENERAL PROVISION

"Subsection (b) of section 1311 of the Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1955 (Public Law 663, 83d Cong.), is hereby amended by deleting the period at the end thereof and inserting the following: ': *Provided further*, That in the case of the Senate such report shall be made not later than March 31 of the year following the year with respect to which the report is made'."

In the heading, on page 49, line 1, after the word "Chapter", to strike out "XII" and insert "XIV."

Under the heading "Claims for Damages, Audited Claims, and Judgments," on page 49, line 9, after the word "in", to insert "Senate Document numbered —— and", and in line 11, after the word "Congress", to strike out "$5,343,868" and insert "$8,117,523."

At the top of page 50, to insert:

"CHAPTER XV. GENERAL PROVISIONS

"UNIFORM ALLOWANCES

"SEC. 1501. The following appropriations and funds available to the departments and agencies, for the fiscal year 1956, shall be available for uniforms or allowances therefor, as authorized by the act of September 1, 1954, as amended (68 Stat. 1114 and 69 Stat. 49):

"Legislative branch:

"Architect of the Capitol:

" 'Capitol Buildings';

" 'Senate Office Buildings';

" 'House Office Buildings';

"Independent offices:

"Civil Service Commission: 'Salaries and expenses';

"Federal Trade Commission: 'Salaries and expenses';

"General Accounting Office: 'Salaries and expenses';

"Interstate Commerce Commission: The appropriation available for the pay of employees entitled to uniforms or allowances therefor under said act;

"National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics: 'Salaries and expenses';

"National Labor Relations Board: 'Salaries and expenses';

"Securities and Exchange Commission: 'Salaries and expenses';

"Smithsonian Institution: 'Salaries and expenses, National Gallery of Art';

"Veterans' Administration:

" 'General operating expenses';

" 'Medical administration and miscellaneous operating expenses';

" 'Maintenance and operation of supply depots';

"Department of Agriculture:

" 'Office of the Secretary';

"Commodity Credit Corporation: 'Limitation on administrative expenses';

"Department of Commerce:

"Office of the Secretary:

" 'Salaries and expenses';

" 'Working capital fund';

"Maritime activities: 'Salaries and expenses';

"Civil Aeronautics Administration: 'Operation and regulation';

"Maritime activities: 'Salaries and expenses';

"National Bureau of Standards: 'Working capital fund';

"Department of Health, Education, and Welfare:

"Freedmen's Hospital: 'Salaries and expenses';

"Public Health Service:

" 'Assistance to States, general';

" 'Venereal diseases';

" 'Tuberculosis';

" 'Communicable diseases';

" 'Sanitary engineering activities';

" 'Disease and sanitation investigations and control, Territory of Alaska';

" 'Hospitals and medical care';

" 'Foreign quarantine service';

" 'Indian health activities';

" 'National Institutes of Health, operating expenses';

" 'National Cancer Institute';

" 'Mental health activities';

" 'National Heart Institute';

" 'Dental health activities';

" 'Arthritis and metabolic disease activities';

" 'Microbiology activities';

" 'Neurology and blindness activities';

"St. Elizabeths Hospital: 'Salaries and expenses';

"Social Security Administration: 'Salaries and expenses, Bureau of Old-Age and Survivors Insurance';

"Department of the Interior:

"Office of the Secretary:

" 'Salaries and expenses';

" 'Working capital fund';

"Bureau of Indian Affairs: 'Education and welfare services'; and

"Department of Labor:

"Office of the Secretary: 'Salaries and expenses'."

On page 53, after line 8, to insert:

"SEC. 1502. No part of any appropriation contained in this act, or of the funds available for expenditure by any corporation included in this act, shall be used to pay the salary or wages of any person who engages in a strike against the Government of the United States or who is a member of an organization of Government employees that asserts the right to strike against the Government of the United States, or who advocates, or is a member of an organization that advocates, the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force or violence: *Provided*, That for the purposes hereof an affidavit shall be considered prima facie evidence that the person making the affidavit has not contrary to the provisions of this section engaged in a strike against the Government of the United States, is not a member of an organization of Government employees that asserts the right to strike against the Government of the United States, or that such person does not advocate, and is not a member of an organization that advocates, the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force, or violence: *Provided further*, That any person who engages in a strike against the Government of the United States or who is a member of an organization of Government employees that asserts the right to strike against the Government of the United States, or who advocates, or who is a member of an organization that advocates, the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force or violence and accepts employment the salary or wages for which are paid from any appropriation or fund contained in this or any other act shall be guilty of a felony and, upon conviction, shall be fined not more than 1,000 or imprisoned for not more than 1 year, or both: *Provided further*, That the above penalty clause shall be in addition to, and not in substitution for, any other provisions of existing law."

Mr. HAYDEN obtained the floor.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arizona yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I think it would be proper very briefly to discuss chapter III, which involves construction money for the Defense Department.

Mr. HAYDEN. That is the largest item in the bill. Does the Senator wish to make a statement with reference to it?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I do. I wish to address myself to the items in chapter III of the bill as it is reported to the Senate.

Mr. President, total budget estimates for this chapter amounted to $1,480,000,000 in appropriations and $859,500,000 in unobligated balances and transfers, or a total of $2,339,500,000. The House of Representatives recommended that a total of $6,450,000 be appropriated for these items, although the House Appropriations Committee allowed $1,402,329,000 plus unobligated balances amounting to $486,612,000 or a total of $1,888,941,000.

The Senate Committee recommends an appropriation of $1,280,377,300 plus $741,427,000 in transfers or a total of $2,021,804,300. This is a reduction from the budget estimates of $199,622,700 in appropriations and $118,073,000 in transfers or a total reduction of $317,695,700. It is over the House bill by $1,273,927,300 in appropriations and $741,427,000 in transfers.

I shall now speak briefly of the individual items.

The Senate Committee recommends for the Central Intelligence Agency building an appropriation of $7 million. This includes $3 million for planning and $4 million for roads and purchase of site. The committee report treats of this matter fully.

For the Department of the Army the committee recommends $486,427,000 by transfer of $58,573,000 below the estimate. For the Navy the committee recommends $443,278,300, which is $85,271,700 below the estimate. For the Air Force, the committee recommends $823,649,000 in appropriations and $225 million in transfers. This is an amount $121,351,000 below the estimate. I shall mention only one of hundreds of items in the chapter that might be mentioned. The committee recommended approval of an appropriation of $79,527,000 for the Air Force Academy.

Except for specific items described in the committee report, the committee approved the authorized program as submitted by the executive branch. Certain other reductions were made because the committee agreed with the House committee that the programs as authorized and justified before the committees could not progress as rapidly as contemplated. These latter reductions should in no way be construed to eliminate or retard the approved items in the program.

I wish to thank all the members of the Department of Defense Subcommittee who attended the hearings and worked on this section of the bill. I believe that, as reported, the funds included will provide the construction necessary to keep our country militarily strong. It will also help to provide the housing so badly needed by the men in our Armed Forces.

The committee can only recommend the appropriation and the Congress approve it. It remains for the executive branch, and particularly the leaders in the Department of Defense, to see that the money is judiciously spent. I call upon those men, both civilian and military, to utilize the funds we provide in a manner that will bring credit upon the Department and effect economy for the country.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to amendment.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I offer an amendment to the committee amendment relating to the United States Tariff Commission.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from Arizona will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 8, line 6, it is proposed to strike out the word "head" and to insert in lieu thereof the word "Chairman", so that it will read "Chairman of the Tariff Commission."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Arizona.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, I do not desire to offer an amendment, but I do desire to compliment the committee on the splendid work it has done in making its report, and in particular I wish to commend it for the additional appropriation made for the Weather Bureau, and especially, in that connection, the million and a half dollars of additional funds for research regarding tornado and hurricane predictions. I have been especially interested in this subject since the very disastrous hurricanes which occurred last year. It is encouraging to find that the United States is not only seeking to repair damage done by such storms but to conduct research into better means of forecasting, which will probably save more money in the end and will cost less at this time.

The appropriation of $1,500,000 for research operations is in addition to the $7,500,000 already appropriated in other items to repair the damage done.

I wish to express my appreciation particularly for the interest shown in the matter of this increase by the senior Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] and the senior Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN].

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arizona yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. I am exceedingly grateful to the Senator from Rhode Island, and I am certain I speak also for the distinguished chairman of the committee, the senior Senator from Arizona, in saying that we appreciate his gracious words.

In order that the record may clearly show what was done in this regard, I wish to read from the report a paragraph relating to the $1,500,000 extra money which the committee recommended should go to the Weather Bureau for research, to enable it better to meet its obligations in affording protection against hurricanes, tornadoes, and other severe storms. I read as follows:

> The committee recommends $1,500,000, half the amount of the estimate, for additional funds for research into methods of bettering hurricane and tornado predictions. The amount recommended will be sufficient to cover the major part of the research operations. It is felt that, if additional equipment for research is required, it may be procured with the funds provided by the regular 1956 appropriation, in excess of the budget estimate, for the procurement of weather observation and research equipment in the Department of Commerce and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 1956. The funds which were provided in that act were to remain available for a period of 4 years because all could not be obligated at this time; the committee can see no objection to the use of a part of the amount for expedited procurement of material now available which will hasten progress to more accurate predictions.

Before closing my remarks, I may say that I think the whole Senate, and indeed the whole country, is indebted, and feels indebted, to the distinguished senior Senator from Rhode Island for his aggressive interest relative to the building up of the essential services of the Weather Bureau, so as to afford better protection against hurricanes, tornadoes, and other severe storms.

Mr. President, while I am on my feet, may I say that one large amount added to the bill for the Department of Commerce relates to the Inter-American Highway. In order that the record may clearly show the thinking of the committee on that matter, in which we are recommending the appropriation at once of the entire amount of our country's contribution, which, added to the amount of this year's appropriation, will make possible the completion of the construction work within the 3-year period covered by recent legislation, I read from the report, as follows:

> Since the consideration of the appropriation for fiscal year 1956, Public Law 129 has been approved (the act of July 1, 1955). The committee, in its report on the regular appropriation for fiscal year 1956 (Department of Commerce and Related Agencies Appropriation Act, 1956), said:
>
> "Inter-American Highway: The committee recommends an appropriation of $25,250,000 for the continuance of the construction of the Inter-American Highway which is the full amount of the authorized but unappropriated balance.
>
> "It is the sense of the committee that the interests of this Nation, our friendship for the neighbor nations, the value of surface access to the Panama Canal, and many other mutual benefits dictate early completion of this highway."
>
> In recommending $49,730,000 for this purpose, the committee is, in the strongest terms, reiterating the views which were stated in the previous report. Under this appropriation, the highway should be completed in 3 years.

I am certain I voice the ardent wish of every member of our committee that the work may be prosecuted just as aggressively and rapidly as sound construction policies will permit, and that we may all look forward to the day, not longer than 3 years off, when citizens of the United States may easily, by motorcar, traverse our friendly neighbors, Mexico and the Central American countries, to arrive at Panama City or the Canal Zone, which is such an important part of this Nation's investment in economic and military stability.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arizona yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Can the chairman of the committee tell me the status of the appropriation for the Great Falls Air Base and the Glasgow Air Base?

Mr. HAYDEN. Those items were spelled out in the House bill.

Mr. MANSFIELD. But I believe they were eliminated on points of order.

Mr. HAYDEN. Yes; subsequently in the House they were stricken from the bill on points of order. The committee restored the necessary funds for the Great Falls Air Base, in the amount of $5,523,000; and provided for the Glasgow site, for the Air Defense Command, $4,706,000. That appropriation is in a lump sum. The House committee report indicates how the lump sum is to be expended, and the Senate report shows the changes recommended from the House committee report.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I thank the chairman. I wanted to get assurance that the projects were included in the bill which is now before the Senate, and to ascertain what amounts were being provided.

Mr. HAYDEN. The amount stated in the committee report is the same as the amount contained in the bill as it was reported to the House.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I thank the chairman.

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

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. As a matter of clarification, with respect to the item which relates to the White House Conference on Education, is that fund adequate to take care of the estimated expenses of the delegates from all sections of the country who will attend the conference?

Mr. HAYDEN. The amount allowed was the full amount of the budget estimate, and included the transportation expenses of the persons who would attend the conference.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Am I correct in understanding that the provision will apply equally in all States?

Mr. HAYDEN. Yes. The idea was that if the conference was to be successful, all the States should be represented; and if no funds for transportation were provided, only those who could afford to spend their own money would come to Washington.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes. Another item is that relating to the Atomic Energy Commission. As the Senator may recall, the House included funds, if my memory is correct, for research and development. I believe the House provided an additional sum of approximately $25 million. Has that item been retained in the appropriation bill as reported by the committee?

Mr. HAYDEN. Yes; it has been included.

Mr. HUMPHREY. So that we may clearly understand the situation, can that money be used for pilot-plant dem-

onstration and pilot-plant experimentation?

Mr. HAYDEN. Everything recommended in the budget estimate was allowed, except funds for the reactor for the cargo ship. All other items as planned by the Commission are carried in the bill.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Since some Senators are interested in the question of REA development, is there anything within the language of the appropriation bill in connection with this particular atomic energy research and development fund which would prevent or prohibit the Atomic Energy Commission from cooperating with rural electric cooperatives in the establishment or the creation of reactor plants or furnaces?

Mr. HAYDEN. That is taken care of under operating expenses, which are appropriated for in the public-works bill. But so far as cooperation is concerned, there is no prohibition against the Atomic Energy Commission cooperating with REA's any more than there is against cooperation with other organizations.

Mr. HUMPHREY. In other words, the funds which are provided for the Atomic Energy Commission in the area of research and development would be available for experimental purposes and pilot-plant purposes for a private utility, a rural electric cooperative, or whatever legitimate purpose of reactor development the Commission might desire, with the exception of the ship.

Mr. HAYDEN. Provision for the ship is omitted from the bill; that is all.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The so-called commercial ship.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I am glad the question was asked of the chairman relative to the discretional authorization to the Atomic Energy Commission relative to research activity and pilot-plant development for the REA Association, because as the matter was discussed in committee it was my understanding that the funds would be made available for use at the discretion of the Atomic Energy Commission, and that the Commission could enter into that field for the purpose of research activity.

I wish to offer three amendments to the bill. The first amendment I propose is immediately after line 4, page 2, following the headings "Agricultural Research Service" and "Salaries and expenses." My amendment reads:

For additional amount for salaries and expenses for research, $380,000.

I believe the funds my amendment suggests must be provided so that additional research activities may go forward. If the problem of surpluses is to be solved, it will have to be done to a great extent by means of research; certainly research will help. I think the amendment is a sound one. I have discussed it with officials of the Department of Agriculture and they are in full support of the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PAYNE in the chair). Will the Senator submit his amendment?

Mr. THYE. I cannot, sir. I have it attached to my copy of the bill. To that copy of the bill are attached my two amendments. The other amendment is intended to be proposed after line 15, page 3, to insert the following language:

FARMERS' HOME ADMINISTRATION

LOAN AUTHORIZATIONS

For additional amounts for "loans authorizations," for loans under title II of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, as amended, $15 million: *Provided*, That not to exceed the foregoing several amounts shall be borrowed in one account from the Secretary of the Treasury in accordance with the provisions set forth under this head in the Department of Agriculture Appropriation Act, 1952.

The language of the amendment has been checked with the Department of Agriculture, so that it will conform with whatever terminology the Solicitor may find to be necessary.

Then on line 19 of the same page, where the sum of $850,000 has been stricken by the committee, under the subheading "Salaries and Expenses," I proposed to insert the amount of $350,000.

I can send this marked-up bill to the desk, if it is desired, Mr. President, so that the clerk may have it, but I have read the amendments which I propose to submit to the bill. I believe the chairman of the committee has had the question raised and explained to him.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, the committee had under consideration certain other provisions which were not authorized by law. What I understand the Senator from Minnesota is doing is offering an amendment which is not subject to a point of order.

Mr. THYE. That is correct.

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

Mr. THYE. I yield.

Mr. YOUNG. Does the Senator plan to offer all three amendments en bloc, or separately?

Mr. THYE. They could be offered en bloc, because they relate to research and increasing the amount of money available for research and loans under the Bankhead-Jones Act. If additional funds are provided, the administrative funds must be increased. That is the reason for proposing the amount of $350,000.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, I think the restoration of $15 million for loan authorization under the Farmers' Home Administration is fully justified. The Department of Agriculture had asked for $30 million. I think a mistake was made in the committee itself in writing up the bill, because I do not believe the committee intended to delete the entire $30 million, but only that part for which there was no authorizing legislation, such as loans to part-time farmers, and appropriations for like purposes. There is opposition to this item in both the House and Senate Agriculture Committees. We had considerable opposition in our own Appropriations Committee, and I think the $15 million should be restored, together with the $350,000 for salaries, but I would object to restoring $380,000 for research.

The Committee on Agriculture and Forestry has been very liberal with research funds. We have appropriated at least $7 million more this year and last year than was appropriated in previous years. In the vast amount of money which has been appropriated for research, which is in excess of $37 million, $350,000 could be found for this purpose. I do not think it represents an emergency which has to be dealt with in a supplemental appropriation bill.

I hope the two items will be approved, but not the one for research.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Will the Senator from Minnesota submit his amendments to the desk?

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, before that is done——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona has the floor.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arizona yield, so that I may state the reason for the $380,000 for research?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. THYE. The additional funds are needed to undertake research designed to aid low income farm families to improve their level of living, in line with the objectives set forth in the report on the development of agriculture's human resources.

The total increase of $380,000 would be used in connection with the following projects: One, farm and land management research, $310,000, to aid such families to increase their earning capacity; and two, human nutrition and home economics research, $70,000, to evaluate the effect of shifts to part-time or off-farm work on family living in terms of nutritional quality of diet and kind of living.

That is the justification for the amount proposed on page 2 following line 4.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, the Department of Agriculture has had funds provided for exactly this same purpose. I would think they would be able to get along from now until next year on the very liberal allowances we have given them.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I would not be as positive in my feeling that the $380,000 was needed as I am on the question of the $15 million and the item for salaries and expenses of $350,000, because I believe the loan fund is a necessity. If the loaning authority fund is increased, the administrative funds will be necessary.

To an extent I agree with the Senator from North Dakota relative to research, but I think the assistance which will be made available by increasing the amount of funds to be administered under the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act is an absolute must, because it is the only way to safeguard the young couples who are seeking to get established as tenants on farming operations of their own.

Mr. President, I certainly hope there will be no objection to the two amendments which are proposed on page 3.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arizona yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. I believe the amendments are very important. I believe the $15 million amendment, relating to the Bankhead-Jones Act, is the most important; and, of course, the increased

amount for salaries is important. Personally I favor the research program, because I believe it is important to have a particular kind of research in this field. However, I value the unanimity of the Senate as highly as or more highly than I do the extra amount which might be used for research. If the need for research funds becomes acute by the time the second session of this Congress begins, I am sure the Senator from North Dakota would not object to making an appropriation for that purpose.

Mr. YOUNG. I would be happy to consent.

Mr. AIKEN. It is simply a question of using the funds which are available for 4 or 5 months.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, may I suggest to the Senator from Minnesota that he withdraw the first amendment and offer the other two en bloc?

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that my first amendment, on page 2, be withdrawn; and that the other two amendments, on page 3, be considered en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is advised that, as of the moment, no amendments have been submitted by the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. THYE. The Chair is entirely correct; I just realized that.

Mr. President, I now offer the two amendments to be found on page 3 in the marked copy of the bill I have sent to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair understands that the Senator Minnesota has requested unanimous consent that the two amendments on page 3 be considered en bloc.

Mr. THYE. That is correct.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Minnesota that his amendments be considered en bloc? Without objection, it is so ordered; and the amendments of the Senator from Minnesota will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 3, after line 15, it is proposed to insert:

FARMERS' HOME ADMINISTRATION

LOAN AUTHORIZATIONS

For additional amounts for "Loan authorizations," for loans under title II of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, as amended, $15,000,000: *Provided*, That not to exceed the foregoing several amounts shall be borrowed in one account from the Secretary of the Treasury in accordance with the provisions set forth under this head in the Department of Agriculture Appropriation Act, 1952.

And in lines 18 and 19, it is proposed to restore the language previously deleted by the committee amendment, and to amend the same, so as to read as follows:

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For an additional amount for "Salaries and expenses," $350,000.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing, en bloc, to the amendments of the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alabama will state it.

Mr. SPARKMAN. It is my purpose to offer a second paragraph at this point, and its effect would be to increase the administrative expenses, as carried in lines 18 and 19. Would such an amendment be in order after the amendment of the Senator from Minnesota, to increase the amount, is agreed to?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will advise that such an amendment to the amount should be offered to the amendment of the Senator from Minnesota before it is agreed to.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Then, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may be allowed to send to the desk an amendment, to be stated at this time, before the amendment of the Senator from Minnesota is voted on.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alabama has a right to offer such an amendment.

The amendment submitted by the Senator from Alabama to the amendment of the Senator from Minnesota will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. As a new paragraph at the end of the amendment of the Senator from Minnesota, it is proposed to insert the following:

For loans under title V, of the Housing Act of 1949, as amended (except grants under 504 (a)), $25,000,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That not to exceed the foregoing amount shall be borrowed in one account from the Secretary of the Treasury in accordance with the provisions set forth under this heading in the Department of Agriculture Appropriation Act, 1952: *Provided further*, That this paragraph shall be effective only upon enactment into law during the first session of the 84th Congress of S. 2126.

And in lines 18 and 19, in lieu of the language proposed to be inserted by the amendment of Senator THYE, it is proposed to insert the following:

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For an additional amount for "Salaries and Expenses", $1,300,000.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California will state it.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I wish to ask whether the amendment of the Senator from Alabama would fall under the heading of a conditional appropriation, which is prohibited.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair rules, on the advice of the Parliamentarian, that the proposed proviso is in order.

Mr. HAYDEN. Is the ruling based upon the fact that a bill authorizing the loans has been passed by the Senate?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment of the Senator from Alabama to the amendment of the Senator from Minnesota is in order because it carries out the provision of an act which has been passed by the Senate during this session.

Mr. THYE. The bill has not been passed by the House, has it?

Mr. HAYDEN. No; but the bill has been passed by the Senate; and thus the amendment to the amendment is in order, under our rules.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is advised that the bill has not passed the House of Representatives.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, let me point out that the amount proposed to be carried in lines 18 and 19 would take care of the administrative expenses required for this amendment to the amendment, and also of the administrative expenses required for the amendment of the Senator from Minnesota.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Alabama to the amendment of the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

The question is on agreeing to the amendments offered by the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] to the amendments offered by the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE].

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question now is on agreeing en bloc to the amendments offered by the Senator from Minnesota, as amended by the amendments of the Senator from Alabama.

The amendments as amended were agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

INCREASE IN SALARIES OF OFFICERS AND MEMBERS OF METROPOLITAN POLICE FORCE, ETC.—CHANGE IN ENROLLMENT OF S. 2428

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I send to the desk a concurrent resolution and ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The concurrent resolution will be read for the information of the Senate.

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 53) was read, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Secretary of the Senate be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed, in the enrollment of the bill (S. 2428), to increase the salaries of officers and members of the Metropolitan Police force, and the Fire Department of the District of Columbia, the United States Park Police, and the White House Police, and for other purposes, to make the following change, viz: On page 5, line 15, of the engrossed bill, strike out "63f–63k" and in lieu thereof insert "61f–61k."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the concurrent resolution.

The concurrent resolution was agreed to.

FELICITATIONS OF CONGRESS TO COMMONWEALTH OF MASSACHUSETTS ON 175TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE ESTABLISHMENT OF ITS CONSTITUTION

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of House Concurrent Resolution 193, extending the felicitations of Congress to the Commonwealth of Massachusetts on the 175th anniversary of the establishment of its constitution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair lays before the Senate a concurrent resolution coming over from the House, which will be read.

The concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 193) was read as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the Congress extends its felicitations to the Commonwealth of Massachusetts on the 175th anniversary of the establishment of its constitution, and expresses the gratitude of the American people for the part played by the early statesmen of Massachusetts in building the foundations which have served the Commonwealth and the Republic so well.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the House concurrent resolution?

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

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, the House concurrent resolution is identical with Senate Concurrent Resolution 50, which was submitted by the Senators from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL and Mr. KENNEDY]. On behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, I ask that the concurrent resolution be agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the concurrent resolution.

The concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 193) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS, 1955

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 7278) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN] a question. Does the pending appropriation bill include $5 million for the Fort Jackson Hospital?

Mr. HAYDEN. Yes; that item is included in the bill.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I wish to make inquiry with respect to the appropriation for the Command and General Staff College at Fort Leavenworth, Kans. Through the kindness of the distinguished senior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], I had the privilege of appearing before the committee and presenting the item. I was accompanied by Secretary of the Army Stevens and General Davidson, the commandant at the Staff College.

On page 13 of the committee report, I find the following paragraph:

Command and General Staff College, Fort Leavenworth: The budget estimate for this item was $8,615,000. The House committee reduced this amount by $5,433,000. Total restoration was requested. The Senate committee granted an additional $200,000 for planning of the academic building, or a total of $3,382,000.

Am I to understand from that language that the amount available—provided the item is approved in conference—will be $3,382,000?

Mr. HAYDEN. The Senator is correct. Plans and specifications will be prepared, so that at the next session of Congress this item can be fully considered.

Mr. CARLSON. I appreciate the consideration shown by the committee with respect to this item. The structure concerned is an important academic building, necessary in the operation of the Command and General Staff College. This is where a thousand or 1,200 top flight officers of all branches are instructed. I hope that in the next session of Congress sufficient funds will be provided to construct this building.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I heartily second the statement of the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON]. I know of the need for this item. I have been on the premises. The Command and General Staff College at Fort Leavenworth is a permanent part of the military program. It pertains to the training of top flight officers. It certainly deserves attention. So far as I am concerned, this item will receive attention next year.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I express my sincere thanks to the Senator from Mississippi.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from Oregon will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 10, line 8, in the committee amendment, after the word "expended", it is proposed to strike out "486,427,000" and insert "$486,426,000."

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I should like to explain, for the benefit particularly of the distinguished Senators from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR and Mr. MONRONEY], who, I am glad to see, are present in the Chamber at this moment, that the amendment which I have sent to the desk deals with the Wichita Mountains National Wildlife Refuge, which has been discussed briefly on the floor of the Senate in the past few days.

Mr. President, the proposed transfer of refuge lands which the Army wants is not reflected in any way in either the authorization bill, H. R. 6829, or this Supplemental Appropriations bill, H. R. 7278. The item is not mentioned in House Report No. 1116, and cannot be found in Senate Report No. 1094. It is, therefore, easy to understand why so comparatively little objection was raised by those who want to preserve the Wichita National Wildlife Refuge when the Authorization bill was enacted and when the appropriation bill was passed by the House.

In the hearings, the Army made it clear, however, that included in the $3,053,000 item for Fort Sill is $2,200,000 for the purchase of approximately 20,000 acres of private lands south of the Wichita Refuge. It was stated during the hearings that $1,000 of that amount is to cover the administrative costs of having the 10,700 acres of refuge lands transferred to the Army by the Department of the Interior—when, and if, Interior surrenders control of the lands.

The Interior Department made an alternative proposal to the Army last spring, but, as I have stated before, the offer has been ignored.

Mr. President, another fact my colleagues should consider seriously is that even after the Authorization bill has become law, and the appropriation bill has been passed by the House, neither the Refuge Manager of the Wichita, the Chief of the Refuge Division, the Director of the United States Fish and Wildlife Service, or the Secretary of the Interior himself, will know exactly where the Army proposes to draw that new boundary line. The Army is requesting $1,000 to cover the administrative expenses of negotiating the transfer, but what about the $77,000 which the Interior Department would need to erect a new big game fence along the new boundary, and what about the additional $100,000 which would be required to build new access roads into the refuge?

While we are on that subject, what about the money that would be required to round up, slaughter, and dispose of the 250 bison and 75 longhorn steers for which there no longer would be pasture on the remainder of the refuge? This would be another Fort Huachuca case over again. This spring the State of Arizona, in despair after trying to work out its game-management program with the Army on that reoccupied area, finally gave up and destroyed the entire buffalo herd at considerable expense.

Mr. President, provision seems to have been made in this bill for the $1,000 the Army would need to negotiate the proposed land transfer, but where is the supplemental appropriation for the $177,000 that would be needed by the Department of the Interior to cover the first obvious costs that would result from this deal? No, Mr. President, this whole thing needs more study, and more of an effort on the part of the Army to resolve its problems at Fort Sill. We do not have to hurry into these hasty decisions, especially during the closing hours of this session of the 84th Congress.

I therefore have offered an amendment to delete that $1,000 from the Fort Sill appropriation, and let this legislative record show that Congress is opposed to the transfer of any part of the Wichita National Wildlife Refuge to Fort Sill.

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

Mr. NEUBERGER. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Is it not true that if the agreement advocated by the Army

is put into effect, it will cost the Fish and Wildlife Service $177,000 for the erection of fences and other appurtenances?

Mr. NEUBERGER. It will cost the Fish and Wildlife Service at least $177,000, because it will have to erect fences and take care of the animals which are now in that portion of the refuge proposed to be taken over by the Army. The Fish and Wildlife Service will have to provide further supervision, and the cost will be at least $177,000, if not more.

Mr. President, it is with some trepidation that I have advocated an amendment to the bill, when I know that the two very distinguished and able Senators from the State of Oklahoma have been in favor of the proposed reduction in size of the Wichita Mountains National Wildlife Refuge, for the purpose of enlarging the artillery range at Fort Sill.

Let me say to them that it is my candid opinion that whenever Federal lands are concerned, it is not a State matter. When we had before us the issue of building or not building a dam which would flood out the Dinosaur National Monument, that proposal concerned not only Utah, but the entire Nation.

There are people in my State of Oregon who desire to reduce the size of the Tule Lake Wildlife Refuge, so that they can enlarge reclamation farms and homesteads; and, although those people are my constituents, I am opposed to it, because I believe that these are Federal reservations, and that the people of the entire United States have a stake in them.

For example, I have opposed reduction in the size of the Olympia National Park in the State of Washington, even though many of the major trade unions which are very active in my State might obtain additional employment through logging of the forests within that national park.

When I was a member of the State Legislature of Oregon I voted against a memorial to Congress seeking to have transferred forests of the Bureau of Land Management to the jurisdiction of the State of Oregon, because I thought the forests properly belonged to all the American people, whether they lived in Brooklyn, N. Y., Milwaukee, Wis., or Seattle, Wash.

Mr. President, I believe a national question is at stake in reducing the size of this great wildlife refuge. Once we reduce the size of the Wichita Mountains Wildlife Refuge, we will have pressure put on us at the Tule Lake refuge in Oregon and California, and at the Olympia National Park in Washington. Pressure will also be put on us with respect to Yellowstone National Park in Wyoming, and at other parks as well.

All these great issues go together, Mr. President.

Therefore, I have submitted an amendment to prevent the reduction in size of the Wichita Mountains Wildlife Refuge for the purpose of enlarging the artillery range at Fort Sill.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, the committee took the action indicated because the members of the committee felt it was in the interest of national defense to do so. Apparently there is a conflict between the fish and wildlife interests and the national defense interests.

In view of the fact that Fort Sill, Okla., is and has been for many years the great artillery training center of our Army, we felt that the slight change involved ought to be made. It is not a substantial change, as can be seen by looking at a map of this whole tract. For that reason the committee has approved the amendment.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, it is with a great deal of regret that the Senator from Oklahoma speaks on this issue.

It was absolutely necessary to take the action recommended in the interest of preserving the Nation's oldest and most famous artillery post. Fort Sill was not established yesterday or during World War II or during World War I. It was established in 1907. Almost every artilleryman who has served our country in its wars has graduated on the terrain of the Fort Sill Reservation. It is unusual terrain, and it gives artillerymen the widest possible choice of firing practice, which will develop, as it has developed in the past, the proficiency of the artillerymen of our Army. That proficiency has led to victory in both world wars.

I should like to say to my distinguished friends from Oregon and other States that we in Oklahoma are as conscious of wildlife as they are. Our people enjoy these wildlife refuges. They go there at the rate of almost a million a year to enjoy them.

We do not entertain the people of Oregon in those wildlife refuges. It is the people of our own State who go there to enjoy the scenic beauty of the refuge.

However, when it becomes necessary to choose between the development of a wildlife refuge on the one hand, and the development of an adequate defense on the other hand, we must lean on the side of developing the strongest possible national defense we can.

If we are not allowed to take this additional 10,700 acres, which is about 6½ square miles in all, out of approximately 59,000 acres of the whole wildlife refuge, we will have to do one of two things. We must either provide within the very near future a new artillery school—but not with the great tradition and fine terrain of Fort Sill—at an expenditure of perhaps $250 million or more; or we must have the Fort Sill establishment continue to serve with a short range, on which the artillerymen can fire only a few thousand yards. If we follow the latter course, we will be giving the United States, for the first time in its history, a second rate defense. Our modern artillery has extremely long range, and it is increasing all the time.

The school at Fort Sill is not merely a practice field or a cantonment. It is where Army officers who will command our artillery batteries in our future wars will be trained.

If they are not trained in this school, and if they are not given the best available ranges for our modern guns, we will be giving ourselves second rate or third rate artillery. That might be fatal in a future war, because the artillery is the sinew of our national defense.

We do not like to take 10,700 acres from the wildlife refuge. However, let me tell the distinguished Senators from Oregon and other States that the State of Oklahoma believes in conservation and in wildlife. We have condemned land all over the State and added it to our wildlife refuges. We have added to the land around dams. We have acquired land with State funds. We have issued bonds with which to build up our recreational and wildlife facilities. We are not trying to take advantage of our wildlife refuges. However, when it becomes necessary to take additional land in order to meet the requirements of a modern artillery range, I do not believe it is asking too much to take from the southernmost boundary a strip about 1½ miles across and about 6 miles wide.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I have no desire to take part in this debate, except that perhaps a member of the Committee on Armed Services should say a word on the subject. The subcommittee which considered the bill and the full committee reluctantly and with great regret came to the conclusion that the only practical way in which to keep the Fort Sill artillery training unit going at its top level was to take the land proposed to be acquired. We, therefore, authorized the taking of 20,000 acres from individual owners—and that was done only after they had had an opportunity to testify before the committee—and 10,700 acres of Government land in the Wichita Mountains Wildlife Refuge.

The 10,700 acres are a part of the 30,544 acres now under a special-use permit to the Army. At the present time more than 30,000 acres, including the 10,700 acres, are under a special-use permit.

After very close examination of the artillery officers and other Army officials, it was found necessary, in order to get the full utilization of modern artillery weapons, to take this additional land.

For that reason alone, we recommended the taking of the land. It was approved by the Committee on Armed Services and by the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee which studied this item.

I should like to call the attention of the Senate to the fact that this subject has not been casually considered by the Senator from Oklahoma or by the committees. The taking of the land was approved by the House Armed Services Committee after long hearings. It was also carefully considered by the Committee on Armed Services of the Senate, and it was approved by that committee. It also cleared the Committee on Appropriations of the House, and then the Appropriations Committee of the Senate. Four committees of Congress have approved the course of action proposed in the bill. After considering all the evidence, these committees have come to the conclusion that, bad and disagreeable as it may be to be forced to acquire 10,700 acres of a wildlife refuge, it is better than destroying the investment of more than $150 million or $200 million we now have in Fort Sill as the finest artillery center in the world, or provid-

ing only short firing ranges, which would mean giving us a second-class artillery.

The Army has made adjustments in order to save the parts of the wildlife refuge which are used by the public. The whole area of scenic highways and lakes and playgrounds has been preserved. The line has been dropped south of the roads. Only that part which is least used by the public is included. Most of that is high, rocky, and inaccessible land, which will not in any way detract in a material way from the refuge.

The big-game pasture will be distant by several miles from the area it is proposed to take. The scenic highway drives over Mount Scott and other places will be preserved, as will be the lakes. I do not see any other possible way to handle the situation if Fort Sill is not allowed to expand in the only direction it can expand.

There are highways, railroads, and crowded agricultural areas to the east, and there are Oklahoma towns to the south, Medicine Park and other thickly settled areas are to the north. Only by extending the range to the west and taking approximately one-fifth of the wildlife refuge can we provide for the kind of artillery training that I know every Member of the Senate would want the boys in our armed services to have.

We are taking 20,000 acres of privately owned land, and we also regret that. But if this were a time of war the Senate would be willing to take an entire county, if necessary, to acquire the kind of firing range necessary to give us the strongest possible fire power and the strongest possible defense.

I hope the Senate will support the four committees of the Congress who have studied this question long and hard. Only by taking the step recommended can we have the kind of defense that will be necessary to assure victory should war come.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, I deeply regret to find myself at issue with the distinguished Senator from Oregon [Mr. NEUBERGER]. I can understand how his heart can yearn for something of which he knows absolutely nothing. If I am not mistaken, he has not been on the ground. If I am incorrect, I should like to have the Senator correct me at this point.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oklahoma yield?

Mr. KERR. I yield.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Does the Senator feel that it is necessary for a Senator to have been on the ground to be able to discuss any place concerning which he wishes certain action to be taken?

Mr. KERR. I do not think it is absolutely necessary, but I think it would not hurt.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oklahoma yield for a further question?

Mr. KERR. I yield.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Would the Senator say that a Senator was estopped from taking a position on an issue before this body if he had not personally visited a location where the particular issue has been centered?

Mr. KERR. Not at all. Nor do I think any Senator who has visited it would be estopped from calling attention to the fact that another Senator was limited in his knowledge of it.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Is it not a fact that the Senate constantly passes on issues which concern all sorts of localities everywhere in this country, from Maine to California, when perhaps only the 2 Senators from the particular State involved have ever actually visited it in person?

Mr. KERR. I would say that has been done. I would not say it has been the uniform rule of procedure.

Mr. NEUBERGER. I should like to ask the Senator from Oklahoma a further question. We legislate continually regarding far-flung international areas where perhaps no Member of the Senate, or, at the very most, a handful of Senators, has ever visited. Would the Senator say that we were precluded from legislating because we had not visited such areas?

Mr. KERR. No; nor would I say we should completely close our minds to information which comes to us from those who have been there.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Is it not a fact that on practically every question which centers in one State and which comes before this Chamber, the 2 Senators from that particular State have, perhaps, the most personal intimacy with the particular place or location?

Mr. KERR. I would say that is very likely, and it is even possible that it is true in the present instance.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Does the Senator think that those of us who come from our particular States are precluded from taking an interest or a position, or even offering an amendment, pertaining to Federal lands within any other State?

Mr. KERR. I certainly do not think the Senator was precluded from offering his amendment. I think it would be well if he now took advantage of the opportunity he has to get information on the subject which he could not have unless he had been there.

Mr. NEUBERGER. I shall listen with interest, but I say to my good friend, the distinguished Senator from the State of Oklahoma, that I should not like to see established here any rule or tradition that a Senator from another State cannot take an active interest or a very positive position as to something within a State with which the Senators from that State have, perhaps, a more personal intimacy. There are Members of this body who take a position directly opposite to that of my colleague from Oregon and myself with reference to how hydroelectric power should be developed in the State of Oregon. Should our answer be that they cannot discuss the basic policies involved?

Mr. KERR. With reference to a matter which applies to the Senator's State I would feel that his State is ably represented in this body, and the senior Senator from Oklahoma would hesitate a great deal to take it upon himself to try to represent the interests of conflicting forces and elements within the State of Oregon, in view of the fact that that State is so ably represented here.

Mr. NEUBERGER. I would say to the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma that I do not regard a national wildlife refuge under the United States Fish and Wildlife Service as an issue involving only the State of Oklahoma because it is within the State of Oklahoma, any more than I think a wildlife refuge in the State of Oregon is an issue of the State of Oregon. There are people in the State of Oregon, farmers and ranchers, who would like to get into the Tule Lake Wildlife Refuge. If I should take the position, because I felt their policy was right, that the wildlife refuge in Oregon should be diminished in size, I would say that a Senator from Oklahoma, or a Senator from Maine, or a Senator from Minnesota, who had never been there, would have a right to debate the subject on the floor, even though he had never visited that wildlife refuge.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oklahoma yield?

Mr. KERR. I yield.

Mr. CHAVEZ. For 24 years I have been advocating taking care of wildlife throughout the country. There are many places about which I do not know, but I am still in favor of protection for fish and wildlife. But the problem here is not whether we favor fish and wildlife, but whether we should expand the artillery school in Oklahoma in the interest of the national defense. The question before the committee was not whether the committee was for or against wildlife. What good will wildlife do us, if our national defense is destroyed?

Mr. KERR. I thank my friend from New Mexico.

I wish to say to the distinguished Senator from Oregon that this is not a case of ranchers or farmers seeking to invade a national wildlife preserve. The fact is, as my able colleague has pointed out, that the national defense agency not only is seeking an additional 10,000 acres of land which presently lie within a fish and wildlife preserve, but it is seeking 20,000 acres now occupied by Oklahoma farm families, whereon they live and reside and make their living. I put all the scrutiny of which I was capable to the proposal to take 10,000 acres from the fish and wildlife refuge, and 20,000 acres from Oklahoma farmers. It was a matter with reference to which I had to be convinced that it was necessary for maintaining efficiency and permitting the improvement of the service of the national defense installation, before I came to the point of accepting the necessity as proposed by the Defense Department. My heart goes out to the hundreds of farm families who are there, and who of necessity will have to be moved.

There is on the 20,000 acres an Indian cemetery which has been hallowed ground for countless thousands of Indians for a century. Some of the great Indians of my State have been buried there. This was the area of the last stand of the buffalo. This was the area populated and inhabited by the tribes of the Indians of the plains—the plains Indians, the Apaches, the Comanches, the Arapaho, and others.

It was at Fort Sill that Geronimo was placed in confinement, and where he lived out the last part of his life.

I came home from World War I, as did many others who had started out early in the war as second lieutenants, and who managed to hold their own mighty well in that rank; and afterward I participated in the organization of the Oklahoma National Guard, which is a part of the now famed Thunderbird Division. Year after year, for almost 10 years, I attended the annual encampment at Fort Sill. As has been said by my distinguished colleague, Fort Sill is the greatest artillery training school on earth.

The eldest of my sons spent his months of training there, in preparation for his service and experience in the Korean war. I have been there and have seen soldiers from the lands of our allies, including Korean boys and others, receiving basic artillery training for service in the armies of our allies.

The Department of Defense tells us that if that Artillery School is to meet its requirements of tomorrow, it must have more room. I was at Fort Sill a few weeks ago and saw a demonstration of the firing of some of the modern artillery with which the Department of Defense has reinforced our country's defense. I saw there a gun which on its carriage would cover an area longer than the Senate Chamber, and is capable of firing I do do not know how many miles. But before that gun could be fired, it was necessary to point its muzzle a little above 45° in elevation, because there was not the range to test its efficiency and the result of its firing to the extent and limits of which it is capable. That gun has never been fired on the Fort Sill Reservation, and there are now hundreds of young Artillery officers training there, who have never yet been permitted to operate that great piece of defense equipment in the way in which it was built to be operated, because of an inadequate range.

It is to meet that difficulty that the Department of Defense has come to Congress. In spite of what my good friend from Oregon has said, that Congress knows nothing about what it is doing, this matter was considered by the Armed Services Committee of the Senate and the House, and was contested. In spite of what my good friend has said, it was authorized upon the testimony heard by the Armed Services Committees of the Senate and the House.

Instead of Congress being uninformed on this subject, the junior Senator from Oregon has demonstrated that he is the one who is uninformed.

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

Mr. KERR. I yield.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Is it not true that the farmers whom the Senator has been mentioning will be reimbursed financially for the lands which will be added to the Artillery Reservation?

Mr. KERR. Yes.

Mr. NEUBERGER. If the able Senators from Oklahoma are on the job, as I know they are, I should think they will see to it that no financial injustice is done to those farmers.

Mr. KERR. If we are able to do that, we will do so.

Mr. NEUBERGER. I know that is correct. Is it not also true that practically every time a highway is enlarged or is constructed, or a power line is built, or a natural gas line is laid, or a railroad is extended, the farmers whose land is taken by eminent domain receive financial reimbursement for the loss of their farms or ranches?

Mr. KERR. I am willing to concede that.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Is it not also true that there is pressure all over the country for the opening of reserved Federal areas, such as wildlife refuges, national parks, and national forests?

I read only recently, for example, that in the neighboring country to the north, which is allied with us in NATO and in the defense of the North American Continent, a great uranium strike was made in Banff National Park. I am certain the Senator from Oklahoma will grant that uranium is just as important to our national defense as is artillery.

Mr. KERR. I may say to my friend from Oregon that that subject is not before the Senate; and if it were, I would want to be much better informed than I now am before I would take the responsibility of deciding that question.

Mr. NEUBERGER. What I am trying to point out is that the neighboring country to the north, confronted with a strike of uranium in Banff National Park, still refused to permit the uranium to be mined, because it was within a national park.

Throughout the United States—in my own section of the country, as a matter of fact—lumber companies are pointing out that additional lumber is needed for national defense; that lumber is important for the national defense; and that, therefore, the timber resources of the national parks must be made available, so that the lumber can be harvested.

The Senator from Oklahoma has said that the artillery range must be enlarged. The point I have sought to make is that once we breach the line, whether it is in the Wichita Mountains Wildlife Refuge for an artillery range, or in the Olympic National Park for logging, or in any other area for uranium mining, or in some other area for ranches or for adding to the agricultural production of our country, the line will be breached everywhere.

Mr. KERR. There may be a basis for the argument that the desire of ranchers, farmers, and others in private business, to exploit the public domain, is similar to the case now before the Senate, but I may say to my good friend from Oregon that I am unable to accept it. It is as different from the case now before the Senate as it would be for one to urge that if the sun rises in the Southern Hemisphere, he is in the north, and that if it rises in the Northern Hemisphere, he is in the south.

The Senator was disturbed about the necessity of building fences to keep out animals. Fences are not built there to keep out animals. This area, both north and south of the present fence, not only the Fort Sill Reservation and the wildlife refuge, has one of the heaviest populations of quail, rabbit, squirrel, and other manifestations of miniature wildlife I have ever seen. They are in an entirely different position from that of the farmers on the 20,000 acres which the Government is seeking to take. There will not be a single quail, a single rabbit, or a single squirrel dispossessed, nor made a victim of eminent domain, nor required to give up his habitation, nor to go elsewhere so that roads, schools, and churches may be built, or cemeteries located. They will continue to live in their peaceful and protected habitation.

There are buffalo and longhorn cattle in this refuge. I should say something less than a thousand buffalo and something less than 500 longhorns will have 50,000 acres on which to roam 12 months in the year; and beyond that, when the grazing becomes scarce on the 50,000 acres which will be held inviolate after occupation, I have the assurance of the military authorities at Fort Sill and in the Defense Department that those animals will be permitted to come on to the Fort Sill Reservation in the periods between the uses of that particular area by the artillery, there to graze to their hearts' content and their stomachs' capacity.

My distinguished friend said there was a national question at stake, and he is right. It is the question of national defense.

Mr. President, actually the land which is already in Fort Sill Reservation is a greater refuge for most of the wildlife occupying both terrains than are the 10,000 acres sought by the Army.

I give my good friend this assurance; there is no animal on that wildlife refuge that knows when he crosses the line between the part held for his occupancy by the Interior Department and that part which is used primarily by the Military Establishment. I am sure the Senator would be amazed at the absence of concern on the part of those magnificent buffalo, longhorns, quail, squirrel, and rabbits as they go back and forth most of the time unmolested, with as little knowledge that they are crossing the line as the waters of the mighty Columbia have when they leave the adjacent State and go into the State of Oregon.

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

Mr. KERR. I yield.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Does the Senator from Oklahoma presuppose that because I have not visited the wildlife refuge we are discussing, I have not visited any wildlife refuge?

Mr. KERR. I do not presuppose it, but I am not sure of it. [Laughter.] If he has, the more he has visited refuges, the more he has become aware of the truth of which I have spoken with reference to the absence of concern on the part of the wildlife when they go from one sanctuary to another between which there is no barrier.

Mr. NEUBERGER. I am beginning to come to the conclusion that the Wichita is the only wildlife refuge which the Senator from Oklahoma has ever visited, and that it is a most unique one.

Mr. KERR. I must say to my friend that if he uses his absence of knowledge in that respect as much as he has on

the floor in relation to this matter at issue, then I am not surprised.

Mr. NEUBERGER. The Senator mentioned the vast gun carriage, approximately the size of this Chamber, which was going to be fired on the artillery range which would be carved from the wildlife refuge. A few moments later he said the animals would not know when they crossed the line. Will they know it when they cross the line and the big guns are being fired?

Mr. KERR. They know it. It is amazing how they know it when they are a foot south of the line and when they are a foot north of the line.

Mr. NEUBERGER. But when the 10,700 acres are taken for use in firing the guns, will the gunners use blanks?

Mr. KERR. No; but the Senator would be amazed how few animals there would be in the few square yards where the blanks would land.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Am I being led to believe there is no danger to the animals, when the people are being moved out?

Mr. KERR. There will be no greater danger then than there is now, because there is no fence between where they are now and where they will be.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Am I being led to believe that the Senator does not favor having any fence whatsoever?

Mr. KERR. I neither favor nor oppose it. I am sure that if a fence is needed it will be provided, but it will not be rabbit proof, quail proof, or squirrel proof, because if they cannot crawl under the fence, they can either fly or jump over it.

Mr. NEUBERGER. The Senator may remember that there has been a previous reference to a squirrel-proof fence.

Mr. KERR. If the Senator wants to dwell on the welfare of the squirrels on the White House grounds, he may do so, but that has as much relationship to this subject as other matters to which he has referred.

Mr. NEUBERGER. The Senator from Oklahoma said there was no national issue involved except that of national defense——

Mr. KERR. No; I said there was a national issue involved.

Mr. NEUBERGER. The Senator did not let me finish. I said the Senator from Oklahoma stated there was no national issue involved except national defense. Is not that what the Senator said?

Mr. KERR. No; I did not say that was the only national issue involved. I said that was the national issue involved. I took the position that it is a national issue that is involved, and that is a more important issue than is the wildlife issue.

Mr. NEUBERGER. When the range of artillery becomes greater than that which the Senator has described, will the Department of Defense take from the wildlife refuge another 10,700 acres?

Mr. KERR. That illustrates the lack of information my friend has about the location and terrain of this fish and wildlife refuge. If weapons with a greater range should be developed, the area used would be farther to the west. It would not involve a greater area where fish and wildlife are found, because the fish and wildlife area goes roughly north. If a greater range is required, it will be to the west. That would not involve an area adapted to a fish and wildlife reserve. I am happy to give that comforting information to my friend.

Mr. NEUBERGER. In other reserved Federal areas where the issue of national defense has been raised, does the Senator also think the areas of wildlife refuges should be reduced?

Mr. KERR. I do not know what the Senator speaks of. I did not know there was another question involving the issue before the Senate.

Mr. NEUBERGER. I did not say it was before the Senate, except collaterally, and the Senator from Oklahoma, who has had far more experience than I in legislative procedure and policy, knows that when a law is enacted, it often has far-reaching effect on other issues not then before the Congress. I do not believe it is possible for us to enact legislation which will diminish a great historic wildlife reserve, dating back half a century, without the legislation having an impact on other Federal reservations, so that the administration may go into them and take out resources or diminish the boundaries in the interest of national defense.

Mr. KERR. I would not belittle the intelligence of the Senate either by acknowledging that the action urged would set a precedent, or that if it were a precedent any Senator, including the distinguished Senator from Oregon, would be unable to use his good judgment with reference to a future piece of legislation, just as he would use it in regard to what is now pending, and on the basis of the issues involved, without feeling that he was bound either by the vote he cast on the amendment or did not cast on the amendment.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oklahoma yield?

Mr. KERR. I yield.

Mr. CHAVEZ. None of us, especially those of us from the West, like to lose any of the lands which belong either to the State or to the Federal Government, whether they be forests or refuges for wildlife, or other public domain. However, I wish to say to the Senate that in my State, the Federal Government owns about 55 percent of the entire area of the land. Guided missiles are being tested in the southern part of New Mexico, in Alamogordo and that vicinity. There are being taken 142,000 acres that belong to educational institutions of the State of New Mexico. There is wildlife in that area. As a matter of fact, a census was taken of the quail, turkey, antelope, mountain sheep, and other wildlife. Hundreds of thousands of acres of the public domain, which were leased to stockmen, are being taken.

Do Senators think we like to have that much land removed from the tax rolls? We do not. But are we going to proceed with the guided missile research and development program, or are we going to say that because New Mexico owns a small piece of land and because the Federal Government owns a certain piece of land, that program will not have the land it needs—not 20,000 acres, but hundreds of thousands of acres?

It is not that we do not like wildlife, or that we wish to deprive the State of a little revenue, or that we wish to deprive a stockman of a place on which to graze his cattle or his other stock, by which he makes a living. But the question is one of dire necessity; and the dire necessity is to keep up to date in perfecting modern means of national defense.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, I thank the great Senator from New Mexico.

I submit that in the interest of national defense, the action of the committee should be approved, and the amendment of the Senator from Oregon should be rejected.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oklahoma yield for a further question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McNAMARA in the chair). Does the Senator from Oklahoma yield to the Senator from Oregon?

Mr. KERR. I yield.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Several times in his very eloquent and able remarks, which I never can hope to be able to match, the Senator from Oklahoma said he had confidence in the intelligence of the Senate and in its ability to decide on this issue in the interest of national defense. Therefore, will he join me in asking that there be a yea-and-nay vote on the issue?

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, I must say that I believe the Senators here are able to make up their minds regarding whether they wish to have a yea-and-nay vote or a voice vote or to vote by means of a division. I must say that I am not persuaded to join with the distinguished Senator from Oregon in any part of his effort in regard to the amendment.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on the question of agreeing to the amendment I have offered.

Mr. DUFF. Mr. President, I should like to make an observation at this time. I desire to say that I believe the discussion which has occurred here deserves the very serious attention of the Senate.

As a member of the Armed Services Committee, I do not intend to challenge the committee's action, nor do I have any intention of putting anything in the way of what is necessary for the national defense, because that is imperative at all times.

But I believe the Defense Establishment certainly is under the obligation, in connection with making these installations, of taking a longer range view regarding the effects on the natural resources of the country and the effects in respect to every phase of our national life.

In Pennsylvania, the armed services have taken, for military installations and establishments, thousands of acres of land which, aside from irrigated land, is the most productive land anywhere in America. In one or two instances, by moving not more than 30 miles, they could have obtained very ordinary land, without destroying some of the best land we have; and the very

ordinary land could thus have been acquired for very much less cost, and with greater advantage both to the armed services and to the Nation.

I have heard the senior Senior from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] refer to the great amount of the tidewater lands of Virginia which have been taken by various branches of the armed services, without regard to the general, overall condition of that State.

Mr. President, when these things are undertaken in the first instance by the armed services, I believe they should act not merely by themselves in proceeding to locate their installations. Instead, they should take various other agencies into consideration.

In the instant case, I understand the Department of the Interior is opposed to the proposal. I am not challenging it; by reason of its necessity in connection with a tremendous operation, already involving $200 million, I do not challenge it. But if there could have been foresight, it would have been possible not to have located in a place where the expansion would make necessary the invasion of one of the great national wildlife refuges of the United States.

Therefore, I rise merely to say that hereafter, when it is time to make installations which will require vast amounts of land, there should be a law to require the military to consult the Department of the Interior, the Department of Agriculture, or other departments, for the purpose of determining whether adequate land for the purpose is available in some other place so as to prevent the use of the most valuable agricultural land or the most valuable industrial land or the most valuable wildlife land merely because the armed services do not have sufficient foresight to consider the possibilities of the situation.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I renew my request for the yeas and nays on the question of agreeing to my amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

The yeas and nays were not ordered.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I rise to discuss this matter very briefly.

It is a matter of great pride to me that in serving in the Senate, I have as a colleague one of the most prominent conservationists in the entire Nation. In fact, if we were to draw up a list of the 25 outstanding conservationists in the Nation, on the basis of their work and their expert knowledge and their writings in this field, I believe that my colleague [Mr. NEUBERGER] would have to be included in the list.

Mr. President, it seems to me that in this case we are dealing with some questions of fact. I do not claim to know the answers to the questions, I say frankly.

I wish to make very clear to Senator MONRONEY and Senator KERR that I know them to be ardent defenders of sound conservation programs in the United States. But when we have such conflicting contentions in connection with an issue, in my judgment it becomes the clear, public-service duty of the Members of the Senate to make the record, so that it will contain the facts, for people to study and to know about.

When I say that I know my two good friends, the Senators from Oklahoma, are certainly as devoted to sound conservation policies as I am, I recall—and for the moment I speak quite facetiously—that at the time of the Democratic National Convention, in 1952, I heard my very good friend, Senator KERR, announce on a television program that his favorite song was Home on the Range, "Where the deer and the antelope play." In fact, let me say that I thought that on that occasion he participated in the rendition of that song as melodiously as he always speaks on the floor of the Senate.

In connection with the reference in the song to buffalo, I desire to suggest to my friend, the Senator from Oklahoma, that if we continue to turn over to the military all the wildlife refuges in the country, the only place where he and I will ever be able to see a buffalo will be either on the back of a nickel or in a zoo here or there.

I believe that a conservation problem is involved in the extension by the military into more and more of the refuge areas, as the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DUFF] has just pointed out.

The Senate knows that I always make clear the source of my information on issues and the source of the data I use in comments I make on issues involving questions of fact. I want the two Senators from Oklahoma to know the source of the record which I now shall make very briefly in regard to this matter, because in recent days I have met with representatives of conservationist groups in the United States, the chief delegate being Mr. Gutermuth, who has briefed me rather thoroughly on their point of view.

I wish to say, for the representatives of these conservation groups, that they do not believe that the Congress has required the Army to put into the record the answers to certain questions of fact which Mr. Gutermuth raised in his testimony before the Appropriations Committees of the House and of the Senate. Therefore I shall present the notes which I made in the series of conference with representatives of the conservation groups, because I think I owe it to the Senators from Oklahoma to do so, because they can, perhaps, answer some of the questions of fact which these conservationist representatives claim are not answered in the present record.

The conservation groups expressed to me the hope that the desired protection of the Wichita National Wildlife Refuge in Oklahoma would be provided in the appropriation bill before it reached the Senate floor. Attention was called to this important matter in my brief remarks on July 22, when I spoke about the Army's attempted rebuttal of a statement by C. R. Gutermuth, who appeared before the House and Senate Appropriations Subcommittees in behalf of five national conservation organizations.

Let me say to my two friends from Oklahoma that there is no question about the fact that I am motivated today in making these remarks by representations which I have received by telegraph, telephone, and letter from conservation groups in my own State who have appealed to me at least to see if a postponement of action on this proposal can be obtained, until further information can be gathered.

Mr. President, the fact that neither the Secretary of Defense nor the Secretary of the Army has responded to Mr. Gutermuth's telegram of July 18 makes me suspicious of the whole proposal. The Army was able to prepare a lengthy, detailed rebuttal to the statement of those national conservation organizations within 1 day, and it is difficult to understand why the accuracy of the Army's statements could not have been checked as quickly.

Is the Army attempting to withhold the real facts in this case until Fort Sill gets the needed appropriation? Although Mr. Gutermuth need not substantiate his statements to me, because I think he is a very reliable conservationist, he did state to Secretary Wilson and to Secretary Stevens in his wires of July 18, that his facts are confirmed by the refuge manager of the Wichita National Wildlife Refuge, and by the chief of the Refuge Division of the United States Fish and Wildlife Service, of the Department of the Interior.

The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DUFF] referred to the fact that the Interior Department continues to oppose extension of this military reservation. It was my last information that when the entire record was in, the Department of the Interior continued to oppose it. I think we certainly need to be fully apprised as to the details of the opposition of the Department of the Interior.

Mr. President, this renewed attempt on the part of Fort Sill to take over those refuge lands should be pondered carefully. This is not the only attempt by the military to gain control of important forest, wildlife, and recreational lands. There is a long list of attempted invasions by the military of all kinds of Federal lands. The Army has been after the Cabeza Prieta and Kofa Refuges in Arizona, and another report came to my attention only yesterday of still another grab for a large part of the Desert Game Range in Nevada. The Navy backed away from the Francis Marion National Forest in South Carolina not too long ago only because of public opposition, and its more recent attempt to take over Passamore Island in Virginia likewise was squelched by an aroused citizenry. The Navy's latest move is to grab 30,000 acres of a game management area in the DeSoto National Forest in Mississippi.

I raise the question, Where does this sort of thing end, unless we try to work out some national pattern or program for the extension of these military installations in order to have at least a minimum of invasion of our Federal reserves, rather than to carry out the program on a hit-and-miss basis, project by project, from term to term?

In reviewing the Army's testimony in the House hearing on the authorization bill, it seems they still are not decided as to the permanency and use of such holdings as Camp Stewart, 285,000 acres in

Texas, and the Yuma Test Station, 900,000 acres in Arizona, yet they just took an additional 100,000 acres in Alaska. Perhaps the Senate should be looking into the entire situation with the thought of examining the overall plans for the present and future needs of the military.

Mr. President, according to the June 4, 1955, issue of the Tulsa World, when Fort Sill got ready to launch its final drive for the acquisition of those 20,320 acres of private lands and 10,700 acres of refuge lands, it had 250 members of the Oklahoma Press Association at Fort Sill for a briefing. Among other things, the commanding general of Fort Sill stated that the 31,000 acres of additional land were needed for practice with new artillery and guided missile weapons. I will not attempt to relate all of the big sales talk that was put out during that meeting in an effort to get the local business interests behind the move, but I am concerned about the recent change in the training program and in the name of Fort Sill. In 1946, the name was changed to Artillery School, with a branch at Fort Bliss, Tex., for anti-aircraft and guided missiles. Last month, however, according to the June 18 issue of the Daily Oklahoman, the name was changed to the Artillery and Guided Missile School. Mr. President, is something being added to Fort Sill that we do not know about, when we already have places like Camp Stewart, and a number of others, that are not being used fully, and which are more than adequate in size to handle those long-range weapons that they are trying to squeeze into Fort Sill?

Mr. President, I am sure that the responsible members of the Appropriations Committee have gone into this subject as carefully as time would permit. It is a tremendous task to pass on the many, much more significant items in this large money bill. However, the national wildlife refuge program of this country means much to me, since those areas do provide wholesome recreation for a harried citizenry, while filling their essential wildlife management purposes. I feel that we should give serious consideration to any thought of relinquishing even a small part of the comparatively few refuge acres that have been set aside and dedicated to that purpose.

I know that on the record the Senators from Oklahoma do not need to yield to any other Senators in their devotion to a sound conservation program. Neither do I yield to any other Member of the Senate in my dedication to an adequate national defense. When it is said that the issue is primarily an issue of national defense, if the facts mean that national defense can be protected only by this course of action, and that there are no alternatives—although the Department of the Interior contends to the contrary—then, of course, the national defense must be given the right-of-way. Not a single Senator will knowingly cast a vote to damage national defense.

Here we have two departments, the Army and the Department of the Interior, at loggerheads. The Department of the Interior does not accept the claim of the Army that this is necessary, because, apparently, there are other places where the so-called additional program to be added to Fort Sill could be conducted. Frankly, I do not know what the situation is in regard to the development of atomic weapons in the field of artillery, but if it is true that we are moving rapidly in the direction of atomic weapons in the field of artillery, it is quite possible that we may desire some locality far removed from this area of Oklahoma for the development of that kind of artillery range.

I am inclined to agree with other Senators, that if we permit Fort Sill to add another 8 miles of private lands to its present holdings, it should endeavor to stay within the 36 miles, or 63,000 yards. I understand that part of Fort Sill is crossed by a railroad and by a State highway, but from a careful study of the map, it would seem that the Army would have an adequate unobstructed space in which to fire the largest of its cannons, which has a maximum range of 31,000 yards. That matter had not been presented until I heard the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR] testify to it.

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

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. MONRONEY. The distinguished Senator from Oregon has touched on perhaps the most misunderstood part of the whole subject. It is the question of why, with a distance of some 30 miles, additional land must be taken. The position of the wildlife people, with whom we would like to agree if we could, is that we should mount the atomic cannon and the other super guns at the far east end of the reservation and fire across State highways and railroads and the entire post, with its personnel establishments and machine shops and schools, on the assumption that the shells could be dropped on the extreme western part of the present land of Fort Sill.

That would be all right if the shells could always be trusted to go in the direction in which they are supposed to go. I am not willing to take that risk of human life.

Mr. MORSE. I would not want to either.

Mr. MONRONEY. That would mean firing across inhabited centers. If the Senator has read the hearings, he has, I am sure, read the suggestion that the Army follow the course it has been pursuing for 2 years—and the Fort Sill artillerymen have been trying to work out this matter in order to please the conservationists—and mount the guns in the refuge and fire into the Fort Sill range. They could mount the gun emplacements in the wildlife refuge, or near the border, as they have been placed, or work out an agreement with the wildlife refuge people and go 4 miles into the refuge and fire the guns in a high arc and lob the shells over the inhabited area across highways and railroads into the impact area in the far eastern part of the reservation.

That is the whole issue. I have read the hearings in the House committee and in the Senate committee. I have read the letters. It comes down to a simple fact. If we are to have an artillery range without an inhabited area between the gun and the impact area, it is necessary to fire from the Fort Sill reservation into the area of impact.

I would like to say to my distinguished friend from Oregon that we have tried to preserve the useful parts of the refuge, and the map which my distinguished colleague has before him, and which I showed to the Senator from Oregon earlier today, shows that we have dropped south of the parts that are used the most, and have gone into the high ground to the west, so as to cause the least interference with the wild life.

We are not indifferent to the value of wildlife. When Camp Gruber, near Muskogee, was discontinued, some 70,000 acres were taken over by Oklahoma A. & M. College and converted into a wildlife preserve. We have added other land as well.

However, when we come face to face with the hard fact that we will either have a second rate artillery, or must build a new artillery school, instead of taking about 10,000 acres of a total of 59,000 acres of wildlife refuge, then I believe we must face the fact, regretfully, that that land is required for our national-defense effort.

Mr. MORSE. I fully appreciate the position of the Senators from Oklahoma. I also appreciate the fact that we are not dealing with something that is all black or all white.

The junior Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY] has been very courteous to me. I am sure he does not object to my putting this in the RECORD. I had a very brief conversation on the floor of the Senate with the senior Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR] before I spoke. However, the junior Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY] came to me and said he had been advised I had some objections to the bill, and I told him that the conservation people of my State and other conservation groups had presented a point of view to me, which I would put into the RECORD. That I have done.

At a conclusion to my remarks I shall make a final suggestion, which I believe is fair and equitable under the circumstances.

Mr. President, the personnel at Fort Sill has a good game management program. They should be commended for the splendid wildlife work that has been done on the fort property. In a clipping from a recent issue of the Lawton Press, I noted that there is a keen desire on the part of some of the officers in charge to broaden their activities to include wild turkey. Could it be, Mr. President, that the fact that some of the best wild turkey habitat on the Wichita Refuge is in the 10,700 acres that the Army wants be one of the factors that is motivating the expansion program? There is ample evidence to show that other areas in different parts of the country were taken over by the military largely because of their recreational values, and I do not think that we should close the door on the 850,000 people that have been using those recreational facilities in the Wichita each year.

As another interesting sidelight, I would like to quote the following sentence from a letter of July 14 from Lt.

Col. B. W. Legare, of the Office of the Chief of Legislative Liaison:

At present, the Department of the Army is also utilizing on a permit basis from the Department of the Interior, in addition to the 10,700 acres referred to above, an additional 19,844 acres, which will be available for public use when it is not in active military use.

It seems to me, Mr. President, that that reflects the attitude of the Army. Fort Sill has its foot in the door on another 19,844 acres, and the engulfing process obviously is working effectively. Perhaps I should add that all, not just a part, but all of the recreational facilities of the Wichita Refuge are confined to the 30,544 acres under agreement.

The record shows that Representative ROBERT L. F. SIKES, chairman of the House Appropriations Subcommittee for Army Construction, stated on the floor when the supplemental appropriations bill was passed, that his committee had acted on the assumption that the land to be taken from the Wichita National Wildlife Refuge by the Army was the least desirable land and the least used land in the refuge, and that it has but few recreational facilities. He expressed the hope that, since it subsequently was shown to his committee that the proposed transfer involves some of the most valuable land in the refuge, and that it contains important recreational facilities, that further consideration should be given to the proposal.

Mr. President, the repeating of the same justification on the part of the Army, and the restating of those questionable statements, does not, in my opinion, constitute a review of the case, as Chairman SIKES recommended. Under the circumstances, the Senate should prohibit the transfer of those refuge lands at this time, and should wait until the Army has either proved its statements or has withdrawn its attack on Mr. Gutermuth and those five national conservation organizations. If it then can be shown that the requirements of Fort Sill cannot be met under this alternative proposal that was submitted to the Army last spring by the Department of the Interior, then, and not until then, should the Congress pass on the matter.

I close by saying that I have great difficulty in getting over the objections of the Department of the Interior. The Department alleges, as I read the record, that the alternative program which it offers will meet the defense needs. The Department of the Army, of course, denies it. I must admit that, on the basis of a so-called comparison of expert testimony, the presumption would be in favor of the Department of the Army. However, it is not a conclusive presumption, as I well know, after serving 8 years on the Committee on Armed Services. I do feel that we ought to have more consideration of the matter on the basis of further study of the representations of the conservation groups and of the representations of the conservation groups and of the representations of the Department of the Interior.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I spoke on this subject on July 20. I have had an opportunity to visit with the senior Senator from Oklahoma and the junior Senator from Oklahoma, and in that visit we discussed the map which has been provided for those of us who are concerned in the matter.

Regardless of the outcome of the discussion—and I believe the outcome is rather apparent—I feel the debate this afternoon on the issue of conservation and on the issue of wildlife refuges is very worthwhile. In behalf of the distinguished junior Senator from Oregon [Mr. NEUBERGER], I wish to say that I know of no man in Congress who has a more justified reputation for being an ardent and effective and devoted conservationist than the junior Senator from Oregon.

Long before his arrival in the Senate, his fame and reputation in the area of conservation, among other areas, had been brought to our attention through his writings, through his speeches, and through his deeds.

I also wish to say that I think it is very important that there be a certain number of stalwarts in the Congress, so-called minutemen, in defense of conservation, because there is a continuous effort in this country to whittle away what seem to be, momentarily, lands which can be sacrificed for what apparently is a great immediate purpose.

We have a country which is growing by leaps and bounds. The head of the National Park Service only recently testified that it would soon be necessary to start to ration our national parks, to place a limit on how many people can enjoy our national parks, the great playgrounds of the people of America. I have not been in all of them, and I intend to go into more of them.

I think the Congress of the United States should have a little more concern about the facilities to be found in wildlife refuges and national parks. The accommodations in some of them are abominable. The roads are not properly cared for. The housing facilities are inadequate, outdated, and insanitary. Yet we appropriate billions upon billions of dollars, and when it comes to taking care of the playgrounds of the people, where they can go and get away from the madhouse in which we live, escape the clatter of automobiles, the roar of airplanes, and the threat of war—whenever it comes to taking care of some peaceful area which God Almighty has put upon this earth we hear it said, "Well, the Army may need it."

I think the issue has been pretty well answered this afternoon. I think the senior Senator from Oregon answered it in the most polite, the most considerate, and yet the most precise terms. He was correct when he said he yields to none when it comes to a strong defense program. He was right when he said that the distinguished Senators from Oklahoma yield to none in their concern for conservation.

It is not a personal argument, Mr. President. It is not an argument over States rights or local rights, but it is an argument over basic public policy. I must say that good arguments can be made, and they have been made, for the expansion of Fort Sill. I can understand very well the desire of the Armed Services Committee and the Appropriations Committee not to liquidate an investment—not only an investment, but a great tradition. I can well understand the deep concern of the two Senators from Oklahoma for the proper expansion, development, and modernization of Fort Sill. It is a part of the great history of their State, as it was even when it was a Territory. It goes back years into the region of folklore and the history of the State of Oklahoma and of the great southwestern section of the country.

I have no argument with them on that point. I do not think either Senator from Oklahoma wishes to be unkind to conservation groups. I know that is not true. I know they are disturbed in their own hearts over making the decision. But decisions have to be made, and they made their decision according to what they thought to be the best interests of their State and of the Nation. We respect that decision.

Also, Mr. President, I think we should have great respect for the conservation groups. Those groups have made their views very plain to the Congress on this issue. Those groups are Citizens Committee for Natural Resources, Izaak Walton League of America, National Parks Association, National Wildlife Federation, Nature Conservancy, North American Wildlife Foundation, Outdoor Writers Association of America, Sierra Club, Southwest Association of Naturalists, Sport Fishing Institute, Wilderness Society, and Wildlife Management Institute.

There are no finer groups of good people to be found. These organizations are nonpartisan and nonpolitical. They represent the organized desire of millions of Americans to preserve in America the great wildlife refuges, parks, and playgrounds as a natural habitat for the growing population of our country.

Therefore, Mr. President, if nothing more comes out of the discussion today than the fact that there is a deep concern in the Congress over what appears to be a losing fight in the conservation and wildlife refuge program, we have at least expended our time well.

I have noted, as the senior Senator from Oregon pointed out, that the locality which we have been discussing is not the only place the United States Army wants to use the public lands.

I should like to quote from an article which was brought to my attention, published in the New York Times of July 3, and written by one of its feature writers who has visited playgrounds and refuges. The writer of the article is Mr. Raymond R. Camp. He points out as follows:

The Desert Game Refuge in Nevada also is being threatened. The Service granted the Air Force permission to use part of the refuge for firing and the Air Force has now announced its intention of taking over primary jurisdiction of the refuge. This would eliminate wildlife interests in the area.

The Army is seeking still another refuge, the Kofa Game Refuge in Arizona, for use in testing poisonous gas on a battlefront scale. As this is the final home of the Galliard Mountain sheep and serves as a major refuge for mule deer, pygy antelope, and

other game, it takes little imagination to realize what will happen to wildlife there.

Mr. President, at times the discussion has been most interesting and has provoked smiles and sometimes a friendly kind of laughter. We are not worried so much about the squirrels, the quail, and the rabbits. We are worried about the people. The funny thing about these little animals is that people enjoy them more than they enjoy themselves. That is why the United States of America is known as a Nation that has so many little pets. In the big cities, where there is hardly room for children, there will be found plenty of dogs and cats, because people like their little pets. They seem to bring them a little closer to what they think is nature. The purpose of game refuges is to preserve animals in a natural habitat so that people can have the experience of going into an area which has not been desecrated or adulterated by human hands.

In Minnesota we have a wilderness area concerning which there is a court case in the Federal court between operators of lodges who want to have the privilege of flying people in by plane and opening up the area to further exploitation and economic development, and those who want to preserve it as it is. The Government has said, "If you wish to go there, you are going to walk or go by canoe." We are going to have one little place in the United States where there is no room for a gas buggy, a train, a honky-tonk, or a saloon. We are going to have a place where there are only grass, bees, bugs, and flowers. I think the bees, the bugs, the grass, and the flowers do a better job in organizing their part of the world than we do in organizing our part.

So, Mr. President, we are talking about a very practical matter. Congress continues to appropriate more and more money for mental hospitals. We are told by doctors that we have nerve tension. They indicate to us that society is so hopped up that people can hardly get anything more with which to hop themselves up. The blessings of the outdoors are essential to us.

I do not think it is proper to leave the RECORD to show that the junior Senator from Oregon was interested only in small animals in his own State. He is interested in the entire country; and I know both the Senators from Oklahoma feel that way.

Mr. President, I wish to pay my respects to the conservation groups. They have talked to me and I hope they will continue to talk to me. I want them continuously to express their concern. But I wish to tell them now that they had better express it in no uncertain way when they are dealing with the Pentagon, because when a project comes up, all that is necessary to say is that the Army needs it. The Army has an insatiable appetite.

I recall that the junior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], in connection with the military public works bill a few years ago, succeeded in having the appropriation cut in half, and it was said that the military could not get by with that amount of money. Yet I point out that the junior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], through his subcommittee, cut the authorization anyway. The country's defenses did not collapse.

We hear of the testimony before the committees, and we learn the number of caps which were purchased from Mr. Lev and others. We hear of the testimony about the number of reams of carbon paper which the Pentagon has. They cannot figure out enough ways in which to use that carbon.

So it is no wonder that some persons are somewhat concerned when the Army says "We need 10,000 acres." Two years ago the Army thought they needed much more than that. I compliment the Senators from Oklahoma. They certainly whittled down the amount of land which the Army thought it needed. I know the Army met strong adversaries when they met the two Senators from Oklahoma.

I think the Senators from Oklahoma have done extremely well in limiting the acquisition. I hope that as a result of this discussion we will have an understanding that the acquisition is "the acquisition," because a time comes when we must try to hold what we have.

There is never enough land for the military; there never has been. We have found that to be true time after time of the Government itself. I do not wish to pick out the military especially. The Government never has enough office space.

So it is to the credit of the Senate Committee on Appropriations, and especially to the two Senators from Oklahoma, that they have stood their ground as well as they have.

I support the amendment which has been offered by the junior Senator from Oregon. I think he has done a great service for his country in bringing this issue to the attention of the people. I am happy to associate myself with him.

I wish to compliment especially the conservation groups, which are not willing to pull down their flag, which are not willing to retreat, which are unwilling to call it quits.

I warn them that in the days to come they had better put as much steam and enthusiasm as they can behind their efforts to protect the national heritage in the great public lands, refuges, and national parks, which are the playgrounds of the American people.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. STENNIS in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the junior Senator from Oregon [Mr. NEUBERGER].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I offer an amendment, which I ask to have read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment offered by the Senator from Nebraska.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 12, line 8, it is proposed to strike out $1,078,649,000 and in lieu thereof insert $1,081,316,000.

On page 12, in line 13, before the period, it is proposed to insert a comma and the following: "and not to exceed $2,667,000 of this appropriation shall be used for medical facilities at the Lincoln Air Force Base, Lincoln, Nebr., as authorized by section 301 of the act of July 15, 1955, Public Law 161."

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, the amendment would provide $2,667,000, in addition to the amount appropriated in the bill, for hospital facilities at the Lincoln, Nebr., airbase. This base is a part of the Strategic Air Command. At this hour of the evening, I shall not elaborate upon the important mission of this airbase and the prominent part which it plays in our national defense.

At present, the Lincoln airbase is without a hospital. It has an improvised or a makeshift infirmary in a barracks-type building.

The request I make is supported by the Air Force, which is asking for the hospital. It is approved by the Bureau of the Budget, and it is authorized by law.

It so happens that this item was not included in the bill which was introduced in the House, and it has not yet been inserted because of a certain chain of circumstances. Earlier this year there was discussion of a proposal to have the hospital of the Veterans' Administration at Lincoln released by the Veterans' Administration and assigned to the Air Force. The local people were brought into the discussion, along with the officials of the veterans' organizations, the Air Force, and others, and the proposal did not meet with approval.

However, in the meantime, there had gone forth to Congress the representations of the departments in regard to omitting the money for the hospital from the bill now before the Senate, and also from the authorization bill. Later the question of whether or not the veterans' hospital could be used by the Air Force was finally decided by the Congress. At that time the authorization bill for the military public works was before the House.

A conference was held by the interested parties, including my colleague, the senior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA], Representative WEAVER, and myself and interested citizens from Nebraska, together with Chairman CARL VINSON, of the House Committee on Armed Services. Assistant Secretary of Defense Floete also was present.

At that conference Chairman VINSON decided that the Veterans' Administration should keep its own hospital, and that Congress should provide a hospital at the airbase. That decision was approved by the House Committee on Armed Services. The item was included in the military construction bill and was included in the sum carried on page 28 of the House report. The House of Representatives approved that action. There was no dispute about it, and no opposition to it.

The bill came to the Senate, and the Senate Committee on Armed Services, in the authorization bill for the construction of military, naval, and air force installations, again approved the decision that the Veterans' Administration should keep its own hospital; and the committee authorized $2,667,000 for a hospital to be constructed at the Lincoln Air Base.

When this appropriation bill was before the House of Representatives, the House committee withheld the funds, saying they were awaiting a decision as to whether or not the veterans' hospital would be used.

The day after this bill passed the House the President signed the authorization bill, which made final the decision, to wit, that the Air Force should construct their own hospital.

As a matter of fact, the veterans' hospital in question is some miles across the city from the Air Force base. It is not an empty building, it is Nebraska's oldest veterans' *hospital* and very much of a going concern. This morning I obtained from the Veterans' Administration a statement of what is taking place there, and I call it to the attention of the Senate.

The Veterans' Administration proposes to operate the hospital with an average daily patient load of 220. The hospital has 258 beds, so there will be an 88 percent average occupancy during the fiscal year 1956; $1,634,000 has been allocated for the operation of the hospital, for fiscal year 1956 and $201,600 has been allocated for the operation of the outpatient clinical services. Contracts for residences have been completed for the fiscal year 1956.

In other words, there is no veterans' hospital available for the Air Force. As matters now stand, we have an Air Force base without a hospital and without adequate medical facilities. The Lincoln Air Force base is an important one. In addition to the need for the hospital to provide medical services to care for the officers and men and their dependents, it will also be a part of the medical training program. Medical units will be established there, mobile in nature, which in time of emergency will be called upon for action in any part of the world.

Not to have their own hospital near the runways is not in keeping with the desires of the Air Force.

I might say in reference to the need for this facility that the local civilian agencies of Lincoln, Nebr., have been called upon to take care of hardship cases among the families of these airmen and officers. The burden has been carried largely by the local chapter of the Red Cross, whose budget in recent months has gone up 600 percent.

I submit that there is no Member of Congress who is willing to take the position that we should have an important Air Force base, a part of the striking arm of this country, a part of the strategic air command, operate without a hospital and adequate medical facilities.

Yet, due to a chain of circumstances, provision for the hospital is out of the bill. I do not blame the committee. It has been diligent. Its members have worked for long hours. They have had many details to consider. The difficulty arose by reason of the conflicting information which came to the committee early this year, when the alternative proposal, which has now been rejected by the Congress, was under consideration.

Mr. President, I sincerely hope that the amendment will be agreed to. If anyone has any doubt about it, he will have an opportunity to inquire of the Air Force as to the need for and the wisdom of the amendment by the time the matter is taken up in conference.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, the Senator from Nebraska has made a very persuasive argument, and I am willing to take the amendment to conference.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. STENNIS in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I shall take only about a minute, but for the purpose of completing the legislative record, I wish to call the attention of the Senate, so that it may be in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, to the report of the committee on the "Missouri River Basin project, transmission division." I am reading from page 38 of the report:

> The committee has approved the request of the Department to use $240,000 of available funds for the completion of the Yellowtail-Lovell transmission line. However, in approving the use of funds to complete this facility the committee desires to make it clear that nothing in the wording of the request of the Department of the Interior, or in the letter of approval of the Bureau of the Budget, is to be understood as a waiver of any preference expressed in section 5 of the Flood Control Act of 1944 or in the Federal reclamation laws.

Mr. MANSFIELD and Mr. MORSE addressed the Chair.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield to the Senator from Montana.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I am glad the distinguished Senator from Wyoming has brought this matter up, because I recall that about a week ago we had a meeting with representatives of the Budget Bureau, the Bureau of Reclamation, and the Department of the Interior—as a matter of fact, the Acting Secretary was there—the meeting being also attended by the Senator from Montana, the senior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. BARRETT], and the distinguished junior Senator from Wyoming, who has the floor.

If I recall correctly, it was at the specific request of the junior Senator from Wyoming that the particular language now incorporated in the bill was sent to the Appropriations Committee. I wish to compliment the Senator from Wyoming for looking after the interests of the people not only of his own State, but of the State of Montana. Language is now incorporated in the report which leaves no doubt as to where there is to be preference.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I thank the Senator. My purpose in calling this to the attention of the Senate is to make clear in the legislative history of the Appropriations Committee, that preference rights to REA's and municipalities are not to be disregarded or waived with regard to transmission lines.

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

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. I was trying to get the floor when the Senator from Montana was recognized, and my purpose was to discuss the very matter the Senator brought up. The Senator will recall that I expressed some concern earlier about some of the language used by the Bureau of the Budget in some of its requests, and by the Department of the Interior in some of its letters of transmittal, in that it seemed to me that those two divisions of Government have not been as specific concerning so-called preference rights provided for in the Flood Control Act of 1944 and in the Federal reclamation laws as I would like to have them be.

I wish to commend the committee for the language contained in the report, because I interpret it as a clear serving of notice on the Bureau of the Budget and the Department of the Interior that the preference language contained in the Flood Control Act of 1944 and in the reclamation laws must be followed and observed and protected.

I know of no one in the Senate who is a greater legal authority on the preference language in the existing laws than is the junior Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Senator is very kind.

Mr. MORSE. He knows of my views. I want to thank the committee for including this language in the report.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I am very appreciative to the committee for adopting the language. The committee today, in authorizing the Trinity project in California, also adopted language to make clear that the preference rights for REA's are to be continued.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I might state that the committee was very glad to have this matter brought to its attention by the Senator from Wyoming. There was a unanimous opinion that the provision should be inserted in the report.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the testimony which was given at the hearings and which is to be found on pages 824, 825, and 826 of the hearings, be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

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

YELLOWTAIL DAM AND OWL CREEK PROJECT

Then, yesterday, before the Legislative Committee on the Interior there was a discussion as to the meaning of the press conference statement of the President with respect to the public works appropriations which were contained in H. R. 6766 and which were added by the Congress though there were not budget items before us. The President in his statement said this:

"In all 107 unbudgeted projects were added by the Congress."

And then later on he said:

"As a consequence of these considerations, initiation of the added projects cannot be undertaken until the detailed engineering plans have been completed and we have a sound basis for cost estimates."

Before this committee approved the Yellowtail Dam and the Owl Creek projects, Yellowtail for Montana and Owl Creek for Wyoming, those two projects had not only been authorized, but initial appropriations had been made and plans had been made.

Thus it was not clear to the legislative committee whether or not those projects were included within the President's statement.

The representative of the Bureau of the Budget testifying before our committee said, with respect to Yellowtail certain additional

engineering material would have to be added, but the Bureau of Reclamation testified, Mr. Dexheimer, that a letter had already been forwarded to the Bureau of the Budget with this detailed information.

So I requested that the 2 bureaus harmonize their statement, 1 that the engineering data was not present, the other that it was present, in order that we might clearly find that these 2 projects were not within the prohibition of the President's conference statement.

He made no list. So I felt it was incumbent upon me to come and report to this committee what that status is.

URGENCY OF PROJECTS

I would like to recommend to the committee, if I may be bold enough to do so, that it include in its report—you may examine the Bureau of Reclamation when they come today, and the Bureau of the Budget, if you call them—but that you include in the report a statement of your own opinion that the detailed engineering facts have been presented so that the work may be going on because it is vitally needed.

I do not need to go into the story again, but I will mention the Yellowtail because there you have another estimate from the Bureau for the construction of a transmission line. The importance of these estimates——

Chairman HAYDEN. That is the Yellowtail-Lovell line?

Senator O'MAHONEY. The Yellowtail-Lovell—is to be found both in the report that you have received from the Bureau of the Budget and in the letter which was addressed to you as chairman of this committee by Acting Secretary of Interior Fred A. Aandahl under date of June 24, 1955. In this letter Secretary Aandahl—I am reading paragraph 2—says:

"This will involve the completion of the Lovell-Yellowtail 115-kilovolt transmission line by the Bureau of Reclamation which would permit integration of the power system of the Bureau and the Pacific Power & Light Co., and systems in Wyoming with the Montana Power Co. system in Montana. The Montana Power Co. would provide the interconnection between its system at Billings, Mont., and the Yellowtail point of interconnection. This interconnection would make it possible to transmit needed power over the Bureau's transmission system to loads in the Wyoming area. The Yellowtail line was partially completed with most of the poles being placed and the conductor acquired at the time that Congress stopped construction by eliminating funds for this purpose."

The point to which I wish to draw attention is that this letter from the Secretary of the Interior makes no reference whatsoever to the preferred usage of power developed at Corps of Engineer dams and Reclamation Bureau dams.

REA COOPERATIVES

There are REA cooperatives throughout the State of Wyoming; there are REA cooperatives in the State of Montana. I asked my office to send over here, and it arrived just in time, a list of REA co-ops in the State of Wyoming:

Riverton Valley Electric Association, Riverton, Wyo.

Big Horn Rural Electric Co., Basin, Wyo.

Wyrulec Co., Lingle, Wyo.

Bridger Valley Electric Association, Mountain View, Wyo.

Wheatland Rural Electric Association, Wheatland, Wyo.

Lower Valley Power & Light, Inc., Freedom, Wyo.

Garland Light & Power Co., Powell, Wyo.

Washakie Rural Electric Co., Worland, Wyo.

Rural Electric Co., Pine Bluffs, Wyo.

Hot Springs County REA, Thermopolis, Wyo.

Carbon Power & Light, Inc., Saratoga, Wyo.

Niobrara Electric Association, Inc., Lusk, Wyo.

Shoshone River Power Co., Cody, Wyo.

Sheridan-Johnson REA, Sheridan, Wyo.

Tri-County REA, Pinedale, Wyo.

If this estimate is to be construed by the letter of the Secretary and by the language of the estimates as designed to provide for integration between existing public utility corporations and the Bureau of Reclamation without recognizing the preference established in the law which authorized this Missouri Basin development, it would be actually a change of law without action by the legislative committee or by the Congress itself.

NECESSITY FOR TRANSMISSION LINE

I think the transmission line is very necessary, and I hope that it will be built because the Yellowtail project has been built. The original line, the beginning of the original line, was designed to bring power for the construction of the Yellowtail project.

Chairman HAYDEN. It would be your desire that either there be a provision in the bill or in the report indicating——

Senator O'MAHONEY. Indicating that this appropriation is in nowise to be construed as limiting or modifying in any respect the preferred uses for electric power from the Bureau of Reclamation power plants set forth in the law.

NEED FOR WHEELING ARRANGEMENT

Chairman HAYDEN. In order to carry out that objective, after this power is delivered at the end of the Reclamation Service line to the private power company in Wyoming, there would have to be some kind of wheeling arrangement.

Senator O'MAHONEY. There would have to be some kind of wheeling arrangement. Wheeling arrangements have been made in the past, but the danger I seek to avoid is the danger that would arise from the construction of this language in the budget report and in the report of the Secretary.

I think that can be easily corrected by a statement in the report, that nothing is intended by this appropriation to deprive preferred users of their rights to receive that power.

If there is to be any modification of the system of stimulating and fostering the growth of REA cooperatives, which is private enterprise if there ever was any private enterprise, municipal systems and the like, why, it ought to be done not by vague language in a budget estimate, but by the action of the appropriate committee.

I thank you very much for your patience with me. If there are any questions, I shall be very glad to answer them.

Chairman HAYDEN. Senator KNOWLAND.

Senator KNOWLAND. So that we can have an opportunity to give a little study in advance, I think we should have some language prepared on it to be submitted to both sides of the table.

Senator O'MAHONEY. Very well. I am back at my old job, I see.

Chairman HAYDEN. Mr. FLOOD, do you have any observations?

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, in these closing moments of the discussion on the supplemental appropriation bill, which really closes up the work of the Committee on Appropriations for the first half of the 84th Congress, I wish to pay tribute to the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations [Mr. HAYDEN]. It is, of course, a tremendous responsibility to be chairman of the Appropriations Committee. Being chairman entails an enormous amount of hard work day and night, in order to accomplish the tasks before the committee.

The Senator from Arizona has accomplished wonders as chairman of this particular committee during this session. The work of the committee has been finished early in the session, and we are ahead of schedule as compared with the work of the committee in former years.

For these reasons, I take this opportunity to pay tribute to the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN] and to the ranking minority member of the committee, the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], because of their able leadership, to the work of the subcommittees, and to the staff of the Appropriations Committee. The staff oftentimes would take the results that had been accomplished at 10 or 11 o'clock in the evening and then work through the night, in order to get bills or reports to the printer and have them on the desks of Senators the next day. So I do not want this opportunity to pass without paying tribute to the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], and the staff of the committee, for a job ably done.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I am sure that the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] and I have benefited greatly, in the accomplishment of the work of the committee, by the very experienced help of all the other members of the committee, many of whom either served as subcommittee chairmen for a second time or served in that capacity in the last Congress.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I should like to associate myself with the remarks of the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE]. I think all of us feel very much as he does in regard to the distinguished chairman of the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. President, I wish to attempt to make a little legislative history regarding the item of the bill dealing with the Republic of Panama.

I have been serving as chairman of a subcommittee which has been considering a treaty with Panama, which I believe will be reported to the Senate tomorrow. The treaty provides for an increase of $1,500,000 in the annuity payment to Panama.

I wish to say that from the discussion of this matter, it is my understanding of the treaty that the activities of the Panama Canal itself should be self-sustaining. I shall vote in favor of the ratification of the treaty. In recommending that the treaty be ratified by the Senate, I shall do so on the understanding that whatever is necessary to keep the Panama Canal self-sustaining will be done by the Congress. I do not believe that can be done at this session, because of the time limitation, and certain legislation will be required in order to accomplish that purpose.

Certainly I shall not oppose this item of the bill; in fact, I am in favor of it. However, I wish it to be understood that

in favoring it, I do so with that understanding, which I believe is the understanding of the committee.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I understand that additional enabling legislation must be reported from the legislative committee and enacted, in order to accomplish the purpose of making the Panama Canal Company pay the cost of the increased annuity. For myself, I shall be very happy to support such legislation.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, in regard to the remarks of the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], let me say that under the provisions of the treaty, after it is ratified, the obligation of the United States will be somewhat greater than it has been heretofore. However, I am informed by good authorities in Panama that it is their purpose to use that particular fund in order to make their contributions to the Inter-American Highway, and not to use the fund for any other purpose.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I hope the Senator from New Mexico did not think I was criticizing anything about the treaty.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I knew the Senator from Arkansas was not doing so. However, I wish to state how the money will be used. It is true that Panama will receive a somewhat larger amount. But I am informed that, instead of using the fund for other purposes, they wish to cooperate with the United States in completing the Inter-American Highway.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I had not heard of that, but I am very pleased to hear it. I understand that the treaty will be before the Senate tomorrow.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I wish to associate myself with the remarks of the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE] regarding the very fair and impartial job which I believe the Appropriations Committee has done this year. In particular, I wish to commend the chairman of the committee and also its ranking Republican member.

I believe I have a little right to speak on this subject, inasmuch as it so happens that a considerable number of Pacific Northwest projects were before the committee this year. I think the members of the committee—Republicans and Democrats alike—demonstrated time and time again that they face these issues on their merits, and not on the basis of political considerations.

Of course, Mr. President, if the members of the committee had wished to play cheap, partisan politics, they could have taken, in the case of some of the projects, a position which they might have thought would serve some partisan, political advantage in relation to the senior Senator from Oregon. However, at no time did I feel that any of my representations before the committee was met on the basis of any partisan consideration at all. Instead, I felt that the people of the Pacific Northwest received from the committee what they were entitled to receive, namely, an impartial, fair consideration on the merits of each project, regardless of the political position of any of the Senators from the Pacific Northwest.

I desire to thank the chairman of the committee, in particular and also the Republican as well as the Democratic members.

Mr. President, I close by saying a special word of commendation in regard to an item appearing on page 38 of the bill, for which the committee recommends the allowance of the supplemental estimate of $2,038,000 for "Construction, Bonneville Power Administration." The funds recommended are to provide for the construction of the necessary transmission facilities to serve the proposed aluminium reduction plant to be constructed by the Harvey Machine Co. at The Dalles, Oreg.

For the past several decades, this project has been a matter of interest and concern in my State. It was generally the old case of whether the chicken or the egg came first. It was perfectly clear that here was a great company which was ready to operate an aluminum plant, provided the power could be made available to it from Bonneville; and the Bonneville Power Administration was taking the position that it needed a transmission line in order to supply the industry with the power.

In the field of aluminum, as in many other fields or phases of American industrial life, competition is desirable; and many of us have felt for some time that this competitive venture should be encouraged. That is why, as the chairman of the committee knows, in previous years I have urged the approval of this particular item, so that the transmission line could be constructed. In the past we were not successful, although, may I say, on several occasions we came very close to success.

This year, my colleague and I joined in the joint public representations on this matter and in representations to the committee. I wish to say to the committee that we deeply appreciate their action on this meritorious and sound item.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. THURMOND in the chair). The bill is open to further amendment.

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

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall it pass?

The bill (H. R. 7278) was passed.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I move that the Senate insist upon its amendments, request a conference thereon with the House of Representatives, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. CHAVEZ, Mr. ELLENDER, Mr. HILL, Mr. STENNIS, Mr. BRIDGES, Mr. SALTONSTALL, Mr. YOUNG, Mr. KNOWLAND, and Mr. THYE conferees on the part of the Senate.

THE EMERGENCY ACCELERATED AMORTIZATION PROGRAM

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, last Tuesday, I commented on a newspaper report about Secretary Humphrey's testimony on the emergency accelerated amortization program. In my comments, I pointed out that I had opposed the 1954 revision of the Internal Revenue Code because of its amortization provisions, and I indicated that this was the amortization provision to which I objected in last year's bill.

Secretary Humphrey has called to my attention the fact that it was the general amortization provisions of last year's bill to which I had objected, rather than to the continuance of the emergency accelerated amortization provision; and I wish to make this correction, for the benefit of the Senate.

The emergency accelerated amortization program under section 168 of the Internal Revenue Code, formerly section 124A, is a justified measure to assist in increasing defense-production capacity, where this method is the most satisfactory from the point of view of the Government. Of course, as Secretary Humphrey pointed out, such measures are justified only as emergency measures, and should be stopped as soon as the emergency is over.

This is why it is surprising to find that during the past three quarters, the number and the dollar value of the certificates issued have been increasing.

The Office of Defense Mobilization, the certifying authority under the law, seems to find more emergency facilities, rather than less, necessary. As the authority to issue these certificates is entirely discretionary, I agree with Secretary Humphrey's concern at this new trend.

This seems one more case, like the exemption from the antitrust laws for voluntary agreements, or the exemption industry-paid employees, where the administration favors continuance and extension of emergency measures which benefit business, particularly big business, at the same time as it takes pleasure in announcing that price and rent controls may be ended because the emergency is over.

The general provisions concerning amortization, relaxing the requirements for the benefit of industry, are a different matter. My objection to those provisions, as to the other provisions encouraging investment, such as the dividend credits, was that such strong measures of encouragement to investment, as contrasted with tax relief for consumers, were not necessary in 1954 to continue the flow of funds into investment. It is not clear just how far these measures helped to stimulate the stock market in its upward course last fall and winter. But it seems clear that these encouraging measures provided somewhat more enthusiasm for investment than was needed by the stock market.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this

point as a part of my remarks the following:

A copy of a letter dated July 20, 1955, addressed to me by the Secretary of the Treasury, calling my attention to the difference which I mentioned, together with his statement to the Subcommittee on Legal and Monetary Affairs of the House Government Operations Committee; a copy of my letter, dated July 26, 1955, in reply to the Secretary's letter, together with a United Press dispatch of July 4, describing the latest period in which the tax writeoffs have been allowed by the Office of Defense Mobilization, particularly calling attention to the nature of the amortization provision with respect to the Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe Railroad, as an example of accelerated amortization for a purpose which it is difficult for me to believe is necessitated by any emergency in the national defense.

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

THE SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY,
Washington, July 20, 1955.

The Honorable J. W. FULBRIGHT,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: My attention has been called to some news reports last night, originating from your remarks in the RECORD at page 10884 relating to my testimony before the Subcommittee on Legal and Monetary Affairs of the House Government Operations Committee, with respect to accelerated amortization.

I have carefully read your remarks in the Record and I am afraid that you are confused between the provisions for accelerated amortization about which I was testifying and the new provisions which revamped the regular depreciation schedules in last year's tax law, which were not under discussion.

The RECORD quotes you as saying: "* * * that this is a procedure or policy which was initiated during the Korean war and has continued since that time, and that all of a sudden the Secretary of the Treasury has discovered that it is an artificial stimulus of a dangerous character. This is the very point which was under consideration last year during the debate on the tax bill, and it was one of the principal reasons why I voted against the tax bill, and why I believe a number of other Senators voted against that bill."

I well remember your objection in the debate last year to the tax bill and to its provisions relating to the depreciation schedules. These, however, have nothing whatever to do with accelerated amortization about which I was testifying on Monday, and it is a fact that those provisions for accelerated amortization were actually passed by the 81st Congress, effective as of January 1, 1950, and they have continued as a part of the Korean program since that time.

For your information, I am enclosing a copy of my statement before the subcommittee, in which you will see that my whole point is that the Korean provisions have now largely outlived their usefulness, and, therefore, from now on should be sparingly used and rigidly confined.

I am sure you will want to correct your mistaken criticism of my position, and I am very glad to have the opportunity to supply you with the facts concerning it.

Sincerely,

GEORGE M. HUMPHREY.

STATEMENT BY SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY HUMPHREY BEFORE THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON LEGAL AND MONETARY AFFAIRS OF THE HOUSE GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS COMMITTEE, JULY, 18, 1955

TREASURY DEPARTMENT,
Washington.

Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, I welcome this opportunity to appear before you and to express the point of view of the Treasury Department on the provisions in our tax laws which allow accelerated amortization for income tax purposes of the cost of certain "emergency facilities."

I want to make it clear that I am not urging repeal. Final decisions on the scope of the program should not be made until the studies now being made by the Defense Mobilization Board have been completed. I wish at this time simply to make certain suggestions which I believe should be carefully considered in any study of the matter.

The "crash" defense program which was initiated in connection with the Korean war has been substantially completed.

Emergency amortization served a useful purpose during the early phases of rebuilding and expanding defense plant capacity to meet that emergency. However, the accelerated tax writeoff is an artificial stimulus of a dangerous type. Its indefinite continuance involves the very real danger that interests receiving the benefits of it come to rely upon it to the detriment of others who are not so favored. A defense mobilization program on a substantial scale may be essential for years to come. Expansion of our defense facilities should be an integral part of our broad, orderly, long-range, natural economic growth. Our basic defense capacity cannot soundly be separated from the broad base of productive capacity in general on which our Nation relies for its economic strength. Artificial stimulants may well become artificial controls. Because this one is not of universal application but is bestowed only upon some who especially qualify as against others who do not, it could become a hindrance to sound, balanced, vigorous growth of our whole free economy. It is not the American way.

Moreover, I think it important to remember, in any consideration of the problem, that several recent changes in the tax laws have substantially altered the tax picture which existed when accelerated amortization of emergency facilities was first adopted. Then we had an excess-profits tax which took up to 82 percent of the profits from corporate business, and thereby tended to discourage large expenditures for new-plant facilities. That tax was repealed as of January 1, 1954. The new liberalized depreciation methods under the 1954 Internal Revenue Code now permit faster capital recovery by all taxpayers equally and meet the basic needs of the whole economy. This reduces the need for singling out particular taxpayers or particular facilities for more favorable treatment than others receive.

A highly selective program may well have merit if it is strictly limited to very special cases—where there is present and pressing need for goods that would be a "must" in time of war and which cannot be met by present facilities and where Government contribution is necessary to meet those goals. I suggest, however, that the broader the program—the more it extends into areas other than the direct production of goods that are directly needed for war—the more difficult it becomes to administer wisely, without essentially arbitrary or discriminatory results.

Indeed, the very existence of such a program may lead some taxpayers to construct facilities deliberately colored to meet supposed defense need. The tax benefits often could more than absorb the waste and extra expense to the taxpayer—but it hardly would be good for the economy.

The revenue effects of the program are significant. I shall present four statistical tables to the committee. They have been prepared by the Treasury staffs. These tables will give you the facts, and our estimates of the direct dollar impact of the present program on the revenue. You will note that the estimated revenue loss this fiscal year will be $880 million. With our budget not in balance, this figure gives us serious concern. Extension of the program well may stand in the way of future more general tax reductions for all taxpayers which would be of important assistance to all business and to our continued economic growth and expansion.

Finally, I should like to speak very frankly about this use of the tax laws to further special programs and accomplish purposes other than simply the collecting of taxes. The power to tax is the power to destroy and revenue laws should be used only to equitably raise revenue, not for other indirect purposes. It is dangerous to use the tax laws for social purposes, to favor one citizen or group of citizens over others, to exercise economic controls, or to indirectly subsidize any segment of our economy.

If, in the wisdom of the Congress, such subsidies or assistance to special communities or for special purposes are desired, then appropriations should be made for the purpose which can be submitted to the Congress through regular channels where the amounts will be well known and where the Congress specifically can vote in favor of or in opposition to special treatment for any group. Under this program of tax reduction in special cases, our net revenues can be reduced and our deficits increased without formal action or appropriations by the Congress. This use of the tax laws, where the stimulants are applied by men, not by law, is appropriate only in an emergency or under special conditions under rigid restrictions when usual procedures are inadequate for our protection.

Rapid amortization unquestionably was of real assistance in expediting preparation for the war and still can be useful if limited strictly and exclusively to that end. It induced the investment of large sums of private means for production that was made available under private management far better and far quicker than otherwise would have been obtained. It kept the investment of public funds to a minimum and it left no great burden of public properties to be disposed of when their war purposes had been served.

The Office of Defense Mobilization has recently requested the agencies that make recommendations to it, such as the Departments of Commerce and Interior and the Defense Transport Administration, to review all existing expansion goals with the following points in mind:

1. Evaluate goals on the basis of defense need. The need for additional expansion shall be quantitatively measured in terms of wartime supply and requirements.

2. Expansion goals shall be based upon shortages which, in the judgment of the delegate agency, will not be overcome without the incentive of tax amortization.

When the Defense Mobilization Board has completed its review of the program in the light of these criteria, and made its recommendations to the Director of Defense Mobilization, it is expected that the program for the future will be on a proper basis.

This is not critical of the past. Nor is it thought best to abandon the practice entirely. But its usefulness in the future will be greatest for the good of the Nation as a whole if from now on it is used only sparingly and very rigidly and strictly confined to direct war-requirements applications.

Effect of allowance of emergency amortization certificates; based on certificates of $30,521 million issued through June 29, 1955

[In millions of dollars]

Calendar year	Value of completed projects [1]	Amount subject to accelerated amortization	Normal depreciation [2]	Accelerated amortization	Excess of accelerated amortization	Decrease in tax liabilities [3]
1950	700	420	6	21	15	7
1951	4,167	2,500	87	292	205	113
1952	9,683	5,810	249	831	582	308
1953	16,000	9,600	463	1,541	1,078	593
1954	22,000	13,200	787	2,280	1,493	747
1955	26,594	15,956	1,132	2,895	1,763	882
1956	28,244	16,946	1,279	2,999	1,720	796
1957	29,479	17,687	1,289	2,633	1,344	605
1958	30,521	18,313	1,279	2,060	781	351
1959	30,521	18,313	1,228	1,383	155	70
1960	30,521	18,313	1,146	743	−403	−181
1961	30,521	18,313	1,080	372	−708	−319
1962	30,521	18,313	1,037	200	−837	−377
1963	30,521	18,313	1,000	63	−937	−422
1964	30,521	18,313	967	0	−967	−435

[1] End of year. These estimates are based on the ODM reported figures, but are modified in order to reconcile with corporate amortization deductions for 1951 and 1952.

[2] Computed on the basis of a straight-line rate of 6 percent, assuming that all certificate holders use the declining-balance method at 200 percent of the straight-line rate for assets acquired after Jan. 1, 1954, switching to straight line when it becomes advantageous.

[3] Effective tax rates reflecting rate decrease scheduled under present law.

Office of the Secretary of the Treasury, Analysis Staff, Tax Division, July 18, 1955.

Effect of allowance of emergency amortization certificates

[In millions of dollars]

	Decrease in tax collections
1951	4
1952	77
1953	266
1954	569
1955	776
1956	880

Effect of allowance of emergency amortization certificates—Continued

[In millions of dollars]

	Decrease in tax collections
1957	810
1958	625
1959	370
1960	87
1961	−167
1962	−310

Effect of allowance of emergency amortization certificates—Continued

[In millions of dollars]

	Decrease in tax collections
1963	−374
1964	−420
1965	−434

Office of the Secretary of the Treasury, Analysis Staff, Tax Division, July 18, 1955.

Tax amortization applications and certifications

[Money figures in millions of dollars]

Period [1]	Applications filed during period [2]		Certificates issued (net) during period [2 3]		Certificates outstanding at end of period [3]	
	Number	Value	Number	Value	Number	Value
1950	1,014	3,923	149	[4] 1,330	149	[4] 1,330
1951	15,909	23,161	5,322	10,104		
1st quarter	6,941	12,695	788	[4] 3,040	937	[4] 4,370
2d quarter	4,030	5,566	1,385	[4] 3,135	2,322	[4] 7,505
3d quarter	2,853	2,628	1,767	[4] 1,805	4,089	[4] 9,310
4th quarter	2,085	2,272	1,382	[4] 2,124	5,471	11,434
1952	7,036	8,101	9,544	12,649		
1st quarter	2,517	2,924	3,267	[4] 5,375	8,738	[4] 16,809
2d quarter	1,802	2,073	3,350	[4] 4,225	12,088	[4] 21,034
3d quarter	1,417	1,559	1,913	[4] 1,825	14,001	[4] 22,859
4th quarter	1,300	1,545	1,014	[4] 1,224	15,015	24,083
1953	3,426	5,765	3,617	4,942		
1st quarter	1,022	1,355	1,176	1,599	16,191	25,682
2d quarter	1,108	1,844	1,235	1,627	17,426	27,309
3d quarter	664	1,503	681	830	18,107	28,139
4th quarter	632	1,063	525	886	18,632	29,025
1954	1,500	2,643	756	635		
1st quarter	374	736	359	477	18,991	29,502
2d quarter	434	609	−107	−568	18,884	28,934
3d quarter	375	917	282	678	19,166	29,612
4th quarter	317	381	222	48	19,388	29,660
1955						
1st quarter	370	920	223	372	19,611	30,032
2d quarter	660	3,012	350	489	19,961	30,521

[1] Based on biweekly progress reports that may not coincide exactly with calendar years or calendar-year quarters.

[2] Derived from cumulative data which reflect revisions, adjustments, and amendments; decumulated data for certain periods may reflect revisions pertaining to other periods.

[3] Data reflect the net effect of certificates issued and canceled; cumulative data reflect revisions, adjustments, and amendments.

[4] Rough approximations.

Source: Office of Defense Mobilization.

Office of the Secretary of the Treasury, Analysis Staff, Tax Division, July 18, 1955.

Effect of allowance of emergency amortization certificates; based on certificates of $30,521 million issued through June 29, 1955

[In millions of dollars]

Calendar year	Value of completed projects [1]	Amount subject to accelerated amortization	Normal depreciation [2]		Accelerated amortization	Excess of accelerated amortization		Decrease in tax liabilities under accelerated amortization [3] as compared to—	
			Straight line	Declining balance		Straight-line depreciation	Declining-balance depreciation	Straight-line depreciation	Declining-balance depreciation
1950	700	420	6	6	21	15	15	7	7
1951	4,167	2,500	87	87	292	205	205	113	113
1952	9,683	5,810	249	249	831	582	582	308	308
1953	16,000	9,600	463	463	1,541	1,078	1,078	593	593
1954	22,000	13,200	684	787	2,280	1,596	1,493	798	747
1955	26,594	15,956	875	1,132	2,895	2,020	1,763	1,010	882
1956	28,244	16,946	987	1,279	2,999	2,012	1,720	931	796
1957	29,479	17,687	1,038	1,289	2,633	1,595	1,344	718	605
1958	30,521	18,313	1,079	1,279	2,060	981	781	441	351
1959	30,521	18,313	1,098	1,228	1,383	285	155	128	70
1960	30,521	18,313	1,098	1,146	743	−355	−403	−160	−181
1961	30,521	18,313	1,098	1,080	372	−726	−708	−327	−319
1962	30,521	18,313	1,098	1,037	200	−898	−837	−404	−377
1963	30,521	18,313	1,098	1,000	63	−1,035	−937	−466	−422
1964	30,521	18,313	1,098	967	0	−1,098	−967	−494	−435

[1] End of year. These estimates are based on the ODM reported figures, but are modified in order to reconcile with corporate amortization deductions for 1951 and 1952.

[2] Straight-line depreciation rate assumed is 6 percent. Amounts shown for declining-balance depreciation assume that all certificate holders use this method for assets acquired after Jan. 1, 1954, switching to straight-line when it becomes advantageous.

[3] Effective tax rates reflecting rate decrease on Apr. 1, 1956, scheduled under present law.

Office of the Secretary of the Treasury, Analysis Staff, Tax Division, July 18, 1955.

JULY 26, 1955.

Hon. GEORGE M. HUMPHREY,
Secretary of the Treasury,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY. Thank you for your letter of July 20 commenting on my remarks in the Senate on July 19 about tax amortization.

You are correct, of course, in pointing out that the tax amortization provision in the Internal Revenue Code revision to which I objected last year was the change in the regular depreciation schedules, rather than the emergency accelerated amortization provision in section 168, formerly 124A, of the code.

I shall be glad to correct this.

I have found your statement interesting, in its harsh criticisms of the program: "An artificial stimulus of a dangerous type"; "it is not the American way", the broader the program * * * the more difficult it becomes to administer wisely, without essentially arbitrary or discriminatory results."

In view of your criticism of the emergency accelerated amortization program, I am somewhat surprised to see that over the past 3 quarter-years, the number of certificates has increased from 222 up to 350, and the amounts from $48 million to $489 million.

As I understand it, section 168 does not require that certificates be issued, but rather limits them to cases where the certifying authority found a proposed facility "necessary in the interest of national defense during the emergency period" and then only to such proportion of the cost as is "attributable to defense purposes." Consequently, it seems to me that it would have been possible for the certifying authority, the ODM, to limit the issuance of certificates in such a fashion as to prevent abuses. And, I take it, the Government could stop issuing these certificates entirely if it should find the emergency over.

We often find that an authority granted to provide for an emergency situation has been continued and used long after the emergency need has passed, partly from inertia, partly because of the vested interests in the bureaucracy which has grown up around it, and partly because the segment of the public which benefits from the authority wishes it to continue.

It occurs to me that this emergency accelerated amortization provision may have outlived its real usefulness, and that the dangers of its continuance may far outweigh the benefits that may be derived from it in the future.

In this connection, it is interesting to note the present administration was quick to terminate price and rent controls and quick to ease the taxes on corporations. But it has urged the continuance of such authorities as the exemption from the antitrust laws for voluntary agreements under section 708 of the Defense Production Act—in fact it has even urged a 20-year extension—and continued exemptions from the conflict of interest statutes for industry-paid employees under section 710 (b) of the same act. And it has urged continuance of the financial aids to business under the Defense Production Act and the tax laws.

I was also interested in your statement that "revenue laws should be used only to equitably raise revenue, not for other indirect purposes. It is dangerous to use the tax laws for social purposes, to favor one citizen or group of citizens over others, to exercise economic controls, or to indirectly subsidize any segment of our economy."

It is indeed gratifying to find you accepting this principle, with which I heartily concur. Unfortunately, I cannot agree with your application of the principle. For example, in the 1954 tax bill my primary objection was that the basic purpose of most of the amendments was to encourage investment, by increased amortization, dividend deductions, and the like, whereas I was of the opinion that equally great, or greater, attention to the tax situation of the consumer was necessary at that time.

What part this emphasis on investments may have played in the recent stock-market upswing is difficult to assess, but favoring and encouraging investment through tax measures in 1954, while at the same time refusing equal relief to consumers, is, in my judgment, difficult to reconcile with your stated principle.

I shall, of course, be glad to look for your support, based on your belief that the revenue laws should be used to raise revenue only, in connection with tariff matters.

Sincerely yours,

J. W. FULBRIGHT,
Chairman.

THREE TAX WRITEOFFS ISSUED BY OFFICE OF DEFENSE MOBILIZATION—CONSUMERS POWER ALLOWED $18,280,000 TO BUILD NEW GENERATING EQUIPMENT

WASHINGTON, July 24.—Certificates for rapid tax writeoffs for 40 defense-related projects were issued between June 30 and July 13, the Office of Defense Mobilization announced tonight.

The certificates permit part of the projects' costs to be amortized for tax purposes over 5 years instead of the usual 20. The new or expanded facilities are valued at $47,768,434.

The largest certificates issued during the 2-week period went to:

Consumers Power Co., Muskegon, Mich., $18,280,000 for electric power generating equipment.

Aero-Jet General Corp., Sacramento County, Calif., $6,525,800 for research and development facilities.

Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe Railway, $4,020,534 for a centralized traffic control system.

The ODM said it approved 35 percent of Consumer Power's application for rapid amortization, 70 percent of Aero-Jet's and 40 percent of the Santa Fe's. The amount approved for rapid tax writeoff depends on the facility's importance to defense.

Since the rapid tax writeoff program began in 1950 to encourage defense and defense-related industrial expansion, 20,001 such certificates have been issued, with a total value of $30,595,004,000.

The certificates have permitted quick tax writeoffs of $18,398,062,000 of the total value.

POLICY AND PROCEDURE IN CONNECTION WITH CONSTRUCTION CONTRACTS

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 622, Senate bill 1644.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (S. 1644) to prescribe policy and procedure in connection with construction contracts made by executive agencies, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Kentucky.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with amendments.

PROGRAM FOR TOMORROW

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I wish to announce the program for tomorrow.

It is the intention of the acting majority leader to call up tomorrow for consideration the treaty, Executive E, 84th Congress, 1st session, a treaty of friendship, commerce, and navigation with the Federal Republic of Germany, signed at Washington on October 29, 1954.

In addition, it is the intention of the acting majority leader to call up for consideration tomorrow the following measures, with the understanding that they will not necessarily be taken up in the order mentioned:

Calendar No. 1053, House bill 4744, to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937, as amended, and the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act;

Calendar No. 1103, Senate bill 514, to provide for the disposal of certain Federal property in the Boulder City area, to provide assistance in the establishment of a municipality incorporated under the laws of Nevada, and for other purposes;

Calendar No. 1108, House bill 6454, to amend the joint resolution approved August 30, 1954, relating to the establishment of the Woodrow Wilson Centennial Celebration Commission, and for other purposes;

Calendar No. 830, Senate Resolution 129, to certify the report of the Committee on the Judiciary to the United States Attorney for the District of Columbia to the end that Joseph Starobin may be proceeded against in the manner and form provided by law;

Calendar No. 831, Senate Resolution 130, to certify the report of the Committee on the Judiciary to the United States Attorney for the District of Columbia to the end that Harry Sacher may be proceeded against in the manner and form provided by law;

Calendar No. 832, Senate Resolution 131, relating to the refusal of Harvey M. Matusow to answer questions before a Senate subcommittee;

Calendar No. 520, Senate bill 912, to amend the act of April 23, 1930, relating to a uniform retirement date for authorized retirements of Federal personnel; and

Calendar No. 1152, Senate bill 2630, to facilitate the establishment of local self-government at the communities of Oak Ridge, Tenn., and Richland, Wash., and to provide for the disposal of federally owned properties of such communities.

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

Mr. CLEMENTS. I am happy to yield.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Can the Senator tell us what the schedule will be for next week?

Mr. CLEMENTS. I will say to my friend from Arkansas that I hope, with sufficient cooperation in both the House and Senate, there will be some prospect that there will be no session next week, so far as the Senate is concerned.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. That is very encouraging.

Mr. CLEMENTS. We hope to be able to complete the legislative program by Saturday night or sooner.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The Senator will have my support.

AUTHORIZATION TO FILE REPORTS AND RECEIVE MESSAGES

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that during the adjournment of the Senate following today's session, the several standing committees be authorized to file reports, and that the Secretary of the Senate be authorized to receive messages from the House.

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

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its work today, it stand in adjournment until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

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

THIRD ANNIVERSARY OF PUERTO RICAN INDEPENDENCE

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, yesterday, July 25, the people of Puerto Rico celebrated the third anniversary of their Commonwealth status, and I believe that it is fitting and proper that we pay tribute to them for the remarkable strides which they have made under this form of self-government.

July 25, in fact, marks two anniversaries of significance. The first commemorates an historical landmark 57 years ago when, under the command of Gen. Nelson A. Miles, United States troops for the first time set foot on Puerto Rican soil. Since its discovery in 1492 by Columbus, and its settlement begun in 1508 by Ponce de Leon, Puerto Rico had been one of the many countries of the New World which formed a part of the Spanish Empire.

In 1898, we were at war with Spain in our endeavor to secure independence and freedom for the people of Cuba. When peace was made, the Crown of Spain ceded to the United States its sovereignty over the island of Puerto Rico. Thereby the United States assumed great responsibility toward the Puerto Rican people, who were Spanish in origin and culture and whose loyalties to that turning point in their history had been Spanish.

In conformity with the fundamental principles of the United States, the fact that this great Republic assumed sovereignty over that island could not end in its people becoming United States subjects. It could only result, as it has resulted, in their developing self-governing institutions in accordance with democratic principles. Ultimately, it had to bring as it has the organization of a free self-governing state in Puerto Rico: the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico.

The people of Puerto Rico have shown a remarkable capacity to adjust themselves to changing conditions and circumstances; for making a practical appraisal of, and for taking appropriate action to meet, those circumstances and conditions. Because of the small size of their island and because of its very limited natural resources, they realized that isolation and separation from the United States was not in their best interest. On the other hand, because of their geographical position 1,000 miles from Miami and 1,500 miles from New York, because of their cultural background, because they are a fully developed people by themselves, admission into the United States Union was not considered the most favorable way to maintain bonds of union with the United States. They brought us a formula conceived in the principles of freedom, democracy, and self-government, unique in the annals of our political system. In accordance with this formula, their bond with the United States does not mean incorporation in the Union, but rather association with the Union by solemn compact. Of course, it is not separation. Under the aegis of a common citizenship, they maintain a voluntary association with the United States. Thus, they have created their Commonwealth, their free state, with a constitution of their own adoption. They exercise the right of decision in all matters of their everyday life, while the United States, with their consent, performs relative to Puerto Rico the same functions as it does in the States of the Union. Today is the third anniversary of the creation of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico.

The benefits of this new association are mutual. Citizens of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico are also citizens of the United States. They can freely travel across the frontiers of this country. They find here the same opportunities which are open to all. All citizens of the United States, resident in Puerto Rico, are citizens of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, and they have the same protection and rights as in any native State of the Union.

There is free trade between the island and the mainland within a common tariff. Puerto Rico's economy has developed to the point where it is one of the best markets for United States products. Last year's purchases from continental United States totaled nearly a half-billion dollars, more than any country in the new world except Canada, Mexico, and Venezuela.

Again, Puerto Rico is a bastion for our defense in the Caribbean, a bulwark defending the Panama Canal. This is due, not only to its strategic position, but also to the wholehearted loyalty of the people of Puerto Rico to the United States and the ideals represented by the United States.

Puerto Rico has become an impressive example of what democratic institutions can do for any people and what people can do further to develop democratic institutions.

In the international sense, the citizens of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico are in the same position as the citizens of the States of Florida and New York; they are United States citizens. As such, they are entitled to our Government's protection. By the same token, when the necessity arose to uphold the principles for which this Nation stands, they have been as eager and determined to defend them on the fields of battle as those born on State soil.

Three years ago today, the flag of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico was raised to the top of the mast in Puerto Rico to fly alongside the Stars and Stripes. Both flags flying together are a symbol of a noble association.

We are proud of the Puerto Rican people and their efforts to reach a higher station in life. We should continue to help them as much as we can in their self-development. They are taxing both brawn and brain to solve their unemployment problem, heretofore extensive and appalling. They are trying to create new opportunities so that they will not have to leave their homeland to make a living. They are developing industrially.

The greater the interest and encouragement on the part of the people of the United States pointing the way for Puerto Rico to achieve higher standards of living, the greater an asset Puerto Rico will be as an associate—both politically and economically. Thus, the greater would be the prestige of the United States before the world, especially before our good neighbors below the border who are kinsmen of Puerto Rico's people.

Again Puerto Rico is convincing evidence of what was meant when Congress recently adopted unanimously the resolution condemning colonialism in the world. At no time can our relationship with Puerto Rico be classified as colonialistic. It is a free and voluntary association, entered into under the terms of a solemn compact which cannot be amended without mutual consent. Conditions and circumstances may change. The terms of the association may also change, as it may be agreed to from time to time, but no backward step will ever be taken. It will be a continuous ascent toward the higher goals of freedom, security, and common understanding that characterize the present relations of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico with the United States.

In conclusion, Mr. President, I would like to take this opportunity to extend to the people of Puerto Rico my heartiest congratulations for having made such an excellent selection in choosing their official representatives. Resident Commissioner A. FERNÓS-ISERN, their representative in the Congress since 1947, has done an outstanding and effective job in presenting to the Congress the many problems affecting Puerto Rico. His sincerity of purpose and sterling character has been indelibly imprinted upon every Member of Congress without exception. Though he has no vote, he has frequently stated to me that he has the votes of 435 Members of the House of Representatives and 96 votes in the Senate of the United States. His activities on behalf of the Puerto Rican people have on more than one occasion amply demonstrated the correctness of this statement. As many of us here in the Congress will recall, it was he who was chairman of the constitutional convention which drafted the constitution of Puerto Rico. It was he who was chosen as a member of the United States delegation to the United Nations when the President of the United States informed the United Nations of Puerto Rico's self-governing status. In his official capac-

ity, as a representative of the people of Puerto Rico, he has justly earned the admiration and respect of every Member in both Houses of the Congress. His warm personality has endeared him to all of us, and I, for one, hope that the people of Puerto Rico will see fit to retain such a worthy representative for many long years in the public service. His great contribution to our cause and the cause of the Puerto Ricans is inestimable.

In Gov. Luis Muñoz-Marin, Puerto Rico has an equally outstanding citizen. As chief executive, he has unquestionably performed outstanding public service in their behalf. He is, in fact, a great leader. It was during his administration that successful efforts were made in industrializing Puerto Rico so that more people could obtain more jobs, which in turn provided them with an increased standard of living. The people of Puerto Rico and the people of the United States owe to him an everlasting debt of gratitude for the great public service which he has rendered and is rendering. The record of progress which already has been made under his administration is one in which we can all take just pride.

It was through the leadership of these men that Puerto Rico has advanced and is continuing to advance under a truly self-governing associated status with the United States.

On this, the third anniversary of its self-governing status, we, the people of the United States, wish the people of Puerto Rico continued success and Godspeed.

ADJOURNMENT

The PRESIDING OFFICER. What is the pleasure of the Senate?

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, in accordance with the previous order, I move that the Senate adjourn until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock and 33 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned, the adjournment being, under the order previously entered, until tomorrow, Wednesday, July 27, 1955, at 12 o'clock meridian.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, JULY 26, 1955

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, Thou knowest how greatly we need divine wisdom and strength in our desires and dreams to build a world which has in it peace and good will.

Show us how we may lift and lead bruised and broken humanity out of its sorrow and sufferings, out of its doubts into faith, and out of its fears into joy.

Grant that as citizens of this great Nation we may strive with all the ingenuity and capacity at our command to preserve its sovereignty and security, giving it our loyalty and allegiance.

May we have a spirit which bears witness to our kinship with the Prince of Peace.

Hear us in His name. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Carrell, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bills, joint resolutions, and concurrent resolutions of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 2150. An act to further amend section 106 of the Army-Navy Nurses Act of 1947 so as to provide for certain adjustments in the dates of rank of nurses and women medical specialists of the Regular Army and Regular Air Force in the permanent grade of captain, and for other purposes;

H. R. 2949. An act for the relief of Jose Armando Quaresma;

H. R. 4106. An act to authorize the crediting, for certain purposes, of prior active Federal commissioned service performed by a person appointed as a commissioned officer under section 101 or 102 of the Army-Navy Nurses Act of 1947, as amended, and for other purposes;

H. R. 4218. An act to authorize the Secretary of Defense to lend certain Army, Navy, and Air Force equipment, and to provide certain services to the Girl Scouts of the United States of America for use at the Girl Scout Senior Roundup Encampment, and for other purposes;

H. R. 4717. An act to provide for the release of the express condition and limitation on certain land heretofore conveyed to the trustees of the village of Sag Harbor, N. Y.;

H. R. 4886. An act to provide that active service in the Army and Air Force shall be included in determining the eligibility for retirement of certain commissioned officers of the Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard;

H. R. 5875. An act to amend title 14, United States Code, entitled "Coast Guard," for the purpose of providing involuntary retirement of certain officers, and for other purposes;

H. R. 5893. An act to amend paragraph I (a), part I, of the Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a), as amended, to make its provisions applicable to active service on and after June 27, 1950, and prior to February 1, 1955, and for other purposes;

H. R. 6277. An act 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;

H. R. 7194. An act to authorize subsistence allowances to enlisted personnel;

H. J. Res. 251. Joint resolution to authorize the President to issue posthumously to the late Seymour Richard Belinky, a flight officer in the United States Army, a commission as second lieutenant, United States Army, and for other purposes;

H. J. Res. 359. Joint resolution to authorize the designation of October 22, 1955, as National Olympic Day;

H. J. Res. 385. Joint resolution authorizing the printing and binding of a revised edition of Cannon's Procedure in the House of Representatives and providing that the same shall be subject to copyright by the author;

H. Con. Res. 50. Concurrent resolution commemorating the 200th anniversary of the migration of the Acadians from Nova Scotia to Louisiana and other areas;

H. Con. Res. 190. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing as a House document of the manuscript entitled "The House of Representatives"; and

H. Con. Res. 193. Concurrent resolution extending the felicitations of Congress to the Commonwealth of Massachusetts on the 175th anniversary of the establishment of its constitution.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 2107. An act to amend the National Defense Facilities Act of 1950 to provide for additional facilities necessary for the administration and training of units of the Reserve components of the Armed Forces of the United States, and for other purposes;

H. R. 2109. An act to authorize permanent appointments in the United States Navy and the United States Marine Corps;

H. R. 3338. An act to amend section 1 of the act of March 12, 1914;

H. R. 5512. An act to provide for the conveyance of certain property under the jurisdiction of the Housing and Home Finance Administrator to the State of Louisiana;

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; and

H. R. 7029. An act to establish a Permanent Committee for the Oliver Wendell Holmes Devise, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bills and concurrent resolutions of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 463. An act to authorize the issuance of commemorative medals to certain societies of which Benjamin Franklin was a member, founder, or sponsor in observance of the 250th anniversary of his birth;

S. 730. An act granting the consent of Congress to the States of Kansas and Oklahoma to negotiate and enter into a compact relating to their interests in, and the apportionment of, the waters of the Arkansas River and its tributaries as they affect such States;

S. 926. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Ventura River reclamation project, California;

S. 1194. An act to provide for construction by the Secretary of the Interior of Red Willow Dam and Reservoir, Nebr., and construction by the Secretary of the Army of the Wilson Dam and Reservoir, Kans., as units of the Missouri River Basin project;

S. 1261. An act to authorize the conveyance of certain lands within Caven Point terminal and ammunition loading pier, New Jersey, to the New Jersey Turnpike Authority;

S. 1683. An act to amend the act of June 13, 1949 (63 Stat. 172), and for other purposes;

S. 1689. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to execute a repayment contract with the Yuma Mesa Irrigation and Drainage District, Gila project, Arizona, and for other purposes;

S. 1834. An act to authorize certain retired commissioned officers of the Coast Guard to use the commissioned grade authorized them by the law under which they retired, in the computation of their retired pay under the provisions of the Career Compensation Act of 1949, as amended;

S. 2351. An act to authorize the conveyance of certain war housing projects to the city of Norfolk, Va.;

S. 2432. An act to permit the use in the coastwise trade of the barge *Irrigon;*

S. 2513. An act to authorize the sale of Welles Village war housing project in Glastonbury, Conn., to the housing authority of the Town of Glastonbury;

S. 2566. An act to amend title 14, United States Code, so as to provide for compensatory absence of Coast Guard military personnel serving at isolated aids to navigation, and for other purposes;

S. 2568. An act to amend title I of the act entitled "An act to authorize and direct the construction of bridges over the Potomac River, and for other purposes";

S. 2573. An act to amend the rice marketing quota provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended;

S. Con. Res. 40. Concurrent resolution to designate the period from September 17 through September 28 as Constitution Week; and

S. Con. Res. 53. Concurrent resolution to make a change in the enrollment of S. 2428, to increase the salaries of officers and members of the Metropolitan Police force, etc.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 6382. An act to amend the International Claims Settlement Act of 1949, as amended.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the foregoing bill; requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. SPARKMAN, Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. MANSFIELD, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, and Mr. HICKENLOOPER to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendment to the bill (H. R. 191) entitled "An act to regulate the election of delegates representing the District of Columbia to national political conventions, and for other purposes," 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. MORSE, Mr. BIBLE, and Mr. HRUSKA to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the bill (H. R. 2851) entitled "An act to make agricultural commodities owned by the Commodity Credit Corporation available to persons in need in areas of acute distress," 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. ELLENDER, Mr. HOLLAND, Mr. ANDERSON, Mr. AIKEN, and Mr. WILLIAMS to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendment to the bill (H. R. 3822) entitled "An act to amend title V of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended," 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. ELLENDER, Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, Mr. HOLLAND, Mr. AIKEN, and Mr. YOUNG to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the bill (H. R. 4778) entitled "An act to provide for the purchase of bonds to cover postmasters, officers, and employees of the Post Office Department and mail clerks of the Armed Forces, and for other purposes," 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. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, Mr. NEELY, and Mr. CARLSON to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate disagrees to the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 1093) entitled "An act to fix and regulate the salaries of teachers, school officers, and other employees of the Board of Education of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes," requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. BIBLE, Mr. GORE, and Mr. BEALL to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 7000) entitled "An act to provide for strengthening of the Reserve Forces, and for other purposes."

The message also announced that the Vice President has appointed Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina and Mr. CARLSON members of the joint select committee on the part of the Senate, as provided for in the act of August 5, 1939, entitled "An act to provide for the disposition of certain records of the United States Government," for the disposition of executive papers referred to in the report of the Archivist of the United States numbered 56–2.

CONSTITUTION WEEK

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the resolution (S. Con. Res. 40) to designate the period from September 17 through September 23 as Constitution Week.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the President is authorized and requested to issue a proclamation designating the 7-day period beginning September 17 and ending September 23, 1955, as Constitution Week, and inviting the people of the United States to observe such week in schools, chuches, and other suitable places with appropriate ceremonies and activities.

The resolution was agreed to; and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FOREIGN AID PROGRAM

Mr. GARY. 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 Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Speaker, in the conference committee to which I have just been appointed, I shall do my very best to maintain the $628 million cut in the mutual security appropriations bill recently voted by the House of Representatives.

I am distressed that the other body has restored over half a billion dollars of the funds previously cut from the bill by the House. I am certain that the mutual security program can be carried on adequately with $2.6 billion of new money, and that the appropriation of $3.2 billion as recommended by the other body, is unnecessary.

I have been a friend of the Marshall plan and other foreign aid programs since their inception following the end of World War II. Without these programs, Europe would certainly be Communist today. The Marshall plan, and its successors, have rebuilt European productive capacity, defense, and markets for American exports. I think these aid programs have been wonderfully successful. Because of this very success, it is now possible to reduce our expenditures for such aid.

I was a member of the House subcommittee which originally cut the Eisenhower administration's budget request $628 million, after careful study of the facts. This year, our subcommittee did not recommend a single penny of nonmilitary economic aid to the major countries of Western Europe. In fact, the bill we reported included no nonmilitary appropriations to Europe at all, except for some assistance the administration has requested for three critical points, West Berlin, Yugoslavia, and Spain. We did, however, make sure that sufficient military aid funds would be available.

A Democrat, I have cooperated in every way with this Republican administration when a clear need for foreign aid funds was shown. I have defended these programs on the floor of the House. My action for a cut this year is based solely upon my belief that the House bill represented sufficient funds to carry out the program properly.

When the administration presented its request for new foreign-aid money last month, it appeared there was a $620 million balance of previously appropriated funds which had not even been obligated. Of this amount only $200 million could be legally carried over into the new fiscal year which began July 1. The rest would revert to the Treasury for other appropriations. This was cause for rejoicing, not criticism, because it indicated that foreign aid needs last year were below expectations and new appropriations could therefore now be lessened.

However, the administration wished to obligate this $420 million before the end of the fiscal year, contrary to provisions of the 1955 Appropriations Act. We were considering that request when on June 28, another $312 million in unobligated funds was reported to our committee. To accommodate the administration, a hastily arranged meeting was held between officials of the administration and the ranking members of our subcommittee, and an agreement was reached to permit immediate obligation of the $312 million, but not the $420 million. The total of $512 million clearly gave the ad-

ministration sufficient room to deal with any emergency which might arise while the Congress was out of session. No justification for a new use for the unobligated $420 million was presented by the administration.

Then on June 30, the last day of the fiscal year, the administration announced reservation of the $420 million for common-use military items, completely contrary to the specific agreement not to obligate these unspent, unobligated, and unreserved funds, which otherwise would have returned to the Treasury.

Our subcommittee promptly cut $420 million in new money from the reserved item in the bill, reported the administration's breach of faith to the full committee and the House, and the House supported the cut. The foreign-aid appropriations bill as passed by the House, was approximately $900 million below the administration's original authorization request, and $600 million below the budget request, because of an additional $200 million in other well-justified cuts.

I strongly resent the methods used to reserve the $420 million after the agreement with representatives of our committee, but aside from that fact I am thoroughly convinced that the amount appropriated for the program by the House this year is entirely adequate for mutual security purposes for this fiscal year. That is the real point. Therefore, I shall do my best to hold the House cut in the conference committee despite the strong pressures which undoubtedly will be exerted.

Mr. PASSMAN. 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 Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Speaker, I doubt if there is another Member of the Congress who understands the many complex problems of the foreign-aid program as the distinguished gentleman from Virginia [Mr. GARY].

Congressman GARY was chairman of the Foreign Aid Subcommittee on Appropriations for 4 years and ranking minority member for 4 years. He helped develop the program and it was the desire of the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Appropriations that Mr. GARY continue as chairman of the Foreign Operations Subcommittee on Appropriations. But inasmuch as beginning with this session of Congress it was made a permanent committee and the rules of the committee prohibit a member from being chairman of two subcommittees, Mr. GARY decided to remain as permanent chairman of the Treasury and Post Office Subcommittee on Appropriations and accept the ranking majority position on the Foreign Operations Subcommittee on Appropriations.

The House is very fortunate in having the distinguished gentleman from Virginia, Congressman VAUGHAN GARY, as a member of the conference that must, in the very near future, adjust the difference between the House and Senate versions of the foreign-aid appropriation for 1956 because he understands the bill and the full reasons for the reductions made by the Foreign Operations Subcommittee on Appropriations and supported by the full Committee on Appropriations and the House.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

Mr. DEANE asked and was given permission to address the House for 15 minutes on Thursday next, at the conclusion of the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered.

Mr. PATMAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 30 minutes today, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered; to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter; on the subject of The Great Conspiracy of 1933: A Study in Short Memories by Paul F. Boller, Jr., which relates to the recognition of Soviet Russia and brings in the important part of the late Secretary Cordell Hull in connection therewith.

PROCEEDINGS AGAINST JOHN T. GOJACK

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Un-American Activities, I present a privileged report and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the report, as follows:

PROCEEDINGS AGAINST JOHN T. GOJACK

Mr. WALTER, from the Committee on Un-American Activities, submitted the following report:

CITING JOHN T. GOJACK

The Committee on Un-American Activities, as created and authorized by the House of Representatives through the enactment of Public Law 601, section 121, subsection (q) (2) of the 79th Congress, and under House Resolution 5 of the 84th Congress, caused to be issued a subpena to John T. Gojack, 1835 South Calhoun Street, Fort Wayne, Ind. The said subpena directed John T. Gojack to be and appear before the said Committee on Un-American Activities or a duly authorized subcommittee thereof, of which the Honorable FRANCIS E. WALTER is chairman, on February 28, 1955, at the hour of 10 a. m., in room 225-A, Old House Office Building, Washington, D. C., then and there to testify touching matters of inquiry committed to said committee, and not to depart without leave of said committee. The subpena served upon the said John T. Gojack is set forth in words and figures as follows:

"By authority of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States of America, to United States marshal, South Bend, Ind.:

"You are hereby commanded to summon John T. Gojack to be and appear before the Committee on Un-American Activities, or a duly authorized subcommittee thereof, of the House of Representatives of the United States, of which the Honorable FRANCIS E. WALTER is chairman, in their chamber in the city of Washington, room 225-A, Old House Office Building, on Monday, February 28, 1955, at the hour of 10 a. m., then and there to testify touching matters of inquiry committed to said committee; and he is not to depart without leave of said committee.

"Herein fail not and make return of this summons.

"Witness my hand and the seal of the House of Representatives of the United States, at the city of Washington, this 19th day of February 1955.

"Attest:

"FRANCIS E. WALTER,
Chairman.

"[SEAL] "RALPH R. ROBERTS,
"Clerk, House of Representatives."

The said subpena was duly served as appears by the return made thereon by Roy M. Amos, United States marshal, by James R. Settles, deputy, who was duly authorized to serve the said subpena. The return of the service by the said Roy M. Amos, United States marshal, by James R. Settles, deputy, being endorsed thereon, is set forth in words and figures as follows:

"Subpena for John T. Gojack, before the Committee on Un-American Activities, served February 23, 1955, by personal service of a copy of this writ on John T. Gojack, at Fort Wayne, Ind.

"ROY M. AMOS,
"United States Marshal.
"By JAMES R. SETTLES,
"Deputy."

The said John T. Gojack, pursuant to said subpena and in compliance therewith, appeared before the said committee on February 28, 1955, to give such testimony as required under and by virtue of Public Law 601, section 121, subsection (q) (2) of the 79th Congress and under House Resolution 5 of the 84th Congress. The said John T. Gojack, having appeared as a witness and having been asked the questions, namely:

"Were you ever a member of the Communist Party?

"Were you then a member of the Communist Party in 1948, at any time during the year 1948?

"I want to ask you one question: Are you now a member of the Communist Party?

"You have left us under the impression at this point that by reading the newspapers you knew that Johnson was chairman of the Communist Party of Indiana and I am asking you if that is the only way you knew Johnson.

"Are you acquainted with Henry Aron, A-r-o-n?

"Mr. Gojack, did Mr. Elmer Johnson or Mr. Aron ever appear and address a group of people when you were present?

"May I ask the witness, do you know whether or not Russell Nixon is a member of the Communist Party?

"Did you take active part in the peace pilgrimage to Washington which was organized by one of the 'front' organizations known as the American Peace Crusade?

"What method was used to get you as an original sponsor? [That is, original sponsor of the American Peace Crusade[1]]"

which questions were pertinent to the subject under inquiry, refused to answer said questions and, as a result of said John T. Gojack's refusal to answer the aforesaid questions, your committee was prevented from receiving testimony and information concerning a matter committed to said committee in accordance with the terms of the subpena served upon the said John T. Gojack.

The record of the proceedings before the committee on February 28, 1955, during which John T. Gojack refused to answer the aforesaid questions pertinent to the subject under inquiry, is set forth in fact as follows:

"UNITED STATES
"HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
"SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE COMMITTEE
"ON UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES,
"Washington, D. C.,
"Monday, February 28, 1955.

"PUBLIC HEARING

"The subcommittee of the Committee on Un-American Activities met pursuant to call at 10:20 a. m., in the caucus room, Old House

[1] Words inside brackets added for clarity.

Office Building, Washington, D. C., Hon. MORGAN M. MOULDER presiding.

* * * * *

"Mr. MOULDER. The committee will be in order.

"This subcommittee was appointed pursuant to the rules of the House as ordered by FRANCIS E. WALTER, chairman of the full committee, and it is composed of three members—the Honorable CLYDE DOYLE, of California, on my right, the Honorable GORDON H. SCHERER, of Ohio, and myself as chairman of the subcommittee. Mr. SCHERER, of Ohio, is absent and will be present within the next few minutes.

* * * * *

"After the testimony of several witnesses, John Thomas Gojack was called as a witness.

"Committee members present: Representatives MORGAN M. MOULDER, chairman of the subcommittee, CLYDE DOYLE, and GORDON SCHERER.

* * * * *

"Mr. MOULDER. Call your next witness.

"Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. John T. Gojack, will you come forward, please, sir?

"Mr. MOULDER. Hold up your right hand and be sworn. Do you solemnly swear the testimony you are about to give will be the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, so help you God?

"Mr. GOJACK. I do.

"Testimony of John Thomas Gojack, accompanied by counsel, Frank Donner

"Mr. MOULDER. Are you accompanied by counsel?

"Mr. GOJACK. Yes.

"Mr. MOULDER. Counsel, state your name.

"Mr. DONNER. My name is Frank Donner, 342 Madison Avenue, New York City.

"Mr. TAVENNER. Please state your name.

"Mr. GOJACK. John Thomas Gojack.

* * * * *

"Mr. TAVENNER. When and where were you born, Mr. Gojack?

"Mr. GOJACK. I was born in Dayton, Ohio, August 15, 1916.

"Mr. TAVENNER. Where do you now reside?

"Mr. GOJACK. I reside in Fort Wayne, Ind.

"Mr. TAVENNER. What is your address in Fort Wayne?

"Mr. GOJACK. My address is 2303 Florida Drive.

* * * * *

"Mr. TAVENNER. Now, will you tell the committee, please, what your present occupation is?

"Mr. GOJACK. My present occupation is in the capacity as general vice president and district president of the United Electrical, Radio and Machine Workers of America, union organization that your chairman announced in the press he was out to put out of business. That is part of the reason why I think this whole investigation is a union-busting venture and not legitimate investigation.

"Mr. TAVENNER. Are you an officer of district No. 9?

"Mr. GOJACK. Yes.

"Mr. TAVENNER. What is that office?

"Mr. GOJACK. I stated in answer to your first question, president of district 9.

"Mr. TAVENNER. A district president. You didn't state what district.

"Mr. GOJACK. I happen to be elected president of district council 9.

"Mr. TAVENNER. Will you tell the committee, please, what your education, formal educational training, has been.

"Mr. GOJACK. Well, my formal education consists of 7 years in parochial and public schools and if you want to include other educational experiences I will be glad to recite them.

"Mr. TAVENNER. I am speaking of your formal educational training. That was the question. Did you attend any other schools besides those that have been mentioned?

"Mr. GOJACK. I believe I went to school when I was in the Army some years ago, and I consider my 16 years in the labor movement somewhat of a schooling——

* * * * *

"Mr. TAVENNER. Now, will you proceed, please, to give us your employment after August 1940, beginning with August 1940?

"Mr. GOJACK. In 1940 while still unemployed at Delco Products, but working for the union to get this plant organized, I was given a job as field organizer for the United Electrical, Radio and Machine Workers of America. I worked as a field organizer until——

"Mr. TAVENNER. Did that begin August 1940?

"Mr. GOJACK. August 1, 1940, if I remember correctly; yes, sir.

"Mr. TAVENNER. You had no prior employment by UE? You went there directly from the Delco Products Co.?

"Mr. GOJACK. As a matter of fact, I was currently unemployed; I was on layoff from Delco. Because I was one of the few workers who would get out at the plant and put out leaflets when the rest of the workers were totally fearful of doing this because of the wrath of General Motors, I was engaged to work as an organizer. They felt I had some courage in facing this giant corporation who had sought to keep a union out of its plant.

"Mr. TAVENNER. When was Delco organized?

"Mr. GOJACK. It was organized in 1940 in December. The election was held in January, if I remember. I had been working voluntarily for the local and, as I applied earlier, I received some very modest amounts of money for organizing, the handbill distribution, and participating in handbilling.

"If I remember correctly, at one point when they couldn't get workers to do it because of the fear of the corporation, they hired Western Union boys and I offered to work for the same money as Western Union boys because I needed funds to supplement my WPA.

"Mr. TAVENNER. Will you continue with your employment by UE beginning August 1, 1940, and the various positions held by you in that organization from that time to the present?

"Mr. GOJACK. As I said earlier, I was engaged as a field organizer for that union about August 1, 1940. Sometime in 1942, I don't recall the exact date, I think the fall of 1942—I would have to check the records to get the exact date—the executive board of District Council 9 in the Fort Wayne area where I had by that time been sent by the national union, hired, asked the international union to give me a leave of absence to hire me as business representative of the district council because of my experience in negotiation. At that point I went off the payroll of the national union and went to work as an employee of District Council 9.

* * * * *

"Mr. TAVENNER. Let's go back again to the period that you were employed by the UE. The last that you told us was that in 1942 you were hired as business agent by the executive board of district No. 9. How long did you serve in that capacity?

"Mr. GOJACK. Until the fall of 1943, at which time I was elected president of District Council 9, if I remember correctly.

"Mr. TAVENNER. How long did you remain president of district 9, the council of district 9?

"Mr. GOJACK. I have been elected annually, reelected annually, for every year since that time on a number of occasions in contested elections, with opponents, but I received the majority vote in our district council meeting in which the elections take place annually, in the fall.

"Mr. TAVENNER. You still hold that position?

"Mr. GOJACK. Yes; the last reelection was in the fall of 1954.

"Mr. TAVENNER. What other positions have you held in the union besides the ones you have told us of?

"Mr. GOJACK. According to the constitution of our union by virtue of that office of district council president, I am automatically a general vice president of the national union and a member of the general executive board. And I have held that office concurrent with the district council position in accordance with the constitution of our organization.

"Mr. TAVENNER. I think now I shall ask the question that the Congressman asked you a few moments ago: Have you been a member of the Communist Party at any time while occupying any of the positions you have enumerated in the union?

"Mr. GOJACK. In 1949 and 1950 and 1951 and 1952 and 1953, and 1954, on August 24, 1954, I signed an affidavit which said 'I am a responsible officer of the union named below, the UE. I am not a member of the Communist Party or affiliated with such party, I do not believe in and I am not a member of nor do I support any organization that believes in or teaches the overthrow of the United States Government by force or by any illegal or unconstitutional methods.'

"Mr. SCHERER. Mr. Chairman, I ask that the witness be directed to answer Mr. Tavenner's question because obviously his answer was not responsive to the question.

"Mr. MOULDER. That is correct. The witness is directed to give a direct answer to the question propounded by counsel. As I recall, he asked you whether or not at any time while you have been employed by the UE in any official capacity, were you at any time a member of the Communist Party.

"Mr. GOJACK. Mr. Moulder, I don't believe that this committee has any right to investigate my political beliefs or affiliations, especially so when its purpose is union busting.

"Mr. TAVENNER. The answer is not responsive to the question.

"Mr. GOJACK. I will explain why. If you want to know my political beliefs, you can check the records in Allen County, Ind.

"Mr. MOULDER. The fact that you refuse to answer that question truthfully—would that have the effect of busting the union?

"Mr. GOJACK. Every time I cast a ballot in a primary election I have had to register my party preference and those records are available to you and that convinces me you are not interested in my political affiliation.

"Mr. MOULDER. You were asked a very simple question as to whether or not you had ever been a member of the Communist Party while you were employed by or actively engaged in any official capacity for the UE.

"Mr. GOJACK. I don't believe that Public Law 601——

"Mr. MOULDER. You can answer that.

"Mr. GOJACK. Gives this committee the right to inquire into my——

"Mr. DOYLE. I do not mean to interrupt you again, but you are proceeding again to read that prepared statement. Why don't you come out for the right and give us a forthright answer, an honest-to-God answer, and answer the question promptly and quickly?

"You know very well whether or not you have been a member of the Communist Party. That is our question.

"Mr. GOJACK. My forthright answer is this——

"Mr. DOYLE. You have taken about 3 minutes already trying to get out of answering that question.

"Mr. GOJACK. I haven't been hedging. You Congressmen have been taking the floor.

"Mr. MOULDER. You said 1949, 1950, 1951, 1952, 1953, and 1954——

"Mr. DOYLE. Down to August 24, 1954.

"Mr. MOULDER. In 1948 were you a member of the Communist Party?

"Mr. GOJACK. This affidavit is still on file. I don't believe the resolution which put you up in business, under the first amendment to the Constitution, gives you the right to inquire into my political beliefs.

"Mr. MOULDER. You have no hesitancy in answering the question as to 1949. That was after the law compelled you to sign this affidavit. Prior to that time, say 6 months prior to 1948, were you then a member of the Communist Party?

"Mr. GOJACK. Mr. Congressman, because these hearings were set up to interfere in labor board elections in Magnavox and Whirlpool—

"Mr. MOULDER. Do you refuse to answer the question?

"Mr. GOJACK. No; if you let me answer the question I will answer it. I will give you the answer in my own way.

"Mr. MOULDER. Were you a member of the Communist Party in the year 1948?

"Mr. GOJACK. Look—it is not a simple question. When you have got paid liars like Matusow around here and you had a fellow from Ohio that was a lunatic that testified in one case, and this committee——

"Mr. MOULDER. You can tell the truth.

"Mr. GOJACK. This committee took the word of a lunatic and tried to frame some people, and Cecil Scott and Representative WALTER——

"Mr. TAVENNER. Cecil Scott never testified.

"Mr. GOJACK. The chairman of the committee said Cecil Scott was a lunatic and altered a document before this committee and WALTER said he would recommend the matter be referred to the United States Attorney.

"Mr. TAVENNER. That doesn't excuse you from telling the truth. What is the truth? Were you a member of the Communist Party at any time before you became a UE employee or since?

"Mr. GOJACK. When you have a paid liar like Matusow——

"Mr. TAVENNER. He is not testifying about you.

"Mr. GOJACK. Matusow tells in his revelations about going into Dayton, Ohio, and meeting with the personnel manager——

"Mr. SCHERER. I ask that this diatribe be stopped, Mr. Chairman. I don't have to take that from you even if the chairman—it is a simple question. Mr. Chairman, I ask that you direct him to answer the question. May I ask a question?

"Were you ever a member of the Communist Party? Let's get the record straight because I want to get this record just right. Were you ever a member of the Communist Party?

"Mr. GOJACK. I am going to answer that question in my own way.

"Mr. MOULDER. The question calls for a civil answer.

"Mr. GOJACK. Not while you have paid liars like Matusow and Strunk, who said this lad was running a strike in a guided-missile plant in Detroit. I was involved in that strike. It is not a guided-missile plant in the first place. I tried to break that strike on that paid liar's testimony.

"Mr. SCHERER. I am directing you to quit talking and answer the question, and, if you don't, you are in contempt. Do you understand?

"Mr. GOJACK. I think it is up to the courts to decide who is in contempt, not you. We haven't reached a stage in this country where a Moulder or a Scherer can tell who is in contempt. I have some faith in the courts of this land yet.

"Mr. MOULDER. The Chair directs you to answer the question propounded to you by Mr. SCHERER. You have not answered the question, I understand.

"Mr. TAVENNER. Let's get together on the question because that is important.

"Mr. SCHERER. Mr. Chairman, may I have the floor?

"Mr. MOULDER. Yes.

"Mr. SCHERER. Were you ever a member of the Communist Party?

"Mr. GOJACK. My answer to that question is that since 1949 I have signed these affidavits, one on file now. McCARTHY had an investigation, which the Department of Justice said——

"Mr. SCHERER. Just a minute.

"Mr. Chairman, I ask that you direct him to answer my question.

"Mr. MOULDER. The Chair directs you to answer the question.

"Mr. GOJACK. I am going to answer your question if you will be patient.

"Mr. MOULDER. When?

"Mr. GOJACK. If you will stop interrupting and let me answer, I will.

"Mr. MOULDER. How long do you think it will take you to answer?

"Mr. GOJACK. I think I can do it in about a minute and a half.

"Mr. MOULDER. That question calls for a simple 'Yes' or 'No.'

"Mr. GOJACK. Not when you have paid liars like Matusow around who frame these hearings.

"Mr. MOULDER. That is enough.

"Mr. GOJACK. I think the first amendment to the Constitution protects me in my right to challenge this committee asking me any questions about my political affiliations or beliefs and especially when it is used for union busting.

"Mr. MOULDER. Do you claim the privilege under the fifth amendment now?

"Mr. GOJACK. No; I have not.

"Mr. MOULDER. The Chair directs you to answer the question: Were you ever a member of the Communist Party?

"Mr. GOJACK. I am saying the first amendment to the United States Constituton gives me the right to challenge your committee using this hearing for union busting and for strike breaking as in the case of this paid liar, Strunk, who lied about the Square D strike.

"Mr. MOULDER. Do you decline to answer the question?

"Mr. GOJACK. I will answer the question my own way.

"Mr. MOULDER. Do you decline to answer the question for the reasons you have just stated?

"Mr. GOJACK. For the reason that the first amendment——

"Mr. MOULDER. You decline to answer for the reason of the first amendment; is that right?

"Mr. GOJACK. No; for the reason that the first amendment of the United States Constitution——

"Mr. MOULDER. That is enough. Proceed.

"Mr. GOJACK. I want to give my explanation.

"Mr. SCHERER. Mr. Chairman, I insist that you ask counsel to proceed now.

"Mr. MOULDER. Proceed. However, I want to——

"Mr. GOJACK. You are not permitting me to give my explanation of the answer.

"Mr. MOULDER. You have not attempted to answer the question. You have been making a speech like an ordinary soapbox Communist orator.

"Mr. GOJACK. I haven't had the opportunity to vote myself a $10,000 raise.

"Mr. MOULDER. Let us proceed.

"Mr. GOJACK. I want the record to show I have not been given an opportunity to make an explanation.

"Mr. MOULDER. Are you refusing to answer the question because Congress voted itself a $10,000 raise?

"Mr. GOJACK. No; but I resent—and not with bitterness against my Government because I love my Government, although I dislike some of the people currently in control of it from Charlie Wilson on down.

"Mr. MOULDER. I ask you——

"Mr. GOJACK. Some of these other corporation people here are here for the sole purpose of using this hearing to bust our union.

"Mr. DOYLE. You have made a speech, so your members will know what you have said before the committee.

"Mr. MOULDER. I want to resubmit the question whether or not you were a memberof the Communist Party in the year 1948 or at any time prior to the time you signed the first affidavit referred to in your testimony.

"Mr. GOJACK. My answer to that——

"Mr. MOULDER. You answered the question as to 1949, 1950, 1951, 1952, 1953, and 1954.

"Mr. DOYLE. No; he has not. All he said was he swore to an affidavit. I do not take cognizance that the affidavit is an answer to the question.

"Mr. MOULDER. Were you then a member of the Communist Party in 1948, at any time during the year 1948?

"Mr. GOJACK. The purpose of this hearing clearly in my mind is not legislative in character.

"Mr. MOULDER. You decline to answer?

"Mr. GOJACK. This hearing is designed to influence an election, designed to smear me. You have no right as a committee——

"Mr. MOULDER. You are arguing with us. You have not answered the question; you have declined to answer it.

"Mr. GOJACK. My answer to the question is when you have paid liars like Matusow, paid liars like Strunk, and paid liars like this lunatic, Cecil Scott, around——

"Mr. DOYLE. This is the fourth time you have given those as your reasons.

"Mr. GOJACK. There may be others.

"Mr. DOYLE. Don't repeat those same reasons. Start in on some new ones, if you have them.

"Mr. GOJACK. I think my reason is about the best one I can think of because I love the United States Constitution and I think that the first amendment ought to protect me, particularly insofar as the first amendment doesn't give or rather guards against the kind of an operation this witch-hunting committee is engaged in.

"Mr. MOULDER. Do you claim this privilege under that amendment and decline to answer?

"Do you decline to answer by claiming the privilege under the first amendment?

"Mr. GOJACK. Yes.

"Mr. SCHERER. Let's go to the next question.

"Mr. MOULDER. All right.

"Mr. DOYLE. It is 4:30, Mr. Chairman. We talked about adjourning.

"Mr. GOJACK. May I finish my explanation? I haven't finished yet. I mean in regard to this paid liar Matusow, this liar Strunk, Cecil Scott——

"Mr. SCHERER. I ask that we proceed with the next question. Matusow was a Communist.

"Mr. GOJACK. Also a union buster. He was your boy then. You loved him then.

"Mr. MOULDER. I want to ask you one question: Are you now a member of the Communist Party?

"Mr. GOJACK. I have this affidavit on file and that affidavit speaks for itself.

"Mr. SCHERER. Wait a minute. I ask that you direct the witness to answer your question. Let's keep this record straight. I am going to make a motion to cite him for contempt.

"Mr. MOULDER. The Chair directs you to answer the question "yes" or "no;" Are you now a member of the Communist Party?

"It is a very simple question calling for a very simple answer.

"Mr. GOJACK. I swore to an affidavit.

"Mr. MOULDER. What was the date of the affidavit?

"Mr. GOJACK. August 24, 1954.

"Mr. MOULDER. I am referring to this date.

"Mr. GOJACK. This covers this date. This affidavit is still on file.

"Mr. DOYLE. It does not.

"Mr. GOJACK. It does.

"Mr. DOYLE. The chairman asked you whether or not you are a member of the Communist Party today, the date you are sitting in that chair.

"Mr. GOJACK. I am telling you this affidavit is on file here in Washington and this affidavit, signed and notarized, says I am not a member of the Communist Party or affiliated with such party and it also has the reference in there to not believing in or not being a member of nor supporting any organization that believes in or teaches the overthrow of the United States by force or by any illegal or unconstitutional methods. That affidavit is on file and in effect.

"Mr. SCHERER. Who do you think you are fooling? I ask you, Mr. Chairman, that you direct him to answer the question.

"Mr. MOULDER. The Chair requests that you answer the question as to whether or not you are now a member of the Communist Party.

"Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Chairman, I submit it is not a matter of requesting, that you as chairman under the law and under your assignment are directing him to answer the question.

"Mr. MOULDER. The Chair directs you to answer.

"Mr. GOJACK. Under the first amendment to the Constitution you have no right to even have this hearing.

"Mr. DOYLE. That is your opinion.

"Mr. GOJACK. Yes; and I am entitled to my opinion in this country still, though we are getting dangerously close to the point when Representative WALTER can tell people how to vote in an election.

"Mr. DOYLE. Why do you decline to give an honest answer? You don't suppose we will take that affidavit as the answer to this question, do you?

"Mr. GOJACK. I am not going to cooperate with union busters. My union is on record as the UAO–WAC, not a bad union, to fight back against McCarthys, McCarrans, Jenners, and Veldes.

"Mr. MOULDER. Do you want to answer or do you decline to answer the question that has been asked? Are you now a member of the Communist Party?

"Mr. GOJACK. I am letting the record speak for itself.

* * * * *

"UNITED STATES HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
"SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE COMMITTEE ON UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES,
"Washington, D. C., Tuesday, March 1, 1955.

"PUBLIC HEARING

"The subcommittee of the Committee on Un-American Activities met, pursuant to recess, at 10 a. m., in the Caucus Room, Old House Office Building, Washington, D. C., Hon. MORGAN M. MOULDER (chairman) presiding.

"Committee members present: Representatives MORGAN M. MOULDER (chairman), CLYDE DOYLE, and GORDON H. SCHERER.

* * * * *

"Mr. MOULDER. The committee will be in order.

"Will you call Mr. Gojack.

"Testimony of John Thomas Gojack, accompanied by counsel, Frank Donner (resumed)

* * * * *

"Mr. TAVENNER. While you were residing in Fort Wayne, was there a strike conducted in General Electric by a local of the UE?

"Mr. GOJACK. Yes, sir; there was.

"Mr. TAVENNER. What was the name of the local, the number of the local?

"Mr. GOJACK. It was at that time UE local 901.

"Mr. TAVENNER. 901. Did the Communist Party participate in any manner in the conduct of the strike?

"Mr. GOJACK. That strike was voted by the membership of local 901, the membership voted upon a plan of strike action which included the establishment of committees for various activities in the conduct of the strike.

"Each chairman of the various strike committees made up what was known as a strike strategy committee. That strike strategy committee met every morning in the office of UE local 901. The entire conduct of that strike was in the hands of that strike strategy committee, the various stewards and picket captains' meetings that were called and also the special membership meetings that were called.

"Mr. TAVENNER. Who was the secretary of local 901 at that time?

"Mr. GOJACK. If I remember correctly, Miss Bertha Scott.

"Mr. TAVENNER. Were you a member of the strike committee?

"Mr. GOJACK. No, sir; I was a member of another GE local at the time, but I served in a helpful capacity, assisting the local in the conduct of the strike.

"Mr. TAVENNER. Did you attend its meetings?

"Mr. GOJACK. Some of them, sir.

"Mr. TAVENNER. Do you recall attending a meeting on January 16, 1946, at which you presented a letter that had been written to you by the secretary of the Communist Party?

"Mr. GOJACK. I don't recall presenting a letter myself. I recall 1 incident in this strike, 2, as a matter of fact; 1 in which the local had received a communication with an offer from someone to give them copies of this paper or to furnish them to people active in the strike. There was quite a discussion about this—at one strike strategy committee meeting, as I recall, as a matter of fact, a heated discussion. The strike strategy committee took a vote on it. I was not a party to the vote. I was not a party to the discussion other than I was asked a question about this paper and, as a matter of fact, I recall this very clearly. Someone raised the question about, does reading this so-called Communist paper, I believe it was the Worker, or the Daily Worker, does that make you a Communist? I remember in response to a question saying that, well, I read the Wall Street Journal and that didn't make me a capitalist, and that I personally read everything I could. I only had seven grades of formal schooling and I gave myself an education after that by reading a lot.

"I have read a lot. I am sorry to say that there are certain things in this country that since the rise of MCCARTHY are now forbidden reading material and I think that is a sad thing for this country.

"Mr. MOULDER. I don't think you need to apologize about your education. You are a very brilliant man.

"Mr. TAVENNER. Do you recall whether or not the communication with respect to making available to your strike committee of the Daily Worker was addressed to you?

"Mr. GOJACK. Sir, I don't recall that at all and I might say this: that the lady who took those minutes of that meeting didn't like me at all and on many occasions I found that the minutes she took completely distorted my position in meetings. As a matter of fact, the closest supporter of this woman, one Dallas Smith, who was involved in another incident where some Communists gave them coffee for the strike, and I will be glad to give you the details on the use of Communist coffee in the strike, that this Dallas Smith later went on to break this union and later was engaged by the General Electric Co. and is today an employee in the personnel office, paid off for helping to break that union.

"That union in that plant happens to be in a very weakened position with less than 500 members out of 9,000 workers in that shop paying dues into the union.

"It was the activities of people like Dallas Smith who was paid off by the company and this woman who distorted the minutes who are responsible for that.

"Mr. SCHERER. This woman who you say distorted the minutes: Was she a fellow union member at the time?

"Mr. GOJACK. She never worked in the shop. She was hired as a secretary. She was then elected to secretary.

"Mr. SCHERER. Of the union?

"Mr. GOJACK. Of the union.

"Mr. SCHERER. You claim she was an employer's stooge for the purpose of sabotaging you?

"Mr. GOJACK. I have no evidence to that effect. I merely stated my belief, my knowledge, that she never passed up an opportunity to do a job on me and how she colored her minutes.

"Mr. TAVENNER. Now, you have charged Miss Scott with altering the minutes or improperly reporting them because you see before me a typewritten statement. Is that the reason you are doing it? You are anticipating that I am going to read you the minutes of that meeting?

"Mr. GOJACK. I don't know how many paid liars you have working for you. I know of three of my own knowledge.

"Mr. TAVENNER. Will you answer the question?

"Mr. GOJACK. As to what?

"Mr. TAVENNER. As to whether or not the reason for your attacking Miss Scott is that you see that I have before me what appears to be a copy of the minutes?

"Mr. GOJACK. I don't see what you have before you. You have all kinds of papers before you.

"Mr. TAVENNER. You have told us that the matter was presented to a meeting and you have told us that the account of it was improperly stated by Miss Scott before I have given you any facts in regard to it at all. Have you seen it before?

"Mr. GOJACK. I know it from other reasons.

"Mr. TANNER. You have seen it before?

"Mr. GOJACK. No; I know this because Mr. Dallas Smith and the group with him who are members of the IUE-CIO, the only McCarthyite union in America, a union that cooperates with you, you had material here yesterday that the IUE-CIO stole from our union office. You are using material stolen by a rival union. This same union, this same clique, Dallas Smith, who is now working for General Electric as a boss, have used and distorted what happened during this strike.

"Mr. SCHERER. What union did you call a McCarthyite union?

"Mr. GOJACK. IUE–CIO.

"Mr. TAVENNER. Let's proceed.

"Mr. GOJACK. I haven't finished my answer.

"Mr. TAVENNER. You are not answering the question. You are arguing extraneous matters.

"Mr. GOJACK. I am explaining that I know of this distortion because the IUE–CIO and Dallas Smith had used this in their attempts to wreck the union in 1949 and subsequent to that.

"Mr. TAVENNER. You are saying the statement is false before you have heard me make any reference to it.

Mr. GOJACK. I am saying it is false because the IUE–CIO have used this repeatedly.

"Mr. TAVENNER. You have stated you have never seen it before.

"Mr. GOJACK. I never have——

"Mr. TAVENNER. In other words, you are swearing something false which you haven't seen and as to which I have not yet asked you a question.

"Let me ask you the question and see whether you say it is false: According to the minutes of January 16, 1946, which I quote: 'A letter was read addressed to Brother Gojack from the secretary of the Communist Party, stating that they would like to donate 100 copies of the Worker, weekly paper of the Communist Party.' Is that true or false?

"Mr. GOJACK. As I recall that meeting——

"Mr. TAVENNER. Will you answer the question, please, and then you may explain your answer. Is it true or false?

"Mr. GOJACK. I don't recall whether I read the statement. The secretary read the letter first, as I remember.

"Mr. TAVENNER. That isn't an answer to the question.

"Mr. GOJACK. They asked me if I had a communication. It so happened that I had received one.

"Mr. TAVENNER. You had received it. That is the question I have been trying to get you to answer. From whom did you receive it?

"Mr. GOJACK. I don't know.

"Mr. TAVENNER. Wasn't it from the secretary of the Communist Party?

"Mr. GOJACK. I don't know.

"Mr. TAVENNER. Who was the secretary of the Communist Party of the State of Indiana at that time?

"Mr. GOJACK. I don't know.

"Mr. TAVENNER. Are you acquainted with Elmer Johnson?

"Mr. GOJACK. Let me explain my other answer—I don't know.

"Mr. TAVENNER. Are you acquainted with Elmer Johnson?

"Mr. GOJACK. I will get to that later. I am going to explain my other answer. The reason I don't know whether this communication came from any Communist, I have received communications from the IUE-CIO and I have seen this McCarthyite union forge communications allegedly from the Communist Party for just such purposes as this.

"Mr. SCHERER. Are you charging another union with forgery now?

"Mr. GOJACK. Just the same kind of forgery your lunatic Cecil Scott used.

"Mr. SCHERER. He has mentioned Cecil Scott. Cecil Scott testified before this committee I think 4 years before I became a Member of Congress, but it so happens I must say, in defense of Cecil Scott, that what he said in that executive testimony has been corroborated over and over again by many competent witnesses. And the testimony of Cecil Scott was never released by this committee. I have to say that.

"Mr. TAVENNER. You made an explanation as to the IUE forging documents. IUE was not in existence in 1946; was it?

"Mr. GOJACK. No; but people who later created this McCarthyite outfit were active in 1946 laying the groundwork for it. Dallas Smith and Bertha Scott were some of those people.

* * * * *

"Mr. TAVENNER. You say there was considerable discussion and difference of opinion about the acceptance of the copies of the Communist Daily Worker or Sunday Worker. I find this paragraph in the minutes, 'A general discussion was held on this matter, at which time opposition was expressed to such a donation and also those in favor of accepting expressed that people can get considerable information from this paper that they cannot get from any other labor or daily paper in the way of labor news.'

"Is anything false about that statement in the report in the minutes?

"Mr. GOJACK. There was a very lengthy discussion, as I recall, and that paragraph describes part of that discussion; yes.

"Mr. TAVENNER. And accurately; doesn't it?

"Mr. GOJACK. Not completely. Accurate insofar as it goes; yes.

"Mr. TAVENNER. Wasn't the report also accurate in that it stated the letter which was presented was a letter addressed to Brother Gojack from the secretary of the Communist Party?

"Mr. GOJACK. I am not sure of that because if a letter had been addressed to me in my capacity as UE district council president without some reference to the GE strike, as I recall it, there was something on the envelope and I don't know where it came from, about GE strike committee, something like that. That was my reason for taking my letter along there. As I remember, other people, someone in the local received a similar letter.

"Mr. TAVENNER. Who was it?

"Mr. GOJACK. I don't recall. If I remember correctly, it was addressed to the district local.

"Mr. TAVENNER. This minute says the document was addressed to Brother Gojack. There isn't a reference to any other person. Was the vote finally that of 10 in favor and 7 against accepting this type of assistance from the Communist Party?

"Mr. GOJACK. As I recall, I don't remember the exact vote, as I recall the strike strategy committee, I was not a member of it, after a very long debate voted to accept the contribution on the basis that they would accept a contribution from anybody and if the Wall Street Journal would have sent out a bundle of their papers they would have accepted that.

"Mr. TAVENNER. Did you at the time, at this meeting, January 16, 1946, know the leaders of the Communist Party in the State of Indiana? That is the chairman and the State secretary?

"Mr. GOJACK. I don't even know what the positions represent; I don't know.

"Mr. TAVENNER. You did not know who the chairman was and who the State secretary was?

"Mr. GOJACK. Mr. Tavenner——

"Mr. SCHERER. I ask that you direct the witness to answer the question.

"Mr. MOULDER. The witness is directed to make a direct answer to the question.

"Mr. DONNER. Will you repeat the question?

"Mr. TAVENNER. Repeat the question, please.

"(The reporter read from his notes as requested.)

"Mr. GOJACK. I am not at all certain who the chairman and secretary was at a given time. I could answer that by saying, and truthfully, that——

"Mr. SCHERER. We assume it is truthfully; you are under oath.

"Mr. MOULDER. Proceed.

"Mr. TAVENNER. Proceed, please.

"Mr. MOULDER. What period of time are you referring to as to who the chairman and secretary was?

"Mr. TAVENNER. January 16, 1946.

"Mr. GOJACK. As I started to say before I was interrupted by that snide remark from Congressman SCHERER, I could answer that question truthfully by saying that I read the press and the Indiana press often reported accounts of activities of the Communist Party, officials of it would issue releases or get in the press. I might have known at that time who these officials were. But when I start answering those kinds of questions I feel that we are getting to the heart of the fundamental objective to this committee in its operation here. I don't believe that this committee has a right to ask me who I know, what my political beliefs are.

"Mr. MOULDER. He did not ask you that question. He just asked you if you knew who was serving in the official capacity and, as you have stated, you may have acquired that knowledge by reading the papers.

"Mr. GOJACK. I don't think they have a right to ask me if I knew Wendell Willkie, whom I knew in Indiana. I don't think you have a right to ask me questions relating to any political connections I may have, any friends I may have. I think we are getting into the heart of my dispute with the committee here. I don't think you have a right to go into any of this.

"Mr. MOULDER. He is not asking you about your political affiliation. He is asking you if you knew who was serving——

"Mr. GOJACK. Here is what he is doing. He is trying to convict me on a guilt by association basis, and I don't think this committee has a right to indict me, let alone convict me. I think that is a job for the courts in this land.

"I think here this committee is getting too far afield from what Public Law 601 has laid out for it. You are doing the job of the courts here and I think you are usurping the rights of the court.

"(The witness conferred with his counsel.)

"Mr. SCHERER. There are only two things this committee can do, and that is cite you for contempt if you are guilty of contempt and, secondly, if you would commit perjury or any witness commits perjury, refer the testimony to the Department of Justice. That is all this committee can do. It cannot do anything else. It cannot convict anybody.

"Mr. DONNER. Is the reporter recording the fact that I consulted with my client?

"Mr. MOULDER. Yes.

"Mr. DONNER. May I object to that, please?

"Mr. MOULDER. The record will show your objection. As I understand the question, it has nothing to do with your association, political association, or any objection you have raised. The question is merely, Do you know who was serving in that period of time in a certain official capacity? Is that right?

"Mr. TAVENNER. Yes, sir.

"Mr. GOJACK. Since Mr. Tavenner has mentioned this name of—what was it? Johnson? I recall knowing from newspapers or discussions that name of Johnson as some Communist official in Indiana. I don't know his position, and I don't know when he was an official, and don't know the time.

"Mr. SCHERER. Is that the only way you know Johnson, because you read it in the newspaper? Is that the only way you know Johnson? Is that what you are telling us?

"Mr. GOJACK. No; that is not the only way.

"Mr. SCHERER. Tell us how well you knew Johnson.

"Mr. GOJACK. I didn't know Johnson well.

"Mr. SCHERER. Or how slightly you knew him. You have left us under the impression at this point that by reading the newspapers you know that Johnson was chairman of the Communist Party of Indiana and I am asking you if that is the only way that you knew Johnson.

"(The witness conferred with his counsel.)

"Mr. DONNER. I want to renew my objection if the record continues to show consultation.

"Mr. MOULDER. Well, also have the record show that the witness has a perfect right to confer and consult with you at any time.

"Mr. DONNER. I understand.

"(The witness conferred with his counsel.)

"Mr. GOJACK. I want to decline to answer that question on the following grounds: It is here where in this area of questioning that I grow fearful of the use of a paid liar like Matusow, a paid liar like Strunk, and a paid lunatic and convicted forger like Cecil Scott and any other paid informers that you may have and because I feel as strongly——

"Mr. SCHERER. Sounds like the article your counsel wrote for the Nation magazine. I remember reading those things in that magazine.

"Mr. GOJACK. If you will be patient I will give you my next comment.

"Mr. SCHERER. I am very patient.

"Mr. GOJACK. I agree with the Baltimore Sun and Time magazine which said that the Matusow case reminds us that stool pigeons are as a class to be despised and not to be trusted——

"Mr. MOULDER. Those are the reasons that you——

"Mr. GOJACK. I haven't finished my reasons.

"Mr. MOULDER. You wish to list some more reasons for refusing to answer the question?

"Mr. GOJACK. Yes.

"Mr. MOULDER. How long do you think it will take?

"Mr. GOJACK. About half a minute.

"Mr. MOULDER. All right.

"Mr. GOJACK. Because I fear the use of such paid informers, who as a class are to be despised, I fear to answer that question and therefore I invoke the protection afforded by the first amendment to the United States

Constitution and I reiterate my basic objection that the first amendment to the Constitution does not give this committee the right to inquire into any of my beliefs, any of my connections, any ideas I may have.

"Mr. SCHERER. Mr. Chairman, I ask that you direct the witness to answer my question. The first amendment is no basis for refusal to answer that question.

"Mr. MOULDER. Is it your question?

"Mr. SCHERER. My question is——

"Mr. MOULDER. The Chair directs the witness to answer the question propounded by Mr. SCHERER. As I understand it, you refuse to answer for the reasons stated.

"Mr. GOJACK. Yes.

* * * * *

"Mr. TAVENNER. Are you acquainted with Henry Aron, A-r-o-n?

"Mr. GOJACK. To this and to every other question that you ask me along these lines for the reasons I have stated earlier, I don't know what paid liar you have here to do a Matusow job on me.

"Mr. MOULDER. We do not have any paid liars, neither has the committee ever employed any witness to testify or compensated any witness for his testimony any more than you are going to be other than for your mileage and attendance before the committee.

"Mr. GOJACK. You had a Matusow who has said quite differently, from what I have read.

"Mr. SCHERER. We have heard about Matusow from you all day yesterday and all day today. He came from the Communist——

"Mr. GOJACK. I don't know Strunk, but I know he is a liar.

"Mr. SCHERER. He came from the same Communist Party that you refuse to say under the first amendment whether you were a member of or not.

"Mr. GOJACK. When you cite testimony here as the counsel for the committee did yesterday from a so-called underground agent Strunk that is so fantastically a lie as that this woman who was 200 miles away ran a strike at Bay City when Bay City is a long way from Detroit, and that the strike was at a guided-missile plant where Square D never made guided missiles, and when Congressman Clardy used that paid liar's testimony to try to break that strike.

"Mr. SCHERER. We are getting away from the question. The question was did he know this man Aron. He is dancing around. Do you know Aron? That is the only question.

"Mr. GOJACK. I have already declined. Aren't you with us?

"Mr. MOULDER. On the ground of the first amendment?

"Mr. GOJACK. Yes, sir; for the reasons stated, and all of the fundamental objections that I have on the ground the first amendment doesn't give you the right to even hold this hearing, let alone ask me these questions.

"Mr. MOULDER. Proceed.

* * * * *

"Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Gojack, did Mr. Elmer Johnson or Mr. Aron ever appear and address a group of people when you were present?

"Mr. GOJACK. To that question and to every other question like it, I repeat my basic objection that this committee has no right to ask me this question, the first amendment to the Constitution prohibits your inquiring into my political beliefs, what meetings I went to. My goodness, if you are allowed——

"Mr. SCHERER. Mr. Chairman, we have heard this speech a dozen times.

"Mr. MOULDER. Mr. Gojack, you have no right to object to a question being propounded to you during the proceedings of this hearing. You can decline to answer for legal reasons if you wish to do so. Why don't you give a direct answer, a direct response, rather, by answering the question or by declining to answer instead of objecting to the committee even existing or the act of Congress creating it, and answer the questions propounded by counsel?

"We understand your opposition to the committee, your bitterness against the committee functions. You have clearly expressed yourself along that line, but I don't think you should proceed to make that statement every time you are asked a question.

"Mr. GOJACK. Mr. MOULDER, this goes to the heart of my objections because——

"Mr. MOULDER. Then decline to answer for the reasons previously stated on the first amendment to the Constitution, as provided by the first amendment to the Constitution if that is your reason.

"Mr. GOJACK. I will do that, but I would like to finish my reply to this one. If this committee can ask me those questions, then you can ask me questions about meetings at which I attended with other trade unionists, A. F. of L. and CIO, Republican Labor Club, then some Democratic committee or itself can declare somebody being involved in 20 years of treason.

"Mr. SCHERER. We are only asking you about Communist meetings. That is all we are interested in.

"Mr. GOJACK. To some people like your friend MCCARTHY being active in another political party involves treason and my point is that this goes to my basic objection. You have no right to ask me the question.

"Mr. SCHERER. Direct the witness to answer Mr. Tavenner's question.

"Mr. MOULDER. The witness is directed to answer the question.

"Mr. GOJACK. I decline to answer on the ground previously stated.

* * * * *

"Mr. TAVENNER. Are you acquainted with Russell Nixon?

"Mr. GOJACK. Yes; I know Russ Nixon.

"Mr. TAVENNER. Was he known to you to be a member of the Communist Party?

"Mr. GOJACK. Russ Nixon is known to me to be a Washington representative, legislative representative of our union.

"Mr. TAVENNER. Yes; we know that. Will you answer the question, please?

"Mr. GOJACK. To this question, sir, and any question about any other individuals regarding political beliefs or affiliations, sir, I respectfully decline to reply on the grounds on which I am challenging the jurisdiction of this committee.

"Mr. MOULDER. Do you not realize that the courts have held that the Communist Party is not a political organization; that it is not a political party?

"Mr. GOJACK. Frankly, I don't know what it is in terms of the court decisions. I read the other day where a fellow was convicted in Chicago for 5 years for being a member of it, under the Smith Act. I am not keeping pace with these court decisions.

"Mr. SCHERER. Then it would not be a political party if you could be convicted and sentenced for 5 years for belonging to it. It is a criminal conspiracy as much as any other conspiracy on the Federal criminal statutes.

"Mr. DOYLE. Mr. SCHERER, may I supplement your observation by saying, assuming that the finding of the Federal court was according to the evidence and law, it would mean that this committee could not possibly be inquiring into your political affiliations when we are asking you whether or not you are a member of the Communist Party, because the court has held that the Communist Party is not a legitimate political party, as I understand Mr. SCHERER's observation.

"Mr. GOJACK. Sir, I am neither a lawyer nor a Government expert on this question. I remember reading in the New York Times the other day where A. MULTER, one of your fellow Congressmen from Brooklyn, said that under this new law to outlaw Communists, the Communist Control Act of 1954, the one that HUMPHREY tacked some amendments onto—according to that one, he stated President Eisenhower could be proven a Communist. I don't know what the legal——

"Mr. DOYLE. May I just sincerely observe, Mr. Gojack, you may not be a lawyer, but you are a very able and very well read young man, apparently. You are a very well informed labor-union leader. I say that because that is my impression from your testimony. You do not need to apologize for not being well read and well informed, because manifestly you are, and you are a very able witness, very, very well informed in all the areas in which you are being questioned.

"Mr. GOJACK. Thank you, Mr. DOYLE.

"Mr. SCHERER. The question still is——

"Mr. MOULDER. May I ask the witness, Do you know whether or not Russell Nixon is a member of the Communist Party? I am just asking whether or not you know that.

"Mr. GOJACK. Sir——

"Mr. MOULDER. Do you or do you not know? I am not asking you to state whether or not he is, but whether or not you know.

"Mr. GOJACK. Sir, I respectfully submit that that question cannot be propounded to me by this committee because it seeks to expose someone, and I don't think that the law under which this committee operates was set up for exposure purposes. My understanding is that that is what the courts are for, to expose people.

"Mr. SCHERER. Their job is to judge, not to expose. It is the job of this committee to expose Communists. That is one of its primary duties, to expose Communists and the nature of the infiltration of the Communist conspiracy in every activity and agency of American life, which includes labor unions.

"Mr. MOULDER. Do you decline to answer that question?

"Mr. GOJACK. Yes, sir; on the grounds previously stated.

"Mr. TAVENNER. May I suggest that he be directed to answer.

"Mr. DOYLE. I move he be directed to answer, Mr. Chairman.

"Mr. MOULDER. You are directed to answer the question.

"Mr. GOJACK. Sir, I respectfully decline on the grounds previously stated.

* * * * *

"Mr. TAVENNER. You have volunteered that you engaged in many meetings in what you have termed in behalf of peace. You are familiar with the Communist Party line, I suppose, with regard to the Stockholm peace appeal and various others that followed it; are you not? You are not?

"Mr. GOJACK. I am not even sure what you mean by the question.

"Mr. TAVENNER. Did you take an active part in the peace pilgrimage to Washington which was organized by one of the front organizations known as the American Peace Crusade?

"(The witness conferred with his counsel.)

"Mr. GOJACK. Sir, on this and all other questions that deal with my activity in any organizations, political or otherwise, what I think, how I feel, what I did about peace, whether I went on a specific delegation or not, and with whom—to all such questions I must respectfully decline to answer on the ground that the first amendment to the Constitution does not give the committee the right to pry into my beliefs.

"Mr. SCHERER. Mr. Chairman, I ask you to direct the witness to answer.

"Mr. MOULDER. Yes, Mr. Gojack, you are directed to answer the question.

"Mr. GOJACK. I respectfully decline to answer for the reasons stated.

"Mr. TAVENNER. I want to make it clear, Mr. Gojack, that I am not interested at all in what your beliefs or opinions were about those matters. What I am interested in is the extent to which the Communist Party was engaged in manipulating peace moves in this country in behalf of a foreign power. That is what I am interested in. My questioning of you is to determine what knowledge or information you had on the subject.

"Mr. MOULDER. May I say, Mr. Tavenner, in connection with your statement, that the

so-called peace moves on the part of the Soviet Union were being instigated over here as propaganda so as to prevent any opposition to their aggression and domination of the free world.

"Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Chairman, may I add to those two fine statements that I am also interested in knowing what the witness knows about the extent to which the American Communist Party, in connection with these peace moves or otherwise, was using the leadership of American labor unions, especially any labor union that the witness might have been a member of at that time or had any connection with. The question is the extent to which the Communist Party had infiltrated American labor unions, if you know anything about it, the extent to which they were using it then and are using it now for their conspiratorial purposes.

"That is all, Mr. Counsel.

"Mr. TAVENNER. The documents which I handed you have dates which are very significant. The letter from Mr. Nixon was on March 27, which was after the so-called peace pilgrimage to Washington, which occurred on March 15; but the letter which he enclosed from the Communist-dominated outfit in Paris was dated February 16, 1951. Normally it would have been expected to have been disseminated before your peace pilgrimage here.

"May I ask you whether or not that letter had any influence upon your action then or later?

"Mr. GOJACK. Which letter are you referring to?

"Mr. TAVENNER. The letter from Mr. Nixon.

"Mr. GOJACK. The letter from Mr. Nixon had no influence on any actions I took with regard to peace. I have acted on my own initiative on that question—letters to the editor at home, and delegations, and many activities.

"Mr. TAVENNER. If you have disseminated among all your unions, representing thousands of members, this propaganda document from Paris, then you were performing a substantial chore for the Communist Party; weren't you?

"Mr. GOJACK. Sir, I didn't testify that I circulated that. I testified that I remember vaguely that on one such communication from some trade union in Europe, which I showed around to people whom I met in my work, someone asked me if they could have extra copies of that. I remember mimeographing that. I am not at all certain—I didn't testify that it was this thing here, and it wouldn't have been circulated to thousands, sir. If it were a matter of something that came from our Washington office or our national office and didn't go directly to the locals, we sent it to about 25 local unions. Then the local unions themselves decided what to do with it, whether to file it, read it at a meeting, or throw it in a wastebasket.

* * * * *

"Mr. TAVENNER. Now I hand you the February 1, 1951, issue of the Daily Worker, at least a photostatic copy of it. It relates to the American Peace Crusade. It gives the names of those who were the initial sponsors of it. I will ask you to state whether or not there appears among the list of sponsors the name of John Gojack, international vice president, UERMWA, Fort Wayne, Ind.

"(Document handed to the witness.)

"Mr. GOJACK. This document appears to be a photostat of the paper you described, with the notation that 65 notables—

"Mr. TAVENNER. Will you answer the question, please? Your statement is not responsive to my question.

"Mr. GOJACK. I am sorry.

"Mr. TAVENNER. The question is: Will you examine to see whether or not your name is listed as one of the original sponsors of that organization?

"Mr. GOJACK. On this paper you show me, this photostat, rather, my name is listed down there.

"Mr. TAVENNER. Does there not appear above your name the statement, 'Other original sponsors include'?

"Mr. GOJACK. After a listing of Thomas Mann, the Nobel Prize winner, four Protestant bishops and leading scientists, writers, Negro leaders, and trade unionists, the language appears which you read on the paper you handed me: 'Other initial sponsors include.'

"Mr. TAVENNER. Does your name appear among those included as original sponsors?

"Mr. GOJACK. Yes; on this document here, my name appears along with some A. F. of L. and CIO leaders, also.

"Mr. TAVENNER. Yes; I know. That is a voluntary statement by you. What I want to find out is, who solicited you as one of the original sponsors?

"Mr. GOJACK. On that question, sir, I respectfully decline to answer on the grounds previously stated.

"Mr. TAVENNER. What method was used to get you as an original sponsor?

"Mr. GOJACK. I respectfully decline to answer, sir, for the reasons previously stated.

"Mr. SCHERER. I ask that you direct the witness to answer the last question.

"Mr. MOULDER. The witness is directed to answer the question.

* * * * *

"Mr. GOJACK. I respectfully decline to answer for the reasons stated, Mr. Chairman."

* * * * *

Because of the foregoing, the said Committee on Un-American Activities was deprived of answers to pertinent questions propounded to said John T. Gojack, relative to the subject matter which, under Public Law 601, section 121, subsection (q) (2) of the 79th Congress and under House Resolution 5 of the 84th Congress, the said committee was instructed to investigate, and the refusal of the witness to answer questions, namely:

"Were you ever a member of the Communist Party?

"Were you then a member of the Communist Party in 1948, at any time during the year 1948?

"I want to ask you one question: Are you now a member of the Communist Party?

"You have left us under the impression at this point that by reading the newspapers you knew that Johnson was chairman of the Communist Party of Indiana, and I am asking you if that is the only way that you knew Johnson.

"Are you acquainted with Henry Aron, A-r-o-n?

"Mr. Gojack, did Mr. Elmer Johnson or Mr. Aron ever appear and address a group of people when you were present?

"May I ask the witness, do you know whether or not Russell Nixon is a member of the Communist Party?

"Did you take active part in the peace pilgrimage to Washington which was organized by one of the 'front' organizations known as the American Peace Crusade?

"What method was used to get you as an original sponsor? [That is, original sponsor of the American Peace Crusade.]"

Which questions were pertinent to the subject under inquiry, is a violation of the subpena under which the witness had previously appeared, and his refusal to answer the aforesaid questions deprived your committee of necessary and pertinent testimony, and places the said witness in contempt of the House of Representatives of the United States.

Mr. WALTER (interrupting the reading of the report). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the report be dispensed with and that it be ordered to be printed.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

There was no objection.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 315) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution as follows:

Resolved, That the Speaker of the House of Representatives certify the report of the Committee on Un-American Activities of the House of Representatives as to the refusal of John Thomas Gojack to answer questions before the said Committee on Un-American Activities, together with all the facts in connection therewith, under seal of the House of Representatives, to the United States attorney for the District of Columbia, to the end that the said John Thomas Gojack may be proceeded against in the manner and form provided by law.

The resolution was agreed to; and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

STATE DEFENSE FORCES

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 7289) to authorize the States to organize and maintain State Defense Forces, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

Mr. MARTIN. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from Texas kindly explain the purpose of this proposed legislation?

Mr. KILDAY. This bill authorizes the States to maintain a State Guard. During the period of the war when the National Guard was in Federal service the State Guard was organized in, I think, all of the States. After the return of the National Guard the State Guard ceased to exist. This permits the maintenance of a State Guard in the States to be available in the event the National Guard is called back to duty and to be trained and to be at the disposal of the Government.

This provision was included in the original bill we had here in connection with the Reserves. When the National Guard and other matters were removed from that bill this went out with it. Full hearings were held in connection with the bill, and it has been reported by the Committee on Armed Services.

Mr. MARTIN. Was it reported unanimously?

Mr. KILDAY. It was reported unanimously by the committee; yes.

Mr. MARTIN. I withdraw my reservation of objection, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. GROSS. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, why was it taken out of the other bill? Was that to make the other bill more palatable, so that it would be easier to pass it in the House?

Mr. KILDAY. That bill was reduced to nothing more than the Reserves. Everything with reference to any other provision except the Reserves was removed from that bill. This is not part of the Reserves, therefore it was removed.

Mr. GROSS. But it was taken out of the other bill in order that the bill passed yesterday would be approved by the House; is not that correct?

Mr. KILDAY. I do not believe that is a fair appraisal of the action in removing

it. I think it was removed because of the decision to confine that bill to the Reserves, and this is not part of the Reserves.

Mr. GROSS. Under the circumstances, Mr. Speaker, I must object to the unanimous-consent request.

The SPEAKER. Objection is heard.

PERMANENT APPOINTMENTS IN NAVY AND MARINE CORPS

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 2109) to authorize permanent appointments in the United States Navy and the United States Marine Corps, with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Page 4, after line 4, insert:

"SEC. 5. The authority contained in this act shall expire 2 years from and after the date of enactment of this act."

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, this amendment merely makes this bill a temporary 2-year bill rather than permanent legislation. The Committee on Armed Services this morning unanimously agreed to this change.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in; and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMMISSION ON GOVERNMENT SECURITY

Mr. WALTER submitted a conference report and statement on the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 157) to establish a Commission on Government Security.

STRENGTHENING OF THE RESERVE FORCES

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill (H. R. 5297) to provide for the strengthening of the Reserve forces, and for other purposes, be taken from the Speaker's table and recommitted to the Committee on Armed Services.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

Mr. GROSS. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, what is this bill?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman has asked unanimous consent that this bill be recommitted to the Committee on Armed Services.

Mr. GROSS. This is the bill to which I objected a moment ago?

Mr. VINSON. No; not at all. This is the first Reserves bill. It is on the Speaker's table. I am asking unanimous consent that it be recommitted to the Committee on Armed Services.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

THE SUMMIT CONFERENCE

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, in my weekly newsletter to constituents on June 20, I wrote of the Geneva Conference, then several weeks ahead, I said:

These conferences will become historically significant. There won't be any world-shaking documents or agreements. The real value * * * will be intangible, for the time being. In President Eisenhower we have a shrewd and astute representative who can read between the lines, see the shape of things to come. He will leave Geneva with a pretty clear picture, he will have in his mind a blueprint of procedure as America continues on the road to universal peace and prosperity under American leadership. We can rest assured this meeting will not be another Yalta or Potsdam. * * * I predict our leader will leave Geneva with the blue chips in his pocket. Moscow will fail in its effort to brand the United States as the enemy of peace.

That my predictions were true, that Mr. Eisenhower has returned from Geneva with a great victory to our credit is clearly shown by the editorial expressions of most of our leading newspapers. One of the best of these editorials, I think, is the one appearing in the Indianapolis Star of July 25. It follows:

GENERAL IKE: MASTER STRATEGIST

Whatever else the summit conference may or may not produce it displayed to the fullest the amazing talent for maneuver of a previously untried statesman on the world scene. President Eisenhower met the Muscovites on their chosen field of battle, blunted the end of their peace offensive, made them shoulder the blame for the Geneva deadlock, and then drove their propaganda battalions from the field with his magnificently timed offer of total and unlimited inspection of armaments by Russia and the United States.

Because of Ike's leadership, Geneva is beginning to shape up as the biggest—not to say the first—victory we have ever scored against the Reds at the conference table. The chances are a million to one against the Reds accepting this plan. It would tear down the Iron Curtain. It would expose to the world the shabbiness and the weariness that lie behind the "monolithic" facade of the police state. It would give Soviet citizens contact with free people. The myth that Russia needs a slave system because of threats by the wicked Western imperialists would be demolished.

So, the first reaction by the Reds indicates that they will try to pigeonhole the plan in some committee while hesitating to reject it outright. Nobody in the world will be fooled by this. The Reds wanted a meeting of the "heads of state" precisely because they thought they could get us over a propaganda barrel with all sorts of phony peace resolutions. It is they who are now over a barrel—and there is the laughable prospect that Messrs. Bulganin, Khrushchev, and Molotov may have to cable back to Moscow for instructions from their superiors to get them off the hook.

This has turned out to be some conference. We have not given away one single country or compromised a vital principle. No ally has been betrayed—like China at Yalta—and no ally has succumbed to Red blandishments. Real peace is nearer because General Ike remembered that attack is the best defense.

COST OF NATURAL GAS

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks, and include a short table.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, I am placing in the RECORD a short table, which I hope the Members will read, which will give authoritative information as to the cost of gas to the consumers, which I feel sure will be of interest in considering the natural gas bill when it comes before this body. It gives the facts as to the cost of natural gas to the consumers covering 10 of the largest cities in the United States.

I hope each Member will carefully study this table.

Average price paid for gas by residential consumers in 1954

City	Service area	Average residential gas bill for 1954	Expense of utility service for transportation and distribution	Amount paid to producers for gas consumed			Producer's percent of consumer's average cost
				Per year	Per month	Per day	
		Dollars	*Dollars*	*Dollars*	*Cents*	*Cents*	*Percent*
New York	Consolidated Edison	50.64	48.93	1.71	14	0.5	3.4
Baltimore	Consolidated Gas, Electric Light & Power Company of Baltimore	65.72	60.28	5.44	45	1.5	8.3
St. Louis	Laclede Gas Co	78.87	71.76	7.11	59	1.9	9.0
Detroit	Michigan Consolidated Gas Co	86.46	78.03	8.43	70	2.3	9.8
Milwaukee	Milwaukee Gas Light Co	78.80	73.59	5.21	43	1.4	6.6
Minneapolis	Minneapolis Gas Co	116.08	101.43	14.65	122	4.0	12.6
Suburban Philadelphia	Philadelphia Electric Co	113.52	107.70	5.82	48	1.6	5.1
Newark	Public Service Electric & Gas Co	59.86	57.02	2.84	24	.8	4.7
Washington, D. C	Washington Gas Light Co	103.59	94.01	9.58	80	2.6	9.2
Chicago	Peoples Gas Light Co	54.06	48.60	5.46	45	1.5	10.1

Sources: Annual reports to stockholders; insurance reports of distributing utilities; annual reports of distributing utilities to State regulatory commissions; annual reports of pipeline companies to Federal Power Commission.

THE LATE HONORABLE J. ROLAND KINZER

Mr. DAGUE. 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 Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. DAGUE. Mr. Speaker, it is with profound regret and a sense of deep personal loss that I must inform the Members of this House of the death of my predecessor, John Roland Kinzer, who departed this life at his home in Lancaster, Pa., early this morning at the age of 81.

Mr. Kinzer was first elected to the House to fill the vacancy created by the death of William W. Greist and served in this body with honor and distinction from January 28, 1930, to January 3, 1947, when, following his decision not to seek reelection, he returned to his home in Lancaster, Pa., where he resumed the practice of law. Mr. Kinzer was born on a farm in Lancaster County, Pa., and following an education in the public schools, graduated from Franklin and Marshall College and was admitted to the Lancaster County bar in 1900.

His marriage to Bertha Snyder brought to his side a devoted wife and confidante who was his constant inspiration throughout their married life, which was terminated by her death a few years ago. He is survived by two brothers: Theodore, with whom he lived, and Dr. H. C. Kinzer, a practicing physician in Lancaster.

Congressman Kinzer represented that type of conservative thinking and living to which the Ninth District of Pennsylvania has always been dedicated. He gave to public office the fullest measure of dedicated service and earned for himself the respect of a constituency who appreciate those qualities in its elected officials. I shall always be indebted to him for his friendly counsel and advice, and in his passing I know that I have lost a stalwart friend and this House has lost one of its most distinguished former Members. I am sure that you will join with me in extending condolences to his bereaved brothers.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DAGUE. I yield.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, I join with the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania in expressing the keenest regret at the death of J. Roland Kinzer. He was my personal friend for many years, and was beloved by all of us who were privileged to serve with him. Roland Kinzer was a man of the highest integrity, a man of great ability, and one of those solid Americans who have done so much to build up this country. His passing is a loss not only for the people who loved to bestow honors upon him but for his State and the Nation. I extend to his family my deepest sympathy in their hour of sorrow.

Mr. DAGUE. I thank the distinguished minority leader.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have permission to extend their remarks on the life and service of the late J. Roland Kinzer.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, it was with deep sorrow that I learned of the passing of my very good friend, and our former colleague, John Roland Kinzer, who died at the age of 81 in Lancaster, Pa. Our State has lost one of its finest citizens.

Mr. Kinzer served in Congress from 1930 until his retirement in 1947. He was an honest, conscientious, and loyal legislator. His work in the House of Representatives was useful and constructive and his ambition was to preserve the principles and ideals of our great Nation.

He was a humble and kindly man and one whom you admired as a companion and a friend. He was always considerate of everybody and the kind of man who added much to our daily lives, with a kind word for everyone.

Today it is with a feeling of sadness that we record his passing, and remember him for the many little acts of kindness that marked his friendship and good will toward all of us who knew him.

CHINESE COMMUNIST SITUATION

Mr. HALE. 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 Maine?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALE. Mr. Speaker, I rise to protest against the possibility of our having any negotiations of any kind and for any purpose with the illegitimate, Communist, so-called People's Government of China, unless the legitimate Nationalist Government is present and participating in those negotiations.

If we have negotiations behind the back of the Nationalist Government, we inevitably legitimate the Communist government of China and will default on every commitment we have ever made to the Nationalist Government. Our treatment of the Nationalist Government of China has been poor enough at best.

Last January we adopted a policy of defending Formosa and the Pescadores, and taking all steps fairly incidental thereto. This policy was a sound one concurred in with only insignificant dissent in House and Senate. The policy has been successful up to this point and there is no reason whatever to weaken on it now.

FOREIGN AID APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. GROSS. 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 Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to commend the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. GARY], for the statement he made a few moments ago expressing his unswerving opposition to the restoration, in conference, of approximately half a billion dollars to the foreign giveaway bill. I simply want to assure the gentleman from Virginia for what it may be worth, that I will be most happy to stay here with him until Christmas if necessary to stop the restoration of those funds.

MOUNT CHOCORUA

Mr. LANE. 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 Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, much as we all respect President Eisenhower, we disapprove of the misguided enthusiasm on the part of a few New Hampshire legislators to change the name of a famous mountain in that State and rechristen it "Mount Eisenhower."

The President who is well schooled in tradition would be embarrassed by this suggestion to change well-known name places at will even though well intended and in his honor.

Mount Chocorua in New Hampshire has been known for decades to millions of tourists who carry with them the legend of the Indian chieftain who defiantly sacrificed his own life rather than submit to the palefaces who invaded his paradise. Old Indian names are a part of our color heritage. To abandon them at the caprice of the moment would be to sacrifice everything in the past just for the whim of the day.

We have enough changes going on around us as it is, without unsettling everything. We do not have to imitate the celebrated novel "1984" where one of the ministries of a totalitarian state was kept busy changing the record of the past to conform to the political needs of the day. We have many beautiful names in our national parks and forests commemorating personages and events of rich past. These should not be disturbed.

Then the policy of the United States Board on Geographic Names, Department of the Interior, is opposed to such tinkering with tradition. And the New Hampshire House of Representatives will be commended for rejecting this proposal.

The following editorial appeared in the Daily Evening Item of Lynn, Mass., on Thursday, July 21, 1955. Also included is a letter from the Department of the Interior.

KEEP CHOCORUA

To thousands of greater Lynn residents who, through the four seasons, journey through Chocorua on their way to the White Mountains, the sight of Mount Chocorua is a previous landmark.

The resolution of Representative WILLIAM T. ROBERTSON, Republican, Gilmanton, of New Hampshire to rename Mount Chocorua for President Eisenhower and at the same time "destroy a grisly Indian legend" will not meet with approval in our own area.

With all due respect to the President, renaming the picturesque mountain to Mount Eisenhower would be a distinct disservice to the Granite State.

If the practice of renaming landmarks to honor national figures grows in legislative favor in New Hampshire, soon there would be no Echo Lake or White Horse Ledge in North Conway, no Old Man of the Mountains, no Flume, no Lost River, no Glen Ellis Falls, no Crawford Notch.

No matter how "grisly" is the Indian legend of Chocorua—the chief who slew every member of a white man's family to avenge the death of his son who was entrusted to its care—the changing of the name of "the Matterhorn of New England" would gain no additional respect for the President, nor would it add to the lore which is so much an interesting part of New Hampshire.

UNITED STATES
BOARD ON GEOGRAPHIC NAMES,
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
Washington, D. C., July 22, 1955.

Hon. THOMAS J. LANE,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. LANE: In reply to your letter of July 21, enclosing a clipping, the proposal to rename Mount Chocorua for President Eisenhower would not be favored by this Board.

The Board does not entertain proposals for changes of well established names unless they are unsatisfactory as names, for such reasons as duplication. Continually changing geographic names would give rise to endless confusion. The name Mount Chocorua is, to my personal knowledge, firmly and widely established. Further, the Board does not entertain proposals to apply the names of living persons to natural features in this country, as you will note from the enclosed policy statement. While this may appear unduly restrictive, its wisdom has been demonstrated repeatedly and much embarrassment to all concerned has been avoided in countless instances.

Sincerely yours,
MEREDITH F. BURRILL,
Executive Secretary.

UNITED STATES
BOARD OF GEOGRAPHIC NAMES,
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
Washington, D. C.

STATEMENT OF POLICY FOR APPLYING NAMES OF PERSONS TO NATURAL FEATURES

This statement of policy is for the guidance of the Board in deciding cases and for the guidance of organizations and individuals who propose personal names for natural features. The policy with reference to place names in Antarctica is stated elsewhere.

It should be understood that the various factors involved in the policy outlined below are relative. Peaks which are major features in eastern United States would be secondary features in western United States and minor features in Alaska.

Features which are prominent in the public mind by reason of accessibility, outstanding natural beauty, or other special attribute should be placed in the category next higher than their magnitude alone would warrant.

Features in areas where many features are unnamed should be considered in the category next lower than their magnitude alone would warrant.

An existing name should not be replaced unless it is a duplicate or is inappropriate.

Names of men who qualify for features of one order of magnitude may be applied to features of a lower order if such application is particularly appropriate.

I. MAJOR FEATURES

With the following qualifications, the Board will consider applying the name of a deceased person to a natural feature of the first order of magnitude, such as a mountain range or group; a high, massive, or spectacular mountain, summit, peak, or ridge; a large river; a major island; or a prominent cape:

1. Only one major feature of a kind should be named for a particular individual, and few features of first order of magnitude of different kinds should be named for any individual.

2. Only one whose public service, achievements, and fame are likely to be enduring should have his name applied to a feature of first order of magnitude.

3. A feature of first order of magnitude, except in an area where few features are named, should be named only for a person whose public service and achievements are likely to be more than regional in effect, though his work and reputation may be only regional in scope.

4. In applying the name of an individual to any feature, and particularly to a first-order feature, a clear distinction should be made between honorable fame and mere notoriety.

5. The importance of the public service or achievements of the person whose name is proposed should be commensurate with the magnitude or grandeur of the feature.

6. In areas where few features are named, a major feature may be named for a person associated with it or with the region in one or more of the following ways:

(a) Through exploration, survey, or scientific investigation resulting in contributions to the knowledge of the feature in question or of the region that encompasses it.

(b) Through personal efforts resulting in conservation of the natural heritage of the place or region or in its long-range development.

(c) Through long association with the feature, such as residence or work in the locality.

(d) Through outstanding public service to the residents and the region.

II. SECONDARY FEATURES

With the following qualifications, the Board will consider applying the name of a deceased person to a natural feature of the second-order of magnitude, such as a mountain other than that of the greatest size, a ridge, a small glacier, a valley, a medium-to-small island, a medium-sized river:

1. The person whose name is proposed should have been associated with the feature or region in one or more of the following ways:

(a) Through exploration, survey, or scientific investigation resulting in contributions to the knowledge of the feature in question or of the region that encompasses it.

(b) Through personal efforts resulting in conservation of the natural heritage of the place or region or in its long-range development.

(c) Through long association with the feature, such as residence or work in the locality.

(d) Through outstanding public service to the residents and the region.

2. The name of a deceased member of the Armed Forces will be considered for application to a feature on or near which he met death in line of duty or engaged in heroic action. The name of a member of the Armed Forces who died in line of duty anywhere will be considered for application to an unnamed feature with which he was associated.

III. MINOR FEATURES

With the following qualifications, the Board will consider applying the name of a person, living or deceased, to a relatively small natural feature, such as a hill, watercourse, or cove:

1. If the name is well established in local usage.

2. Name of an early occupant or owner.

3. The name of a member of the Armed Forces who died in line of duty anywhere will be considered for application to a feature with which he was associated.

4. The name of a person who died on or near the feature.

MARCH 5, 1946.

CONVEYANCE OF CERTAIN PROPERTY TO STATE OF LOUISIANA

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 5512) to provide for the conveyance of certain property under the jurisdiction of the Housing and Home Finance Administrator to the State of Louisiana, with Senate amendments and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 2, strike out lines 7 to 12, inclusive.
Page 2, line 13, strike out "3" and insert "2."

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, is this legislation approved by the minority members of the committee?

Mr. SPENCE. I do not think it has been. I will withdraw the request if the gentleman wishes. I will tell the gentleman what the Senate amendments do. Originally the funds available to pay for this were to be available from the Hill-Burton Act. The Senate amendments struck that provision out.

I asked the author of the bill to communicate with the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT] about it.

Mr. MARTIN. Is the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT] agreeable to it?

Mr. SPENCE. I have not heard whether he was contacted or not.

Mr. MARTIN. I think probably the gentleman should withhold action on the amendments until the gentleman from Michigan can be consulted.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw the request.

STATE DEFENSE FORCES

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, I renew my request for the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 7289) to authorize the States to organize and maintain State defense forces, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 61 of the National Defense Act, as amended (39 Stat. 198), is amended by adding the following subsections:

"(b) In addition to the Army National Guard and Air National Guard heretofore authorized by this act, the States may, as provided by the laws of such State, organize and maintain State defense forces in conformance with regulations prescribed by the Secretary of the Army. The regulations of the Secretary of the Army shall, among other things, provide for the maximum composition of the State defense forces within each State and shall limit the organization of such forces, during periods of peace, to a strength as deemed appropriate for organizing and planning and to serve as a basis for the rapid expansion of such State de-

fense forces, if and when any part of the Army National Guard or Air National Guard may be ordered to active duty in the service of the United States, or during periods of a national emergency declared by the Congress or proclaimed by the President. State defense forces established under this section may not be called, ordered, or in any manner drafted, as such, into the Armed Forces of the United States. State defense forces may be used within their respective State borders as deemed necessary by the chief executive thereof. A member of a State defense force established under this section is not exempt from military service in the Armed Forces of the United States under any Federal law by reason of membership therein, and further, such member is not entitled to pay, allowances, subsistence, transportation, or medical care or treatment from Federal funds. No person may become a member of the organized militia established under this section if he is a member of the Reserve Forces as defined in section 101 of the Armed Forces Reserve Act of 1952.

"(c) The President may prescribe for the issuance of such arms, ammunition, clothing, and other items of military equipment for the use of the State defense forces as he deems appropriate.

"(d) The National Guard Bureau shall be charged with administering the provisions of this section pursuant to policies prescribed by the Secretary of the Army and shall be the channel of communication between the Department of the Army and the several States.

"(e) As used in this section, the term 'State' means any State, Commonwealth, Territory, the District of Columbia, the Virgin Islands, the Canal Zone, or Guam."

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.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan asked and was given permission to address the House for 20 minutes today, following the legislative program and previously entered special orders.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts asked and was given permission to address the House for 5 minutes today, following the legislative program and previously entered special orders.

NATIONAL SYSTEM OF INTERSTATE AND DEFENSE HIGHWAYS ACT OF 1955

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 314, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 7474) 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. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill, and shall continue not to exceed 3 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Public Works, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. No amendments shall be in order to section 4 of the bill except amendments offered by direction of the Committee on Public Works, which shall be in order notwithstanding any rule of the House to the contrary, but shall not be subject to amendment, and except it shall be in order to move to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert as a substitute the text of the bill H. R. 7494 and all points of order against such substitute are hereby waived. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill H. R. 7474 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, with or without instructions.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, how long has this rule been out and may I ask whether under our rules it can be considered at this time?

The SPEAKER. It can be because it was reported on yesterday.

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes of my time to the gentleman from Illinois and at this time I yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. Speaker, this rule will make in order consideration of the bill (H. R. 7474) to amend and supplement the Federal-Aid Road Act. This rule is a modified open rule. All of the sections of the bill, H. R. 7474, are open to amendment in the usual fashion except section 4 which deals with the tax provisions.

In addition to that, the so-called Dondero bill, H. R. 7494, which, as I understand it, includes the Clay report recommendation for a bond method of financing will be in order as a substitute for the whole bill.

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOLLING. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Is it the gentleman's understanding that under the rule, supported by the committee, that it will not be in order for an amendment to be proposed as a substitute proposal in the nature of a bill introduced by the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. THOMPSON] and as outlined before the Rules Committee yesterday by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. JONES]?

Mr. BOLLING. We were informally advised that such a bill would be in order as an amendment or as a substitute for the Dondero substitute. Since it does not contain provisions with regard to taxation, we were informed that that particular piece of legislation would appear to be in order as an amendment to the Dondero bill.

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. In other words, if this rule is adopted, the House will be given an opportunity to vote upon the so-called Thompson bill, the substitute which will be offered by the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. THOMPSON] or the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. JONES] or the gentleman from Mississippi?

Mr. BOLLING. That is my understanding.

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOLLING. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. I take this time because there is only an hour on the rule. I do not think that is sufficient time to go into this matter. There are also 3 hours general debate and the 3 hours general debate as provided in the rule is not going to give every Member an opportunity to be heard. I would like to have at least 30 minutes to speak on the bill. It is the most far-reaching bill this Congress has ever passed. It is a tax bill—one of the largest tax bills ever passed. It is an appropriation bill—appropriating more money than the House has ever appropriated in any bill. I venture to say there will not be 25 percent of the Members have a chance to speak on the bill. I would be inclined to vote against the rule unless I can be assured that every Member will be given an opportunity to speak on this far-reaching piece of legislation. Now, the gentleman said this was a semi-open rule. He should have said "semi-open gag rule" because, if there was ever a time when the American taxpayers were gagged, it is in this rule. The tax plan cannot be remedied and you are ramming it down the throats of all of the farmers and the truck drivers and a lot of business enterprises. They will be gagged to death—clear out of existence. This is about the worst piece of legislation I have ever seen come before the House.

Mr. BOLLING. The gentleman is aware that there are 19 sections to the bill, and only 1, section 4, is closed to amendment.

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. That is the tax section.

Mr. BOLLING. Therefore, under the 5-minute rule, every Member will have adequate opportunity to express himself in the usual fashion.

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. For 5 minutes.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOLLING. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. But the tax feature in this bill is closed to any amendment; is that correct?

Mr. BOLLING. Except to the amendment which is contained in the bill H. R. 7494, made in order by the rule, which is commonly called the Dondero bill, and contains the Clay report proposal for a bonding program to finance the legislation.

Mr. GROSS. But individual Members of the House will not have an opportunity to offer amendments to the taxing features of this bill.

Mr. BOLLING. That is correct, with the qualifications I have stated.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOLLING. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. In addition, the Committee on Public Works can offer amendments.

Mr. BOLLING. The gentleman is correct. The Committee on Public Works is also authorized to offer amendments.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the

gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN].

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, the Nation's present highway systems, Federal and State, are inadequate to do the job they are called upon to undertake every 24 hours of the day.

Almost every element of our economic expansion—which has brought us, under this administration, the greatest prosperity in our history—has kept pace with our growing Nation. We have lagged in the nationwide development of our most necessary roadways.

That is the reason why we must have a bold, aggressive program to get the highway-building job done—a job that is most necessary for the growth and the security of the United States.

We must remember that America is in a period of massive population growth. For this reason, our road-building plans should be laid out on the basis of at least the next decade if we are to accomplish what is needed to keep our highways in pace with our economic development.

President Eisenhower has developed a 10-year accelerated highway-building plan which will be wholly adequate for the growth and for the defense needs of our Nation for many years after its completion.

The President's highway program provides for the completion of broad avenues of exit from cities and for high-speed highways throughout the land.

The President's plan proposes that the Federal Government expend $3,122,500,000 a year—or a total of $31,255,000,000 in 10 years. The biggest share of the Federal Government's expenditure—$25 billion—would go to improve and expand interstate highways over the 10-year period. The various States and municipalities will be asked to contribute a total of $1,166,660,000 during the 10-year period, bringing to nearly $27 billion total expenditures for the interstate system.

Under the President's plan, States would not be called upon to siphon off vast matching funds to meet Federal requirements, but would instead be able to continue improvements with their own funds of highways not eligible for Federal aid.

The President's program, realistically taking into account the rapid population growth and economic expansion now underway, directs its emphasis squarely at the place where the people's needs are greatest. This program provides $6,225,000,000 in Federal aid for primary, secondary, and urban road construction over a 10-year period, broken down as follows: Primary roads, $3,150,000,000; secondary roads, $2,100,000,000; urban roads, $750 million, with $225 million going for forest highways.

Detailed studies of roadbuilding needs indicate that this is the amount needed and the amount that can be economically spent on roadbuilding over a 10-year period.

The President's plan will not raise taxes; it will not increase the Federal debt.

The President's plan will, across the Nation, bring relief in the form of better roads to those of us who are paying more than we should be to travel on today's narrow, jammed, and dangerous highways.

In seeking to establish a Federal Highway Corporation to finance the 10-year, $31,225,000,000 highway program, the President has taken into account the support of his program from many sources. These include the majority of the Nation's governors and mayors. These are the men who must accept the final responsibility for meeting the people's needs.

The Federal Highway Corporation would sell 30-year bonds to raise more than $21 billion. Additional revenue for highway building would come from regular sources, without increasing taxes.

Bond issues for highway construction are as old as the Nation's highway system itself.

By using this system of finance, by 1956 the Nation would have a 40,000-mile, 4-lane network of roads, linking all major industrial and urban areas and providing 90 percent of all cities of 50,000 population and over, including 42 State capitals, with modern, safe, and efficient roads—roads adequate to meet emergency needs and adequate for the anticipated growth across the Nation.

No other road program before us will do so.

Overall, the 10-year program for providing the necessary road network will cost $101 billion in 10 years. The plan calls for Federal aid totaling 30 percent of this total in the 10-year period.

State and local governments, to meet the needs, are expected to increase their expenditures on Federal-aid primary and secondary road systems to finance the remaining 70 percent.

I ask this Congress to approve the President's program, in keeping with what, in my opinion, are the wishes of the majority of the State and local governments in the Nation.

As a Member of this body, I am fully aware that we are in substantial agreement that we must undertake without delay a major roadbuilding task across the Nation.

The appalling accident and death rates will be reduced on a new highway system and economic waste will fail. These are immediate benefits of the program.

What we must do if we are to meet the issue intelligently is build up a modern network of highways in the next decade, not a piecemeal construction program in a shorter period. Not a lagging, dollar-consuming program that will, prayerfully, do the job sometime in the far-distant future.

Some critics question the need of spending $11 billion in interest on 30-year highway bonds.

Let me answer that in this way:

Each day every car owner in the Nation wastes money on inadequate roads.

Every time a driver makes an unnecessary stop in his car because of bad or crowded roads, it costs him or her a cent and one-half in tire, brake, and battery year.

Each year, the waste in gasoline and oil on old-fashioned, crowded roads and highways costs individual motorists a total of $43.32; unnecessary tire wear costs each of us a total of $11 a year; unnecessary wear and tear on brakes cost $6.25.

Within the next decade, when the President's highway program will be needed most, an estimated 81 million vehicles will be traveling a total of 814 billion miles each year—an increase of 46 percent over the total number of drivers and miles traveled today. This road program will save money to the auto drivers.

The need is now. Our farmers are bringing their produce to market on rutted and soft-surfaced roads in many areas, paying dearly in wear and tear on their trucks in doing so. We need new highways for our children—to see that they get to school and back home safely. We need new highways for our housewives—for their weekly shopping, to keep the home going. We need new highways for our industrial development. And our military leaders emphasize the desperate need for a modern highway system. We in Congress have a responsibility to the people of our great country. They are a patient people, they are a responsible people, and they are a grateful people. I can think of no other service that could abound with benefits for so many as this 10-year program to bring up to date the American road system.

We have a man of high vision in the White House. After careful study, he has proposed a 10-year highway plan that will meet all of our needs in the foreseeable future. It is geared to the entire administration program of peace and prosperity. It treats all Americans as partners in the necessary venture of building up a modern system of travel to match the Nation's industrial and population growth.

The best Nation in the world surely should have the best highway system in the world.

The President's program will provide for such a great need and will keep our highways in pace with our general economic progress and our prosperity. Let us substitute his bill for that reported by the committee.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARTIN. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Do I correctly understand that the gentleman is supporting this semiclosed rule that prohibits any amendments whatever on the tax provisions of the bill?

Mr. MARTIN. The only way we can get legislation on the floor is through a rule, and that rule having been reported, yes, I shall support it.

Mr. GROSS. A rule excluding any amendments to one of the most important features of this bill, which is the taxing feature? What is complex about taxes with respect to motor vehicles and fuels?

Mr. MARTIN. The gentleman is not going to get into a debate with me on taxes in this short space of time. I do not have sufficient time to do that. But the only way we can secure a road bill is to adopt the rule putting the legislation in order.

Mr. CHRISTOPHER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARTIN. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. CHRISTOPHER. I believe the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts said that the President's road program contemplated the spending of $101 billion over a 10-year period for this highway program, and I think he also said that could be accomplished without raising taxes or without increasing the national debt. Now I submit that I need a little explanation on that, and I wish the gentleman from Massachusetts would explain that statement so that even a Congressman would understand it.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARTIN. I yield.

Mr. MASON. I have an explanation of that question, and I expect to have time given to me to answer it.

Mr. CHRISTOPHER. I will listen to it with great interest.

Mr. MARTIN. I believe the gentleman from Missouri is an intelligent Member of the House, and when the facts are presented to him, he will appreciate how it can be done. I must ask him to remember that we are a growing country and we are constantly increasing our resources. As they develop, we can pay this bill without hurting anyone, and we hope some day in the not too distant future that the tension in the world will be removed, and then we can pay these bills so rapidly that you would not know that we had done it.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARTIN. I yield.

Mr. McCORMACK. My question is this, assuming that the Dondero substitute is not adopted—just assuming that.

Mr. MARTIN. I do not like to assume that. I am hoping, John, that you will give me enough votes to pass it.

Mr. McCORMACK. But assuming that it is not.

Mr. MARTIN. I cannot assume that, but you can.

Mr. McCORMACK. Well, they ask these questions in a courtroom on the basis of an assumption.

Mr. MARTIN. I am not a lawyer. I am just a plain newspaperman who tells the truth always, and not on the basis of assumptions.

Mr. McCORMACK. If the situation develops where the final vote is between the bill reported out of the committee and a straight authorization, that is with the Dondero substitute not adopted, would the gentleman then favor the committee bill?

Mr. MARTIN. The gentleman would have to go into his office and prayerfully give consideration to any such unexpected alternative.

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARTIN. I yield.

Mr. McGREGOR. I just want to add my word with reference to the question raised by the gentleman from Missouri relative to the $101 billion highway program. There has never been presented to this Congress a program calling for $101 billion. As the result of a survey made, which would be the utopia of all engineers, including all roads, even the farm-to-market roads, the primary roads, and the interstate roads and all the intrastate road systems, if they were built to the plans and specifications described by certain engineers the overall cost including the share of the Federal Government and the States and the local governments might possibly be $101 billion. But we have never had presented to this Congress for any consideration a $101 billion road program.

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. FALLON].

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Speaker, I take this time not to go into an explanation of the bill, but I first would like to compliment the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN] for his explanation of the Clay report. It is a synopsis of what we heard for the past 7 or 8 weeks when we were holding hearings on that particular subject. I would like to inform the House why and how the bill that we are considering is here today, and how it comes to be here. While we were considering hearings on the Clay report, the other body took action on it. The other body, because of the huge interest cost of $11,500,000,000 and the mortgage on the highways of America for 30 years, voted down the Clay report 2 to 1; I think the vote was 60 to 31. We were told at the time that if we brought a bill in here, a straight authorization bill to do the same job that would raise the public debt limit the President would not sign it. So we were faced with only one alternative, and that was the unpopular task of trying to get a highway bill which will do the job after the study of the bill by Public Roads, the State highway commissioners, and the study that the Clay Commission made and reported to the President. So we took the unpopular course of bringing a bill in here that will finance this program and build it in a period of 12 years and pay for it in a period of 15 years. That is the reason this bill is here today.

It would have been an easy task for this committee to bring in an authorization bill that the President would not sign, but we would only be wasting the time of the committee and the time of the House. Also, it is foolish even to bring in a bill with the bond features in it, outside of the public debt, because the other body has already served notice on us that they would not pass such a bill at this session.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FALLON. I yield.

Mr. McCORMACK. Under the bond issue what will be the ultimate additional cost that the American people would have to pay?

Mr. FALLON. It was reported in the other body, and it was testified to before our committee that it would cost an additional $11,500,000,000 that would be paid out in interest and other charges.

Mr. McCORMACK. One further question: Is it fair to assume that even if the committee bill passes, which is a 12-year program, that there would have to be additional programs? Because the 40,000-mile interstate mileage is not going to complete the future necessities and demands of our country. Is that true?

Mr. FALLON. That is correct.

Mr. McCORMACK. If we pass a bill providing for a bond issue, bonds would be issued for probably up to 30 years, so we would be giving a first mortgage on our highways for 30 years. Is that right?

Mr. FALLON. That is right.

Mr. McCORMACK. Let us say that 10 or 12 years from now it becomes necessary to extend the program, pass another bill and authorize another bond issue; that would be a second mortgage at that time. It would be rather difficult to raise a second mortgage under those circumstances, would it not?

Mr. FALLON. That is correct.

Mr. McCORMACK. This bill is a pay-as-you-go bill.

Mr. FALLON. That is correct, and all the money that is authorized to be spent on the highways in the next 15 years will be available for 15 years further if the necessity arises.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FALLON. I yield.

Mr. HALLECK. Apropos the questions of the gentleman from Massachusetts, is it not also true that if the Dondero substitute should prevail providing for the issuance of bonds then, if the Congress of the United States levy additional taxes specifically to reduce those bonds, to that same extent you would reduce the life of the bonds, and interest payments would be reduced?

Mr. FALLON. That is absolutely true.

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, there are three bills that will probably be considered if this rule is adopted, and a number of others have been introduced.

I do not think any of these bills ought to pass at this time. Everybody is in a hurry to adjourn and we have this adjournment rush on for this weekend, but whether it is this weekend or next weekend, this House is not going to give to this complicated matter the serious determination that a matter of this magnitude needs.

I do not care which one of these bills you pass, you are going to be buying a pig in a poke for $48 billion. Somebody is going to pay for it.

The Democratic bill undertakes to fix the pay-as-you-go plan; and, of course, the tax is placed upon probably the most unpopular users of the highways. The Republican bill has by some arithmetical legerdemain managed to fix it up so that nobody is going to pay anything. There is not going to be any additional bond issue, there is not going to be any additional tax. If that can be done I am for it, so are the rest of you, but I doubt whether that can be accomplished. It all illustrates that we are in a state of confusion about this bill.

There are four separate minority reports on the committee bill and we are just not in a position to consider it at this time.

Let me tell you something about this closed rule. The Rules Committee gave to the Committee on Public Works the right to write a bill on a tax matter and

present it to you without any right of amendment. When I asked the chairman of that committee whether his committee had asked for a closed rule, I was told that the committee had voted on the question of a closed rule and the committee itself voted 17 to 11 against asking the Committee on Rules for a closed rule. In addition to that, I was told that the Committee on Public Works had voted, probably by a similar majority, against asking for an open rule. We never were able to find out what the committee itself wanted in the nature of a rule and the committee itself now does not know what it wants in the nature of a rule because there are four minority reports.

Here we are in the last 5 days of the session being asked to deal with this tremendous proposition. What are you thinking about? This should not be considered at this time and none of these bills ought to be passed.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. Of course the gentleman knows of my high regard for him and he knows also that I know, and agree with him, that we ought to proceed carefully with measures of this sort. But I would like to call to his attention the fact that a commission was appointed, the Clay Commission, that studied this matter for months and months. The Committee on Public Works held hearings for weeks and weeks. There were deliberations within the committee. And then after weeks and weeks of deliberations the committee reported a bill. The rule, I think properly, makes in order a substitute so that the House can work its will as between a tax bill and a bond issue bill. Personally, I think we are probably as well informed about the matter as we will ever be and that now is the time to proceed to act on the measure.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I would be glad to answer the gentleman's question if I knew what it was.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. As I understand the gentleman from Indiana, he says the Clay Commission knows all about this, so it is not necessary that we know anything about it.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Yes, that seems to be the way things are working out.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. AYRES].

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Virginia had a good point when he brought out and emphasized the fact that there is much confusion in connection with this bill. It is true there was much time spent on the Clay report. There was considerable time spent in hearings by the committee on that phase of the matter. But in all of my experience in the Congress I have never seen the taxpayer divested of his cash so rapidly as the Public Works Committee did in the 12 hours of hearings on the tax provision of this bill. In 12 hours they were able to come up with a scheme which will relieve the American taxpayers of $12 billion. I do not think we can improve on a billion dollars an hour.

When we say that certain segments of our economy are going to pay this tax, we are just kidding the American taxpayer. Whenever you put a tax on a basic transportation item such as you are doing in this bill, you are doing nothing more than placing indirectly a hidden manufacturer's sales tax on the American people. When we vote the issue here today will be whether you and I want to vote for a discriminatory tax under a closed rule where the discriminatory feature cannot be removed or you want to vote for a bill that has been proposed by the President of the United States and has been given thorough consideration.

I hope that the Dondero substitute will be agreed to. Time and much consideration has been given that bill. I am not going to be critical of the closed rule. Ever since I have been here we have out of necessity had to consider tax measures under a closed rule. But I am critical of a precedent being broken and a committee other than the Committee on Ways and means being assigned what is primarily a tax bill. What we have is a discriminatory tax bill which incidentally gets highways.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. WILSON].

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, the time allotted by this rule is wholly inadequate for even fair consideration of this bill. I guess that in general debate it will amount to spending about fifteen or sixteen billion dollars per hour of study by this committee.

Now, this bill will project a tax program and a spending program many years into the future. It had, as the gentleman who preceded me mentioned, 12 hours of study in the Committee on Public Works. And, as the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Rules said, "Just look at the different views that the committee had on this bill." Here are the minority views. Turn to the front page of your report and read it for yourselves: Additional minority views, separate views, individual views. It is what you might call a political quickie, and little good and much harm is sure to come from this bill if it is enacted.

Now, as to the rule: They call it a limited open rule. Well, it depends on who the man is who is sponsoring the rule. It is so gaggy that few of you are going to have an opportunity to be heard on this bill, but every one of you is going to be given an opportunity to be heard when you go back to your districts, when the farmers start talking to you about this tax when they start collecting it. There will be a 3-cent tax put on their fuel, and they will get a refund of 1 cent, and when they buy that 50 gallons of gasoline and they get that 1 cent for the use of the machinery on the farm, they will say, "Why do we not get the other 2 cents?" If they are entitled to a 1-cent reduction, they are entitled to 3. They ought to have it, and they will want to know why they cannot get it.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. GEORGE. Your diesel-fuel people have had that exemption on off-the-highway use, have they not?

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. I will go into that later, but I will not take the time on this rule to explain that. But it is so gaggy that a lot of you folks will be anxious to get away from the mess and come back to the District next year when the Congress reconvenes and reconsider it.

I want to correct a misimpression that was left here by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ALLEN] and the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BOLLING]. The gentleman from Illinois said, "Is it not true that this rule is open enough so that the members of the Committee on Public Works can offer amendments?" And the gentleman from Missouri said, "Yes." Well, that is not true. Read the rule. The members of the committee have no opportunity to offer amendments. The only way they can do that is to go into executive session and call this thing back. Here is the language in the rule: No amendment shall be in order to section 4 of this bill except amendments offered by direction of the Committee on Public Works. Now, that is not the individual members. The members of the Committee on Public Works have no opportunity to offer amendments to this bill; it is only an amendment offered by direction of the committee, not the members. I want that impression cleared up, because it has been called to my attention that any member of the Committee on Public Works could offer an amendment. He cannot do it.

Again I want to remind you of the vote in this committee. A motion was made to direct the chairman of the Committee on Public Works to go to the Committee on Rules and ask for this gag rule. That motion was voted down 17 to 11. Now, that is how the committee stood on it. They were opposed to this gag rule themselves. And, of course, when they asked for instructions in regard to an open rule, they also voted that down. So, that further adds to the confusion. It shows that they did not know what kind of a rule they wanted, because they did not know what kind of a bill they had to offer.

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I regret very much that the rule that has been presented to the House today makes it impossible for me to offer an amendment which I had intended to offer to the bill, to provide for an exemption of all nonhighway users from payment of the gasoline tax. The committee recognized the fact that it is improper and inequitable to tax nonhighway users for gasoline, when this fuel tax is dedicated to a road program, when it exempted nonhighway users from the tax increase.

WHAT IS FAIR?

If it is equitable to exempt 1 cent of the tax, it is certainly fair and just that the entire 3-cent tax also be exempted. The rule that has been presented for the handling of this bill today makes it impossible for this House to express any voice in that matter. I think we are passing up a great opportunity here to enact legislation under a fair system that will be fair to farmers and fishermen and anybody else who uses gasoline in a nonhighway use.

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. SISK. I should like to commend the gentleman on his statement, that this rule makes it impossible to offer his amendment. I agree with him completely on the justice of his proposed amendment.

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. I thank the gentleman. This is going to make it inevitable that we act upon this proposal at some later date. Nonhighway users in the country are not going to allow such an iniquitious situation or condition in our tax laws.

Mr. DENTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. DENTON. I want to concur in what the gentleman is saying. I think it is unfair to tax people for highway use when they do not use the highway. When this law was enacted, farm equipment was not mechanized. Mostly horses were used. It is not fair that these people should pay a road tax when they are not using the highways.

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. I thank the gentleman. Certainly it is not fair to charge a farmer 2 cents of tax and exempt him on the 1 cent.

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. Speaker, I wish to commend the gentleman on his efforts and let him know that I heartily agree with him. Is the gentleman advocating that we vote down the rule?

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. The gentleman is making it very clear that he does not think the rule is fair.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MASON].

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, I expect to talk solely on the tax features of this bill.

Mr. Speaker, the automobile and truck owners of America are now paying more than their fair share of the taxes. In 1953 the Federal Government collected on gasoline, lubricating oil, tires, and tubes $1,144,000,000 in excise taxes. On automobiles, trucks, buses, trailers, and auto parts and accessories, the Federal Government collected another $1 billion in excise taxes. In 1953 the Federal Government gave back to the States in grants-in-aid for roads $515,444,540, retaining approximately $1,750,000,000. This means the Federal Government kept $3 out of every $4 collected in special taxes from autos and truck owners, turned $1 back to the States for building of roads, and spent $3 for general Government needs.

The auto and truck owners of America are being gypped because they pay all the other taxes for Government that other citizens pay and in addition these special taxes.

Mr. Speaker, if the one and three-quarter billion dollars now collected from the automobile and truck owners of America in special taxes now being used for general Government expenditures were earmarked for this road program, it would pay the entire cost of the bond program of the President's plan plus the interest, without the need of any new taxes.

I am therefore against any new taxes for this road-building program, because I am convinced that the taxes now being collected will pay and should pay for the bond program and the interest thereon.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MASON. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Does not the gentleman feel that a measure of this importance should come before the House at a time when we have ample time for debate and real opportunity has been given to the proper committee, the gentleman's Committee on Ways and Means, to do something on the tax measure? This is really a tax measure as well as a highway bill.

Mr. MASON. Of course, that is the only sensible course.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I think the only sensible thing to do here is to vote down the rule and in that way have the opportunity to amend the bill so as to improve it.

Mr. MASON. I agree with the gentleman.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MASON. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. Is it not true that the Committee on Ways and Means by a formal vote delegated the tax power exercised in this bill to the Committee on Public Works?

Mr. MASON. It is true that they did by a formal vote of 15 to 10. That speaks for itself.

Mr. DIES. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MASON. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. DIES. How did the gentleman vote?

Mr. MASON. Of course, the gentleman knows how I voted without asking that.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS].

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, it is absolutely unthinkable that a measure of the ramifications of this bill should come before the House of Representatives under any part of a gag rule. I do not care what committee of the Congress delegated to another committee authority with respect to taxes. I have to vote here today on my own responsibility as other Members do. I simply want to say that this rule ought to be defeated. If someone does not put on a quorum call when we finish debate on the rule, you can be sure you are going to vote on the record to knock out this gag rule. It is unbelievable that Members of the House are denied the opportunity to offer amendments to the important tax section. Defeat of this rule will mean, and very properly so, that the House will have an opportunity to work its will.

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The question was taken; and the Speaker announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present, and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 274, nays 129, answered "present" 1, not voting 30, as follows:

[Roll No. 130]

YEAS—274

Adair	Coon	Hayworth
Addonizio	Cooper	Hébert
Albert	Corbett	Henderson
Alger	Coudert	Herlong
Allen, Calif.	Cramer	Heselton
Allen, Ill.	Cretella	Hess
Andresen, August H.	Cunningham	Hiestand
Andrews	Curtis, Mass.	Hill
Arends	Curtis, Mo.	Hoeven
Aspinall	Dague	Hoffman, Ill.
Auchincloss	Davidson	Holifield
Avery	Davis, Tenn.	Holmes
Ayres	Davis, Wis.	Holt
Bailey	Deane	Holtzman
Baker	Delaney	Hope
Baldwin	Dempsey	Horan
Bass, N. H.	Denton	Hosmer
Bates	Derounian	Huddleston
Baumhart	Devereux	Hull
Beamer	Diggs	Hyde
Becker	Dixon	Ikard
Belcher	Dodd	James
Bennett, Fla.	Dollinger	Johansen
Bennett, Mich.	Dolliver	Johnson, Calif.
Betts	Dondero	Johnson, Wis.
Boggs	Dorn, N. Y.	Jones, Mo.
Boland	Doyle	Judd
Bolling	Ellsworth	Karsten
Bolton, Frances P.	Evins	Kean
Bolton, Oliver P.	Fallon	Kearns
Bosch	Fascell	Keating
Bowler	Feighan	Kee
Boyle	Fenton	Kelley, Pa.
Bray	Fine	Kelly, N. Y.
Brooks, La.	Flood	Keogh
Brooks, Tex.	Forand	Kilday
Brown, Ohio	Ford	King, Calif.
Brownson	Frazier	Kirwan
Broyhill	Frelinghuysen	Klein
Buckley	Friedel	Kluczynski
Budge	Fulton	Knox
Burnside	Garmatz	Knutson
Bush	Gavin	Laird
Byrnes, Wis.	Gentry	Lane
Canfield	George	Latham
Carnahan	Gordon	Lesinski
Carrigg	Grant	Lipscomb
Cederberg	Gregory	Lovre
Celler	Griffiths	McConnell
Chase	Gubser	McCormack
Chelf	Hagen	McCulloch
Chenoweth	Hale	McDonough
Christopher	Halleck	McGregor
Clark	Hand	McIntire
Clevenger	Harden	McVey
Cole	Harrison, Nebr.	Macdonald
	Harrison, Va.	Machrowicz
	Harvey	Mack, Wash.
	Hays, Ohio	Madden

Magnuson	Reed, Ill.	Thomas
Mailliard	Rees, Kans.	Thompson, Mich.
Martin	Reuss	Thompson, N. J.
Meader	Riehlman	Thompson, Tex.
Merrow	Robsion, Ky.	Thomson, Wyo.
Metcalf	Rodino	Thornberry
Miller, Calif.	Rogers, Colo.	Tollefson
Miller, Md.	Rogers, Fla.	Trimble
Miller, Nebr.	Rogers, Mass.	Tumulty
Mills	Rooney	Udall
Minshall	Roosevelt	Utt
Mollohan	Rutherford	Vanik
Morano	St. George	Van Pelt
Moulder	Saylor	Velde
Multer	Schenck	Vorys
Murray, Ill.	Scherer	Wainwright
Nicholson	Schwengel	Walter
Norblad	Scott	Weaver
O'Brien, Ill.	Scrivner	Westland
O'Hara, Ill.	Scudder	Wharton
O'Hara, Minn.	Sheehan	Widnall
O'Neill	Sheppard	Wier
Ostertag	Short	Wigglesworth
Patman	Sieminski	Williams, N. J.
Patterson	Sikes	Williams, N. Y.
Pelly	Siler	Willis
Pfost	Simpson, Ill.	Wolcott
Polk	Simpson, Pa.	Wolverton
Powell	Spence	Wright
Price	Springer	Yates
Priest	Staggers	Young
Prouty	Sullivan	Younger
Rabaut	Talle	
Ray	Teague, Calif.	

NAYS—129

Abbitt	Flynt	O'Konski
Abernethy	Fogarty	Osmers
Alexander	Forrester	Passman
Andersen, H. Carl	Fountain	Philbin
Ashley	Gary	Phillips
Ashmore	Gathings	Pilcher
Barden	Granahan	Pillion
Barrett	Green, Oreg.	Poage
Bass, Tenn.	Gross	Poff
Bell	Gwinn	Preston
Bentley	Haley	Quigley
Berry	Harris	Rhodes, Pa.
Blitch	Hays, Ark.	Richards
Bonner	Hoffman, Mich.	Riley
Bow	Jackson	Rivers
Brown, Ga.	Jarman	Roberts
Burdick	Jenkins	Robeson, Va.
Burleson	Jennings	Rogers, Tex.
Byrd	Jensen	Sadlak
Byrne, Pa.	Jonas	Seely-Brown
Cannon	Jones, Ala.	Selden
Carlyle	Jones, N. C.	Shuford
Chatham	Kilgore	Sisk
Chudoff	King, Pa.	Smith, Kans.
Church	Landrum	Smith, Miss.
Colmer	Lanham	Smith, Va.
Cooley	Lankford	Smith, Wis.
Crumpacker	LeCompte	Steed
Davis, Ga.	Long	Taber
Dawson, Ill.	McCarthy	Taylor
Dawson, Utah	McMillan	Teague, Tex.
Dies	Mack, Ill.	Thompson, La.
Donohue	Mahon	Tuck
Dorn, S. C.	Marshall	Van Zandt
Dowdy	Mason	Vinson
Durham	Matthews	Whitten
Edmondson	Morgan	Wickersham
Elliott	Morrison	Williams, Miss.
Engle	Moss	Wilson, Ind.
Fernandez	Murray, Tenn.	Winstead
Fino	Natcher	Withrow
Fisher	Nelson	Zablocki
Fjare	Norrell	
	O'Brien, N. Y.	

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Blatnik

NOT VOTING—30

Anfuso	Hardy	Radwan
Boykin	Hillings	Rains
Buchanan	Hinshaw	Reece, Tenn.
Chiperfield	Kearney	Reed, N. Y.
Dingell	Kilburn	Rhodes, Oreg.
Donovan	Krueger	Shelley
Eberharter	McDowell	Vursell
Gamble	Miller, N. Y.	Watts
Gray	Mumma	Wilson, Calif.
Green, Pa.	Perkins	Zelenko

So the resolution was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Dingell for, with Mr. Blatnik against.

Mr. Anfuso for, with Mr. Green of Pennsylvania against.

Mr. Zelenko for, with Mr. Boykin against.

Mr. Donovan for, with Mr. Eberharter against.

Mr. McDowell for, with Mr. Radwan against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Shelley with Mr. Kilburn.

Mrs. Buchanan with Mr. Reece of Tennessee.

Mr. Perkins with Mr. Miller of New York.

Mr. Rains with Mr. Rhodes of Arizona.

Mr. Watts with Mr. Gamble.

Mr. Hardy with Mr. Hinshaw.

Mr. Gray with Mr. Chiperfield.

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Speaker, I have a live pair with the gentleman from Michigan, Mr. DINGELL. Were he present he would have voted "yea." I voted "nay." I therefore withdraw my vote and answer "present."

Mr. ENGLE, Mr. FOGARTY, and Mr. PHILBIN changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. WRIGHT changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

INTERNATIONAL CLAIMS SETTLEMENT ACT OF 1949

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 6382) to amend the International Claims Settlement Act of 1949, as amended, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. RICHARDS, ZABLOCKI, DODD, VORYS, and Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON.

NATIONAL SYSTEM OF INTERSTATE AND DEFENSE HIGHWAYS ACT OF 1955

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 7474) to amend and supplement the Federal Aid Road Act approved July 11, 1916 (39 Stat. 355), as amended and supplemented, to authorize appropriations for continuing the construction of highways, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 7474, with Mr. KEOGH in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. Chairman, the year 1954 saw the recognition by many people of the existing deficiencies in our highway system and the necessity for doing something about it at an early date. Committees were appointed by the governor's conference and by the President of the United States to give attention to this problem. The activities of these groups culminated in a report to the President by his Advisory Committee on a National Highway Program, in January of this year. The report of the Advisory Committee pointed to the inadequacy of our present system of highways to accommodate the approximately 58 million motor vehicles now registered to operate over them and the urgent necessity to deal with the national traffic jam immediately in view of the prospect of vehicle registrations reaching 81 million by 1965. The report attributed these conditions to two basic causes: First, the 4-year moratorium imposed upon construction during World War II, which prevented both adequate maintenance and replacement; and, second, the shrinkage in the purchasing power of the road dollar. While dollarwise our expenditures on roads have increased materially since construction activities began after World War II, the level of physical construction is now but little higher than it was prewar. The resulting failure of our highway program to keep pace with needs has contributed to the high level of casualties from traffic accidents, which is truly alarming. Accidents on our highways take approximately 100 lives every day and the daily rate of injury is approximately 3,000. No monetary value can be placed on this appalling loss, nor must any be placed upon it for the people of this country to want to take drastic remedial action. The monetary cost attributable to highway accidents was placed in the Clay committee report at approximately $4⅓ billion annually. Improved highways will of course not eliminate these costs, but studies do demonstrate that both the accident rate and the fatality rate are sharply reduced on roads built to the standards intended to be used on the interstate system which it is our purpose to build at a greatly accelerated pace as a means of meeting the serious problem we are confronted with.

Bills were introduced in the Senate and House implementing the program outlined in the report to the President by his Highway Advisory Committee. The bill in the House was referred to the Committee on Public Works and came before the Roads Subcommittee, of which I am chairman. The Senate acted first on the highway program and passed a bill, S. 1048, which also was before the Roads Subcommittee. Extensive hearings were held on these bills, as a result of which the committee reached certain conclusions and arrived at certain decisions. There was little dissent from the view that our present system of highways was inadequate to meet the anticipated needs of commerce, the national and civil defense, and the desires of the public generally for an abundance of high quality roads. However, some divergence of views appeared on such questions as the role to be played by the Federal Government in relation to the governments of the several States; the type of network most needed; the length of the program required; and, of foremost importance, how the program was to be financed.

H. R. 4260, designed to carry out the plan of the President's Advisory Committee, placed special emphasis on the National System of Interstate Highways and authorized the expenditure of $25 billion of Federal funds over a period of 10 years, nearly all to be financed by bonds to be issued by a Federal Highway Corporation created by Congress for this purpose, with the bonds to be outside the Federal budget and not included in the national debt subject to the statutory debt limit. The total cost of the interstate system was estimated at $27 billion, with the State and local governments providing the balance of $2 billion. It was contemplated that the Federal contributions to the primary, secondary, and urban systems be continued at a level less than the $700 million annually, provided by the Federal Highway Act of 1954, specifically $600 million for these three categories. The bill passed by the Senate contained authorizations for appropriations for a 5-year period through the fiscal year 1961, amounting to $7¾ billion in total for the interstate system and $900 million annually for the regular Federal-aid primary, secondary, and urban systems. No financing provisions were included. Constitutionally, of course, no tax provisions could be incorporated in the Senate bill, and the bond-financing proposal was rejected as basically unsound.

At the conclusion of extensive hearings before the Roads Subcommittee, I introduced a bill, H. R. 7072, incorporating a somewhat different approach to the solution of the highway problem. Upon consideration in executive session, a special subcommittee consisting of 5 Democrats and 4 Republicans was appointed to consider H. R. 7072, S. 1048, the bill that passed the Senate, and H. R. 4260, the bill carrying out the views of the President's Advisory Committee on a national-highway program, now superseded by H. R. 7494. They concluded that H. R. 7072 came closer to meeting the views of the committee than the other bills and recommended that consideration be given to that bill with certain amendments. These amendments were incorporated in a committee print, and because it contained a section imposing taxes to finance the program in part, 2 days of hearings were held on this feature before the full Public Works Committee. Everyone desiring to be heard was given an opportunity and practically all parties that had shown an interest in the subject did appear and make a presentation on the subject. The Ways and Means Committee cooperated by designating five of its members to sit with the Public Works Committee to hear the testimony on the tax provisions.

Numerous amendments to the committee print were agreed to involving a compromise of many viewpoints, chiefly in connection with the tax provisions, and a clean bill, H. R. 7474, was introduced. That bill was reported favorably by a vote of 17 to 9 and is the bill now before you. Minority views were submitted by four members of the committee. Additional minority views were submitted by 2 of the signators of the minority views and 3 other members of the committee. Separate views were submitted by 2 of the signators of the additional minority views, and individual views were submitted by 1 of the members of the committee. This rather complicated lineup is a reflection of the complexity of the problem, and as I explain the bill briefly, section by section, I shall attempt to bring to your attention as fairly as I can, the nature of the differences of views in the committee. At the outset, however, I should like to give you a broad outline of the bill and draw to your attention the major differences between this bill, the Senate bill, H. R. 7494, and the present law.

The overall objective of H. R. 7474 is to provide a blueprint as well as the means for accomplishing a long-range highway program with due emphasis on our most immediate need, namely, the interstate system, but with due regard for the remainder of our highways, namely, the regular Federal aid primary and secondary systems and the urban extensions thereof. H. R. 7474 authorizes the appropriation of $24 billion over a 13-year period beginning with the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, for the construction and improvement of the interstate system. In this respect the bill closely resembles H. R. 7494 with its proposal for a Federal expenditure of $25 billion over 10 years, and differs materially from the Senate bill which only authorizes $7¾ billion over 5 years. The Senate bill thus provides only an initial program constituting about one-third of the total program. Our committee is strongly of the view that it is preferable to make provision for the entire program at this time in order that the benefits of long-range planning may be derived. In this respect all of the bills reflect a change in the policy of the present law which authorizes appropriations for only two years.

As to the regular Federal aid program, H. R. 7474 authorizes the appropriation of $725 million for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and declares it to be the intent of Congress progressively to increase the sums for these purposes by $25 million each year through the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969. This constitutes an average of about $875 million per year and by 1969 the annual total would be $1,025,000,000. In this respect our bill more closely resembles the Senate bill which authorizes $900 million annually for the next 5 years. H. R. 4260, on the other hand, contemplates a freezing of Federal contributions for the regular Federal aid programs at $600 million a year for an indefinite period, possibly 30 years. With respect to this important item we believe our bill to be infinitely better than H. R. 7494, which ignores the needs of these important segments of our highway system. It should not be overlooked that these systems, which carry approximately 85 percent of the total traffic, probably mean more to the farmers and to the enjoyment of motoring by the private automobile owner than does the interstate system. As compared with the Senate bill, again we think our bill better because it permits longer range planning.

In one way or another, all of the programs reflected by the three bills I have been discussing contemplate a continuation at current levels of the Federal contribution for roads in the Federal domain.

The matching ratio for regular Federal aid is to be continued on a 50–50 basis under all of the proposals. On the interstate system, as a recognition of the predominating national interest, the matching ratio has been changed from the present 60–40 Federal to State ratio to a 90–10 Federal to State ratio under H. R. 7474 and the Senate bill. In H. R. 4260 no specific matching funds by the States are specified, but it is stated in the President's Advisory Committee report that the traditional requirement for local financial participation is sound and that the States would be expected to contribute annually the amount they are required to contribute under the 1954 act to obtain funds from the $175 million made available to the interstate system by the Federal Government 1954, and that the cities would be expected to participate to the same degree.

So much for the general outline of the program. Hand in hand with the consideration of the program itself went the consideration of how to finance it. This was a responsibility that the committee recognized and was willing to face squarely. There were some who felt that it would be sufficient for our committee to decide what was needed in the way of roads to meet our needs and to let someone else worry about where and how the Federal Treasury would meet the bill. However, in view of the general recognition of the unbalanced state of our Federal budget and the already burdensome level of our national debt, it was felt by the majority of our committee that our responsibility to the American people went beyond that and that the highway bill itself should deal with the problem of financing. Once determined that we should deal with this distasteful but all important aspect of the problem, the first major decision to be made was whether the program should be financed on a deficit basis through borrowings or on a pay-as-you-go basis. H. R. 7494 reflecting the views of the President's Advisory Committee is a deficit plan and our committee rejected it, as did the Senate, and agreed to put the highway program on a pay-as-you-go basis. There can be no doubt this decision was a wise one. The plan in H. R. 7494 would pledge the revenues derived from highway users for a period of 30 years to pay for roads that are to be built in 10 years. What is to happen at the end of 10 years? Does anyone think that our roads will then be adequate for the following 20 years and that the Federal Government will not be called upon to contribute more than $600 million per year after 10 years? We had best be realistic and recognize that this cannot be so. This seems to be clearly recognized by President Eisenhower who is quoted on page 2 of the Advisory Committee report as saying that after the completion of the 10-year program "we shall only have made a good start in the highways the country will need for a population of 200 million people"—a population estimated to be reached in 1970. Furthermore, this deficit financing plan

would result in the expenditure of $11½ billion over the next 30 years in interest alone. To mortgage the future wealth of this country in peacetime to pay for a road program would seem to me to be the height of folly. I feel that a true appraisal of the overall effect of such an approach would be that it was a serious blow to national defense rather than the creation of an asset for the strengthening of our defenses. In short, our committee did not want our road program to be tainted with financial irresponsibility.

Putting the road program on a pay-as-you-go basis meant imposing taxes to help pay the bill. Normally, of course, the determination of what taxes to levy falls under the jurisdiction of the Ways and Means Committee but here we did not have a normal situation. In the first place, there was no dissent from the view that the users of the roads were the ones who should pay for them, thus narrowing to a limited area the taxes to be looked to in order to raise the needed revenue. Thus, there was no issue with respect to this problem which the Ways and Means Committee would normally reserve to itself. In the second place, the amount of revenue to be raised was not dependent upon a consideration of the whole Federal budget or broad fiscal policy, matters on which the Congress looks to the Ways and Means Committee, but rather upon the road program provided for by the Public Works Committee. Finally, the equitable allocation of the burden among the different classes of users was dependent upon considerations falling more particularly within the knowledge and experience of the Public Works Committee than the Ways and Means Committee. We, of course, sought and were generously given able technical assistance by the staff of the Ways and Means Committee and other experts who normally draft tax measures. In short, I am convinced that from a substantive standpoint there has been no encroachment by the Public Works Committee upon the prerogatives and jurisdiction of the Ways and Means Committee.

After hearings and a careful study of various tax proposals, the committee incorporated a section increasing the rates of the excise taxes on gasoline, diesel fuel, the larger sized tires and tubes and trucks and buses, and imposing a new tax on the material used in retreading and recapping large tires. These proposals are estimated to increase general fund revenues by $12.4 billion over the 16-year period beginning with fiscal year 1956 and ending with fiscal year 1971.

The existing tax rates on gasoline, diesel fuel, and large tires and tubes would produce about $21.6 billion over this same period. Thus, assuming normal growth in highway usage, total revenue available will amount to $34 billion and will cover 96 percent of the estimated total Federal expenditures for highways. The committee believes the improvement in the highway system which will result from its program will increase tax yields even further and thus eliminate this gap between these revenues and the highway expenditures provided under this bill.

I will discuss certain aspects of the tax provisions further as I go through the bill section by section.

At this point, having described the program provided for by H. R. 7474 and the tax provisions included to permit the accomplishment of this program on a pay-as-you-go basis, I wish to call your attention briefly to the minority views signed by four members of the committee, since their views relate principally to these two features.

The minority views take exception to the size of the program for the interstate system and to the inclusion of any tax provisions in the bill. One reason given for the opposition is that because of the size of the program it would be inflationary because of a shortage of cement and of highway engineers. Evidence presented before the committee satisfied the majority that present capacity and planned expansion of material production would be ample to meet the program provided for by the bill. The signers of the minority views recommend the substitution of a plan calling for an expenditure of $1 billion annually on the interstate highway system for a 10-year period. In discussing the taxes it is stated by the minority that they have no objection to a soundly developed program of user taxes to bear the larger share of the increased cost of the interstate system, but they take various exceptions to the tax proposals included in H. R. 7474. The objections voiced did not seem to the majority to be well grounded and it was felt that they stem primarily from opposition to the inclusion of any tax provisions in the highway bill. The signers of the minority views recognized that under their substitute proposal with no provision made for increased taxes there would be a substantial gap between the cost of the program and any revenues that might reasonably be anticipated. It is to be noted that the minority also renounced the plan called for by H. R. 7494. The substitute proposal of the minority is basically a deficit-financing proposal with the taxpayers having to carry the burden which should properly rest upon the users of the highways. It should also be mentioned that in individual views filed by one member of the committee agreement was expressed with the views of the minority with regard to their position with respect to the size of the program on the interstate system. However, he expressed disagreement with the views of the minority with regard to the tax provisions and agreement with the policy of the majority in putting the highway program on a pay-as-you-go basis through the levying of new taxes.

Another important provision of H. R. 7474 is one having to do with size and weight limitations. While fundamentally a problem of State regulation, the committee felt that if the Federal Government is to pay 90 percent of the cost of the national system it is entitled to protection against damage to that investment, caused by excessive loads on the highways. Hence provisions have been included in the bill to withhold apportionment of funds for the national system from any State which increases its maximum weights and dimensions of vehicles over those permitted in State laws in effect on March 1, 1956, or than the standards recommended by the American Association of State Highway Officials, whichever are greater. This is an entirely reasonable provision. The proposed interstate system will be built to specifications substantially in accord with those recommended by the American Association of State Highway Officials. It should be clearly understood that this provision will not cause any State to reduce the size and weight limitations now in effect. This is identical with a provision in the Senate bill except that in that bill the date governing State laws is July 1, 1955, instead of March 1, 1956. H. R. 7494 does not contain any provision dealing with sizes and weights but we think it highly important that any bill passed by the Congress contain such a provision. It is worthy of note that none of the minority views or the separate or individual views took any exception to the inclusion of such a provision.

Another feature of H. R. 7474 is a provision having to do with the relocation of facilities of public utilities caused by the reconstruction of highways. Section 7 of the bill provides that 50 percent of the cost of relocation of utility facilities necessitated by the construction of a project on the Federal-aid systems may, on the recommendation of the State highway department, be paid from Federal funds whenever under the laws of the State where the project is being constructed the entire relocation cost is required to be borne by the utility. It is also provided that in no case shall the reimbursement on any project exceed 2 percent of the total approved cost of such project. In view of the magnitude of the proposed highway program, and the resulting heavy financial burdens on the utilities that could not reasonably have been anticipated, the committee felt that it would be fair and equitable to include a provision such as I have described. A similar provision was included in the bill passed by the Senate. H. R. 7494 contains no provision similar to this. Exception to this provision was taken by the five signers of the additional minority views.

The last provision to which I wish to call attention at this time is one contained in section 11, providing that all workmen employed on the initial construction work on projects in the interstate system authorized by this act shall be paid wages at rates not less than those prevailing in similar construction in the immediate locality as determined by the Secretary of Labor in accordance with the Davis-Bacon Act. No similar provision is contained in S. 1048 as passed by the Senate or in H. R. 7494. In separate views signed by two members of the committee exception was taken to the inclusion of this provision.

At this point I should like to indicate to you the coverage of H. R. 7474 by describing briefly and in general terms the content of each section of the bill. For the most part I think it unnecessary to give you the detailed provisions of each section nor to comment on them as the

most important points have already been covered in my previous discussion of the bill. This, however, will not be true with respect to section 4, the tax provision, which will require further detailed comment.

Section 1 of the bill contains the authorization for appropriations for the regular Federal-aid program other than the interstate system for the fiscal year 1957 and includes an outline of the program for the next 13 years through the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969, in the form of a declaration of intent. The details of this section have already been presented to you.

Section 2 contains the authorization of appropriations for the construction and improvement of the interstate system for a 13-year period beginning with the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and extending through the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969. The authorizations start with $1.2 billion for the year 1957 and gradually increase to a maximum of $2.3 billion for the years 1964 and 1965, and then gradually descend to the level of $1.2 billion for the years 1968 and 1969. The total of these authorizations is $24 billion. The committee is of the view that with a program of this magnitude and of this duration spelled out in advance, and with the gradual acceleration provided for by this plan, the road-construction industry will be able to keep pace and thus avoid the inflationary effects feared by the minority. Section 2 also provides for the manner of determining the sums to be apportioned each year among the States. The sums are to be apportioned in the ratio which the estimated cost of completing the national system in each State bears to the estimated total cost of completing the entire national system, as set forth in computations filed by the Bureau of Public Roads in House Document No. 120, 84th Congress. S. 1048 provides that the money for the interstate system shall be apportioned in the same manner as now provided by law. The apportionment provision in H. R. 7474 seems much preferable to that in the Senate bill for it is designed to insure the uniform completion of the entire interstate system whereas the Senate provision does not necessarily insure that result. The size and weight limitation provision already described is also to be found in section 2. Following the size and weight limitation provision there is a direction to the Secretary of Commerce to expedite the conduct of tests by the Highway Research Board of the National Academy of Sciences in cooperation with the Bureau of Public Roads and certain others for the purpose of determining the maximum desirable dimensions and weights for vehicles operated on Federal-aid highway systems, and to submit such recommendations to Congress not later than March 1, 1958.

Section 3 would permit up to 20 percent of the amount apportioned to any State in any year for expenditure on Federal-aid, primary, secondary, urban, and interstate systems, respectively, to be transferred from the apportionment under one system to any of the others, when requested by the State highway department and approved by the governor and the Secretary of Commerce as being in the public interest. The current rate of transfer permissible and not applicable to the interstate system is 10 percent. State highway officials have urged the increase of this percentage to 25 percent. The committee determined that a figure of 20 percent was reasonable and that this greater latitude and flexibility was desirable. This figure of 20 percent is the same as that included in S. 1048.

This brings us to section 4, containing the taxing provisions, which is probably the most important section of the bill, or if not the most important section, at least of coequal importance with sections 1 and 2 of the bill setting forth the road program. Its importance stems from the fact that our committee is firmly convinced that if there is no means provided for financing the road program there will be no law establishing such a program. Quite understandably, this section was the most controversial in the entire bill. The committee had two principal objectives; the first was to provide a scale of taxes that would produce sufficient revenue so that when added to the revenue anticipated from existing taxes on fuel, large tires and tubes, there would be sufficient money coming in to pay for the program provided for in sections 1 and 2 of the bill. As I have already indicated to you, the $12.4 billion expected to be raised from the new taxes, when added to the $21.6 billion expected to be derived from the existing taxes on the items named, will cover about 96 percent of the estimated total Federal expenditures for highways during the 13-year program. The second major objective of the committee was to divide the burden of the new taxes equitably among the various classes of users. This the committee feels it has done.

The taxes imposed by section 4 include an increase of the tax on gasoline and special fuels from 2 cents to 3 cents; an increase in the tax on diesel fuel from 2 cents to 4 cents; an increase in manufacturers' excise tax on trucks, truck trailers, and buses from 8 percent to 10 percent; an increase in the tax on tires larger than 8.50 by 18, used on trucks, trailers, and buses, from 5 cents to 15 cents per pound; an increase in the tax on tires larger than 7.25 by 18 but not larger than 8.50 by 18, used on trucks, trailers, and buses, from 5 cents to 8 cents per pound; an increase in the tax on inner tubes for tires larger than 8.50 by 18 from 9 cents to 15 cents per pound; and a new tax on camelback or recapping material having a crown width of 6 inches or more amounting to 15 cents per pound.

Exemptions from the increases are provided for nonhighway uses and for municipal transit systems. In view of the fact that the proposed new taxes are designed as user charges to pay for the highways it was deemed to be both logical and equitable that off-highway uses of both fuel and tires be exempted, as for example in connection with the operation of farm machinery.

In view of the importance of this section I should like to explain to you briefly the manner in which we arrived at the various taxes. Knowing approximately the amount of money we had to come up with, it soon became obvious to the committee that a very large proportion of the total would have to be derived from an increase in the tax on gasoline, as this appeared to be the only feasible source from which anything like the required sum could be obtained. This becomes clear when you realize that of the $12.4 billion to be raised over the 16-year period, $9.3 billion of it, or 75 percent, is to be derived from an increase of 1 cent per gallon in the tax on gasoline. Furthermore, this is a reasonable feature of a user charge system because it does reach out and tap all of the users of the highways.

With this as the basic tax provision, certain natural consequences followed. The first of these, and one of relatively little significance, was that the tax on certain special fuels should similarly be increased from 2 cents to 3 cents. Another was that the tax on diesel fuel, which is becoming more and more to be used as the fuel in heavy commercial vehicles, should be increased. Here, however, there was a question as to how much the increase should be. Currently the rate on diesel fuel is at the same level as the rate on gasoline, namely, 2 cents a gallon. When considered as a user charge this is inequitable to the users of gasoline because vehicles using diesel oil obtain on the average about 1.6 times as much mileage as vehicles of similar size and weight using gasoline. Thus, to equate the tax to terms of the relative use of the highways, the tax on diesel fuel should be approximately 1.6 times as high as the tax on gasoline.

After the increases proposed in this bill go into effect, the Federal tax on gasoline will be 3 cents. Accordingly, it would seem appropriate that the tax on diesel fuel should be close to 5 cents per gallon. As I have pointed out the increase in the tax on diesel fuel is only to 4 cents a gallon. Frankly, this is one of the compromises that it was necessary to make in connection with the consideration of this bill in the committee, and while I personally felt that a 5-cent tax was more appropriate on diesel fuel, I am willing to abide by the judgment of the majority of the committee and support the tax of 4 cents a gallon on diesel fuel, provided all the other provisions of this section receive support.

Another consequence that flowed from the decision of the committee to impose as a basic tax an increase of 1 cent per gallon in the tax on gasoline was the realization that the across-the-board imposition of such a tax would result in a heavy discrimination against the private automobile and in favor of the heavy commercial vehicles. Evidence before the committee indicated that for each ton-mile of use of the highways a heavy truck paid only about one-fifth as much gasoline tax as the average automobile paid. Accordingly, when heavy commercial vehicles pay the same rate of gasoline tax as private automobiles, this discrimination against the private automobile is created, and the committee felt that some additional tax

applicable only to the heavy commercial vehicle should be included in the proposed new tax structure.

It was suggested by a member of the committee that tires served to reflect use of the highways in terms of weight and distance because the heavy vehicle requires more and larger tires, and the greater the mileage of such a vehicle the more often the tires would have to be replaced. Accordingly, it was determined that a tax in the form of so many cents per pound on the rubber in the tires used by the vehicles of the size and type so greatly favored by the uniform gasoline tax would meet the requirements of the situation. Data presented to the committee indicated that the size of the tires used by such vehicles were those larger than 8.50 by 18. The question then remained as to what the rate per pound should be on such tires.

Evidence was presented to the committee that indicated that it would take a tax of 41 cents per pound on rubber to overcome the discrimination against the private motorist created by a 1 cent a gallon gasoline tax. No competent evidence refuting this figure was presented to the committee, but it was felt that an increase in the tax on rubber for large tires of this amount would perhaps be too drastic a tax at this time and that a lesser rate of tax should be imposed. The committee finally arrived at a tax of 15 cents per pound on the large tires. This is a very modest tax and in my judgment too low, but again I am willing to abide by the decision of the committee in this respect. It is estimated that at the outset the increase in the tax on large tires will bring in approximately $45 million revenue per year and that over the 16-year period it will average approximately $65 million per year.

The committee felt that in addition to the increase to be imposed on large tires there should also be a somewhat smaller increase on medium size tires for commercial vehicles because while the discrimination in their favor in comparison with the private automobile is not nearly as marked as in the case of the heavy trucks, some discrimination does exist and also it is anticipated that enormous benefit would be derived from the new roads by this class of vehicles. Accordingly, the committee concluded that an increase in the tax on rubber in tires of this size of 3 cents per pound should be included. The tax on medium tires is expected to produce about $9 million at the outset and ultimately reach $14 million, with an average of about $11.5 million.

The tax on the so-called camelback, or retreading materials, is a natural corollary of the tax on large tires. It is imposed only on camelback of the size normally used on the large size tires. One important consideration in this connection was that it was feared that without such a tax various people might be inclined to recap tires more often than was safe in an attempt to avoid buying new tires carrying the newly imposed taxes.

The increase in the manufacturers' excise tax on trucks, buses, and trailers from 8 to 10 percent is certainly fully justified for there is no reason why private automobiles should be paying 10 percent as they are now and trucks, buses, and trailers pay some lesser amount. Particularly is this so in view of the highly favorable treatment that they receive through the imposition of the common rate of tax on gasoline. Thus you have a brief explanation of how the committee arrived at its conclusions to impose the various taxes in section 4.

Despite the conviction of the committee that the taxes being imposed on heavy trucks were extremely moderate, the committee took pains to investigate to determine what the probable overall effect would be on the trucking industry as a consequence of the construction of the new roads called for by the program and the imposition of the taxes provided for in section 4. Data obtained from reliable trucking sources indicate that it is the judgment of the industry itself that the proposed new roads will probably result in savings annually to the trucking industry of over $1 billion. Probably the best means of comparing the savings anticipated from the construction of new throughway type highways such as the proposed interstate system and the cost of the taxes to be imposed by this bill is in the terms of cost per vehicle mile. According to truck studies, operations over roads of throughway design as compared to other roads will result in savings of at least 5 cents per vehicle mile. All of the increased taxes imposed by section 4 taken together would increase operating costs for heavy trucks approximately one-half cent per vehicle mile. There can be no question about the modest nature of the taxes being imposed upon the trucking industry by this bill. If there is anything wrong with the tax provision insofar as it imposes taxes upon heavy trucks, it would be because the level of the taxes is too low, not too high. However, even if the tax is not adequate, the bill does establish the principle of the user charge, which is a great step forward.

The president of the American Automobile Association supported the taxes on the heavy trucks but felt that the tax on heavy tires should be at the rate of approximately 50 cents per pound instead of 15 cents. Representatives of the railroads also supported the user charge on trucks in the form of the tax on large tires but felt that in order to overcome what they regard as the subsidization of the heavy trucks by the private automobile through the payment of an equal rate of 3 cents per gallon as proposed on gasoline, it would take a tax of approximately $1.20 per pound on tires. The committee took into consideration all of the conflicting views and reached the conclusion that the proposal now contained in H. R. 7474 is fair and equitable as between users and will result in a soundly financed highway program.

Returning now to an analysis of the bill, section 4 also contains certain technical provisions for the imposition of floor taxes and also for refunds on floor stocks at the end of the tax period. It will not be necessary to explain these in detail.

Section 5 permits the Secretary of Commerce to acquire lands for the new interstate system and provides the means of controlling access to the roads to be built as part of the interstate system.

Section 6 permits the Secretary of Commerce to make certain advances to the State for the acquisition of rights-of-way. This is an important provision which it is believed will result in substantially reduced costs of acquisition of rights-of-way for the new interstate system.

Section 7 contains the provisions with respect to relocation of utility facilities, which I have already discussed.

Section 8 declares it to be the sense of the Congress that all segments of the Federal-aid system should be improved to standards adequate for national defense and national economy at the earliest practicable date. The Secretary of Commerce is to submit to the Congress by February 1, 1957, and annually thereafter, a report together with recommendations regarding the progress in attaining this objective.

Section 9 provides that the Secretary in connection with the undesignated mileage of the national system shall take into consideration elimination of bottlenecks in evacuation routes leading from target areas as designated by the Federal Civil Defense Administration.

Section 10 provides for agreements between the Secretary and the State highway departments to control access to the national system. It also provides that these agreements shall contain provisions necessary to insure to the users of the system benefits of free competition in purchasing supplies and services adjacent to the highways in the system.

Section 11 contains the Davis-Bacon Act provisions already discussed.

Section 12 authorizes the inclusion in the national system of toll roads, bridges, or tunnels under certain specified conditions.

Section 13 would broaden the definition of the term "construction," as contained in section 1 of the Federal Aid Highway Act of 1944, by adding thereto the following words: "cost of relocation of tenants, cost of demolition of structures, or removal of usable buildings to new sites, including the cost of such sites."

Section 14 contains certain administrative changes deemed necessary to carry out the greatly expanded program provided for by H. R. 7474. It provides for the addition of certain top supervisory and administrative grades. It also changes the name of the Bureau of Public Roads to the Public Roads Administration and abolishes the office of the Commissioner of Public Roads. It also provides that the new administration be headed by an administrator appointed by the President with the advice and consent of the Senate.

Section 15 repeals so much of section 1 and section 2 of the Federal Aid Highway Act of 1954 as authorize appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957. This was appropriate because the new bill provides authorization of appropriations for that year.

Section 16 provides that section 13 of the Federal Aid Highway Act of 1950 relating to hearings for projects involving bypasses shall not be applicable to projects on the national system constructed pursuant to section 2 of this act.

Section 17 provides that all provisions of the Federal Aid Highway Acts not inconsistent with this act shall remain in full force and effect and that all inconsistent provisions are repealed.

Section 18 is a separability clause.

Section 19 provides that this act may be cited as the "National System of Interstate and Defense Highways Act of 1955."

This, gentlemen, is the bill presented to you for your consideration by the Committee on Public Works. In my judgment it is a realistic bill providing for a sound program of highway construction, soundly financed. In view of the complexity of the problems involved and the diversity of the interests affected, I think there was a remarkable degree of agreement among the members of the Public Works Committee. I recommend this bill for your favorable consideration and support.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Maryland, Mr. FALLON, the acting chairman of our committee, has presented to the House clearly and distinctly the provisions of the committee bill. It is my purpose to present to the House what is contained in the President's bill or the Clay committee bill, which embraces a different philosophy from that reported by our committee.

The subject of highways in this country is not new. Although we have the finest network of highways of any country in the world today, yet through the years and because of war they have been neglected and we are far behind in preserving or providing the necessary highways for our people. We must provide an adequate system to support the economy of our country which travels on the roads of the Nation today. The purpose of this legislation is to see whether or not we can provide a method by which the American people shall have a system of highways adequate for their needs, adequate to carry the 70 percent of the economy of the Nation, because that is about the percent of our business that now travels on the highways of the United States. Knowing that we are far behind as a Nation in the construction of roads, the President in 1954 conceived the idea of appointing a commission now known as the Clay Commission—by the way, it was a bipartisan commission—to study the question of our need for roads in the United States and make a report. That committee or commission was in session over 4 months, and it is my information that they contacted nearly every segment of the American economy, business, labor, agriculture, industry, in order to get all of the information they could on which to file a proper report with the President. That report is now known as the Clay report, as I have said.

Two bills were introduced at the beginning of the year, known as H. R. 4260 and H. R. 4261, the first one by the gentleman from New York [Mr. BUCKLEY], the chairman of the Committee on Public Works, and the other by myself, which embodied substantially the provisions and the recommendations of the Clay Commission. With few minor amendments and one major amendment, that report containing the recommendations is embodied in the bill which I will offer today as an amendment to the committee bill, so that the House may have its choice.

The committee bill provides a method of taxation to be immediately assessed to pay for the roads. The Clay bill, or the bill I have introduced, provides a different method of securing the money, namely, the issuance of bonds to run 30 years in order to spread the burden over a longer period of time and also to provide a way so that more people and more cars will help to pay the bill instead of fastening it on the people in the next 10 or 15 years.

There are no new taxes provided in the Clay bill or my bill. Present taxes remain unchanged and no new ones added. My bill leaves it exactly as it is now. It does not contain two things that are in the committee bill. It does not contain the Bacon-Davis provision. It does not contain the reimbursement of utilities. It does not contain the provision for reimbursement to the States for roads already built.

What the acting chairman of the committee has said in reference to the report and the committee bill clearly indicates, of course, that only 12 hours were spent upon the taxing feature of the Fallon bill. I do not agree that this is a gag rule because section 4 of the bill covers the subject of taxation. We all know, at least those who have been here any number of years, that you cannot bring a tax measure to the floor of the House in any other manner and hope for any success for final conclusion on it except under a closed rule. So I believe the rule adopted is fair. I know that amendments may be offered to the bill which I introduced—H. R. 7494. I do not know exactly what they may be. Be that as it may, the bill will be offered and Members will have an opportunity to express their will on the kind of a road bill they think we ought to have.

I remember well what the chairman said in reference to the action of the other body; that they had voted down the Clay bill, or the philosophy contained in it, by a vote of better than 2 to 1. I do not believe the House of Representatives should always be guided by what another body does in regard to legislation. We have the right to express our views. We represent the American people. I think they expect us to present to them the kind of legislation which will in the best way provide what they need the most, namely, an adequate highway system to meet our fast-growing economy.

Why do I say that the Clay bill in my judgment is the better bill? We have 58½ million registered cars in the United States today. The Nation is growing at the rate of about 2½ million in population every year. In addition to that, we are adding to the highways of the Nation every year between 2½ or 3 million new cars. The industry has been providing about 6 million new cars a year, but 3 million old cars leave the highways each year. This leaves a net gain of about 3 million cars a year on our highways. In 10 years that means 30 million more cars will be on the highways of this country in addition to the 58 million we now have. It shows the great need, and also I think the great emergency that faces us, to provide an adequate system of highways at the earliest possible time.

As to taxes, my own opinion is that inasmuch as the interstate system—and that is what we are talking about here today—does involve the question of the Nation's security and national defense, that all of the people of the United States should share in paying for the new roads through the issuance of bonds rather than assess new taxes. I believe the people would be perfectly willing to pay, just as we are doing now, and they would not be unduly burdened by paying the additional interest if spread over a 30-year period.

I am sure that every Member in this House can think of project after project in his district that has been financed and constructed in the same manner as we propose to build the roads under the Clay bill or my bill.

Schoolhouses, waterworks, sewer systems, and nearly every great public project in your State and district, with few exceptions, are paid for by borrowing the money, issuing bonds and paying interest thereon. They pay for them as they use them. That is exactly the philosophy of the President's or the Clay bill.

I have heard something said about a Presidential veto. That is the first time that subject came to my ears. I know of no road bill that the President has said he was going to veto. If that has gotten abroad, I certainly did not hear it.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DONDERO. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. KEATING. May I ask the gentleman if the substitute he proposes to offer has specific provisions as to how these bonds are to be paid off? Does it earmark any revenues for that purpose?

Mr. DONDERO. I do not believe under the laws of the land you can definitely earmark revenue, but at least there is a moral connection between the revenue from gas and other fuel taxes from which the bonds and interest would be paid over a period of years.

Mr. MORANO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DONDERO. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. MORANO. As I understand, the formula is contained in the gentleman's substitute?

Mr. DONDERO. Yes; I omitted to mention that.

Mr. MORANO. Will the gentleman explain what the formula is with respect to matching funds?

Mr. DONDERO. Under the 1954 Act, the formula on the ABC roads is 50–50, just as it has always been. The Clay bill provides that the $622 million needed for matching funds in these 3 categories of roads remains the same, and the amount received above that will be given to the corporation under the bill.

That would amortize the bonds and interest as they come due.

Mr. MORANO. Is it estimated that there will be more than $622 million coming in?

Mr. DONDERO. There will be.

Mr. MORANO. So that you will have excess money to help pay interest on the bonds and retire them?

Mr. DONDERO. That is correct. The tax on gas, diesel fuel, and other user taxes now amounts to about $2,300,000,000 a year.

Mr. WITHROW. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DONDERO. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. WITHROW. I believe the gentleman ought to state that Secretary of the Treasury Humphrey, when he appeared before the committee, made the positive statement that could sell these bonds, and very readily.

Mr. DONDERO. That is correct. There is no question about the bonds being sold. Undoubtedly it would follow the same rule we adopted in the St. Lawrence Seaway bill, where bonds were provided for payment.

Mr. MORANO. Does the gentleman have any information as to how much interest may be on those bonds?

Mr. DONDERO. It has been stated as eleven or eleven and a half billion in the 30 years they will run.

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 13 minutes to the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. DEMPSEY].

Mr. DEMPSEY. Mr. Chairman, I think everybody in this House, and certainly every witness that appeared before our committee, acknowledges we must have additional roads. The road situation has reached a condition where there is very little safety. We are killing more than 100 people a day and injuring over 3,000 people a day.

As far as I am personally concerned, I am for doing something about the highways. Our highways are 20 years behind the rest of our Nation's economy. It is pretty near time that we set up some funds to correct the evils of the past. We have spent too little money on highways in the past, and that neglect is what people are suffering from now.

We have heard our chairman, the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. FALLON], explain the bill. We have heard the ranking member of our committee, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DONDERO], explain his part of the bill and what he thinks about it. They are both very able men. I propose to vote for a highway bill. Whichever bill this body feels is the better bill will have my approval. I do think there are many things to be considered. There is very little difference, if any, between the Clay bill and the Fallon bill. There is no difference in the amount of money involved or any difference in the way the money will be applied. A formula has been worked out, which I think is most equitable. In the past we have expended the money in the respective States, so far as Federal aid is concerned, on the basis of population and on the basis of the number of miles of roads in the State and so on. This bill does not do that. It is a more equitable bill. Whether you have the Clay bill or the Fallon bill, the same application appears so far as the allocation of funds is concerned. There are 40,000 miles of highways to be brought up to a high standard by both bills. The allocation of funds is predicated upon what the cost in the respective States will be. In other words, if each State had 100 miles of roads or 1,000 miles of roads, they would not all get the same amount of money because the costs in some States are very much higher than in others. In States like New York, California and Pennsylvania, the costs are high. In the Western States the costs are low. So that annually you would get one-tenth or one-twelfth of the amount required under either bill, depending on the number of years, to apply to that percentage of the roads in your State so that all States could have their roads completed at the same time.

The Secretary of the Treasury, Mr. Humphrey in appearing before our committee, pointed out that there were two routes we could take. We could take the Clay bill using the bonds and setting up a corporation or we could provide taxes. He said he preferred the bond route, but that the other was very satisfactory to him. As a matter of fact, he said from the standpoint of inflation—there was more inflation in the bonds than there was in paying-as-you-go. He also said he did not know any Secretary of the Treasury who would not welcome additional funds coming into the Treasury.

The thing that concerns me about the so-called Clay bill and the bond route is this: We have a certain income coming in from gasoline taxes and diesel-fuel taxes. Those are the only two tax features we have being considered in the Clay bill. From those two sources the annual revenue at the present time is approximately $1,019,000,000. The present allocation for primary and secondary roads runs something over $600 million. We have estimated the increase as we go over the years of the additional taxes which we will get from gasoline and diesel fuel. Those are the only taxes that would be considered, that is, to pay off the bonded indebtedness and to pay for the upkeep and improvements of the primary, secondary, and urban roads. The bonded indebtedness will be paid off over a period of 30 years, and it is going to take all this surplus money that we do not spend for the primary and secondary roads to pay off the bonds and the interest. There is not a man or woman in this House who does not know that you must improve the secondary roads and the primary roads over these 30 years.

We are going to have a serious situation in regard to the increasing number of cars on the highways, 3 million a year. In 15 years we are going to have a condition probably more serious, if that is possible, than you have today.

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DEMPSEY. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. FALLON. The gentleman calls to the attention of the House the fact that in the report we show that 100 persons are killed daily on our highways and 3,000 sent to hospitals. We also had testimony before our committee to the effect that in the last 10 years 300,000 lives were lost on the highways; the economic loss was $35 billion; and that we hospitalized 8 million people.

Mr. DEMPSEY. That is correct.

Mr. FALLON. And the forecast for the future is that this loss is going to increase alarmingly.

Mr. DEMPSEY. It is going to increase alarmingly, and unless we get this job started immediately, I think the responsibility must rest on the shoulders of each Member of this House.

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DEMPSEY. Very briefly.

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. The gentleman made the statement that Secretary of the Treasury Humphrey had more or less agreed that there were two ways of financing this project, one by raising taxes, and he approved this. Is it not true the gentleman would imply that he approved this particular tax program?

Mr. DEMPSEY. I will say this to the gentleman, he said he had checked over these figures and there was very little difference between what we showed and the results of the Treasury Department experts.

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. But does the gentleman mean to imply that he said that this is the right proportion of tax and on the right items to raise the money? I want to make that clear.

Mr. DEMPSEY. He did not say that because he did not appear there as an expert on raising money for highways. He did say he would welcome a payment plan, that if a choice had to be made between two plans he would prefer the Clay bill. That is what he said.

Mr. BURNSIDE. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, I believe the gentleman will remember that he said in answer to questions I asked him that he would have no objection to the Fallon bill.

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. But did he say that the tax on rubber was just right?

Mr. BURNSIDE. He said this tax would be all right.

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. Did he say that the excise tax was just right, that the diesel-fuel tax was just right?

Mr. DEMPSEY. Mr. Chairman, I did not yield for two Members to engage in an argument between themselves. I refuse to yield further. I tried to answer the question.

Fifteen years from now we are going to have a much more difficult situation on our highways. Under the Clay bill our highway funds would be mortgaged for 30 years. Where are we going to get the money to keep up the primary and secondary roads that tie into the interstate system? And that is something that is very necessary to do.

Secretary Humphrey did say that we would not in this bill take money from the general fund, that for whatever money we use we must either issue bonds or create taxes. That was the statement of the Secretary of the Treasury. I think he was very frank and a very splendid witness, so far as I am concerned.

I shall not take much more of your time, but for a great many years I have

been trying diligently to obtain more money for highways, because I have had occasion to know of the need. We must build a better road base, we must build lanes that are wider, we must build highways that are wider. It is not sufficient to have a lane that is 9½ feet wide when the trucks themselves are 8½ feet. We must have 12-foot lanes and a 6-lane interstate system instead of 2 lanes.

And I would like to speak of the death situation. For every 2 people we kill on a four-lane highway with a comparable mileage we kill 7 people on a two-lane highway. We have these narrow bridges, nearly 10,000 of them, on the 40,000-mile interstate highway system, bridges that are entirely inadequate.

I am most regretful that the Treasury cannot see its way clear to provide some of the money so badly needed, because when we kill over a hundred people a day on the highways it is more than all the men who were killed in the Korean war. Twenty-four thousand people were killed there, but we kill from 36,000 to 38,000 a year on the highways of America. I think the time has come when something should be done to correct this situation.

I, as I am sure was every other member of the committee, was hopeful that an adequate highway development program could be carried out without any additional tax. Weeks of careful and conscientious research and study provided convincing evidence that this could not be done. It was either a reasonable and equitable tax increase or adoption of a plan that would cost $11.5 billion in bond interest alone and tie up our normal tax income for roadbulding purposes for the next 30 years. That freeze of funds could result only in another serious deterioration in our highways and places us in a position of having once more to seek additional income to provide traffic arteries adequate to cope with our constantly increasing motor vehicle population.

To burden the American taxpayers with $11.5 billion additional, of which not $1 would build roads, even though the taxpayment were extended over the 30-year period does not make sense. It is not good business.

It is entirely possible that the tax increases proposed in this bill may be inequitable, insofar as some segments of the taxpaying group are concerned. The burden may be disproportionately distributed. But I can assure you that any inequity, if there be one, is not the result of prejudice or bias on the part of any committee member. If such an inequity should be shown to exist by even brief experience, it can and will be readily corrected.

It is well to bear in mind, I believe, that financial considerations in this legislation are not confined to taxation alone. The roads to be constructed under this program will result in enormous savings for owners and operators of vehicles. Conservative estimates made by traffic experts are that operating cost of the passenger cars will be reduced at least 1 cent a mile, while for larger vehicles they will amount to 4 cents a mile. Our deteriorated and inadequate highways have been costing us many human lives each year. It is estimated that this annual toll of 38,000 will be cut by at least 5,000 by improved roads. There will be material reduction in the more than 1 million injuries resulting from traffic accidents as well as in the $3 billion a year in property damage and other losses incurred on our present deficient highway system.

The attitude of the American public in general, the great rank and file of the men and women who own and operate motor vehicles every day, has been most gratifying. Very few have voiced any opposition to the proposed gasoline-tax increase. To my mind, that is evidence beyond refutation that they are willing to pay for better roads, that they recognize the need for those roads, and that the proposed gasoline-tax increase is the most sensible way of investing in those roads.

Personally, I would be very happy indeed if we could devise some magical way of solving our highway problem, so that our defense effort and economic welfare would not be seriously hampered, without resorting to any tax increase, without the issuance of bonds which would add to our indebtedness and increase our interest burden. But the Nation's best fiscal experts, including the Secretary of the Treasury, told our committee what would be necessary in order to carry out the contemplated highway program. We agreed upon what we believed would be the wisest and most economical course in the long run. This legislation is the result. I believe it is entitled to the support of every Member of this House.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DEMPSEY. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I want to commend the gentleman for the fine statement he has made. It has been clear, open, and all embracing. The gentleman's statement is like his character.

Mr. DEMPSEY. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. McGREGOR].

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Chairman, I want to take this opportunity first of paying my respects to the distinguished chairman of the majority party, the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. FALLON]. He has been most fair in our deliberations. He has given the minority party every consideration except for about 30 days when they had their own private little party and we Republicans were not invited. Outside of that he has been most considerate. I also want to pay my respects to the ranking minority member of our committee the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DONDERO], and the junior member from New Mexico [Mr. DEMPSEY].

I want to join with the gentleman from New Mexico in his statement that, in his opinion, the American people want better roads and they are willing to pay for better roads. But, let us be honest. If you want roads you are going to have to pay for them.

There are two ways of paying for these roads, one in the form of bonds, as is suggested in the Clay Committee report, and, second, by means of taxes, which the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. FALLON] has submitted for your consideration in the bill which came out of our committee.

I resent very, very much the inference from some people that the Public Works Committee did not give proper consideration to the highway measure. Let me say that the Clay Committee bill had hearings before our committee from April 18 to June 1, inclusive, 90 percent of that, if you please, on the interstate system. Last year we had 13 weeks of hearings on the intrastate system. So, certainly, we have given the road program every consideration.

It has been suggested to us, and I think rightly, that if you were to bring an authorized highway bill to the floor of this House for consideration everybody would vote for the highway bill and then if you brought a revenue-raising measure later to the floor for consideration everyone would vote against the revenue-raising measure. So, let us be honest, let us have a backbone where some wishbones are. Let us live up to our responsibility. If we are going to vote an authorization for the expenditure of $25 billion let us have the intestinal fortitude to say: Yes, we are going to raise the money to pay for it.

As I said before, you can do it in two ways, by bonds or by taxes. No one likes taxes. It is rather amusing to hear some of my good friends get up and raise the question, "Did Secretary Humphrey say that he was in favor of 5 cents or 7 cents or 9 cents?" Of course he did not. We did not ask him the question. We were trying to determine how much money was necessary and then to try to get an equitable tax for all people, if you please. But, regardless of what taxes you put on some people, they will insist that they want the other people to absorb that particular tax. Now, that is the thing that we are faced with. Nobody likes a tax proposal, but let us give the people a road bill that will be satisfactory, and will carry an equitable tax program.

Two years ago in the 1954 Highway Act we authorized and appropriated the approximate amount of money that was collected through the gasoline and diesel tax, $966 million. What are we doing in this particular bill? We are saying to the people, "You who use the roads are going to pay for them." You could not satisfy some people if you took off all the tax except possibly one-tenth of 1 percent. They want good roads, but they want somebody else to pay for them.

Now, the Clay Committee report, which I am advocating, is the result of many weeks of study by a nonpartisan group. It was adopted by the Governors Conference. Not only a majority of the executives, if you please, but nearly every single governor signed that report.

I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Did the gentleman say all 48 governors endorsed the Clay report?

Mr. McGREGOR. That is my understanding.

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. I think the gentleman is incorrect. I think if he will check, he will find he is in error.

Mr. McGREGOR. If the gentleman will name a governor who did not sign it, I will be very happy to stand corrected.

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. I am authorized to speak for only one, the Governor of Mississippi. He did not sign it.

Mr. McGREGOR. Of course, I may be in error. I know that the distinguished gentleman from Mississippi has opposed the highway bill ever since we started it, and probably his Governor is doing the same thing. So, I may be in error, and if I am, I stand corrected. We will say, then, that 47 governors signed the report.

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. I still raise a question about that.

Mr. McGREGOR. So we will say that 47 governors signed it. But, it was signed by a large majority. Put it that way. And I was told that it was a strong majority, and finally unanimous, so I thought. But, I recall now that the gentleman from Mississippi did raise a point of order in the committee that his Governor had not signed it. So, I withdraw the name of the Governor of Mississippi. However, the rest of the governors favored the Clay report. Why? Because we were adequately taking care of the ABC roads along with the interstate system, and we are not putting an exorbitant tax on anyone. You say that is not good business? You farmers, if you decide you have a milk market and need an extra cow, what do you do? You go to the bank and borrow the money and buy the cow. That is good business. And, we are doing it on a sound financial basis, and that is the reason I am pleading with you to back up the substitute that is going to be offered by the gentleman from Michigan. In that way we can go along with a good highway program and give you just as many miles, and you are not going to put on a new tax that hurts anyone.

Mr. Chairman, several months ago President Eisenhower, along with the vast majority of the traveling public, recognized a need for an increased highway program. This was brought about by a full recognition of the bottlenecks in various localities which were most disastrous to both a civilian and military defense program. It was also brought about because of the recognition that approximately 36,000 lives were lost in highway accidents last year.

In order to get a full and complete picture of the needs and necessary expenditures, President Eisenhower appointed a nonpartisan commission to make a thorough study of the needs of our highway system. This study was headed by Gen. Lucius Clay, retired. After many weeks of hearings, they reported to the President their findings and made a recommendation that an adequate highway program could be established without additional taxes, the financing being handled by issuance of bonds dependent upon anticipated revenue.

The President submitted the so-called Clay report to the Congress with the understanding that it was a basis on which the Congress could establish an adequate highway program to meet our civilian and military needs. The program was incorporated in legislation presented in the House of Representatives by the gentleman from New York, Congressman BUCKLEY, chairman of the Public Works Committee, H. R. 4260; and Congressman DONDERO, ranking Member from the State of Michigan, H. R. 4261.

Hearings were held and many, many witnesses appeared before our committee and a large majority, including a full report on the governors conference which represented all the governors of the United States, were in favor of the Clay Committee report.

Before the hearings were finally completed, Speaker RAYBURN called a meeting of the Democratic members of the Public Works Committee to draft their own highway bill and, for the first time since I have been a Member of Congress, politics entered into the highway program. The Republican members of the Public Works Committee were not invited to the so-called session of the Democrats to draft highway legislation.

The result of that meeting was the introduction by Congressman FALLON of H. R. 7072 which called for a 6-cent diesel fuel tax, an increase of 4 cents; a 3-cent gasoline tax, which was an increase of 1 cent; a 50-cent-per-pound tire tax, which was an increase of 45 cents per pound on all tubes 9.00 by 20, which was an increase of 41 cents per pound. Retread or camelback tires had a new tax of 20 cents. The new bill as recommended by the Democratic members of the Public Works Committee before presentation to the full Public Works Committee included Republicans.

Mr. FALLON's bill, H. R. 7072, got such a hot reception from the general public because of its exorbitant and ridiculous tax increases that the acting chairman of the Public Works Committee, who was the author of H. R. 7072, asked that a subcommittee be appointed including Republicans. May I state here, Mr. Chairman, that I have served under many chairmen but never have I served under any that was more fair and willing to assume his responsibility than the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. FALLON]. At our first meeting, when we were called to consider H. R. 7072, Mr. FALLON attempted to explain to all of us that H. R. 7072 was his bill and was not authorized by the Democrat Party. Of course, to anyone on the Hill, this statement is without question one absorbing the blame of the Democrat Party. Knowing George, as we affectionately do, we are certain that he did not introduce any bill without the sanction of the leadership of his particular party. So, after many meetings that we know of, we can truthfully say that H. R. 7072 is the responsibility of the Democratic Party and not Mr. FALLON.

When our full Public Works Committee met relative to H. R. 7072, it was decided that the Republicans, the minority party, should be taken into consideration because the Democrats were bound and determined to put a tax upon the people to pay for their highway program.

A subcommittee was appointed, and this subcommittee reported H. R. 7474—and may I add I voted against it—and it is the stepchild of the bill that aroused such public sentiment, known as H. R. 7072.

The President's Commission—General Clay's commission—made a report that it would give us as many miles of highways and in approximately the same period of time as H. R. 7072 without the additional taxes that is carried in the so-called Fallon or Democratic bill.

Mr. Chairman, at this point I would like to include in my remarks the recommendations of the original Fallon bill, H. R. 7072, and the recommendations of its stepchild, H. R. 7474. Regardless of what the new bill might call for, the Republican Party certainly can be given credit for reducing the taxes on the users of our highways of diesel taxes from 6 cents a gallon to 4 cents a gallon. From tax on tires of 50 cents per pound to 10 cents per pound. From 50 cents per pound on large tubes to 6 cents a pound, and on the so-called camelback from 20 cents a pound to 15 cents a pound—material alone.

At this point, Mr. Chairman, I am not going to take the time of the Congress to enter into various arguments relative to other sections of the bill presented by the majority party of the Public Works Committee. The records will show, however, that we Republicans were very active and gave the controlling vote on whether or not off-the-road users would be exempt from the various taxes set forth by the Democratic Party in this legislation.

We all recognize, Mr. Chairman, that we need an adequate highway program, and we recognize that many want a highway program, but, in their opinion, the other person should pay for it. I am one who firmly believes, and my record will justify the statement, that I want an adequate highway program, with an equitable distribution of the taxes, which is certainly not exemplified in H. R. 7474.

Even though I am not in accord with H. R. 7474 as it is written, yet I firmly believe that if we cannot substitute the Clay Committee report for this legislation that the only chance we have for a highway program is to vote for H. R. 7474 and let the legislation go to a conference between the House and Senate and endeavor to iron out the differences. After all, Mr. Chairman, I reiterate my previous statement that I think the American people want better highways and are willing to pay for them providing they are certain that this additional tax be used for highway purposes. I will do my best to bring this about.

H. R. 7474

Selected additional Federal excise taxes proposed rate and yield, fiscal years 1956–71

Gasoline, 1 cent additional	$9,281,000,000
Diesel tax, 2 cents additional	512,000,000
Large tires (sizes larger than 8½ x 18), 10 cents additional	1,075,000,000
Inner Tubes for above tires, 6 cents additional	52,000,000
Tires (7¼ up to and including 8½ x 18), 3 cents additional	183,000,000
Manufacturers' excise tax on trucks, busses, and trailers, additional 2 percent	928,000,000
Camelback with a crown width of 6 inches or more, 15 cents per pound	395,000,000
Total	12,426,000,000

H. R. 7072, FALLON BILL

Department of Commerce, Bureau of Public Roads—Selected Federal excise taxes, existing and proposed

Item	Fiscal 1955			Fiscal 1956–70		
	Present	Proposed	Difference	Present	Proposed	Difference
1. Diesel tax:						
Rate ... cents per gallon	2	6		2	6	
Yield ... dollars	23, 219, 000	69, 657, 000	46, 438, 000	476, 850, 000	1, 430, 550, 000	953, 700, 000
2. Gasoline tax:						
Rate ... cents per gallon	2	3		2	3	
Yield ... dollars	925, 362, 000	1, 388, 043, 000	462, 681, 000	18, 597, 150, 000	27, 895, 725, 000	9, 298, 575, 000
3. Tires 9.00×20 and over (weighing 90 pounds or more):						
Rate ... cents per pound	5	50		5	50	
Yield ... dollars	22, 580, 000	225, 800, 000	203, 220, 000	500, 540, 000	5, 005, 400, 000	4, 504, 860, 000
4. All other tires:						
Rate ... cents per pound	5	5		5	5	
Yield ... dollars	109, 130, 000	109, 130, 000		2, 419, 760, 000	2, 419, 760, 000	
5. Tubes 9.00×20 and over:						
Rate ... cents per pound	9	50		9	50	
Yield ... dollars	3, 252, 000	18, 065, 000	14, 813, 000	72, 082, 000	400, 455, 000	328, 373, 000
6. All other tubes:						
Rate ... cents per pound	9	9		9	9	
Yield ... dollars	8, 201, 000	8, 201, 000		181, 818, 000	181, 818, 000	
7. Camelback:						
Rate ... cents per pound		20			20	
Yield ... dollars		46, 000, 000	46, 000, 000		829, 950, 000	829, 950, 000
Total, yield ... dollars	1, 091, 744, 000	1, 864, 896, 000	773, 152, 000	22, 248, 200, 000	38, 163, 658, 000	15, 915, 458, 000

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. MACK], a member of the committee.

Mr. MACK of Washington. Mr. Chairman, everybody is agreed that this Nation desperately needs and earnestly wants more, wider, better and safer highways. Everybody desires to eliminate the 36,000 deaths and the hundreds of thousands of injuries that occur each year on our Nation's highways. When we spend money to better highways, we get it back from the savings that are made, the savings in hospital and medical bills, the savings in wear and tear on our automobiles, trucks and tires. We get it back in the saving on insurance rates automobile owners pay. We get back the money we spend on highways. There is no controversy over that.

So let us here today talk about some of the things which are in controversy. There are four matters in controversy. The first of those is the proposal to give twenty-five to fifty million dollars to the traction companies of the Nation's great cities. This bill, H. R. 7474, provides that we shall take money away from the gasoline and tire users and give twenty-five to fifty million dollars of that money to the traction companies of the big cities. These transit company magnates are the only highway users in the entire Nation who are exempted from the tax provisions of this bill. When one of the gentlemen in our committee talked about the sorry financial plight of the traction companies in New York he almost wept. Last night, I happened to run across a financial magazine and looked at the financial statement of this traction company to which we are going to give part of the twenty-five to fifty million dollars. The report showed that this company made twice as much money in the first three months of this year as it had made in the first three months of last year. I do not think that this Wolfson amendment, as it might be called, should be in this highway bill. But it is there and it is going to stay there, because it is one of the things that we cannot take out of the Fallon bill. We can eliminate this give-away to the transit companies by voting for the President's plan.

There is another proposal in this bill that should never have been in the bill. That is this bill's proposal to give away $970 million of the tax money we take from the gasoline and tire users to the utility companies of this country. The Democrats are always saying that they are for public power and against private power. But here in their bill they give $970 million of the taxes raised by this bill to the great utilities of the country.

Then there is also the Davis-Bacon provision of the bill. That is not a matter of controversy among the members of the committee because we voted Bacon-Davis into the bill by a vote of 28 to 4. Both Republicans and Democrats on the committee supported this provision. But in some sections of the country people are opposed to this proposal.

The big controversy in this bill is over its financial provisions. The President of the United States proposes that we finance this vast highway program by a bond issue to be paid off with the revenues which we derive from the present 2-cent-a-gallon gasoline tax. The President does not feel additional taxes are necessary. During recent years we have been collecting $875 million a year from the gasoline tax. Yet we never have spent, up to July 1 of this year, more than $575 million of the $875 million in any year. Here is a surplus of $300 million we have been diverting from roads to other purposes. The President proposes to take that surplus and the increased returns from gasoline taxes that is occurring at the rate of $50 million a year and employ all of this revenue to pay off these road bonds. The President thinks his plan is sound financially.

The Secretary of the Treasury, the greatest authority on financing in Government says the President's bonding plan is sound. The Treasury experts say it is sound. The Secretary of Commerce says it is financially sound. The Bureau of Public Roads says it is sound. Most of the governors of the United States say the President's bill is sound, workable and desirable. But the Democratic majority of the Committee on Public Works by unanimous vote say it is unsound and they turned down the President's bonding plan and prepared a high tax plan in its place.

After the committee completed hearings, I think on June 1, there was a period of 36 days when nothing was done. No committee sessions were held. During that time there were reports that the Democrats were holding sessions of their own, with no Republicans present, trying to develop a tax plan as a substitute to the Eisenhower program.

The Speaker of the House of Representatives was quoted in the press as being opposed to a bonding plan and urging the committee to take action and get out a highway bill. Then the Democrats did come out with H. R. 7072. The taxes in H. R. 7072 were unfair, unjust and punitive. These punitive tax proposals in that original Democratic bill resulted in the Members of Congress receiving thousands of telegrams in protest to these proposed exorbitant and excessive taxes.

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MACK of Washington. I will yield when I have completed my statement.

Mr. FALLON. The gentleman spoke about a bill I introduced. I do not think he made a fair statement. I do not believe the gentleman would want to make an unfair statement.

Mr. MACK of Washington. I do not want to make an unfair statement, but let me finish my statement, and then let the gentleman give his answer to it.

The Democrat members of the committee had meetings and finally introduced H. R. 7072. It was the only bill before the committee. It was the Democrat's high tax proposal as a substitute for the President's proposal for a bonded highway program. The telegrams poured in. We had a meeting and a subcommittee was named. Not until the subcommittee met did we begin to consider any reductions in the onerous and unjust taxes that were proposed by H. R. 7072, the Democrat bill.

Let me tell you what these taxes in that original Democrat bill were. There

was a provision that every heavy truck tire should bear a tax of 50 cents a pound. These truck tires weigh 100 pounds each. This would be a $50 tax per tire, a 900-percent increase over the present rate of tax.

The tax on truck tubes was increased by the original Democrat bill from 9 cents a pound to 50 cents a pound, a 500-percent increase.

The tax increase on gasoline in the Democrat's bill was 1 cent a gallon, or 50 percent, and on diesel oil a competing fuel to gasoline, it was to be 4 cents, or a 200 percent increase over present rates.

On camelback retread material that wholesales at 31 cents a pound, the tax in the Democrat bill was to be $1 a pound, 3½ times the cost of the material itself.

I noticed in press accounts that some of the Democrats have been protesting that the trucking industry and the tire people have complained about the taxes in this Democrat bill. These Democrats hinted that if the truckers and tire people did not stop complaining they were likely to destroy the highway bill. What industry in this country would not complain if it was proposed to increase their taxes 900 percent, as the Democrats proposed in the case of tires, or 3½ times the price of the commodity, as the Democrats did in the case of camelback? Would not the candy people protest if you proposed a tax of 17 cents on a 5-cent candy bar? Would not the shoe men protest if you proposed a $35 tax on a $10 pair of shoes? Would not the clothiers throughout this country protest if you proposed a $175 tax on a $50 suit of clothes? Of course Members of Congress got telegrams of protest from these people. They were justified in protesting to these proposed unfair and unjust taxes.

Finally the committee went into session with the Republicans and the Democrats attending. The committee discussed this bill very diligently and very thoroughly, and the committee now has come out with the present bill which, in my estimate, is not too bad a bill. The taxes originally proposed have been materially reduced. The $50 tax on heavy truck tires has been reduced to $15. The tax on tubes, that was to be 50 cents a pound, has been reduced to 15 cents. The tax on camelback is made to apply only to the camelback used in big tires and it is reduced to 15 cents a pound instead of being $1 a pound proposed in the original Democrat bill. The diesel fuel tax, that was 6 cents in the original Democrat bill, has now, by the action of both the Republicans and the Democrats working together, been reduced to 4 cents. It still is, I think, too high, but is not really as onerous and not nearly as bad as was first proposed.

It is a pretty fair bill, not good, but not too bad. My position on this legislation is that I will support the substitute that will be offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DONDERO], which would adopt the President's plan, or the Republican bond plan. If, however, the President's plan is voted down, I will vote for the bill that is now before the House because safer highways are desperately needed.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Washington has expired.

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Chairman, before yielding time to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. KLUCZYNSKI], I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. BUCKLEY].

Mr. BUCKLEY. Mr. Chairman, I listened attentively to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. MACK] refer to the gentleman from New York as having a crying towel when I was talking about the buses of the city of New York, and also buses throughout the United States generally. It was rather interesting to note that he said the bus system of New York City was making money. For his information, 40 percent of the buses operated within the municipal limits of New York City today have been taken over by the city of New York, because they are unable to pay their franchise tax and have been unable to make any money. Under this bill, a nonuser of the Federal highways is not supposed to be taxed. The buses in the city of New York are confined within the boundaries of the city of New York. For instance, the county which I have the honor to represent, Bronx County, has four Congressmen. The county is 4 miles square, and we have a population of 1,800,000 in that county, and not like the district represented by my colleague, the gentleman from Washington [Mr. MACK]. The buses in the city of New York never go on an interstate highway or on a secondary highway. The only roads over which those buses travel are the routes to which they are assigned from the time the buses are manufactured until the time that they go to the junkyard. Why should buses that operate within the city limits—and this applies not only to New York City but to every other city throughout the United States—have to pay taxes applicable to interstate highways, either a diesel oil tax or a gasoline tax or a rubber tax when the bus is never used on an interstate highway or a secondary road. Of course, Mr. MACK is going to prove to us that the bus companies of New York City are making money; but I would want to see that proved. You cannot vote against this bill, Mr. MACK, because you know yourself the Democrats make a very strong effort against taxing people. But I know that after this bill goes through, the President of the United States when he signs this bill, is going to say this is not the kind of bill I wanted—I did not want to tax the people—but he is going to sign it. Am I right? Yes.

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 12 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. KLUCZYNSKI].

Mr. KLUCZYNSKI. Mr. Chairman, I am very sorry that in this important legislation we have had to have politics injected. I am very happy to be a member of the Committee on Public Works. The membership of that committee is nonpartisan with respect to legislation of this character. We are a good American committee and we leave our politics outside in the hallway. I am sorry that this incident happened on this very important legislation.

Mr. Chairman, the bill before us today H. R. 7474 is known as the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways Act of 1955.

The extensive hearings which were held on this legislation reminds me of when I was a member of the Committee on Banking and Currency and we had the defense production measure under consideration. Everybody agreed that controls were necessary, but the slogan appeared to be: Please do not control our particular industry. And so it is with H. R. 7474. Everybody seems to agree that we need better roads. Everybody appears to be in favor of an interstate highway system. Most Members of the House and Senate are in favor of adequate Federal highways, but nobody seems to want to pay for them.

The Committee on Public Works held extensive hearings for 8 weeks. After listening to all of the testimony, the Fallon bill was favorably reported from the committee by a vote of 17 to 9. It is my belief that there is not a member of the committee who is satisfied with all features of the bill. We all appear to be in agreement that something must be done to improve the highway system in order to keep to a minimum the loss of human lives on the roads. We must make our highways safer for the motorist, the truck driver and pedestrians.

The gentleman from Maryland [Mr. FALLON], the sponsor of H. R. 7474 and chairman of the Subcommittee on Roads, should be congratulated for making it possible to consider this important measure and afford us the opportunity to debate the bill. The chairman of the subcommittee has been fair at all times with the hearings. He gave everybody an opportunity to be heard, who expressed a desire so to do.

It is generally believed that we must build adequate roads. The Chicago American in its July 22 issue has given an excellent definition of what is meant by the word "adequate." The editorial states by "adequate" is meant a highway system constructed to handle modern traffic safely. It means straight, wide, graded, divided highways with control of access wherever this is needed. If the highways could be built by direct appropriation, that would be favored. If they could be constructed through the issuance of revenue bonds, that would be favored. If they could be established by increased taxation, that plan would be favored.

In the 83d Congress, I introduced H. R. 3637 providing that all money collected annually by the Federal Government from highway users of gasoline, fuel oil, excise taxes on tires, tubes, batteries, accessories, new cars, trucks and buses, which would yield about $2½ billion a year should be placed in a Federal highway aid trust fund, and used for this purpose, instead of going into the general revenue fund of the Treasury and used for other purposes. If this was done we would not today be debating on how to finance a multi-billion dollar much needed Federal highway program.

The administration's bill of February 1955, called for construction of the Interstate Highway System through a revenue bond issue. Under that plan the Gov-

ernment would pay 95 percent of the cost. Under the proposed 30-year bond issue, it is estimated it would cost the taxpayers $11 billion in interest alone.

The Fallon bill levies tax increases and will pay 90 percent of the cost. Because the House Public Works Committee, despite crushing pressure has had the courage to report it favorably after many days of intense and sometimes heated private discussions, I am in favor of the enactment of the measure for adequate Federal highways, no matter how it is financed.

When the pressure was at its heaviest, one of the committee members made this remark, "We have heard from everyone except the public." No one can speak adequately for the public except their Representatives in Congress. The public has no organized lobby or pressure groups and I am confident that we will give the public proper representation in the consideration of H. R. 7474 on the floor of the House today.

The public recognizes it will have to pay the increased taxes no matter upon what industries or articles they may be levied. The public also knows that you spend the money in building the roads and they will pay for them and nonetheless will bless you for the benefits conferred upon them in according them safe means of highway transportation.

Mr. Chairman, I sincerely hope this measure is passed by an overwhelming majority.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SCHERER].

Mr. SCHERER. Mr. Chairman, it was to be expected that in providing legislation for the largest public-works program in all history that intense controversy and marked differences of opinion would develop.

The proposed expenditure of approximately $34 billion has brought tremendous pressures on Members of Congress. As a result, our attention has been diverted from the principal objective of the legislation, namely, the critical and crucial need for a courageous highway program.

There is no longer any question that the highway systems of this country are totally inadequate to meet present and future transportation needs.

It has been said that America is a nation on wheels. Today there are 58 million automobiles on our highways. In 10 short years 90 million vehicles will crowd the roads of America. It has been clearly established by the evidence adduced before the Public Works Committee that our expanding economy will be stifled to an unbelievable degree if we do not break the traffic bottlenecks that are gradually strangling our transportation lifeline. Economic loss due to inadequate highways has reached a staggering sum, not to mention the thousands of persons that are needlessly killed each year because of these same inadequate highways.

We, therefore, come to the inescapable conclusion that an adequate and effective highway construction program is as important to the national welfare as is our defense program. In fact, highway betterment is in itself a defense measure. We all know that the industrial areas will be the frontline trenches of the next war and that the only defense against atomic attack is evacuation. The evidence is overwhelming that our present highways could not possibly evacuate the cities of the United States in the time required much less move large military equipment and manpower rapidly and effectively across this country.

The time to act is now. Tomorrow may be too late. It is essential that the Congress act courageously. We must reconcile our differences—many of them petty—as to how this job is to be done.

Many of us favored the plan and method recommended by the President in the Clay report as the most effective way to handle this gigantic program. When it became apparent in committee that the method of financing the program suggested by the President was not acceptable to the majority then those of us who recognized that roads were paramount and the method of obtaining them secondary gave serious consideration to the proposals contained in the Fallon bill.

The Fallon bill and the President's program set forth in the Dondero bill are almost identical insofar as the basic and crucial parts of the legislation are concerned.

With a few exceptions only the method of financing the program is different. While the methods are different the authors of both bills have wisely and courageously provided the means of paying for this gigantic project. They are unlike the Gore bill in the Senate and the Thompson bill in the House that provide no method of financing. These latter bills are ideal for those who want to point to the fact that they voted for roads but who want to avoid the political responsibility of providing funds—who now suggest that the method of financing be deferred and turned over to the Ways and Means Committee for intensive study—who will then find it convenient at a later date to vote against such taxation programs as the Ways and Means Committee may eventually recommend.

Secondly, the Fallon and Dondero bills differ from the Gore and Thompson bills in what I consider to be the very heart of this road legislation.

For the first time in history the Fallon and Dondero bills provide for the distribution of funds on the basis of need. The money will be spent where it will do the most good—where it will do the most toward relieving traffic snarls that are gradually but surely strangling American transportation.

If we are going to follow the overwhelming and almost uncontradictable evidence adduced in the 7-week hearing before the Public Works Committee—evidence from the most competent authorities in the country—we must at least adopt the method of distributing funds as set forth in the Fallon and Dondero bills. These bills deal primarily with the interstate system. Its very name indicates that it is the system with which the Federal Government should be primarily concerned. It is on this system that we find the large volume and extreme density of traffic between centers of population. It is on this system that we find the bottlenecks—the slowdowns, reduced to a snail's pace, just outside and in the cities and towns.

The reasons for these conditions can be understood when we realize that the interstate system, which consists of only 37,600 miles, represents approximately 1 percent of the total road mileage in this country. This 1 percent, however, carries one-seventh of all the traffic. It means, therefore, that the density of traffic on the interstate system is 14 times the average density on all other highways.

These conditions have resulted in tremendously increased automobile operating costs, such as gasoline and oil consumption waste, brake and tire wear, and, above all, an unbelievable man-hour loss. The loss to the trucking industry, which is eventually passed on to the consumer, is incalculable.

The rebuilding of the interstate system to the standards required will save 1 cent a mile in operating costs for passenger cars.

The trucking industry will save 4 cents a mile in operating costs.

All this will result in a total savings to highway users and our economy of $1,475,000,000 per year.

The evidence is conclusive that it is on the interstate system where we are having a disproportionate number of accidents and loss of life. The rebuilding of the interstate system will result in a reduction of monetary losses from accidents alone amounting to $725 million per year. The total savings, therefore, will reach the staggering sum $2,100,000,000 a year. These savings alone will offset much of the cost of the program.

Furthermore, one of the principal advocates for the development of the interstate system is the Department of Defense. The Defense Department, like all of us, has no problem with its equipment reaching the main arteries of traffic from its installations. It points out that its difficulty, like yours and mine, begins when it attempts to transport large military equipment and personnel across the country on the interstate system. The Department of Defense, without reservation, recommends that the interstate system be developed as proposed by the administration and that it be given priority.

The testimony shows that the primary, secondary, and farm-to-market roads are generally capable of adequately doing the job that is demanded of them today.

I drive between Cincinnati and Washington quite often over the interstate system. In view of my service on the Subcommittee on Roads, I have made careful observation of conditions. Time and time again I have driven in a long line of traffic, frequently crawling up steep grades with other vehicles behind big trucks. While impatiently waiting to move ahead more quickly, I have glanced down the intersecting secondary roads. Invariably they have been in good condition, with little or no traffic on them. Usually vehicles, if any, on these intersecting thoroughfares would be stopped at the intersection waiting to enter the crowded arterial highway. I

am certain each of you has had similar experiences. There are 1 million miles of such secondary roads in this country that carry only from 1 to 100 cars a day.

I am not saying these secondary roads are perfect—that they do not need improvement and that we should not spend any money on them. All I am trying to do is to point out the relative needs.

Last year this Congress almost doubled the amount of Federal funds allocated for these other systems. The fact is that most of this additional money has yet not been used for improvement of these roads. Some States are going to have difficulty in matching the new funds provided for in the 1954 act.

If the interstate system is improved as recommended by the President all other roads will have made available further additional funds in the nature of a hidden windfall. Because of the heavy demands on the interstate system, States today are spending a large part of their own highway funds on the rebuilding and maintenance of the interstate system within their respective States. If the Federal Government takes over the cost of rebuilding these interstate roads the States then will be able to use the money they are now spending on the interstate system on their secondary highways. These roads are primarily the States responsibility anyhow.

Now, in spite of what has been shown about relative needs, it is now proposed by some to dump additional millions on these roads.

Thirty States have said they will not be able to match these additional amounts. Why do some then in the face of these facts and all of the evidence to the contrary and against the recommendations of 97 percent of the witnesses who appeared before our committee, insist on giving these additional Federal funds for the secondary systems. Why do some advocate this when the available money is limited—when this money could be used so much more profitably if it were used where it is actually needed.

A long list of highway experts and responsible organiaztions, headed by the Association of State Highway officials, proved by cogent evidence that the solution to our critical highway deficiencies was the immediate and uniform, and note I say uniform, rebuilding of our interstate system under modern scientific highway engineering standards in every State in the Union. The cost of doing this job will vary from State to State depending on the number of miles of the interstate system within the State—topography, land acquisition costs, width of highways, utility relocation costs, number of grade separations, and interchanges.

Both the Fallon and Dondero bills will give America the highway system she so badly needs in the shortest possible time. Because the need is critical this House must do everything possible to reconcile our differences over the method of financing the program. I realize this is a difficult assignment, particularly in view of the tremendous pressures that have been exerted on us by those who have special interests at stake.

Mr. THOMPSON of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCHERER. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. THOMPSON of Louisiana. Have not the highway users provided millions of dollars over the past 20 years for general purposes?

Mr. SCHERER. I still say that the Thompson bill provides no financing.

Mr. THOMPSON of Louisiana. It certainly does.

Mr. SCHERER. As I say, these latter bills are ideal for those who want to point to the fact that they voted for roads but who want to avoid the political responsibility of providing the funds.

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. JONES].

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, so far the equation has been between two propositions. One group of advocates is for H. R. 7474 and the other is for the so-called Clay proposal. There are members of the committee who think that there is still a better approach to the solution of the highway problem than that contained in either one of those two proposals heretofore discussed.

I want to call the attention of the Members to the minority report commencing at page 36 of the committee report. I hope the Members will read the dissenting views, because it is impossible for us at this time to go into every section of the bill for the purpose of making a comparative analysis.

Let us review briefly the most recent history of the Highway Act. The most important category of roads to be dealt with in any of the three proposals is the interstate system of roads. Under the Highway Act of 1946, it provides that there would be a system of highways known as the interstate highway system or defense highways. It comprises 40,000 miles out of a total of 720,000 miles which make up the Federal road system that is eligible for Federal assistance. Up to the present moment there has been designated on the interstate system 37,600 miles. The balance of the mileage has yet to be designated.

In the 1952 act we authorized for appropriation the first money items for the interstate system. We provided $25 million. In the fiscal year that has just expired there was expended or contracted for expenditure $25 million for the 40,000 miles of road. This year there will be expended or authorized for expenditure under contract with the State highway departments $175 million on a matching basis of 60–40. All other categories of roads are on a 50–50 basis.

In the same period the secondary roads in 1955 got $165 million. In 1956, this year, they will get $210 million.

The primary or principal arterial roads, exclusive of the interstate system, got $247 million in the calendar year 1955 and $315 million for the fiscal year 1956.

The urban roads got $137 million for 1955 and $175 million for the fiscal year 1956.

Now let us see the differences between the proposals now pending before the committee. Section 1 of H. R. 7474 provides that the interstate system will obtain for the first year approximately $1.2 billions. The amounts made available in 1956 on the matching basis of the so-called ABC roads will be $725 million with an increase of $25 million annually until it reaches $1 billion. That is not provided for in the so-called Clay bill. The Clay bill freezes the amounts of money at the figure of the 1954 act. The bond would be issued for a 30-year period, with an accelerated amount for the interstate system. There would be no increases in the categories that are frozen.

In addition we have the Thompson bill, H. R. 7542, which provides for a 10-year program which provides for a billion dollars a year for the interstate system. We will commence the fiscal year 1957 with $725 million for the ABC roads and increase it $25 million a year until in 10 years it reaches the $1 billion.

The reason for that is that we acknowledge there is a tremendous road problem in our country. We are increasing the number of vehicles on our highways by approximately 3 billion a year, as the gentleman from Michigan pointed out. If we are going to take a uniform approach to the road program, it means that we cannot undertake the program and neglect other categories of roads. The interstate system carries only 14 percent or one-seventh of the total vehicular traffic now on our highways. Yet the adoption of either the Clay proposal or H. R. 7474 would mean that the interstate system would get a far disproportionate amount of money than would be obtained under a uniform approach such as proposed in the Thompson bill.

In section 3 of the Dondero bill, which is the Clay proposal, and the Fallon bill, which is H. R. 7474, there is a 20-percent exchange. We have heard a great deal of comment that the States could take this 20 percent which accrues under all categories of roads and transfer it to suit their needs. We all know that the State of Alabama or the State of New York or State of California, as the case might be, is not going to take the 90–10 money, that is, 90-percent Federal Government and 10-percent State government money and put it on the secondary or primary roads whereby they will be required to put up 50 percent of the total cost of the project. The 20-percent figure will make no great change in the ABC systems of roads nor will the State be a greater beneficiary or recipient of Federal assistance from the amounts made available to the interstate systems of roads.

Section 4 is the tax provision. Of course, it is the most controversial section of the bill. The so-called Clay plan, they say, does not increase the taxes, and the gentleman from Ohio made a great plea for honesty and forthrightness in dealing with this problem of taxes. If it is a forthright proposition that he insists upon, then let him oppose the so-called Clay bill where there is not one red penny to be collected in taxes, but which takes the money from the General Treasury of the United States where all the taxable sources of revenues is now deposited and turns it over to the corporation to pay that amount which naturally increases the deficit of the Federal

Treasury. How can you spend over $2 billion a year without jeopardizing the fiscal situation of the Federal Government when you increase the debt by a minimum of $24 billion in 10 years? If he wants to avoid that, then let him vote against the Clay plan. Under the Thompson proposal, there is the recognition that on this enormous program of road construction where we, for the first time, are providing an enormous amount of money in the sum of $1 billion for the construction of the interstate system that there is no great and imperative need for increased taxation. In the first place, these taxes expire on March 1, 1956.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Alabama has expired.

Mr. FALLON. I am sorry, but the time has all been allocated as fairly as I could divide the time between the members of the committee. I can give the gentleman an extra minute.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, the Committee on Ways and Means will have an opportunity next March to sit down and in an orderly fashion review the fiscal situation in relation to the $12.4 billion which is proposed in taxes under the Fallon bill. Why was it necessary for us to have to consider for the first time a revenue measure for raising money for a highway program? Further, we had 12 hours to consider the question of a $12.4 billion tax program. I hope that the provision of H. R. 7474 will be voted down, and that the so-called Clay plan will be rejected. I hope we will adopt a bill that will increase the amount for roads and give the Congress an opportunity to review this whole situation in a normal fashion, as we have done heretofore.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. SCUDDER], a member of the committee.

Mr. SCUDDER. Mr. Chairman, today we are considering one of the largest projects ever dreamed of, and more than likely the biggest project the world will ever attempt. As I recall, this project will amount to approximately 90 times the cost of the Panama Canal, all to be built within a period of about 12 years.

As a member of the Public Works Committee that for almost 2 months considered the administration bill which was the result of an extensive investigation by the Clay Commission, I feel that the theory in general is sound and that the highway program as recommended could be built without the imposition of any new or additional taxes. The opposition to the payment of interest during the reasonable life of this project in my opinion is very much of a bug-a-boo. Money in the taxpayers pocket from an interest standpoint offsets the interest charge that would accrue against the obligation for the construction of the highway. However, this bill was voted down in committee and as the Gore bill had passed the Senate, we are called to work out a compromise bill.

The original bill as submitted carried tax provisions that would have in many respects crippled the highway users and in my opinion, was very unfair. We were able to reduce the proposed taxes by amending H. R. 7474 to a point where at least the highway users could operate without the confiscation of the businesses and industries. H. R. 7474 is not a compromise measure but an entirely different approach to the cost for construction of highways. I voted to report this bill after we had greatly reduced the proposed taxes because I realize the great need for an adequate highway system. We cannot continue the terrific traffic casualties that amount to some 36,000 a year and the maiming of more than a million each year. The cost of our inadequate highways is estimated in loss of wages, medical expenses, property damage and cost of overhead insurance, at about $4,350,000,000 each year.

With improvements contemplated under this act, it is estimated that at least 4,000 lives will be saved each year because of safer highways, and millions of dollars in property losses. With the Federal Government assuming 90 percent of the cost of the national interstate system, the States with the amount of Federal appropriation money plus their own highway income, will be able to bring the highway system of our country up to a high standard of improvement within the 10-year program.

The Dondero bill H. R. 7494 I understand, will be offered as a substitute to H. R. 7474. If this substitute is approved I shall endeavor to amend the same by a reduced tax as contained in the present bill by the following amounts which will truly be a compromise bill: Reduce the gasoline tax from 1 cent to a half cent, reduce diesel fuel from 2 cents to 1 cent, reduce the tax on small truck tires from 3 cents to 2 cents per pound, reduce the tax on large sized tires from 10 cents to 5 cents, reduce the tax on large tubes from 6 cents to 4 cents per pound, reduce the tax on camelback from 15 cents to 7½ cents per pound but allow the 2 percent manufacturer's tax to remain the same as this would merely bring the truck tax on a par with the tax now imposed on private pleasure cars. These taxes though reduced would produce new income of about $7 billion and added to the tax now being collected, should retire the entire obligation in a period of less than 20 years. This should be a practical and reasonable compromise between the two theories set forth for the financing of this program.

I trust that when the opportunity presents itself that I may secure the support of the membership of the House.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. GEORGE].

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. Chairman, when I became a Member of the Congress in 1949, I requested appointment to the Public Works Committee. My reason for doing so was the fact that I had just completed 10 years of service in the Kansas State Highway Department in an executive capacity. During that period of time, I had attended numerous national conferences of State highway officials, and had attended numerous conferences of the States making up the Mississippi Valley group.

At these meetings I became thoroughly familiar with the highway problem of the United States—not only as it applied to rural and urban areas, but the tremendous deficiencies that exist in our great cities.

I thought, from my knowledge and background, I might be able to contribute something to the Public Works Committee, especially as it related to our national highway program.

During the first Congress, in 1950, I was also shocked and surprised to find that the Bureau of the Budget was only proposing a $400 million appropriation to the States.

The record showed that the gasoline tax alone was producing, in national revenue, almost twice that amount of money. I asked the representatives of the Bureau of the Budget how they justified their figure on the basis of our tremendous highway needs, and how they could reconcile less than 50 percent of the highway users tax going back to highways for construction to benefit the traveling public. They could not and did not try to justify their figure.

The Public Works Committee, in its wisdom, upon my motion, decided to increase this amount $100 million a year for construction purposes. We members of the Public Works Committee were still not satisfied that this was an adequate program, so under the leadership of Congressman HARRY MCGREGOR, who became chairman of the Roads Subcommittee of the Public Works Committee in 1952, your committee held exhaustive hearings on highway needs and what should and must be done to bring our highway program to a more nearly adequate system.

I want to assure you that these hearings were held entirely on a bipartisan and nonpolitical basis as our committee has always operated on this basis up to the present time. After these hearings, the Public Works Committee passed a greatly expanded highway program providing for $900 million in Federal aid.

Upon the basis of our study and what highway builders everywhere knew, and the traveling public were finding out to their sorrow, the Congress of the United States had been backing an entirely inadequate highway system. We had not even remotely tried to keep up with the tremendous needs in this field.

It was with this background and the special knowledge of our problem that the President of the United States, Dwight D. Eisenhower, appointed what has become known as the Clay Committee, to make recommendations to him as to how we could satisfactorily meet our tremendous transportation problem.

This was a bipartisan committee. They consulted with the National Association of State Highway Officials, all the Governors of the United States, all of the State highway departments, the organization of the Council of Mayors of the United States, and other interested groups.

After an exhaustive 3-month study, the Clay Committee made its report to the President, with certain specific recommendations as to how it would be feasible to implement this large highway-building program.

Congressman BUCKLEY, of New York, Congressman DONDERO, of Michigan, and myself, all introduced a highway measure intending to implement the Clay Committee recommendations, which would give us an adequate national highway defense system in a period of 10 years.

The Public Works Committee started its hearings the middle of April on the provisions written into this bill. The hearings lasted until June 1 and comprised 1,093 pages of testimony from all segments of our economy, 90 percent of whom endorsed the provisions contained in this proposed law.

At this point, I would like to introduce in the RECORD testimony given by Governor Ribicoff, of Connecticut, who appeared before our committee at the time of the governors' conference in Washington, and the evidence he gave was after the Senate had reported out the Gore bill. Governor Ribicoff's testimony is in line with the opinions expressed by a vast majority of the governors, as well as the mayors of the cities in the United States:

STATEMENT OF HON. ABRAHAM RIBICOFF, GOVERNOR OF THE STATE OF CONNECTICUT, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS, MAY 4, 1955

Governor RIBICOFF. All I want to say is, it is very good to get back and see so many of my former colleagues. As my eye goes around the hall, there are very few who did not serve with me in the 81st and 82d Congresses.

Of course, when you sit on the executive side, the problems look a little different than when you are on the legislative side.

But I do want to say I have been designated by the six New England governors to present the New England point of view. As you know, the New England States have 3 Democratic and 3 Republican governors. I come before you talking for Connecticut, Rhode Island, New Hampshire, Massachusetts, Vermont, and Maine.

All of us have studied this problem and we have come to a unanimous agreement that we prefer the Clay proposal to the Gore plan. As a matter of fact, we find that we would have great difficulty in matching the funds required by the Gore plan. We do find that we will not have any difficulty in supplying the matching funds under the Clay proposal. * * *

In answer to some of the questions you asked, we in New England feel that there is not anything wrong in bonding for capital improvements. You used the phrases "pay-as-you-go" or "pay later." I would like to substitute the phrases "pay-as-you-use" or "pay-as-you-ride." Basically these roads are going to be built for people to use during the next 30 years or more. Under those circumstances I do not think it is too onerous to expect the people who are actually using the roads to pay for those roads as they were using them, because it is the same thing in the most simple and elemental sense as a young man who is getting married and who wants to buy a house. I suppose he could save $500 a year for 25 or 30 years and then when he is an old man, get a house. Or, he can go down to the bank and get a mortgage on the house and enjoy it for the next 25 years or 30 years, and pay the interest charges, and capital expenditures off while he is using that home himself and his family.

It is my hope that this committee will report out a bill. As a governor, and listening to the governor's conference in Washington these last few days, it is very obvious that the highway needs in every State are as important as any other issue facing our people. I know and you know, whether it is the city of Washington, or Detroit, or Hartford, Conn., or wherever you come from, we have traffic snarls and traffic tangles that are really freezing the mobility of our Nation. With the amount of automobiles being used, if we do not solve the highway needs you are setting this Nation into economic paralysis. * * *

The six New England governors definitely feel that the Gore bill is not a good bill, and we do believe that the Clay program is a good program.

I respectfully hope that you gentlemen in considering this legislation will take these factors into account.

Mr. Chairman, up until June 1, the Public Works Committee had been practically free of partisan politics, and it was for this reason I have been proud to be a member of this committee. However, on that date, for some reason, our hearings on the President's proposal were stopped. The Democrat members of our committee met in private sessions, and a few weeks later, we were presented with the Fallon bill.

The Public Works Committee then proceeded to vote to substitute the Fallon bill for the President's bill. This was done with all the Democrat committee members voting for this substitution.

Of course, our committee was thrown into a turmoil. In order to prevent not having highway legislation this year, the committee voted to authorize the chairman and the ranking minority member to appoint a roads subcommittee of 5 Democrats and 4 Republicans to see if we could work out some compromise in the taxing provisions of the Fallon bill which would be more acceptable to the general public, and to see if we could once again restore the bipartisan action that has always prevailed in our Public Works Committee.

After numerous meetings by this roads subcommittee in which they scaled down the taxing provisions of the Fallon bill, the result of their action was presented to the full committee for its consideration. After further amending the Fallon proposal, we have the bill that is before us today for your consideration.

My State of Kansas is not particularly concerned or involved in this legislation because, out of our 128,000 miles of highway, 10,000 miles of which are on our Federal and State system, and 35,000 miles of which are on our farm-to-market system, we only have a little over 600 miles involved in the measure we are considering today for the interregional highway system.

If I were to look at this legislation purely from a congressional viewpoint, as it affects my district, or even as it affects my State, I would adopt the provincial attitude and be against all of these provisions. But with the knowledge I have, I realize the tremendous need for some type of an expanded highway program. I do not want to see us get bogged down in trying to promote the common good, in purely partisan politics.

It is my intention to support the amendment, which will be offered by Congressman DONDERO, to substitute the administration's measure in preference to the Democratic bill. I am doing this with the idea in mind that it will get the job done quicker and will cause less dislocation in our financial and taxing structure.

If this substitute is adopted by the Congress, and those people who want to substitute the taxing provision, and who believe we should more or less pay for this program as we go, they, of course, can push their taxing provisions in the next session of Congress.

It has occurred to me that we should, in fairness, try to raise more money for this program, and above all, we should see that if it is raised, it applies to our highway systems throughout the United States.

I believe the Ways and Means Committee should make an exhaustive study, starting in January, with the idea in mind of raising more revenue for highway purposes and equalizing inequalities they now have in existing law. For instance, they now levy tax on gasoline at the source and the average farmer throughout the United States, who burns tractor gasoline, is forced to contribute to this fund without any exemption or refund, while his more fortunate neighbor, who is operating on a much larger scale and can afford the investment in a diesel tractor, does not pay any tax for fuel consumed off the highway.

This procedure over a period of years has penalized the small farmer and given special privilege to the large operator with more high-priced equipment.

I think we should pass the President's proposal, based on the studies begun in past years, and on the Clay Committee Report, which was worked out with the governors, mayors, and State highway department officials of the United States.

If we substitute this measure for the Fallon bill, then I think the Ways and Means Committee should make adequate provisions in the coming year to liquidate this program as fast as they find it to be reasonable and practical.

I urge that you support the Dondero substitute.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. BECKER], a member of the committee.

Mr. BECKER. Mr. Chairman, I would just like to give a little history of the proposed bill known as the Clay plan. It bears the name of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DONDERO], the ranking minority member of the Committee on Public Works and former chairman of that committee.

First, however, I want to compliment the chairman of the Committee on Public Roads, the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. FALLON]. During the many long weeks of hearings he met with some very trying situations but through all of them kept his equilibrium and always came up with a smile. He treated every member of the committee fairly and every person who appeared before that committee received a full hearing.

This is the first time in my legislative experience, both as a member of the New York State Legislature and as a Member of the House, when a bill came before a committee with as comprehensive a report as this, submitted by the committee headed by Gen. Lucius D. Clay, a nonpartisan committee, made up of people who were experts in various fields of ac-

tivity. After many months of hearings, the Dondero bill was written, formulating the plan, which has been approved by the President of the United States.

The Committee on Public Roads held hearings for 7 long weeks, beginning on April 18 and running well into June. They appear in this volume of 1,100 pages of testimony. I can say without fear of contradiction that of the people appearing before the committee better than 95 percent spoke in favor of the Clay plan, which is the Dondero bill featuring the bond plan. Over 95 percent testified in favor of that plan. I can remember hardly anyone who testified against it. The governors of the various States appearing before the committee, both Democrats and Republicans, were heartily in favor of this plan of financing. Every one spoke in favor also of an interstate system throughout the entire United States, not only because of the economic benefits but for national-defense requirements.

Mr. Chairman, after the hearings were concluded we had silence for several weeks. Then we heard—I am speaking about myself and the Republican members—that the Democratic members of the Public Works Committee were holding private caucuses and would come up with a new bill. Several weeks later, we were apprised of a bill encompassing the various provisions that is now known as the Fallon bill. Before hearings were set on the Fallon bill we received hundreds and hundreds of telegrams and protests on its provisions.

Only then were hearings set on the tax provisions. Twelve hours of hearings were provided, and even in those hearings, I think the record will show, that there was a great deal of testimony in opposition to the taxing provisions.

Now, very briefly the picture is simply this: The Clay committee convinced me that the Dondero bill was a good bill and that the financing provisions were completely sound and workable. Seven weeks of testimony by various governors, experts, road people, and other witnesses confirmed that it was in the best interest of the people.

The question will be brought up here about $11.5 billion in interest to provide for the bonds under the Clay plan. Well, none of us like to pay interest. But let me call your attention to the fact that since 1945 this Congress has voted $65 billion in foreign aid, every dollar of which is deficit financing which means borrowed money and the taxpayers of this country are paying $1.6 billion a year in interest in order to provide for foreign aid. That makes $16 billion in interest that we will pay on that deficit financing for foreign aid in a 10-year period.

So, what is wrong with providing a plan for financing by a bond issue to give the American people good highways? I see nothing wrong in it. Our whole economy is based upon financing on installment buying. That is how this highway system can be built. I say that the Dondero bill is a good bill, and the bonding provisions are good, and I hope it prevails.

There is one thing I would like to say in closing. The Davis-Bacon provisions are not in the Dondero bill, I shall support that as an amendment, to be offered by the gentleman from Washington [Mr. MACK].

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, in reference to the general history of this highway legislation, I, too, want to join in the tributes that have been paid to the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. FALLON], in regard to the work that he has done on this bill. I also want to pay tribute to the chairman of our full committee, the gentleman from New York [Mr. BUCKLEY].

Through the cooperation of these two leaders of the committee and various other members, we achieved a notable victory in that committee, one that has been obscured in this fight about the taxing provisions. The great victory that was achieved was the resounding defeat of this so-called Clay plan or, let me be more specific, the Eisenhower plan, which was turned down by the committee by a good, substantial vote.

FINANCIAL HOCUS-POCUS

The Eisenhower plan was rejected in the committee for a number of reasons. I think the most obvious reason and the most compelling reason that motivated the people who voted against the Eisenhower plan was the question of the financial legerdemain involved in that plan. It was a matter of simple honesty as opposed to this question of whether you are going to try to cover up and conceal an addition to the national debt.

The gentleman from New York who just preceded me has made it very plain that the Eisenhower plan would be, as he says, an addition to the national debt. Of course, it would be written out in such a manner that it would not be added to the debt limit that would cost the taxpayers an extra $2 billion. But, that would not amount to much if it saved us from adding to the debt limit. What is $2 billion if we can avoid asking for a debt-limit increase? It is a cheap matter to put up $2 billion to stop from adding to the debt limit. In fact, we have spent more than that, and we will, to avoid this increase in the debt limit.

FREEZE ON OTHER PLANS

In addition to that, the Eisenhower plan would provide for a 30-year freeze of all of the normal Federal aid assistance. The normal primary and secondary roads assistance that we have been carrying on, that we have expanded this year for the first time at a good margin will be frozen at the present level. That is envisioned in order to pay for the Eisenhower bonds and to pay for this $11 or $12 billion in interest that would be required under that proposal.

There is some question as to actually how much the interest would be. We have estimates in regard to this interest that would make it perhaps higher than was suggested here.

MR. CAMPBELL'S OPPOSITION

A lot of statements have been made about the witnesses who appeared before our committee. Nobody on my left side has mentioned that very outstanding Republican appointed by the President of the United States to be Comptroller General, Mr. Joseph Campbell, who appeared before our committee and very strongly opposed the Clay plan and the method of financing as the worst type of unsound financial legislation.

The testimony of Mr. Campbell was one of the important factors in the decision of some 19 members of the committee to reject the Clay plan. As I mentioned earlier, the great victory that was achieved in our committee was the rejection of the Clay plan, which is nothing more than financial legerdemain to get up a pump-priming system that will help give us some economic activity, without the cost having to be reflected in the national debt as we normally consider it.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BALDWIN. Is it not true that in the committee, all the way through, the gentleman was opposed to any highway system?

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. That is completely untrue, and anybody who says that, I shall repeat it to him in stronger language.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. No; I do not want to dwell upon that point further. I made it very clear in the committee that if the financial plans proposed were in accordance with correct user taxes I would support such a plan. Unfortunately, the majority of the committee did not support my ideas.

TAX VOTES

While we are talking about that, I would like to pay my respects to some of my good Republican colleagues who have been complaining about the taxes in this bill, yet, when the issue came up in regard to taxes in the committee they voted for every one of them.

I would like to pay my respect to those people on the Republican side who complained about limited hearings, when the vast majority of the Republican members of the committee voted to limit those hearings.

There are a great many things wrong with this bill, as has been pointed out. We voted out $12 billion of taxes in 12 hours of hearings, or about a billion dollars per hour of hearings.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. I yield.

Mr. CRAMER. So far as the gentleman was concerned, the great victory in the committee was the defeat of the Clay proposal. Having won that victory, is the gentleman now willing to go along with the Fallon bill or is the gentleman going to vote for the Thompson bill, which is no bill at all?

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, I yielded for a question, not for a speech on the Thompson bill. I shall vote for the Thompson bill, which is certainly in keeping with a conservative attitude toward a financing program. If the gentleman on my left were concerned

about the economic policy of our country, were really concerned about how we should proceed under this program, they should consider the Thompson bill, which is a moderate bill, to start with, and which can be expanded in the future to meet any type of goal desired if economic conditions so indicate and if the workings under the bill should so indicate in the future.

PUMP PRIMING

I have heard some rumors from the left side of the aisle to the effect that one of the reasons for promoting this bill—it has not been brought out in debate, but several of them mentioned it to me privately—that this is a good bill to stir up economic activity in this country and keep things prosperous and make things all right in that way. I agree that perhaps it is along that line, but I have some question about how our overall economy would be affected by this bill.

Certainly the Fallon bill, which is before us, is much to be preferred to the Clay plan. But actually, the most conservative and the soundest approach that could be made to this legislation is the Thompson bill. We could accelerate the program as provided under the Thompson bill, consistent with the manner in which we can provide proper taxes upon the actual users of the interstate highway system, instead of putting them upon the general public, because 86 percent of the general public will not use this interstate highway system.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. I wonder if the gentleman, in stating his objections to the Clay plan has brought out the fact——

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. It actually was the Eisenhower plan.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. The Eisenhower plan, if the gentleman prefers to call it that—has brought out the fact that the testimony developed the fact that the roads would probably wear out in about 20 years, and that you would still be paying for another 10 years for roads that had already worn out?

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. I have not referred to that, but others have. We would be having second and third mortgages on these roads under the Eisenhower plan. At the same time the normal primary and secondary systems would be frozen with no additional aid.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. As a matter of fact, did not the Secretary of the Treasury, Mr. Humphrey, testify if that came about certain taxes would have to be imposed?

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. It was borne out in his testimony to the committee that we would either have to have new taxes at that time or new bonds.

Mr. SCUDDER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. SCUDDER. Was there anybody in authority who said these highways would be worn out in 20 years? As I understand it, they were remarks made by individuals. But the rights-of-way will not deteriorate, the foundations are not going to deteriorate, and the bridges will not deteriorate in that time.

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. The rights-of-way will not deteriorate, but I should point out the situation in a lot of the States right now, that the rights-of-way will become obsolete in connection with the construction of the new interstate system that we expect to authorize, I am told that in a lot of the States some of the present interstate system of rights-of-way will have to be abandoned because they are not large enough and it would be too expensive to widen them. That will be the situation when the traffic count gets higher at the end of this period.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. WITHROW].

Mr. WITHROW. Mr. Chairman, I yield to no one in my desire to see an adequate and constructive road program projected. I definitely feel that the program recommended by President Eisenhower and embodied in the measures introduced sometime ago by Congressman BUCKLEY, of New York, chairman of the Public Works Committee of the House, and by Congressman DONDERO, of Michigan, who is the ranking Republican member of the Public Works Committee. Both of these bills provided for the establishment of a Federal Highway Corporation and vested it with the authority to issue bonds to finance the program. Said bonds and the interest on them to be paid by the residue of the 2-cent gasoline and the 2-cent diesel oil tax after financing the Federal-aid program now in effect and which the Federal Government participates in to the extent of approximately $800 million, all on a 50–50 participation basis.

The testimony before the Public Works Committee was that there is a grave need for an expanded Federal-highway program, particularly as it affects our interstate system. All of the bills proposed to date emphasize a greatly expanded interstate highway program with the matching funds changed from the 50–50 formula to a 90–10 formula, with the Federal Government supplying 90 percent. I favor a bond issue to finance this expanded highway program. Secretary Humphrey, appearing before the committee, stated that he would have no difficulty selling the bonds. I shall support the Dondero substitute when it is proposed.

The need is urgent for new and improved highways; however, this is not a valid argument for adopting a revenue provision which is not only harsh, but, in my opinion, is discriminatory.

I am opposed to the revenue section of this bill for two reasons: First, that it places a further tax burden upon an already overtaxed product, gasoline; and, second, that it hits a class of taxpayers in my State who are now straining under the burden of a $60 million worth of State tax increase recently imposed by the Wisconsin Legislature.

I do not know how it has been with the rest of you, but I for one have been literally deluged with telegrams and other communications from the people back home asking me to spare them the added burden of this proposed increase in the Federal gasoline tax.

In Wisconsin the State gasoline tax was raised this year from a rate of 4 cents a gallon to 6 cents—a 50-percent increase—costing the highway users of my State an additional $22 million a year. Accordingly, this proposed 50-per cent increase in the Federal tax rate would add still another $11 million to their gas-tax burden.

Added to this is the fact that the Wisconsin Legislature this year found it necessary to increase some of the general State taxes which fall heavily upon car owners and other citizens alike. Among these was a $29 million increase in the surtax on individual incomes, and a $7 million increase in the cigarette tax. Such is the picture of the present tax situation in my own State, and probably in many other States as well.

With less than 2 million taxpayers in the State of Wisconsin, that $60 million increase in State revenue spells for the average citizen an added tax bill of $30 to $35 a year.

With 1.3 million motor vehicles registered in Wisconsin, the $22 million increase in the State gas tax means an added $17 a year for the average car owner to pay in that 1 item—and if we now add yet another cent to the Federal tax rate, he will be paying, on an average, more than $76 a year in gasoline taxes alone—half again as much as the $51 he paid last year.

This brings me to my other point—that gasoline is a commodity which is already being taxed at a staggeringly high rate when compared with all the other automotive products and supplies.

The prevailing price of regular gasoline in Wisconsin is now a little less than 23 cents a gallon, but when you add to that the 6 cents of State tax plus the proposed 3-cent Federal tax, you have a levy amounting to 40 percent of the selling price.

That, I submit, is exactly four times as much tax as we now pay on luxuries—and I am just wondering today how many people back home actually consider their cars to be such superluxuries as to warrant the fancy schedule of taxes now being fashioned for them to pay.

Many of the people I talked to seem to think that this Federal highway program, tied in as it is with national defense, should be financed in large measure out of general revenues and should not be paid for just by those people who happen to own automobiles and trucks.

Why, they ask, should the car owner, in the face of all the special taxes he now pays to support ordinary highway programs, be saddled with this extraordinary item of national defense spending?

That is a tough question to answer—and if the answer of this Congress is to be that the full weight shall be placed on highway users, then I say that the least we can do is turn our sights toward some of the other automotive taxes—the ones which are not duplicated at State level and which, therefore, now carry a far lower tax rate.

The present 10-percent Federal excise on new cars now produces about $1 billion a year, while the 8-percent tax on trucks, trailers, and buses yields another

$200 million or more. If we were to increase those rates—not to the 40-percent level at which gasoline is now taxed—but merely to a conservative 15-percent rate, we would gain an additional $675 million a year in revenue. That is $175 million more than the $500 million the proposed increase in the Federal gas tax is calculated to produce.

But looking into this a little further, just as a matter of interest, we might also apply that 15-percent rate to the item of auto parts and accessories, which are now taxed at 8 percent. There we would gain $179 million a year.

And as for tires and tubes, we have heard a good bit of testimony on that point. The present tire tax, though stated in terms of cents per pound, figures out, I believe, to about 6 percent of the price. By boosting that tax rate to the equivalent of a 15-percent levy, we would get another $200 million or more.

Lubricating oil is another item to be considered, but in checking into that I find that the present Federal tax of 6 cents a gallon already amounts to something between 37 and 50 percent of the manufacturer's price, so there is no need to talk of raising that one. It is already 2 or 3 times as high as our hypothetical 15-percent level.

So now let us recapitulate to see, just as a matter of curiosity, what revenue gains we would achieve by applying a 15-percent rate or its equivalent to all those Federal automotive taxes which are not duplicated at State level.

A 15-percent tax on new automobiles would add $500 million a year.

A similar rate on trucks, trailers, and buses would add $175 million a year.

A 15-percent tax on parts and accessories would add $179 million a year.

The equivalent of a 15-percent tax on tires and inner tubes would add about $200 million or more.

All of these add up to something over $1 billion a year in increased revenues—and all this without increasing any of those individual taxes to anything higher than 15 percent, which is but a fraction of the present level of taxation on gasoline.

But bear in mind that I am not saying that this is what we should do. As I said before, I feel that the people of my State—and especially those who own automobiles—are already paying full and plenty in special taxes levied for highway purposes. They should not be called upon to finance this phase of national defense single-handed.

My point is this: that with combined taxes on gasoline in Wisconsin and most other States now amounting to 35 percent of the price, and going up to 40 percent if we impose this Federal increase.

And with so many States now faced with the necessity of further raising their State gas tax rates as the only apparent means of financing their own part of the vast highway program blueprinted for them by the Federal Government.

Where is the wisdom of a proposal that puts the Federal Government in the position of further invading this particular field of taxation which is the mainstay source of State highway revenue and a field in which the States themselves hold a prior claim?

Why should the tax on gasoline constantly go up and up—to 40, 50, and perhaps some day to 100 percent of the retail price, while all these other automotive excises—which are not duplicated at State level—must be held so sacredly to a conservative level of 10 percent or less?

The same argument applies with equal force to the increase in the Federal tax on diesel fuel oil. I believe that the proposed differential between gasoline and diesel fuel is not justified. The economy of operating a diesel engine is being narrowed each year by improvements in gasoline engine design and development. Any differential presupposes a fixed and constant fuel consumption differential between the gasoline and diesel engine. These assumptions are not valid.

I am likewise opposed to the additional taxes on tires and tubes imposed in section 4 of the most recent Fallon bill. I am not sure that these taxes will not do harm to a great industry. I say this because I believe that the Public Works Committee of the House is not in any position to pass on taxation matters which have such an impact on our present economy as do the taxes imposed in section 4 of H. R. 7474. In discussing the taxation features in our committee at all times there was considerable confusion due to the fact that the committee had neither the experience nor the facilities to act wisely on these very intricate and related activities. Probably the most absurd situation was in Mr. FALLON's first bill, H. R. 7072. There was a tax imposition of 20 cents a pound on recapped or retreaded tires which would make the cost of the retreaded tire more than the cost of a new tire and would put in the neighborhood of 10,000 firms now recapping tires out of business. Likewise the other revenue features of the first Fallon bill were ridiculously high; they have now been toned down and somewhat corrected, I believe, for the prime purpose of obtaining support in this House. These tax features of the highway bill should have been gone over by the Ways and Means Committee so that we would have an experienced and capable analysis of the taxes and of the repercussions it was reasonable to expect the taxes would have upon our present economy.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WITHROW. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. I certainly think the gentleman is making a wonderful statement and I know he has worked hard on this matter. We are both deeply interested in problems that face certain municipalities and I am sure he will recall that while the highway legislation was being considered by the Public Works Committee, the representatives of the city of Milwaukee, and of the cities of La Crosse and Madison, called to our attention a problem that has arisen in conjunction with the eligibility of certain urban routes for Federal assistance.

The representatives of these cities suggested that the 1955 Highway Act include a provision which would make certain urban routes, which do not constitute direct extensions of the primary or secondary systems, eligible for Federal assistance.

Will the gentleman advise me whether the bill before us contains a provision which would carry into effect the recommendations made by the above-mentioned cities?

Mr. WITHROW. Indeed I was very much interested in regard to that. Mr. DuPont, President Eisenhower's special assistant, who was assigned to the road conference told us under interrogation that section 3 of H. R. 7474 would take care of that because it would permit of the transfer of 20 percent of funds if approved by State highway authorities.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. In other words, the bill before us will make Federal assistance available for certain lateral, feeder, distributor, circumferential, and civil defense evacuation routes which may be required to furnish maximum utility of the various Federal-aid systems within or adjacent to urban areas.

Mr. WITHROW. We were assured by Mr. DuPont that it would.

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the Delegate from Alaska [Mr. BARTLETT].

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Chairman, there has been a suggestion or two here this afternoon that the taxing provisions of this bill constitute its most controversial feature. I do not dissent from that conclusion. In fact, the taxing provisions are the all-important ones to Alaska. Indeed, they are the only ones which apply. Here is a situation where taxes are being imposed without any corresponding benefits, or any benefits at all. I do think it is important that the interests of the more than 200,000 people in Alaska be recognized even though the main consideration has to do with more than 160 million highway users elsewhere.

Alaska is the only one of the States or Territories not included within the Federal aid highway system. Puerto Rico is included. Hawaii is included. Even the District of Columbia is included. But not Alaska.

All our public domain roads are now built by direct appropriations made to the Department of the Interior in the annual Interior Department appropriation bill. Of course, supplementary funds are advanced by the Territory of Alaska, although not according to an established formula.

So if H. R. 7474 should be enacted or any bill with similar taxing provisions, it will mean that Alaskans will have to pay more for gasoline, more for diesel fuel for highway vehicles, more for tires—without a dollar being returned for roads. I submit that this is altogether unfair. At this time we play our part in making available Federal funds for road construction and road maintenance by the Department of the Interior on the Alaska public domain in that we pay all highway taxes applied to Americans elsewhere. Now it is intended apparently to impose upon us these very substantial increases without any benefits being returned.

Long ago I took up with the Clay Committee the proposition of devising a formula so that Alaska might be included in the administration's highway plans.

The reply made to me in effect said that it was well understood that Alaska's 586,000 square miles had a highway system extending only about 3,000 miles because the Federal Aid Acts were not applicable there; yet at the same time, because the general Federal system did not extend to the Territory of Alaska, the committee could not consider Alaska's needs. Subsequently, I urged upon the appropriate legislative committees what I considered the high desirability of making provision for Alaska roads under the accelerated building plans being advanced in the various bills which were taken up. Yet the net result is that no provision has been made for Alaska except that we shall be taxed along with those who will actually benefit from highway improvements which increased taxes will bring.

I cannot state with positiveness why it is that despite efforts made at various times Alaska has never been included in the Federal Highway System. It is certain that it must be if the country is to be opened up by the same type of road-building program which has had such marvelous results elsewhere under the American flag.

The report on H. R. 7474 states that it is intended to produce revenues sufficient for a pay-as-you-go highway building program. So far as Alaska is concerned, it will be a stay-where-you-are program. Alaskans will pay but they will not go. They will not be permitted to.

The report elsewhere states that "Because the committee believes that the additional burdens resulting from its tax program should fall largely upon highway users, it has made provision for the exemption of nonhighway users. The committee has also attempted to concentrate the burden upon those who will benefit most directly from the improvement of the Nation's highway system." Using then the committee's own criteria, I want to suggest with all possible emphasis that before final action is had upon a highway bill that justice and equity demand that Alaska be exempted from its taxing provisions.

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. ZABLOCKI].

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the legislation before us.

Earlier today, I voted against the rule under which the Highway Act of 1955 was brought before this House. I did this because I objected to the conditions outlined in the rule, which prohibit amendments to section 4 of the bill, other than those proposed by members of the Public Works Committee.

Now, to me section 4 of the bill before us is of grave importance. This section, in effect, increases taxes on highway users by some $12 billion over the period of time involved in this legislation. Twelve billion dollars is a tremendous amount of money. I felt that the proposed tax increases warranted a full study by the Ways and Means Committee, which is the taxwriting committee of this House. While I am wholeheartedly in favor of financing highway improvements on a pay-as-you-go basis, I did not feel that a $12 billion tax boost should be voted without prior study of the subject by the Ways and Means Committee, or without opening that section of the bill to floor amendments.

This issue, however, was settled when the majority of this House voted to accept the rule. What we have to consider now is the overall highway bill.

I am in favor of the bill because it will help to solve our highway problem. Now most of us will agree that the economy of our Nation is greatly dependent upon motor-vehicle transportation. We will also agree that we have failed to keep our highway systems adequate to meet our needs, and that we have piled up a backlog of deficiencies which will have to be overcome if our economy is not to become stagnated.

In 1946, 9 years ago, we had some 34 million motor vehicles registered in the United States. This year, the registrations have reached the 58-million mark. Further, it is estimated that within 10 years that number will be increased to 81 million.

While this astonishing increase has been taking place, our expenditures for highway construction and improvements have lagged behind. In terms of 1941 dollars, we spent less on highway programs in 1953 than we did in 1938, even though the number of registered motor vehicles had almost doubled between those two dates.

Such a state of affairs cannot be permitted to continue. We must try to improve our highway program, and we must do so quickly.

I believe that the bill before us will help us to solve our national highway problem. It is true that the bill does not go as far as some people feel it should go. Nevertheless, it is a constructive piece of legislation and it merits our support. It is my hope that the bill will be approved without delay.

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HAYS].

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. Mr. Chairman, on June 30 of this year the Commission on Intergovernmental Relations, a Presidential commission, sometimes referred to as the Kestenbaum Commission, on which 5 members of this House serve, completed 2 years of arduous work in studying various grants-in-aid programs. Among the topics to receive considerable attention and study is the matter of improved highways. I have not had an opportunity to study the application of general principles which the Commission recommends to the bill now pending, but I do wish to call to the attention of the House the principal recommendations of the Commission as set forth in its report. It is to be regretted that the report was delayed and that few Members of the House have had an opportunity to study the detailed recommendations and findings of this Commission. It will take but a few moments to read the principal recommendations and with your indulgence I shall do that. I shall include as a part of my remarks the entire chapter on highways.

Mr. DOLLIVER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa, who rendered an excellent service as a member of the Commission.

Mr. DOLLIVER. Is it not true that the Commission spent a great deal of time considering the problem of State and Federal relationships with respect to highways and that probably we had more discussion and more controversy about this subject than any other single subject that was studied by the Commission? We considered it from the very beginning and found ourselves finally in pretty good agreement on it.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. Yes; that is certainly true, and I appreciate the contribution of my friend from Iowa.

Here are the Commission's recommendations:

The Commission recommends that the actual construction and maintenance of highways be performed by the States and their subdivisions.

The Commission recommends that the present Federal-aid highway program be continued and that funds appropriated thereunder be increased. The increase in funds should be so allocated as (1) to give recognition to the national responsibility for highways of major importance to the national security, including special needs for civil defense, and (2) to provide for accelerated improvement of highways in order to insure a balanced program to serve the needs of our expanding economy.

The Commission recommends that the expanded highway program be financed substantially on a pay-as-you-go basis and that Congress provide additional revenues for this purpose, primarily from increased motor fuel taxes.

The Commission recommends a reduction in the extent and degree of Federal supervision accompanying highway grants-in-aid.

The Commission recommends the repeal of provisions of the Hayden-Cartwright Act requiring the States to expend certain amounts of specific taxes for highway purposes.

Mr. Chairman, in addition to the recommendations which I have just read I believe that the Members would be interested in the comments of chapter 11 of the report and with permission of the House I am including it in my remarks as follows:

CHAPTER 11

HIGHWAYS

From the inception of our Federal system, a nationwide interest in highways has been recognized. The Constitution itself gives Congress the powers to establish post-roads and to regulate commerce among the States.

During the first 40 years of the Republic, many turnpikes were constructed by private companies seeking profit through tolls. Some of the States invested in the securities of the turnpike companies. In 1806, the National Government began construction of the National Pike, or Cumberland Road, and by 1819 the road extended 131 miles from Cumberland, Md., to Wheeling, W. Va., on the Ohio River. By 1819, Pennsylvania had completed a surfaced highway from Philadelphia to Pittsburgh.

Soon after the development of the steam locomotive in 1830, the resources of the country were directed to construction of railroads, and highways entered a period of neglect. Until almost the turn of the 20th century, local governments handled such road building as was done. A good-roads movement in the late 19th century was spearheaded by a coalition of bicyclists demanding smooth roads for recreation, farmers wanting to get out of the mud, and railroad interests seeking feeders to their lines. During the 1890's State aid to counties for road construction was begun and several State highway departments were organized. The movement spread rapidly,

particularly after the automobile appeared. By 1917, all States were participating in highway development.

In the same period, the National Government developed an interest in highways that has continued to the present day. An Office of Road Inquiry, established in the Department of Agriculture in 1893, eventually became the Bureau of Public Roads in the Department of Commerce. Federal highway activities, including aid to the States, are presently centered in this Bureau. From 1893 to 1912, the Bureau's functions were limited to investigation and research. In 1912, the Congress authorized $500,000 for an experimental program in rural postroad construction. The Federal-Aid Road Act of 1916 continues to be a part of the basic legislation governing Federal highway aid. It authorized Federal aid funds of $75 million over a 5-year period and, together with legislation enacted in 1921, established the principles of (1) limiting Federal aid to construction projects on designated primary highway systems, (2) apportioning funds among States by statutory formula, and (3) requiring State matching of Federal aid in fixed proportions.

During the depression of the 1930's, the National Government participated in highway construction through various emergency programs which were outside the regular channels of highway aid. As a matter of fact, in every year from 1936 to 1941, inclusive, emergency highway aid exceeded regular aid by substantial amounts.

New regular aid programs for designated urban extensions of primary highways and for a limited mileage of secondary roads were initiated under the Highway Act of 1944. This act also provided for selection of a national system of interstate highways limited to 40,000 miles. Authorization of aid specifically for the interstate highway system was first provided in the 1952 act.

Extent of Federal aid

Regular Federal highway aid (as distinguished from special or emergency aid) has supplied only 8.51 percent of total revenues used for all highway purposes over the 33-year period since 1921. By intervals, the percentages are: 1921–31, 5.76 percent; 1932–42, 9.19 percent; 1943–53, 9.49 percent. However, regular Federal aid has supplied much larger percentages of expenditures for highway construction, as shown in the following comparison:

	Total highway construction expenditures	Regular Federal aid	Percentages
	Million	*Million*	
1921–31	$12,106	$1,075	8.88
1932–42	13,686	2,254	16.47
1943–53	18,330	3,328	18.16
	44,122	6,657	[1] 15.09

[1] Average.

It is estimated that total expenditures for highway construction in 1954 were $3.7 billion, of which $2.1 billion was expended on systems eligible for Federal aid. About $600 million, or 16 percent, of the $3.7 billion represented Federal funds.

Federal aid authorizations for each of the fiscal years 1954 and 1955 total $575 million; for 1956 and 1957 the total is $875 million for each year, as follows:

	Each fiscal year 1954 and 1955	Each fiscal year 1956 and 1957
Interstate system	$25,000,000	$175,000,000
Primary system	247,500,000	315,000,000
Secondary system	165,000,000	210,000,000
Urban highways	137,500,000	175,000,000

There is considerable lag between the authorization figures and actual appropriations. Payments are made only as money is needed to meet State claims for reimbursement; claims are not filed until actual construction begins.

National participation in the total highway expenditure varies greatly from State to State. When expressed in terms of all highway costs, including planning, construction, maintenance, interest, and administrative overhead, the percentages of Federal aid in 1952 highway expenditures were 3.7 percent in New Jersey, 4 percent in Maryland, and 8.6 percent in California. At the other extreme, percentages were 35.1 in Wyoming, 33.5 in Nevada, and 26.6 in New Mexico. When expressed in terms of construction costs only, the National Government's share ranged from 6 percent in New Jersey to 53.9 percent in Nevada.

Federal aid is apportioned among the States by statutory formulas which give weight to population, land area, and specified road mileage. Prior to the 1954 act, dollar for dollar matching of all Federal funds was required in most States, an exception being made for States in which unappropriated and unreserved public lands and nontaxable Indian lands constituted more than 5 percent of the total area. In these States the matching requirements were reduced according to the amount of such lands. The 1954 Federal-Aid Highway Act reduced the State matching share from 50 to 40 percent for the interstate system, again providing a downward adjustment for States with large public-land areas. State per capita income is not taken into account in either the allotment or the matching process.

Allocation of responsibilities

Large public expenditures for highways during the past three decades have produced a highway network which in many respects is the finest and most extensive in the world. But the highway system as a whole does not yet measure up to the growth of population and traffic, economic advancement, and change, and imperative defense needs. If, indeed, the highway situation is critical, then the National, State, and local governments all have a vital stake and a large obligation in its rectification. If the United States is to maintain and advance its productive and defensive strength, which depends so largely upon the efficiency and economy of the transportation system, an acceleration of the rate of highway improvement is needed, particularly with respect to major highways. Consequently, the Commission bases its recommendations upon the necessity for a stepped-up highway construction program during the next 5 to 10 years.

In the view of the Commission, the primary responsibility for highway development rests with States and their subdivisions. A preponderant proportion of the country's total highway mileage is intrastate or primarily local in character, and State and local highway departments by and large are competent and adequate. However, the national interest in an adequate highway system is so great as to justify action by the National Government, at certain times and under certain conditions, in encouraging and supplementing State action. National-State highway relationships should be flexible, not static. Under normal conditions States can and should fulfill their responsibilities for highway functions with a minimum of Federal aid. But when defense needs or economic conditions disrupt the status quo, the National Government should expand its role.

In the light of these premises, the following recommendations are submitted:

The Commission recommends that the actual construction and maintenance of highways be performed by the States and their subdivisions.

The National Government should give technical assistance to and cooperate with the States on problems of highway construction and maintenance. However, only in those cases where a highway is built in a National park, reservation, or similar area, or as limited access to a Federal facility, should construction be undertaken by the National Government.

It would be a basic mistake and wasteful duplication for the National Government to embark upon a new program of actually building, maintaining, and operating any large segment of the highway network. Highway construction and maintenance have been handled by the States and localities with consistent competence.

The Commission recommends that the present Federal aid highway program be continued and that funds appropriated thereunder be increased. The increase in funds should be so allocated as (1) to give recognition to the National responsibility for highways of major importance to the national security, including special needs for civil defense, and (2) to provide for accelerated improvement of highways in order to insure a balanced program to serve the needs of our expanding economy.[1 2 3]

[1] Mayor Henderson believes that in carrying out the recommended highway program, greater emphasis ought to be placed upon the development of highways in urban areas.

[2] Mr. Burton, Governors Thornton, Jones, and Shivers, Senator Schoeppel, and Congressman Dolliver join in the following statement:

"We regretfully dissent from this major highway recommendation by the Commission. The recommendation endorses a permanent direction we believe to be unsound.

"In recent years State executives had substantially moved to a position of supporting State assumption of highway responsibilities upon the release of national highway user revenue sources for State use. This could not be done suddenly and was subject to reservations regarding federally impacted areas and the circumstances of States wherein there was a low ratio of population to highway mileage like the Western States with their large area of Federal land holdings.

"We likewise recognize that an important exception should be made for purposes of economic stabilization, and also for the need to 'catch up' on current highway deficiencies in the interstate system and metropolitan arterial systems. We are deeply impressed by the persuasive argument of the President that this Nation mobilize all its forces to arrest the terrible traffic toll upon human life, and that the National and State Governments work together on this important task. We believe that national assistance in 'catching up' is warranted by safety, military, and civilian defense necessities.

"Nevertheless, the above reservations are minor alterations of the principle of State responsibility and the 'catch-up' needs are of an emergency nature—but a real emergency. Federal assistance can speed the time when the ultimate fiscal and administrative highway responsibilities can be returned to the States and we believe that the Commission should be definitive in recommending this.

"We believe that every effort should be made to conduct the program on a pay-as-you-go basis. We are not intransigent in this matter but stress the importance of a sound balance of urgent need, fullest possibilities of current financing, and the capacity of contractors to do the job."

[3] Governors Driscoll and Battle dissent, as follows:

"We do not question the need for a greatly improved highway system. The States have recognized this need and have established new records for highway construction. In the development of a highway program it is

The Commission is cognizant of existing critical highway needs and of the efforts being exerted by all levels of government to meet them. Total governmental highway expenditures for 1954 are estimated at $6.4 billion, compared to $4.9 billion 3 years earlier. Legislation enacted in 1954 increased Federal financial assistance to the States for highway purposes by more than 50 percent. However, there is abundant evidence that the current rate of highway improvement is not sufficient to meet current emerging needs. Failure to meet these needs will seriously affect the national security and the national economy. Humanitarian considerations alone, in terms of reducing the annual toll of highway accidents, call for vigorous action in revamping the unsafe segments of the highway network.

The Commission believes that there is sound justification for Federal participation in the improvement of many highways. The Commission generally approves existing legislation, which provides Federal aid for primary highways, including interstate routes and urban extensions, and for secondary roads, including farm-to-market roads.

The Commission believes that present circumstances justify a concentration of increased Federal highway funds on a limited mileage of highways of key importance to interstate commerce and to military and civilian defense. However, this does not mean that other highways now eligible for Federal highway aid should be neglected in an expanded program.

The Commission believes that civil defense is primarily a responsibility of the National Government. This has particular relevance in the case of highways required for civil defense. Special and costly features needed to adapt new roads to civil defense needs should be financed largely by the National Government.

The Commission considers toll highways a matter of State and local policy. Present and past Federal-aid highway acts have provided, however, that no tolls may be charged on roads partly financed by the National Government. The Commission endorses this principle and recommends that no Federal aid be given for any toll road.

Financing and supervision

The Commission recommends that the expanded highway program be financed substantially on a pay-as-you-go basis and that Congress provide additional revenues for this purpose, primarily from increased motor-fuel taxes.[4]

The effect of the Commission's recommendation on highway aids will be to increase Federal expenditures substantially. Additional revenues should be provided to meet a major share of these expenditures. An increase in taxes is preferable to deficit financing as a means of supporting larger highway outlays by the National Government. The latter method would result in high interest charges and would shift the burden to citizens of a future generation, who will have continuing highway and other governmental responsibilities of their own to finance.

The Commission recommends a reduction in the extent and degree of Federal supervision accompanying highway grants-in-aid.

Congress should be constantly alert to prevent procedural abuses by any administrative agency to which it may delegate duties. Federal agencies should diminish controls over the details of State highway planning, design, and construction. Over the years, the Bureau of Public Roads has made a notable contribution to highway improvement in this country through technical leadership and the stimulation and coordination of State activity in this field. However, in the light of the maturity and competence of most State highway departments, it appears to the Commission that the Bureau of Public Roads could relax much of its close supervision of State highway work. The Bureau has already made a good start but more can be done.

The 1954 Highway Act sensibly permits, under certain conditions, the substitution of certifications by State highway authorities for detailed compliance checks by the National Government. National legislation and administrative regulations of the Bureau of Public Roads might well leave the States free to carry forward their highway programs, simply certifying that they have complied with Bureau requirements. Through spot checks of performance and through complete accounting records, the Bureau could forestall misuse of Federal funds.

Although the Commission favors relaxation of Federal supervision, it believes that the National Government should continue to prescribe basic minimum standards for the construction of federally aided highways. Moreover, where interstate highway connections are involved, the Bureau of Public Roads should continue to exercise strong guidance.

The Commission recommends the repeal of provisions of the Hayden-Cartwright Act requiring the States to expend certain amounts of specific taxes for highway purposes.

The National Government may rightfully require State matching of aid which it extends, as the law already provides. Beyond this the National Government should not go. The States should be free to use their tax revenues as they see fit. Elsewhere in this report the Commission has urged a careful reappraisal by the States of all constitutional and statutory requirements, such as earmarking of specific taxes, which fetter the ability of the States and their subdivisions to deal with their fiscal problems. Certainly the National Government should not add to the fiscal problems of the States by imposing additional and unnecessary restrictions.

---

unwise to pledge gasoline taxes that may be paid 10 years from now to meet today's needs. It is equally unwise during a period of comparatively full employment for the Nation to go substantially into debt to meet its highway requirements. Likewise, there must be a reasonable balance between the construction program and the ability of contractors to build roads on a competitive basis.

"The Commission's proposal, when compared with the unrealistic programs presently being considered, is moderate. Its advocacy of a pay-as-you-go program for free public highway is commendable. However, we must dissent from the Commission's recommendation for an increase in highway grants for the following reasons:

"(1) Responsibility for the construction and maintenance of a modern nationwide highway system should rest with the States. They have demonstrated their ability to cooperate with one another in the development of an interstate system. Within the various regions of this country, they are more conscious of their own and one another's needs than any agency of the National Government. If given the opportunity to do so, they may be expected to meet the national interest.

"(2) While the total contribution of the National Government for highway construction is small in comparison with the contribution of the States and their political subdivisions, its impact on State budgets and policies is substantial because of a wide variety of administrative and policy controls. These range all the way from an attempt by the National Government to compel the States to dedicate State taxes to a discrimination against toll roads and parkways. In addition, the Government has sought to control wages, establish national standards, choose routes, and more recently an attempt has been made to control the use of margin areas along federally aided highways. Any increases in highway grants may be expected to increase the budgetary impact and further curtail the fiscal independence of the States. History discloses that representatives of the Bureau of Public Roads have on more than one occasion advocated increased authority over State highways. An increase in the grants will tend to give the National Government a dominant vested interest, with Federal control the inevitable consequence.

"(3) The proposal continuing two or more levels of government in a single operation increases costs, retards construction, and results in wasteful duplication and overlapping of effort where none is necessary.

"(4) There is a better way to accelerate the construction of an adequate national highway system. The present Federal gasoline tax should be repealed. This may be done outright or on a tax offset basis, as in the case of the unemployment compensation tax. If the later procedure is adopted, it should be the prelude to outright repeal of the tax. The gasoline tax now being collected by the National Government was first imposed as a temporary tax to meet an emergency situation and has long been regarded by many as a tax that should be returned to the States. In a limited number of States which have large Federal land holdings and in which the need for highway aid may be demonstrated, it should be granted for a limited period out of general revenues of the National Government.

"(5) The funds required to support the grant-in-aid device are collected from the citizens of the States. The States with the greatest density of population, the greatest highway needs, and the largest number of traffic accidents are likewise the States whose citizens make the largest contribution to the Federal Treasury. These are also the States to which the largest highway grants will be given. This unnecessary and wasteful 'exchange' of tax dollars inevitably strengthens the centralization of our Government in Washington. In fact, the grant-in-aid programs that have been proposed are more likely to strengthen centralized bureaucracy than to speed highway construction. By requiring more dollars for administration, these programs leave fewer dollars for pavements. By the same token they weaken State and local governments. As de Tocqueville said: 'A democratic people tends toward centralization, as it were by instinct. It arrives at provincial institutions only by reflection.'"

[4] Mr. Folsom dissents from this recommendation:

"The Nation's needs for an improved interstate highway system are urgent. Unless taxes are increased substantially, borrowing may be needed to finance accelerated construction of this system. The borrowing needed should be done on a self-liquidating basis with the amount of debt related to anticipated highway-user revenues. Regardless of the method of financing, Federal highway expenditures should be paid for from highway-user revenues only, not from general tax revenues."

Mrs. Hobby, Mr. Burton, and Governor Thornton join in this dissent.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as she may desire to the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. ST. GEORGE].

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Chairman, I would like at this time to put in the RECORD something which bears out what has already been well said here today. That is, this is not a political matter. While it is not a political matter I think we all have a right to a difference of opinion. I hold in my hand a telegram which I

would like to read, and may I say, incidentally, that I am not the only one to receive this telegram. It reads as follows:

Before recording your position on pending highway program and related tax increases, I respectfully urge further study of the far reaching effects of such legislation on basic economy of our State. My appeal for your consideration is based on conviction that harmful results must follow imposition of huge burden of new taxes on motor vehicles now widely used in practically all branches of New York industry, agriculture, and commerce. Suggestion that more thought be given tax question is addressed to entire New York delegation regardless of party affiliation. Am certain every Representative in both parties wants to safeguard the future prosperity of our State just as much as I do. Cannot help regarding proposed increases in excises on vehicles, other equipment, tires, tubes, etc., as burdensome and discouraging to operators, but wish to comment in particular on much larger sums involved in suggested increases on motor fuel. Some Members of Congress from New York may not realize that present State and Federal taxes on motor fuel now take $180 million yearly out of pockets of our vehicle owners. New State and Federal taxes passed this year or now pending would add $90 million beginning January 1, 1956, raising total to $270 million, annually. Of this tremendous sum, motor-trucks, which are the work horses of the economy and provide services essential to every family and all business, will be forced to pay 30 percent or $80 million yearly. I believe such drastic measures call for more thorough study even if decision on question has to go over to next session.

Regards.

I would just like to say that the telegram is from James A. Farley, who certainly has the interest of our State at heart and certainly cannot be accused of being a partisan of my side of the aisle.

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 8 minutes to the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. BURNSIDE].

Mr. BURNSIDE. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. WILSON], asked a question as to the adequacy of the program and as to the statement that Secretary Humphrey made while he was a witness before the committee. I read now from the committee print so that this may be straight in the RECORD:

Mr. BOGGS. I have just one other question. As I understand your answer to my previous question, it is that if this bill provides the necessary revenues out of current revenues, then you approve the bill. Is that correct?

Secretary HUMPHREY. To do the job. Any bill that will do the job in the necessary time and that will raise sufficient revenue to pay as we go is the thing I cannot object to as Secretary of the Treasury of the United States.

Now let me follow that with another quote from Mr. BOGGS and the Secretary:

Mr. BOGGS. One final question and I am finished.

Secretary HUMPHREY. The only thing, Mr. BOGGS, this committee must not do, is to pass a bill and not provide some way of financing it.

Mr. BOGGS. One final question. Have you studied the tax schedules proposed in this bill?

Secretary HUMPHREY. I have. Yes, sir.

Mr. BOGGS. What do you think of them?

Secretary HUMPHREY. I think that it will raise the money outlined. I think the figures and the computations are correct as nearly as can be reasonably estimated, and I think it will raise the amount of money over the period approximately as they are outlining it. * * *

Mr. BOGGS. Do you think the proposal is fair and equitable?

Secretary HUMPHREY. That is a very big question.

Mr. BOGGS. It sure is.

Secretary HUMPHREY. I think it is a pretty good spread of the taxes that would be required among the people that will benefit from a substantially improved highway system.

Mr. BOGGS. That is all, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman, I am sure you have just heard of the Kastenbaum pay-as-you-go report. I feel this so strongly because I know the problem West Virginia has had to meet its costs, and I know in that State they have paid as they go, and they have gotten pretty good roads for the money they have been spending.

Mr. Chairman, the highway-aid bill now under consideration by this body is the most important piece of legislation to be discussed here this session. We had more than 15 weeks of debate on this bill in our committee. Its success or failure can have a vital impact on the economic well-being of this country over the next 2 or 3 decades. Everyone testifying before our committee realized that we needed the highways. Not a single person would say we did not need the highways.

I am sure that no one here has any doubt of the extreme need to plan and accelerate the construction of a bigger and better highway system in the United States. We have 90- to 100-mile-per-hour cars and 30- to 40-mile-per-hour highways. So you can see easily why there is the slaughter on the highways that the Members have been talking about this afternoon.

It is a matter which demands action now. At the present time, there are 58 million automobiles, 10 million trucks, and 250,000 buses crowding our highway system. Traffic experts predict the total will increase to more than 80 million motor vehicles in the next 10 years, an increase of 40 percent.

There is no doubt in my mind that an adequate highway system in this country is the key to the continued expansion of our national economy. In the next 15 years, the population of the United States may well grow to 200 million people and whether employment and family income continue to rise will depend to a great extent on the highway building program outlined in this bill—the Fallon bill.

The motor vehicle is no longer a luxury in the United States. It is a necessity; our everyday pattern of life is based on it. Yet, we have done virtually nothing since the end of World War II to expand or improve the web of highways that bisects this country.

Do you realize that we are spending only one-half as much money as we did 20 to 30 years ago, as compared with the expansion of the economy since that time, on highways?

Work should begin immediately to build broad new traffic arteries across the country, to resurface and widen existing roads and eliminate the thousands of miles of dirt roads which still carry some of this country's motor vehicles.

This is a point that I want to drive home to those from the rural areas. This bill will carry a 90–10 provision that will relieve sums of money for primary and secondary roads, large sums of money. Not only that, but there will be $25 million more per year to be added to the primary and secondary roads of our country as listed in the Fallon bill.

Not only our economic well-being, but our military strength too, depends upon a smoothly geared network of good highways. Every day lost in providing this network of first-class highways may mean disaster as the result of delay in moving defense equipment and the evacuation of our people in the event of enemy attack.

Although there have been differences of opinion here as to the proper method by which to finance this gigantic undertaking, I believe the concensus is unanimous that the continued prosperity and safety of this Nation demands that the Congress take action to overcome the major road deficiencies as rapidly as possible.

I am prepared to vote in favor of the bill as it has been reported to the House by the Public Works Committee, including the provisions to increase taxes on highway users and provide $12,400,000,000 in additional funds for highway construction between now and July 1, 1971.

During consideration of the bill in committee I offered an amendment, which was accepted, to exempt from any increased Federal tax on gasoline the off-highway users of gasoline. In my opinion, this was the only fair attitude the committee could adopt, in view of the fact that the off-highway user of gasoline does not contribute in any way to the deterioration of our highways.

I see no reason why a company which has motor vehicles using gasoline for fuel and operating strictly within the confines of its plants, should be taxed to support public highways. Many companies which fall within this category are, at the same time, contributing their share toward maintaining the public roads through the purchase of gasoline to power motor vehicles which they use on the highways.

For this reason, Mr. Chairman, I introduced my amendment to section 4 of H. R. 7474, the amendment which has come to be known as the Burnside amendment. I think it entirely fair. It would apply not only to the plants I just mentioned but, for example, to farmers who use rubber-tired, gasoline- or diesel-propelled machinery entirely on their farms. In practically every case these people own cars or trucks which are used on the highways and which would be subject to the additional tax imposed. To tax their farm machinery, however, would be to impose a double burden, a burden which our farmers can ill afford, when they are finding it so difficult to farm profitably. Mr. Chairman, I know you are familiar with the drastic decline suffered recently by the coal-mining industry. West Virginia mines use a great deal of machinery which is operating almost entirely underground, which never sees the light of day. To impose the

additional tax upon this machinery when the very companies which operate the mines where it is used also frequently use fleets of trucks which will be taxed on the highways would be most unjust. This, too, is avoided by my amendment, which the committee approved. In the case of both farms and mines, I think that it is vital that we take no action which will discourage the use of modern equipment. I would not want to impose a tax on machinery used either in mines or on farms if that tax would discourage the use of machinery which enables farmers to employ modern agricultural methods and which makes it easier for miners in their very difficult and dangerous work. These, Mr. Chairman, are but a few of the examples where I think my amendment relieves what would otherwise have been injustice. The same situation is true in many other fields as well. Trucks and other machinery used entirely in the woods in lumbering operations and other off-highway users are exempted.

I do not see how the committee could have approached the problem of paying for our roads in a fairer way. Particularly, Mr. Chairman, in light of the Burnside amendment No. 2, which eliminated from additional taxation all camelback used to recap tires with a 6-inch crown or less. Now, Mr. Chairman, that would eliminate taxes on camelback for recapping medium and small size tires such as those used on Fords, Chevrolets, Plymouths, and so forth. I also included in this amendment the cutting of the diesel tax from 5 cents a gallon to 4 cents a gallon. These amendments, I feel, eliminated inequities. I am glad to say that the Committee on Public Works adopted them.

The bill as it is presently constituted provides a pay-as-you-go approach to the problem of financing this highway program, an approach which I believe is the most practical. Support for this type of financing is contained in many of the statements made before the committee by experts in the highway field.

The United States has been operating too long with horse-and-buggy highways in an economy which demands broad, new, streamlined traffic arteries for maximum strength and efficiency. This bill is a step toward providing that streamlined system.

Mr. YOUNG. 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 Nevada?

There was no objection.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Chairman, the House finds itself in a unique position with regard to highway legislation today. Usually we have more problems than cures. In this situation we have as many, or more, proposed cures than problems. Yesterday one of my constituents inquired whether H. R. 7474 was the 7,474th bill proposed in this session or the 7,474th highway bill.

One place where there does seem to be a unanimity of opinion is in the fact that we face a critical situation with regard to highways unless vigorous action is taken immediately. We are told that in 1946 there were 34 million vehicles. Today there are 58 million, and 10 years hence the figure will be 81 million.

In order that we select the proper palliative from among the vast array of legislative nostrums that have been offered to us, it is my feeling that we should go back to first principles—that we should pay less attention to the alleged wonders of each proposed cure and more attention to the basic symptoms of our patient.

First, the study I have made of the highway problem in Nevada and elsewhere in the West seems to indicate that this body should strive for legislation which would permit long-range planning and orderly development.

It has been the custom for many years for Congress to make highway legislation containing authorizations for subsequent 2-year periods. With the passage of S. 1048 by the other body, this was increased to a 5-year period. Even such an increase, however, does not enable the long-range planning which is necessary to smoothly and efficiently accomplish the mammoth task which faces us. I am pleased that both of the major proposals facing us today, that is H. R. 7474 and the recommendations of the Clay committee, which I understand will be offered in the Dondero amendment, cover a much longer period of time. This will make possible orderly development of our highway facilities and permit necessary long-range consideration.

Secondly, it is my feeling that any highway legislation that comes out of this body should be as much as possible on a pay-as-we-go basis. Insofar as it can be ascertained those who receive the benefits should bear the economic burden which is a necessary part of the construction of the improved facilities. In this respect I feel that provisions of H. R. 7474 are preferable to the financial scheme contained in the Clay committee report.

I do not mean to say that I approve entirely of the new tax revenues that are included in the provisions of this bill. I regret that a closed rule does not permit this House to speak its will with respect thereto.

However, I am pleased that the present excise taxes contained in this measure represent a great improvement over those contained in H. R. 7072, which was reported from the Public Works Committee several weeks ago.

There is almost no one who opposes at this time an enlarged highway construction program. Chief dispute centers on the financial provisions involved in the respective proposals. With the national debt limit in excess of $275 billion, I feel it important insofar as possible that we pay the expenses of the enlarged program as we proceed to construct the roads and facilities.

Therefore, it is my feeling that we should continue the status quo on the Federal-aid system and place chief emphasis on the interstate network because it will make the greatest contribution to national defense and the development of our economy. In Nevada, for example, our main highway problems are U. S. 40, which passes over Donner Summit, and U. S. 91 which runs between Los Angeles and Las Vegas. There are dangerous, time-wasting bottlenecks on both of these roads that should be eliminated at the earliest possible opportunity.

There are certain provisions, however, of H. R. 7474 which, in my opinion, are not satisfactory in their present form. First, the provision of paragraph 2 (e) which imposes weight and size limitations on trucks using the interstate system will have a discriminatory effect on States such as my own. The legislation provides that if a State does not now have laws and regulations, it will be given until March 1, 1956, to complete consideration thereof. Where the State legislature meets only in the odd-numbered years, such as in Nevada, this precludes an opportunity for the State legislature to deliberate on the problem and may well freeze into effect undesirable limitations.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. CRAMER].

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, we have heard much said today with regard to the need for additional highway facilities here in America. Let me review briefly some of those needs to make certain we understand just exactly what they are and the fact that either by the expenditure of some of this money resulting from additional taxes or, in the alternative, the setting up of this Corporation and paying for construction through a bond-issue program, is needed if we are to provide for these highways. It is absolutely essential at this time that something be done immediately to solve this problem, and that it not be put off.

The annual savings as the result of the interstate system alone, and that is the 40,000-mile system alone, would be in lives 3,500 per year. The cost of accidents would be reduced by 250 percent if just this 40,000-mile interstate system were completed. The total cost yearly resulting from not having a complete interstate system is $2.1 billion, an amount equal to the amount to be expended under either of the proposals presently under consideration. So I think that alone clearly shows that this highway program is needed.

In addition, there will be savings estimated in automobile operation as follows: The average automobile saving would be 1 cent per mile resulting from the completion of the interstate system alone. There is an argument over whether or not the increased tax of 1 cent per gallon is equitable with an average operation of 15 miles per gallon and a savings, thus, of 15 cents per gallon.

As to the operation of trucks, it is estimated that for those who operate on the interstate system the saving will be 4 cents a mile, and the average mileage of diesel trucks is 6 miles per gallon, meaning they are saving 24 cents per gallon on the operation of diesel fuel, and the suggestion is there be 2 cents additional per gallon on the diesel fuel.

It is a little bit difficult for me to see why under these circumstances the trucking interests are not being bene-

fited substantially and claim to be so much discriminated against.

I want to point out further that of the amount of money to be raised, $12 billion, only $3 billion could by any stretch of the imagination be included in this so-called discriminatory tax classification—the difference between $12 billion and $9 billion.

Let me point out to you that the Clay report showed there are approximately 9,303,000 trucks in America today. If you take the $3 billion over a 15-year period, that will be only $200 million additional tax that group will have to pay, or $22 per truck per year.

Let us be fair about it. Let us get down to the heavy trucks. Let us say the tax were limited to them alone, which it is not, and we would have then approximately 85,000 trucks, and a cost of approximately $225 a year per truck, for getting the best highways they have had in the history of their trucking operation. Is this such a discriminatory tax then?

I personally have spent most of my time working for the President's program, the Clay plan. That gives the people additional roads without additional taxes. That is no sleight-of-hand trick. Anyone who has had any experience in municipal, State, or county financing knows that is the way we get things built today without having the money to do it today. We have to go out and borrow, and I have not found a financier who is willing to lend you money without charging you interest.

That is the situation. You have a situation with the Dondero proposal, the Clay proposal before you, where it has been suggested that we are going to have a 30-year freeze of the ABC roads. the primary, secondary, and urban roads. I want to suggest to you that is not true. In the first place, there is more money spent this year as the result of last year's authorization than has even been spent on primary, secondary, and urban roads in the country's history. That does not mean that this amount of money is going to be frozen for a 30-year period under the Dondero plan at all. If in the wisdom of this Congress it should see fit in the next session next year to vote more money for those primary, secondary, and urban roads, they can do it, just as they did back in 1954. So to say you are freezing in any way the ABC roads under the Dondero proposal is wholly inaccurate. The suggestion has been made that these roads are not going to last over a 30-year period.

In all fairness, on that question, that question was specifically asked of the road authority, Mr. du Pont, as he appeared before the committee, and he made the unqualified statement that the largest cost of your roads is not the surfacing material, but it is the providing of the rights-of-way and the undersurface, and that amounts to 70 percent of the cost and that that will last indefinitely. So you could not possibly be talking about more than 30 percent of the cost under any circumstances.

The value of the Dondero bill is that it gives you a road program without any additional taxes. It does not in any way hamper or cripple the ABC road program. It also provides for a pay-as-you-use program. We have been discussing all types of programs here today—the pay-as-you-use program, the pay-as-you-go program, or tax program or the alternative Thompson bill, the not-pay-at-all program.

I favor paying as you use, with no additional taxes if this is possible under the present temperament of the House.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. SCHWENGEL], a member of the committee.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Chairman, this is the first time I have had a chance to stand in this well and address you. Because of that, I have one thing to ask of you. That if you ask me any questions please make them easy, because I know you are graduates in this game of legislation and I do not feel quite equal to combat some of the political questions from the floor.

I want at the outset to pay tribute to the chairman of our Subcommittee on Roads and Highways [Mr. FALLON] and to the members of the committee who sat through many, many hours patiently listening to volumes of testimony on this very important question of roads for America. At this point, I am constrained to remind you, especially you people who have been wondering when we are going to do something for America while we are doing something for people all over the world—here is the place where we can do something for America. I want to pay tribute to that great American appointed by our President, General Clay, and his committee who gave us an exhaustive study and a complete report and presented without question the great need for highways in America. It has been testified to by virtually hundreds, yes thousands of people who have the welfare of the economy of our country at heart. As I sat through the hearings on this very important committee on this important legislation, I could not help but be impressed with the fact that here we were in this committee and in this Congress presented with a proposition that is the greatest thing ever presented to this legislative body or any legislative body in any nation in all the history of the world for the economy, and for the economic welfare of our Nation. Therefore, it is of tremendous importance to the people we represent. You have heard a great deal about what it is going to cost and what it is going to cost if you do not have it. We, on the committee, were reminded that we were going to pay for this highway system whether we build it or not in increased costs of accidents and loss of lives. If nothing else makes it important, that one factor certainly ought to make it important to all of us. I should like in my few moments here to tell you a little about the governors of our 48 States and why it was that the vast majority of them came to us and testified in favor of this kind of legislation—maybe for not all of the Clay report in all its detail, but they were willing to accept the Clay report, in general, because it recognized the principle that they have known and understood in their respective States for a long time, and that is the gasoline tax should be dedicated to the building of roads, and the Clay report does that very thing. It practically guarantees that the revenue from the gas tax will be used for the building of a road system. Therefore, they were willing to change their position of returning this tax to the States and fitting their plans in with this program of the interstate system.

Something has been said and a lot more will be said about the prerogatives of the Ways and Means Committee being taken over by the Public Works Committee, and I agree that that probably is not in order and as it should be; but being a member of that committee and its being assigned to us we had to do the very best we could. So with general agreement we gave 12 hours to it. In the beginning I agreed to it feeling it was not enough, and when we ended it I still felt it was not enough time to pass upon the testimony that was presented to us.

In spite of this, I think we had a pretty good answer to the tax question, and there are some good things in the tax provision presented in the Fallon bill. If we do not adopt it, I am rather hopeful that we will not, it can then be taken up by the Ways and Means Committee. All of the testimony heard before our committee can be of great use to the Ways and Means Committee as they consider it later.

We will have an opportunity to vote on three plans: The pay-as-you-build, the pay-part-and-borrow-part, and the Clay report.

I want to submit to you the Clay report as a compromise plan. That sounds strange, I know, but I present it to you as a compromise plan for the reason that I think it is a good plan and presents a plan to start the road program. The Ways and Means Committee can then act as it goes into session as soon as Congress convenes next year.

In closing let me just say this, let us not play politics with this, let us not for political reasons scuttle America's future economic prosperity, the happiness of its people.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. BALDWIN], a member of the committee.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. Chairman, the Public Works Committee has come before you today with several versions of highway bills upon which we have devoted a great deal of time. I think there is no question in the mind of the committee that there is an urgent need for highway improvement in this country. We had a tremendous amount of testimony before the committee as to the number of lives lost, the casualties inflicted, and the property damage incurred because we have not had adequate highways. So the decision we are making today is not whether or not we need expanded highways; the difference of opinion seems to be on the method of financing them.

There has been some discussion as to whether or not the American people are willing to pay what will be required for

the construction of adequate highways. May I say that in one county in my district in California the situation on roads became so critical, so crucial, that the people of that county voluntarily voted a bond issue by over two-thirds vote to raise $10 million which to them in that one county was just as big as the total amount to be raised in the Clay proposal—$10 million for one county to construct roads urgently needed. So I think that as long as they would vote that for themselves, it indicates the answer to this problem.

Those people voluntarily showed that they wanted those roads so badly they were willing to vote a bond issue for that purpose. I am of the opinion they have demonstrated the fact that they also would be willing to build the roads provided by the Clay plan. We have many other evidences of the fact that people are willing to invest in the future in a similar way. How many of your constituents go out and pay 100 percent cash for the homes they desire to buy? They know that their home is an investment in the future, they are glad to pay for it as they use that home. So they pay a part of it down and continue to pay for it year by year. They are willing and glad to pay interest because they are getting an asset that is well worth it. It is exactly similar to what we are proposing to do in the Clay plan which, may I say I am going to endorse and support when it comes before us.

I would like to mention one other thing in connection with the Dondero bill as it has been proposed here and which the gentleman from New York [Mr. BECKER] mentioned a few moments ago. He had in mind submitting an amendment to provide for a Davis-Bacon Act prevailing wage provision in the Dondero substitute bill. The gentleman from New York [Mr. BECKER] and I have discussed this and we are going to submit such an amendment so that there will be provided a Davis-Bacon provision in the Dondero version of the highway bill. It is our opinion that there should not be any difference between the Dondero bill and the Fallon bill on anything except basically the financing plan when the Dondero bill comes before this body. It is our understanding it will be possible to submit amendments to the substitute bill, therefore it is our intention to submit this amendment.

When we get to the consideration of the interstate highway system, we might as well recognize the fact that the same rules that apply to other Federal financing should apply there. The Davis-Bacon Act provision would provide that prevailing wages should likewise apply to the financing of the interstate highway system which now we are definitely recognizing in this act as primarily a Federal responsibility. So at the appropriate time such an amendment will be submitted and I hope we will have the support of the majority of the Members of this body when that amendment comes before you.

Mr. BURNSIDE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 7 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GENTRY].

Mr. GENTRY. Mr. Chairman, it is my opinion that major highway construction is needed and that it will cost us almost as much, in actual dollars and cents, not to do the construction—and thus not have a modern road system—than it will to do it and thereby realize the kind of highway transportation system which is warranted by our highly industrialized economy.

May I presume to offer only brief comment on this legislation out of my several years' experience in highway administration. If the House should decide at this time to set up the construction of the interstate system, not by increment, as it might well do, but in its entirety, it would be my opinion that, in the interest of fiscal responsibility, and, in the interest of our country and its people, taxes should be imposed which would pay a substantial portion of its great cost of $24 billion.

I should like to add, too, that it is my definite conviction that the tax provision of this bill is a fair one.

Legislation to effect highway improvement, desirable as it may be, should not serve as a vehicle for the inclusion of unjust, unfair, and unwise provisions which raid the Treasury and serve to defeat its primary purpose by robbing it of needed funds.

There is, from my viewpoint, one particularly vicious provision in this bill. It is section 7, which says to the States that they may give hundreds of millions of dollars to the utilities. Under the circumstances, this question of reimbursement is simply no business of the Congress. It should not be in this legislation because it is not right, either legally, equitably, or morally. It would perpetrate a wrong.

Just what does section 7 provide? Seemingly innocently enough, it says that—

> Fifty percent of the cost of relocation of utility facilities * * * may be paid from Federal funds whenever, under the laws of the State where the project is being constructed, the entire relocation cost is required to be borne by the utilities.

That sounds quite benign but what does it really mean? It actually means that regardless of the common law; regardless of the holdings of the courts of last resort; regardless of valid statutes enacted by the States under which permits have been given and are being given to utilities to place their facilities on the rights-of-way, solely under the condition that they would move them at their own expense to permit needed highway improvement; regardless of the tens of thousands of presently existing legal, written contracts that have been made between the States and the utilities, at the express request of the utilities, by which they were allowed to use highway rights-of-way for their facilities upon their contractual obligation to remove them when highway improvement was needed; regardless of the fact that the officials of the State highway department have made long trips to Washington on 2 occasions during the last 3 months to earnestly protest any inclusion of a reimbursement provision—regardless of all these things, this provision would say to the States that we offer you the money to do that which would vitiate your contracts, violate your State laws, destroy your State's sovereignty, do that which you earnestly plead with us you do not want to do, and which you believe should not be done by you or anyone else—all for the sake of giving more than 99 percent of the money provided to firms not needing and not entitled to it.

The majority report says the utilities claim they did not know an expanded highway program would be undertaken when they signed these contracts. They said it but it is just so much hogwash. Why? One answer is that they have made some of these contracts, at their own specific request, in recent months, and after the projection of the expanded program. Another is that it has been known by everyone for a long, long time that our main highways had to be expanded and many utility executives have been active for years in campaigns to procure such expansion. Another is the fact that the utility lobby to put this over was set up in Washington, not this year, but in 1952 some 3 years before the Clay report. Because of the pressure of this lobby, and somewhat as a measure of defense against it, Congress, more than a year ago—and still before the Clay report—authorized a public-utility relocation study which was undertaken both by the Bureau of Public Roads and the Research Board of the National Academy of Science. Both studies certainly devastated the utilities on this issue but it did not devastate their lobby. It is still with us. Another convincing reason as to why this legislation did not spring from the effort to reconstruct the interstate system is the fact that it provided for reimbursement to the utilities, not just on the 40,000 miles of the interstate system, but on the entire 730,000 miles of the Federal aid primary, secondary, and urban road system. This is done though the bill was supposed to be an interstate bill. No, there is nothing to their claim that they were in ignorance when they made the contracts. They made them because, doing so would save them hundreds of millions of dollars in right-of-way costs. It is a well-known fact that most of these utilities have bought little rights-of-way during their history and not one of them purchases rights-of-way when it can use that owned by others.

The majority report also states that isolated instances were cited where relocation costs were such as to seriously impair capital structure. The cases were so isolated that they practically did not exist. It is my opinion that it might be difficult to find even one case that would withstand an investigation of the facts. The leading witness for the utilities claimed that he would be practically ruined if Congress did not provide him reimbursement. He cited a case, or cases, in which he said his removal costs would be $1 million or more, an expense which would only cost him $480,000 since otherwise he would have to pay 52 percent of it in taxes. Further examination of this witness developed the fact that his firm is capitalized at more than $300 million and that his revenue in the 13-year period during which he would have to relocate his facilities would be more than $1,300,000,000. Just for the record, his indicated removal costs would be less

than one twenty-eighth of 1 percent of his revenues.

You will find more than 99 percent of utility ownership to be in much the same position financially. However, if there should happen to be a case of some small utility that would be really greatly burdened by facility readjustment cost, is it not reasonable to suppose that the State highway department, the officials and employees of which would be well known to the utility, probably would cooperate in some manner in helping him. Certainly we do not need to give practically the whole of this great sum of money to prosperous companies not entitled to it, in order to help some little fellow that might be found in some part of our country.

Would it not be a sad commentary, under the circumstances, for us, in effect, to try to force this authority on the States, an authority they do not want, an authority they pleadingly insist, if accepted and acted on by them, would be wrong in principle? If there is anything sacred in State sovereignty, it should be respected where the facts show it has been exercised so fully as it has by the States in this matter.

By passing this provision we simply would be sending the utility lobby back to the State capitols where it was working without success in this same endeavor before it decided to transfer its activity to Washington.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. WILSON].

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I feel very badly about this situation. I asked the Committee on Rules for more time. Sufficient time was not given in the Public Works hearings or before the Committee on Rules. I was promised at least 5 minutes and possibly 10, and now I find myself with only 3 minutes in which to discuss this matter.

I represent a section of Indiana in which is located the Cummins Engine Co. which started making engines in 1919. They spent 13 years developing what is the finest diesel engine on the market before they marketed the first motor. They spent vast sums of money perfecting that motor. The first year in which they operated in the black was 18 years later, in 1937. Now they manufacture more than 50 percent of all the diesel engines used in highway motor transportation.

That diesel engine costs twice as much as a gasoline engine and the excise tax is twice that paid on other engines. It is a heavier engine. It carries a net pay load less than that of gasoline engines. The principal factor that enables them to sell that engine, which is so essential to our mines and in our defense program today, is the fuel-economy differential. There is that economy differential between a gasoline motor and a diesel motor. Because of that differential the diesel people are able to sell that more expensive motor.

Now we would discriminate against this industry. We would do away with that fuel-economy differential, and in doing that we may put an industry out of business.

Some people who see heavy trucks along the highways seem to think they are all diesel powered. They are wrong. Actually, less than 2.3 percent of the heavy trucks in the East are diesel powered. The diesel motor is the best, the cleanest, the most perfect motor that can be built. It has more perfect combustion. That is how they get the fuel economy that you cannot get with any other type of motor. Gasoline motors put out 12,000 percent more poisonous carbon-monoxide gas than do the diesels. Other internal-combustion engines cannot meet the requirements of the Bureau of Mines for that reason.

So we see the diesel engine does operate a little more economically and safely. You get 10 cents a mile for driving your automobile today, if you work for the Government, but only 2 cents of that is spent for gasoline. Therefore, we can figure that only about 20 percent of the cost of operating a truck is for fuel.

It was first proposed in this bill to increase the diesel fuel tax 300 percent of its original, while the increased gasoline tax was only 150 percent of its original. The Public Works Committee cut down the diesel-gasoline differential, but a differential still remains. I regard that as discrimination, and discrimination is bad. I know we cannot amend the taxing features of this bill, but I call the attention of my colleagues to these discriminatory features, nonetheless.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of our time on this side to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. AYRES].

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Chairman, I am not so naive as to think that I am going to change anyone's opinion on this proposed legislation. However, I do want to clarify two things.

The gentleman from Washington [Mr. MACK] went into some detail as to charges that had been made and news stories that appeared in the press, regarding the lobbies that had been operating around Washington in connection with this bill. He went on to state that the discriminatory tax naturally made it necessary for the rubber and trucking industries to come in and protect their interests.

Coming from the rubber capital of the world and the largest trucking center in the United States, I felt perhaps I should clarify the record. I perhaps am responsible in some degree for bringing in the trucking interests and the rubber interests. I was aware that the railroad lobby was operating here. I told my boys, "You better come down to Washington. These boys are really organized. If you don't hurry they will soon have the dome." And they got here.

The thing that really disturbed me was the fact the railroads were lobbying behind the scenes before the Fallon bill was introduced. On June 24 they sent out a letter, and this letter went out from the American Short Line Railroad Association, in which they recommended to their members that they contact Congressmen and get them to vote for a 50-cent-per-pound increase in the tire taxes. I would like to read two paragraphs from this letter:

> We believe two essential provisions—(1) limitation of vehicle sizes and weights and (2) graduated user charges on heavy vehicles—should be included in any legislation authorizing a Federal highway-aid program.

Then they went on to say to their membership:

> If there is any hope of getting these two essential provisions in the final legislation, it must be done through your prompt efforts with as many Congressmen as you may properly approach.

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AYRES. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. MEADER. The gentleman says "may properly approach."

Mr. AYRES. "With as many Congressmen as you may properly approach."

Mr. MEADER. Does the gentleman think it is proper for the railroads to take an interest in throwing stones in the way of competitors, that is to say, the trucking industry? Is that a proper approach?

Mr. AYRES. I do not think it is proper. By the same token, I do not think it is right for this Congress to enact discriminatory legislation that will put the trucking industry at a disadvantage and give a competitor an advantage.

Honestly, I am not too concerned about what is going to happen here this afternoon. I have sat here through the entire debate. I have heard the many discrepancies that have been discussed, many different opinions. Regardless of what bill we pass here this afternoon it will go over to the other body. The gentleman over there who will be heading the Finance Committee has stated he wants to take a good look at this bill, and when that gentleman takes a good look at it, he is on record over a period of years for never being for any discriminatory tax. They are well-versed in that field. I think it is quite significant that they have asked to take a look at it.

The other thing I am happy about is that not one member of the Committee on Ways and Means has come here this afternoon and said that the tax provisions in this bill are adequate.

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MACHROWICZ].

Mr. MACHROWICZ. Mr. Chairman, I had not expected to take time here today, but I think there are several matters that need some clarification. I think the two gentlemen who just preceded me made a very good argument for their particular industry. However, I do want to call your attention to the fact that when Secretary Humphrey testified before our committee on July 12, I asked him a question, and that question was prompted by a series of questions asked just prior to that by my distinguished colleague from Michigan [Mr. DONDERO]. I asked this question:

> Mr. Secretary, I think you have answered most of my questions, but the series of questions my colleague from Michigan, Mr.

DONDERO, has asked you have raised in my mind an inference that probably the Clay plan might be more advisable because this plan would impose a burden which our committee could not stand.

I want to ask you this question in view of those series of questions: Do you feel this new bill, which has been proposed, this new proposal of taxes, would impose an unfair burden on our economy that any segment of it could not stand?

Secretary HUMPHREY. Your question has two points to it.

As to the first, as to the total, I would say "No," without any question.

As to whether this spread is absolutely fair in all respects, I haven't heard the testimony of other witnesses and I would hesitate to answer that.

My general impression is that it would not; but, as I say, I haven't heard the other witnesses.

I do think it is a fair spread.

So I think probably we have not too much to worry about as to whether or not this will ruin any particular segment of our economy.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MACHROWICZ. I yield.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Is the gentleman saying to the Committee that neither the Fallon bill nor the Clay plan is the Republican plan, since it is supported by the Secretary of the Treasury?

Mr. MACHROWICZ. No; I most certainly will not.

Mr. THOMPSON of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MACHROWICZ. I yield.

Mr. THOMPSON of Louisiana. I appreciate the gentleman yielding. Just a few moments ago, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. CRAMER] made an observation that I was going to agree with. He said that only $3 billion of this proposed tax could possibly be discriminatory. I agree with that. It is just about $3 billion. Is this good? There are other things too, but I will not labor the point. But, small business is vitally interested in what happens to the taxes on things that small-business men use, and on the stocks that they have in their stores. I also remember in the committee, I introduced an amendment which would have straightened out one of these inequities having to do with floor stocks of tires on which the small-business men have to pay taxes, but the factory-owned outlets do not have to pay taxes until the time of sale, and the gentleman from Florida made a point of order against my amendment. I think we are overlooking the small-business man here, and we ought to give them consideration.

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MACHROWICZ. I am sorry, my time is limited. I must decline to yield.

Mr. McGREGOR. The gentleman made a statement which I am certain he would want corrected as to just what the Secretary said.

Mr. MACHROWICZ. I am sorry. I decline to yield.

Mr. Chairman, there is one other matter that I would like to bring out, and that is the fact that much has been said here about the Clay Committee report. But very little has been said about the report of another committee, the chairman of which was appointed by the President of the United States, and upon which five members of this Congress also participated. The gentleman from Arkansas and the gentleman from Iowa said a few words about that, and I wish you would remember that on June 29 of this year the Committee on Intergovernment Relations, of which Mr. Kestenbaum was chairman and of which five Members of this Congress were members, unanimously stated that they do not favor the Clay report, but that they do favor a financing plan such as the one proposed by the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. FALLON]. May I state also that one gentleman for whom we all have high respect, Joseph Campbell, Comptroller General of the United States, appeared before our committee and I think it would be useful for some of us to know what he said about the Clay report. Here is what he said before our committee about the Clay bill, the Dondero bill:

> We think that the proposed method of financing is inadvisable because the result would be that the borrowing would not be included in the public debt obligation of the United States while the issuance of the corporation's bonds would be with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury, and they would be repaid from the permanent appropriation——

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, there is no doubt in my mind that our national highway program should be accelerated. The real question is how and to what extent, within Federal and State budgets the program can be stepped up. Our Nation is tied together at the present by a network of highways which has sustained the unity of the Nation and has provided for the very basis of the name we bear—the United States. It is nevertheless the distinct obligation of the individual States and they should have the final say and control of all highways to be constructed within their borders. Locations, priorities, and so forth, should be made by the individual State highway departments after consultation with an appropriate Federal agency. This consultation should be a prime requirement because at the present due to the vastness of the country and many other problems peculiar only to the individual States, there exists a hodgepodge of construction and various proposals for linkage of the interstate system.

Each holiday that passes points up the fact that our present highway system is inadequate for existing traffic conditions, leave any defense traffic in the event of a national emergency. Improvements have not kept pace with increased traffic demands and cost of an inadequate system is high not only in wear and tear of automotive equipment, but also in accidents and loss of life. The present plight of our interstate system was forcibly brought to my attention during the hearings I conducted as chairman of the subcommittee for Civil Defense for the District of Columbia when the problems of evacuation were discussed.

Throughout our entire country, large-scale evacuation would be needed in the event of an A-bomb attack. The Federal Civil Defense officials stated that the withdrawal task from our major cities would be the biggest problem ever yet faced, and a prime contributing factor was the highway system as it exists at present. For the information of those present, it is estimated that as a matter of Federal policy, at least 70 million people would have to be evacuated from target areas in case of threatened enemy attack. No urban area in the country today has highway facilities equal to this task. The rapid improvement of the complete 40,000-mile interstate system, including the necessary urban connections, is therefor a very vital civil and national defense matter.

I am, Mr. Speaker, wholeheartedly in opposition to the Davis-Bacon proposal in the legislation under consideration at the present. Certainly I am not opposed to a workingman making a decent wage; but in legislation of this type, I do not believe that the Federal Government should prescribe to the individual States the prevailing wage rate to be paid for the construction and improvement of the highways within that State, whether they be a part of the interstate system or not. Therefore it is my hope that someway, somehow, this provision can be stricken from the bill.

I think also, Mr. Speaker, that closer scrutiny could be given to the tax features of the bill. It appears that there are certain inequities in the bill as it has been presented to us; although I agree with the pay-as-you-go idea as set forth in the legislation.

I am including a number of telegrams I have received, Mr. Speaker, each asking that I do what I can to either defeat or support certain provisions of this legislation. A glance at these telegrams will show the predicament that virtually every Member in this body is in at the present time and it may point to the fact that there is need for further study and additional deliberation on the tax features of the legislation under consideration.

> AUSTIN, TEX., *July 25, 1955.*
>
> Hon. OLIN TEAGUE,
> *House Office Building,*
> *Washington, D. C.:*
>
> As executive director of the Organized Trucking Industry of Texas, representing some 1,200 commercial motor vehicle operators, I want to confirm this industry's feeling that a Federal highway program is imperative at this session. Our only concern is that it is equitably financed. We feel that Representative TOM STEED's compromise plan will do the job and is a road program we can live with as well. I hope you can give such a plan your active support.
>
> JIM TAYLOR,
> *Executive Director, Texas Motor Transportation Association.*

> AUSTIN, TEX., *July 21, 1955.*
>
> Hon. OLIN E. TEAGUE,
> *House of Representatives,*
> *Washington, D. C.:*
>
> The Texas Good Roads Association holds it imperative that the Fallon bill up for floor consideration be passed and that quickly. It would be tragic and disastrous if the Federal Congress failed to make available in the 84th regular session moneys to finance an expanded, modernized, and integrated highway construction program. We urge you to work diligently and enthusiastically for the

passage of this bill. Any tax bill always runs the gauntlet of protest and opposition. Every affected industry has had an opportunity to present its viewpoint and spell out alleged inequities and unwise provisions. We frankly are greatly concerned by the inclusion of the utilities section and the Bacon-Davis section which we think will compound hurtful provisions. We know all legislation is based on compromise and seldom reflects all provisions which one thinks beneficial and sound but we do insist we have to get a bill through this session in the interests of a sound national economy, national defense, and certainly in the interest of safety and convenience of the motoring public. We are hopeful that it will not vitiate sound established principles of governmental practice. To that end we urge your unending support of the bill with rule changes which will permit consideration of wise amendments. Time is of the essence. Good citizenship requires that no consideration operates as a road block to bar the final adoption of the Fallon bill with essential amendments to make it acceptable to the Senate.

IKE ASHBURN,
Texas Good Roads Association.

TRANS-TEXAS AIRWAYS,
Houston, Tex., July 20, 1955.

Hon. OLIN E. TEAGUE,
United States Congressman,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN TEAGUE: It is my understanding that the House Public Works Committee has reported out favorably highway bill H. R. 7072 which proposes to finance a highway program through a series of tax increases, including a 1-cent increase in tax on gasoline. The committee approved an exemption for nonhighway users from such increased gasoline tax which includes aviation use.

On behalf of Trans-Texas Airways, I urge your support of such exemption for nonhighway purposes in view of the fact that the gasoline tax provisions in this bill are obviously intended to provide revenue from highway users for an expanded highway construction program and that the imposition of an increase of tax on gasoline used for nonhighway purposes would be inequitable.

We sincerely request that you will support the bill as it now exempts nonhighway users from the proposed increased gasoline tax.

Cordially yours,
TRANS-TEXAS AIRWAYS,
JACK K. AYER,
Executive Assistant to the President.

AUSTIN, TEX., *July 22, 1955.*

Hon. OLIN E. TEAGUE,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

We would appreciate your best efforts in seeing the utility provision struck from the highway bill. We consider this an invasion of States rights and conflicting with contracts now existing between the States and utilities companies.

TEXAS HIGHWAY BRANCH ASSOCIATED GENERAL CONTRACTORS.

WASHINGTON, D. C., *July 22, 1955.*

Hon. OLIN E. TEAGUE,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

The American Trucking Associations is vigorously supporting the national-defense highway program. It was the first taxpaying group to express at congressional hearings on May 12 and again on July 11, its willingness to pay tax increases to support the program, our objections are directed to those revenue provisions in section 4 of H. R. 7474, which call for a higher rate of tax on diesel fuel than on gasoline and a higher tax rate for truck tires, tubes, and tire recapping material than on other tires, tubes, and tire-recapping material. This does not mean we object to trucks paying more than automobiles. The same rate of tax for cars and trucks produces enormously greater tax payments per truck than per car.

AMERICAN TRUCKING ASSOCIATIONS, INC.,
NEIL J. CURRY, *President,*
JOHN V. LAWRENCE,
Managing Director.

CORPUS CHRISTI, TEX., *July 19, 1955.*

Hon. OLIN E. TEAGUE,
House of Representaives, Congress of the the United States, Washington, D. C.:

City transit companies are now paying more than their just portion of gasoline and diesel fuel tax to build State and Federal highways upon which they are not licensed to operate while paying to the municipalities a tax for use of city streets. Texas State 54th legislature recognized this and gave Texas transit some relief by amending house bill 660 to exempt city transit companies from additional State fuel tax. Urge that you adopt similar amendment exempting urban transit from all additional taxes proposed in H. R. 7072 to allow us to continue this necessary operation under private ownership.

B. GORDON FORSYTH,
Chairman, Texas Transit Association; Vice President, Nueces Transportation Co.

DALLAS, TEX., *July 20, 1955.*

Hon. OLIN E. TEAGUE,
Washington, D. C.:

Last night House Public Works Committee under heavy labor pressure voted to include Davis-Bacon provision in highway bill substantially like section 11, Fallon bill, H. R. 7072. We wish to voice our objections to this section and particularly the need for a thorough investigation of the Davis-Bacon law and its operations by the House Labor Committee before it is extended into these new areas heretofore reserved to the States. It has cost the taxpayers millions of dollars and has been used to raise labor standards insofar as wages are concerned on public works by means never intended under the law. All of this has been at the taxpayers' expense with the help and support of political allies of organized labor who are located in key spots in Government service. We ask that you make a valiant fight on the floor and vote against the inclusion of the Davis-Bacon provision in the House Public Works Committee Highway bill.

F. S. OLDT,
National Director, Association of General Contractors of America.

FORT WORTH, TEX.

OLIN E. TEAGUE,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.:

Passage of H. R. 7072, a bill at levying additional unfair taxes against the trucking industry, would be a serious blow to these businesses which already carry more than their share of the tax load. Strongly urge that you vote no to this vicious legislation.

J. T. CALNON.

FORT WORTH, TEX.

OLIN E. TEAGUE,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.:

Strongly urge that you vote no to H. R. 7072 which poses a serious threat to trucking industry. Passage of this unfair measure would force many of the Nation's truckers, who already carry a heavy tax load, out of business. Such action would seriously damage the Nation's economy.

KEN W. DAVIS.

AUSTIN, TEX., *July 6, 1955.*

Hon. OLIN TEAGUE,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.:

Public and private utilities including the nearly 300 independent telephone companies throughout Texas are anxious to obtain passage of the reimbursement provisions of the Federal Highway Relocation Aid bill. Unless the provisions of the Gore bill are substantially followed discrimination against utilities will increase the cost of service in the future and will operate to force location of utilities away from public rights-of-way thereby increasing the cost of and reduce the efficiency of maintenance as well as increase cost due to relocation expense. Some utilities already enjoy such immunity. We feel sure when you consider the overall situation that you will be satisfied to support this legislation.

TEXAS TELEPHONE ASSOCIATION,
J. B. HALEY, *Executive Secretary.*

FORT WORTH, TEX., *July 1, 1955.*

Hon. OLIN TEAGUE,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.:

We are advised House of Representatives intends to take up H. R. 7072 for final passage before adjournment. This is the Federal highway bill with provisions added for raising revenue through increase in Federal gasoline tax from 2 to 3 cents and Diesel from 2 to 6 cents and excise taxes on tires and tubes size 920 or over and weighing 90 pounds or over from 5 and 9 cents, respectively, to 50 cents per pound. These increases will yield about $850 million per year with large vehicles paying about half of it, although they are only a fraction of the total motor vehicles. This would cost Greyhound an amount equivalent to 20 percent of its entire 1954 net income before taxes. We are unalterably opposed to the bill because of its confiscatory impact on the motor-bus industry. In any event the measure should not be taken up without first affording to those affected a full public hearing before the proper congressional committee. We urge you to assist us in postponing consideration of the bill until such time as the committee can hear all of the facts with reference to this measure.

E. F. FREEMAN,
President, Southwestern Greyhound Lines, Inc.

CORPUS CHRISTI, TEX., *July 7, 1955.*

Hon. OLIN E. TEAGUE,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.:

Strongly urge your opposition to H. R. 7072 which adds $2,000 per year to already-taxed trucks.

JOE F. HALL.
HALL OIL CO.

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Chairman, how much time remains?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Maryland has expired. All time has expired.

The Chair desires to make a statement: Under the rule no amendments are in order to section 4 of the pending bill except amendments offered by direction of the Committee on Public Works which shall be in order notwithstanding any rule of the House to the contrary, but shall not be subject to amendment, and except it shall be in order to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert as a substitute the text of the bill H. R. 7494.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of the Federal-Aid Road Act approved July 11, 1916 (39

Stat. 355), and all acts amendatory thereof and supplementary thereto, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of $725 million for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, which sum shall be available for expenditure as follows:

(a) $326,250,000 for projects on the Federal-aid primary highway system.

(b) $217,500,000 for projects on the Federal-aid secondary system.

(c) $181,250,000 for projects on extensions of these systems within urban areas.

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

Any sums apportioned to any State under this section shall be available for expenditure in that State until June 30, 1959, and any amounts so apportioned remaining unexpended at the end of such period shall lapse: *Provided*, That such funds shall be deemed to have been expended if a sum equal to the total of the sums herein and heretofore apportioned to the State is covered by formal agreements with the Secretary of Commerce for improvement of specific projects as provided in this act, and prior acts.

Recognizing it to be in the national interest to foster and accelerate the construction of a safe and efficient system of Federal-aid highways in each State, it is hereby declared to be the intent of Congress progressively to increase the annual sums heretofore authorized by the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1954, for construction of projects on the Federal-aid primary and secondary systems and approved extensions thereof in urban areas, by amounts which in each year shall provide an increase over the immediately preceding year of not less than $25 million, commencing with the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, as hereinbefore provided, and continuing such progression in each of the succeeding fiscal years, through the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969, for which funds may hereafter be authorized. It is further the intent to allocate the total funds thus provided to the three categories in the same relative ratio as hereinbefore provided for projects on the Federal-aid primary and secondary systems and approved extensions thereof in urban areas.

It is further declared to be the intent of Congress to continue during the life of this act the authorizations for roads in the Federal domain at annual rates not less than those contained in sections 3, 4, and 5 of the Federal-aid Highway Act of 1954 (Public Law 350, 83d Cong.).

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I offer a preferential motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. WILSON of Indiana moves that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with the recommendation that the enacting clause be stricken out.

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, this is an unusual procedure one must go through in order to get to speak briefly on a bill of this importance. In this stampede to get out of here the committee would ram a $48 billion tax bill down the throats of the country. Let me tell you that it is not going to be popular. If you think it is, wait until you go home.

I want to offer a few figures here for the benefit of some of the Members. I want to let you know how many truck drivers and owners there are opposed to this bill in the State of Indiana. I am going to take 1 congressional district of Indiana—and that district is not the largest or the most heavily populated—where they have 25,743 truck registrations. The value of those trucks is $28,317,000. They employ 19,977 people, with a payroll of some $82 million a year. They are not going to be very happy about this bill, especially since they have not had a chance to be heard on the merits of the bill.

If the bill is so good, why did not the committee that sponsors it give more vitally interested people an opportunity to testify? I was given 3 minutes. I have been fighting this bill a long time, yet I was given only 3 minutes to explain my position.

More than 100,000 hogs are sold every year at the Producers Market Association stockyards near one important Indiana city. Trucks run daily, hauling 75 percent to the eastern markets, usually to New Jersey and Pittsburgh.

Who is going to pay the extra cost this bill would impose on the trucking industry? Why, of course, the consumers. It is going to be passed on. The trucking people cannot stand it all. Members of this body had better take a second look at the people who operate the trucks back home and those who will be affected by a hike in trucking charges.

And then there are the farmers who are going to have to be checked and questioned about the 1-cent refund on fuel tax he is supposed to get, under this bill. He will find he has to pay 3 cents Federal gasoline tax and he is going to wonder why only 1 cent is refunded. Why, if he can get the 1 cent back, can he not get the other 2 cents? If you think these farmers are plumb crazy you are absolutely wrong. The farmers are getting pretty smart and they are going to remember this thing when the time comes.

This is the worst bill, the worst procedure I have ever seen in the 15 years I have been a Member of Congress. I happen to be the only Republican ever elected from my congressional district in Indiana. I have been here 15 years and if I look after my people and their interests I will be here a long time more.

But, if I help to ram this bill down their throats and take a long vacation and get my salary increased $7,200 a year and go off fishing and say "to heck with them," they will not send me back, and I would not blame them.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw my preferential motion.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DONDERO: Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

"Short title

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

"Objective and policy

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

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

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

"TABLE OF CONTENTS

"Title I—Federal Highway Corporation

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

"Title II—Concerning the Department of Commerce

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

"Title III—Miscellaneous

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

"TITLE I—INTERSTATE HIGHWAY FINANCE CORPORATION

"Creation of Corporation

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

"Management of Corporation

"SEC. 102. (a) The management of the Corporation shall be vested in a Board of Directors (hereinafter referred to as the 'Board') composed of four members. One of these members shall be a full-time public member appointed by the President, by and with the consent of the Senate, without regard to political party affiliation, and the President shall designate such full-time public member as Chairman of the Board. The three remaining members shall be the Secretary of Commerce (hereinafter called 'Secretary'), the Secretary of the Treasury, and the Secretary of Defense, or their representatives. The Commissioner of Public Roads shall serve as executive secretary of the Board.

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

"Duty of Corporation

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

"Corporate powers

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

"(1) shall have succession in its corporate name;

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

"Corporate financing

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

"(b) There are hereby authorized to be appropriated and there shall be paid by the Secretary of the Treasury to the Corporation for the fiscal year 1956, and for each fiscal year thereafter in which there are outstanding unmatured obligations of the Corporation, out of any moneys in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, amounts equal to the revenue in excess of $622,500,000 collected during each fiscal year, as shown by the official accounts of the Director of Internal Revenue, from the taxes (including interest, penalties, and additions to taxes) imposed by sections 4081 and 4041 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 on gasoline and special fuels, upon certification by the Board and the Secretary of the Treasury as necessary to finance this program. The Secretary of the Treasury shall enter into a contract with the Corporation providing for the payment of such amounts to the Corporation, which contract shall stand as security for the outstanding obligations of the Corporation, it being the intent of Congress that such amounts shall be dedicated to the construction of the Interstate System. The Secretary of the Treasury may advance to the Corporation in any fiscal year an amount not in excess of the estimated appropriations for that fiscal year, such advances to be repaid from amounts subsequently appropriated hereunder in that fiscal year. The Corporation shall pay into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts, on the basis of annual billings as determined by the Secretary of the Treasury, an amount for each fiscal year that bears the same ratio to the estimated costs of collecting taxes, refunds of taxes, and costs of making refunds of taxes under section 4081 and 4041 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 for that fiscal year as the appropriation hereunder bears to the estimated total revenue collected under those provisions for that fiscal year.

"(c) The Corporation may issue to the Secretary of the Treasury its obligations in an amount not to exceed in any 1 year the amount necessary above all other revenues of the Corporation to provide for debt service of the Corporation during that year but not to exceed the aggregate amount of $5 billion outstanding at any one time. The obligations issued by the Corporation under this subsection shall have such maturities as may be prescribed by the Corporation with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury and shall be redeemable at the option of the Corporation before maturity in such manner as may be stipulated in the obligations. Each such obligation shall bear interest at a rate determined by the Secretary of the Treasury, taking into consideration the current average rate on outstanding marketable obligations of the United States of comparable maturities as of the last day of the month preceding the issuance of the obligation of the Corporation. The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized to purchase any obligations of the Corporation to be issued under this subsection, and for such purpose the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized to use as a public debt transaction the proceeds from the sale of any securities issued under the Second Liberty Bond Act, as now or hereafter in force, and the purposes for which securities may be issued under the Second Liberty Bond Act, as now or hereafter in force, are extended to include any purchases of the Corporation's obligations hereunder.

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

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

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

"Services and facilities of other agencies

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

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

"Misappropriation of funds

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

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

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

"Report to the Congress

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

"TITLE II—PROVISIONS CONCERNING THE DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

"Cancellation of authorizations

"SEC. 201. (a) Section 2 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1954 is hereby repealed.

"(b) Section 1 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1954 is hereby amended by reducing the authorization for projects on the Federal-aid primary system in urban areas, and for projects on approved extensions of the Federal-aid secondary system within urban areas, for the fiscal years ending June 30, 1956 and 1957, from '$175 million' to '$75 million.'

"Interstate system

"SEC. 202. In furtherance of section 7 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1944, the Secretary is authorized, within the limitation of 40,000 miles, to approve as part of the interstate system such lateral feeder and distributing routes, and circumferential routes as may be required to furnish maximum utility of the system within or adjacent to urban areas, provided that one or both ends of such routes shall lie on a route of the system. The Secretary is further authorized to approve as part of the interstate system any highway which complies with the standards of section 203 and which lies on an approved route of the interstate system irrespective as to whether or not tolls are collected for the use thereof. The Secretary is authorized, in cooperation with the State highway departments, to designate as promptly as reasonable possible routes to take up the mileage still undersigned so that the entire 40,000 miles of this system shall be designated. In approving any undesignated mileage the Secretary shall designate those routes which contribute most to the benefit of the system as a whole and are most important from the point of view of national defense. In case the actual construction of highways on the system increases available undesignated mileage the Secretary may redesignate this mileage in accordance with the preceding sentence. No additional mileage shall be placed on the system until the Secretary shall certify that 80 percent of the mileage originally designated has been improved to the approved standards.

"Standards

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

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

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

"(d) The standards shall be periodically reviewed by the Secretary, after consultation with the appropriate State and Federal officials, to insure maximum utility of the completed system with due recognition to the desirability of developing a national system having the greatest uniformity of characteristics possible.

"Expenditure authorization

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

"Distribution by States

"SEC. 205. (a) All sums herein authorized shall be apportioned among the several States in accordance with needs of the interstate system in the several States as determined in accordance with the provisions of this act: *Provided*, That the following amounts (representing 90 percent of the needs of the several States with respect to the interstate system, as reported in House Document No. 120, 84th Cong., 1st sess.), shall be distributed to the States as next hereinbelow set forth:

[Amounts in thousands]

State	10 years	Annually
Alabama	$328,811	$32,881
Arizona	188,622	18,862
Arkansas	182,776	18,278
California	2,089,397	208,940
Colorado	140,752	14,075
Connecticut	499,500	49,950
Delaware	59,330	5,933
Florida	445,622	44,562
Georgia	629,921	62,992
Idaho	96,292	9,629
Illinois	958,212	95,821
Indiana	780,526	78,053
Iowa	248,133	24,813
Kansas	185,779	18,578
Kentucky	442,800	44,280
Louisiana	443,272	44,327
Maine	132,549	13,255
Maryland	390,730	39,073
Massachusetts	754,179	75,418
Michigan	1,166,141	116,614
Minnesota	434,781	43,478
Mississippi	221,252	22,125
Missouri	538,728	53,873
Montana	137,038	13,704
Nebraska	96,034	9,603
Nevada	66,106	6,611
New Hampshire	59,785	5,979
New Jersey	1,221,470	122,147
New Mexico	212,141	21,214
New York	1,202,310	120,231
North Carolina	222,215	22,222
North Dakota	96,161	9,616
Ohio	1,224,656	122,466
Oklahoma	339,274	33,927
Oregon	287,460	28,746
Pennsylvania	684,019	68,402
Rhode Island	110,582	11,058
South Carolina	164,953	16,495
South Dakota	85,576	8,558
Tennessee	341,855	34,186
Texas	784,814	78,481
Utah	214,418	21,442
Vermont	159,601	15,960
Virginia	512,514	51,251
Washington	420,742	42,074
West Virginia	232,726	23,273
Wisconsin	290,158	29,016
Wyoming	266,261	26,626
District of Columbia	136,621	13,662

Provided, That the Secretary shall, in cooperation with the several States, reevaluate the remaining needs of the interstate system in the several States in 1958, 1961, and 1964, and shall render a written report to the Congress on or before the 1st day of February in each of such years containing the results of such reevaluation and his recommendations with reference to any proposed changes in the distribution of the balance of the funds apportioned in the foregoing table: *Provided further*, That the Federal share payable on account of any project on the National System of Interstate Highways provided for by funds made available hereunder shall be 90 percent of the total cost thereof, plus a percentage of the remaining 10 percent of such cost in any State containing unappropriated and unreserved public lands and nontaxable Indian lands, individual and tribal, exceeding 5 percent of the total area of all lands therein, equal to the percentage that the area of such lands in such State is of its total area; *And provided further*, That such Federal share payable on any project in any State shall not exceed 95 percent of the total cost of such project.

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

"(c) On or before July 1, 1956, and on or before July 1 of each year thereafter, the Secretary shall establish an approved estimate of cost for construction of projects on the interstate system in each State, and the Secretary shall in accordance with needs and subject to the provisions of section 205 (a), determine the ratio of the approved estimate of cost for each State to the total of the approved estimates of such costs for all States.

"Scheduling of construction and participation by States

"SEC. 206. (a) On or before April 1, 1956, and on or before April 1 of each year thereafter, each State desiring to avail itself of funds hereunder shall file a statement and an estimate of the cost of projects it proposes to construct during each of the next two fiscal years. The Secretary shall examine these estimates, and before the beginning of each fiscal year, commencing with the fiscal year 1956, he shall establish an approved construction program, including the estimated cost thereof, for each State for such fiscal year.

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

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

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

"(e) Payments to the States made pursuant to this section shall be subject to the conditions (1) that construction of projects on the interstate system in each State shall be in accordance with the standards approved by the Secretary; (2) that the State participates in the costs of construction in each fiscal year in the matching amount provided for such State under the terms of section 205 (a); and (3) that the State will have the same obligations as to maintenance of the projects constructed under this act that it has under Federal-aid highway legislation.

"Right-of-way acquisition

"SEC. 207. (a) If the Secretary shall determine that the State highway department of any State is unable to obtain possession and the right to enter upon and use the rights-of-way, lands or interest in lands, improved or unimproved, including the control of access thereto from adjoining lands, required for any project on the interstate system with sufficient promptness, and each such State has agreed with the Secretary to pay, at such time as may be specified by the Secretary, an amount equal to 10 percent of the costs incurred by the Secretary in acquiring such lands or interests in lands, or such lesser percentage as may be applicable under the provisions of section 205 (a), the Secretary is authorized, upon the request of such a State, prior to approval of title by the Attorney General, and in the name of the United States, to acquire, enter upon, and take possession of such rights-of-way, lands or interests in lands, including the control of access thereto from adjoining lands, by purchase, donation, condemnation or otherwise in accordance with the laws of the United States (including the act of February 26, 1931; 46 Stat. 1421), and to expend funds for projects thereon. The authority granted by this section shall also apply to lands and interest in lands received as grants of land from the United States and owned or held by railroads or other corporations. The cost incurred by the Secretary in acquiring any such rights-of-way, lands or interest in lands may include the cost of examination and abstract of title, certificate of title, advertising, and any fees incidental to such acquisition; and shall be payable out of the funds apportioned to the State hereunder available to the Secretary for construction of projects on the interstate system. The Secretary is further authorized and directed by proper deed, executed in the name of the United States, to convey any such rights-of-way, lands, or interest in lands, including the control of access thereto from adjoining lands, acquired in any State under the provisions of this section, except the outside 5 feet of any such right-of-way in States unable or unwilling to control access, to the State highway department of such State or to such political subdivision thereof as its laws may provide, upon such terms and conditions as may be agreed upon by the Secretary and the State highway department, or political subdivisions to which the conveyance is to be made. Whenever the State is able and agrees to control access, the outside 5 feet may be conveyed to it.

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

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

"TITLE III—MISCELLANEOUS

"Definitions

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

"(a) The term 'interstate system' means the National System of Interstate Highways as authorized to be designated by section 7 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1944, and includes those routes heretofore designated by the Commissioner of the Bureau of Public Roads, as well as routes to be hereafter designated. The mileage so designated as of June 30, 1954, is 37,600 miles. The mileage of the routes so designated is calculated by stating the mileage of the most traveled highway between control points. The mileage of the entire system is limited to 40,000 miles.

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

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

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

"Amendment to Corporation Control Act

"SEC. 302. Section 101 of the Government Corporation Control Act (59 Stat. 597), as amended, is hereby further amended by adding thereto the words 'Federal Highway Corporation.'

"Construction of this act

"SEC. 303. If any section, subsection, or other provision of this act, or the application thereof to any person or circumstance is held invalid, the remainder of this act and the application of such section, subsection, or other provision to other persons or circumstance shall not be affected thereby.

"Effect on present law

"SEC. 304. All provisions of Federal-aid highway legislation shall remain in full force and effect, and shall apply to the required actions to be taken, and payments to be made, by the Secretary under this act in connection with the interstate system with the same force and effect that said provisions of the said legislation applied to such actions and payments in connection with the interstate system prior to the passage of this act, except that the provisions of this act shall supersede any provision of the said legislation which conflicts with a provision of this act, except that section 13 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1950 shall not be applicable to the interstate system, and for the purposes of section 12 of the Hayden-Cartwright Act, the allocations made under this act shall not be deemed an apportionment."

Mr. FALLON (interrupting the reading of the amendment). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the further reading of the amendment be dispensed with, and that it be open to amendment at any point.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, and I shall not object except to say that the amendment which I have offered is the Clay report bill so that the House will understand it.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. I object, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, as I said at the beginning of the debate on this legislation, this is perhaps the largest legislative proposal for the building of highways ever offered by any civilized government in the history of the world. It is not a $48 billion program on the part of the Federal Government either under the Clay bill or under the Fallon bill. The Fallon bill proposes $24 billion in taxes, the Clay bill $21 billion in bonds.

Now, much has been said in regard to the payment of the interest that might accrue on these bonds. To begin with, the people to whom that interest will be paid will pay back to the Federal Government a considerable share of it in income taxes.

There has been criticism here this afternoon that the roads will be worn out before the bonds are paid. Let me say certainly the rights-of-way will not wear out; neither will the foundations of the roads wear out. The top may wear out as it does on all other roads. I am reminded of the building of the Pennsylvania Turnpike, which was nearly 20 years ago. It is true that in some places they have been compelled to blacktop it, but that is all. In addition to that, if it becomes necessary, whether it is built under this bill or the Fallon bill, let us remind ourselves and be aware of the fact that the maintenance and repair of these roads is the responsibility of the States and not of the Federal Government. I am sure the States will not expend money where it is not necessary, and I do not think anybody need fear that the roads will wear out before the bonds are paid.

It has been pointed out that there will be great savings to the people of this country, if we provide a more adequate system of highways. Not only will there be a great saving of life, estimated at more than 10 percent—I hope it is more—but also a saving in the destruction of property upon the highways of the Nation today which amounts to the staggering sum of approximately $4 billion. If we save even a quarter or half of that, plus the saving of life, that is justification enough for the Congress of the United States to pass legislation to provide better and more adequate highways.

I want to repeat, so no one will misunderstand, that the bill which I have introduced is the same as the original Clay bill that was introduced back in January-February of this year, with one exception and with a few minor amendments.

The Bacon-Davis provision is not in the bill which I introduced. Neither is there a provision for payment to utilities for the relocation of their facilities. A provision that was in the original bill provided for payment to the States for roads already built, and that has been omitted from this bill. Those are the main features. Otherwise, the rest of the bill remains practically the same. The financing provision is the same. I am sure that everyone understands what my bill contains even though it was not read in full. I was in complete accord with the motion made by the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. FALLON] who has been helpful and cooperative in presenting legislation for highways, and a wonderful acting chairman of the committee.

So, as we come to a vote on this bill, let everybody understand what it is, so that no mistakes will be made. Now that Members have a choice, 1 of 2 things will be done; either they will vote for

the financing of the highway program over a period of 30 years, through the issuance of bonds, or they will vote for the Fallon bill which provides for the imposition of taxes. In either case, there is a choice offered and an opportunity for the House to express its judgment in connection with the greatest road program ever presented to the United States Congress.

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I might say that all during the hearings and conferences the ranking Member on the Republican side has been of very great help and a steadying influence. We do not differ in any way on this highway program except on the financial section. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DONDERO] and I have worked together on road programs for the past 10 years, and at no time have we ever differed on the need for road legislation that came before the House.

The reason why we shifted our attention from the Clay bill or the Dondero bill is the fact that the other body took such positive action against it. It is true that we should not always be influenced by the judgment or actions of the other body. But as a practical matter we had to take this action into consideration. If there is to be any chance of a highway bill this year, it certainly cannot be the Dondero bill, because if we were to go into conference with two different philosophies, there would be little possibility of an agreement. I think we have got to find some legislation close to the provisions of the bill from the other body. That was the main reason why this bill was voted down by the Committee on Public Works.

Another reason was there would be $11,500,000,000 in interest, which would make this road program cost $11,500,000,000 more than it would cost under H. R. 7474. That is a fact. There is no way of dodging it. It would cost $11,500,000,000 more.

So we must decide here today whether we want to pay for these roads in 15 years in cash and no interest charges or whether we want to pay for them over a period of 30 years on credit with huge interest costs.

The fact is, at the end of 15 years, we will be able to say to the next generation, "Here is something that is paid for."

Mr. DEMPSEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FALLON. I yield to the gentleman from New Mexico.

Mr. DEMPSEY. There seems to be some confusion on the utilities question. Is it possible for any utility to get any reimbursement unless the respective State highway commission recommends it?

Mr. FALLON. Under the basic law, the Bureau of Public Roads cannot honor anything coming from anybody except the State highway commission.

Mr. DEMPSEY. And the State highway commission must recommend it before any reimbursement can be made?

Mr. FALLON. That is correct.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FALLON. I yield.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Under the present law, if a particular utility wanted to apply for these benefits, and have the State reimburse them, is it not true that the Federal Government would participate in the relocation cost of the utility?

Mr. FALLON. At the present time, yes.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. So why is it necessary to have any section at all in here about that?

Mr. DEMPSEY. This even limits it. This is 2 percent and half of the cost.

Mr. FALLON. This limits it to 50 percent of the cost and 2 percent of the cost of the project.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FALLON. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. JUDD. Does anybody believe that a State highway commission would not recommend that the Federal Government pay the 50 percent if the law authorized the Federal Government to do so? The State would not do it if it had to use only its own money, but is not the State highway commission likely to say, "Sure, go ahead, if the Federal Government will pay it, it is fine."

Mr. FALLON. The State is allowed to do it now and the Federal Government picks up the check for 100 percent. Under this amendment it can pick up the check only for 50 percent, and only when recommended by the highway commission.

Mr. DEMPSEY. If the State recommends it, the State puts up half and the Government puts up half. It does not take it from the Federal Government.

Mr. FALLON. That is right.

Mr. MACK of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the Dondero substitute.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MACK of Washington to the substitute amendment offered by Mr. DONDERO: On page 20, line 16, renumber section 207 as section 208 and add a new section 207 as follows:

"Labor standards

"SEC. 207. The Secretary of Commerce shall take such action as may be necessary to insure that all laborers and mechanics employed by contractors or subcontractors on the initial work performed on highway projects in the National System of Interstate Highways authorized by this act shall be paid wages at rates not less than those prevailing on similar construction in the immediate locality as determined by the Secretary of Labor in accordance with the act of August 30, 1935, known as the Davis-Bacon Act (40 U. S. C., sec. 276–a)."

Mr. MACHROWICZ. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MACK of Washington. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. MACHROWICZ. Will the gentleman explain whether this is the same amendment as now contained in the Fallon bill?

Mr. MACK of Washington. This is the same amendment that is contained in the Fallon bill.

Mr. MACHROWICZ. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. MACK of Washington. The Davis-Bacon provision was put into the Fallon bill by a vote of 28 to 4. In short, almost all of the Republicans and nearly all of the Democrats on the committee are in favor of the Davis-Bacon provision.

The Davis-Bacon provision is an old law in the United States. It has been on the statute books for 25 years, since 1931. The authors of the Davis-Bacon law when enacted in 1931 were the Senator from Pennsylvania, Mr. Davis, who was at one time Secretary of Labor in a Republican administration, and Mr. Bacon, a Representative from the State of New York. Mr. Bacon, a Representative of our State of New York, I am told was a very wealthy man and a very conservative man. The circumstance which led Mr. Bacon to propose the Davis-Bacon bill was that the Veterans' Administration was engaged in building a veterans' hospital in his district in New York State.

The contractor who had the lowest bid was from outside of the State of New York. He brought in a crew of a thousand workers from a low-wage area and built barracks in which to house this crew, messhalls in which to feed his workers, and opened a company store in which to sell these workers goods. This aroused the opposition of the business people of the community; it aroused the opposition of the contractors in the State of New York, and it aroused the opposition of labor. As a result, Congress in the Hoover administration, a Republican administration, in 1931 enacted this law in order to protect workers against this type of unfair competition.

The Davis-Bacon law, now on the statute books for a quarter of a century, is in force on many types of public works.

The Davis-Bacon law today applies wherever Federal money is employed to build airports, to construct schools, to carry out slum clearance, to build Federal hospitals. It applies to the lease-purchase program of public buildings enacted last year by the 83d Republican Congress.

The Davis-Bacon law requirements are in force even where the Federal Government pays all of the cost to construct such roads as forest roads and Park Service roads.

I, by my amendment, am asking that this Davis-Bacon law apply to the interstate highways that are to be built under this bill and toward the cost of which the Federal Government will provide 90 to 95 percent of all the money used to build them.

If it is right to have the Davis-Bacon provision in the highway act and in force where the Federal Government provides all the money, certainly there is nothing wrong to enforcing the Davis-Bacon law where the Federal Government puts up 90 percent to 95 percent of the money.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MACK of Washington. I yield.

Mr. DONDERO. As one who introduced the Clay bill as an amendment, I certainly have no objection to your proposal.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MACK of Washington. I yield.

Mr. BALDWIN. I wish at this time to join in the remarks of the gentleman from Washington [Mr. MACK]. I hope very much the committee will adopt his amendment.

Mr. MACK of Washington. I know the gentleman from California had a similar amendment ready to offer and would have offered it had he had an opportunity.

Mr. HOLMES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MACK of Washington. I yield

Mr. HOLMES. I want to commend the gentleman from Washington for offering this amendment, and I will join in supporting the amendment.

Mr. MACK of Washington. Mr. Chairman, the highway program proposed by this bill authorizes the spending of $48½ billion during the next 15 years for the construction of new highways. This will be the greatest public works program in the history of mankind. The money provided in this legislation would build the equivalent of 140 Panama Canals—the Panama Canal cost $360 million to build. No building program of such colossal magnitude heretofore has ever been undertaken.

To carry out this program great companies will organize construction crews and then bid on the thousands of highway projects to be let.

The Government, under law, must accept the lowest bids for these jobs. What I seek to safeguard against through the Davis-Bacon provision is that companies which organize construction crews in low wage areas shall not be permitted to bring low paid crews into States and areas where wages are higher and thereby break down wage rates where good wage rates now prevail.

We do not want contractors to get contracts based on their ability to hire labor cheaply. We want them to compete on a basis of ability, competency and efficiency, not on low wages. The Federal Government should not be a party to encouraging the breaking down of wage standards in any area where good wages prevail. That is why the protection of the Davis-Bacon law is needed in this bill.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MACK of Washington. I yield.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Chairman, I rise to support the so-called Clay bill as introduced by our colleague from Michigan [Mr. DONDERO]. I am opposed to the Fallon bill primarily because I oppose its discriminatory tax provisions. A howl of protest followed this attempt by the Public Works Committee to usurp the Ways and Means Committee's jurisdiction and include unequal and unfair taxes in the bill. But why these taxes at all? In our expanding economy the present taxes on gasoline will pay off a bond issue. All local financing is done that way. Suffice to say that with the estimated net increase of 3 million cars annually traveling our highways the administration's original proposal to finance the cost by issuing bonds is absolutely practical in my judgment.

The only reservation I make in support of the Clay bill is that this Davis-Bacon provision must be included. The inclusion of the Davis-Bacon provision is absolutely essential to the maintenance of living standards in the State of Washington, with particular reference to my district of Seattle and Kitsap County. My area is a high-cost-of-living area, and prevailing wage rates must be maintained if labor in my district is to hold the wage scales necessary to the maintenance of proper living standards under these high-cost conditions. We have had occasions in the past when outside contractors with out-of-area labor came in and undercut local labor markets. I am unalterably opposed to the repetition of such a situation. Consequently, I am supporting the Clay bill, with the intention of supporting an amendment providing the Davis-Bacon wage provision when it is offered.

Mr. SCHERER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MACK of Washington. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio, a member of the committee.

Mr. SCHERER. As a member of the committee, I join the gentleman from Washington in supporting his amendment.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MACK of Washington. I yield.

Mr. KEATING. I was happy to hear the ranking minority Member say that he had no opposition to this amendment. I think it greatly improves the substitute amendment, and I hope the amendment will be adopted and that the substitute will be adopted.

Mr. MACK of Washington. The committee voted for it 28 to 4.

Mr. MORANO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MACK of Washington. I yield.

Mr. MORANO. I wish to congratulate the gentleman from Washington for offering his amendment, and I shall support it.

Mr. THOMPSON of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, I offer a substitute amendment for the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DONDERO].

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. THOMPSON of Louisiana as a substitute for the amendment offered by Mr. DONDERO: Strike out all after the enacting clause of H. R. 7474 and insert in lieu thereof the following: "That, for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of the Federal-Aid Road Act approved July 11, 1916 (39 Stat. 355), and all acts amendatory thereof and supplementary thereto, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of $725 million for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, which sum shall be available for expenditure as follows:

"(a) $326,250,000 for projects on the Federal-aid primary highway system.

"(b) $217,500,000 for projects on the Federal-aid secondary system.

"(c) $181,250,000 for projects on extensions of these systems within urban areas.

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

"Any sums apportioned to any State under this section shall be available for expenditure in that State until June 30, 1959, and any amounts so apportioned remaining unexpended at the end of such period shall lapse: *Provided*, That such funds shall be deemed to have been expended if a sum equal to the total of the sums herein and heretofore apportioned to the State is covered by formal agreements with the Secretary of Commerce for improvement of specific projects as provided in this act, and prior acts.

"Recognizing it to be in the national interest to foster and accelerate the construction of a safe and efficient system of Federal-aid highways in each State, it is hereby declared to be the intent of Congress progressively to increase the annual sums heretofore authorized by the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1954, for construction of projects on the Federal-aid primary and secondary systems and approved extensions thereof in urban areas, by amounts which in each year shall provide an increase over the immediately preceding year of not less than $25 million, commencing with the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, as hereinbefore provided, and continuing such progression in each of the succeeding fiscal years, through the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, for which funds may hereafter be authorized. It is further the intent to allocate the total funds thus provided to the three categories in the same relative ratio as hereinbefore provided for projects on the Federal-aid primary and secondary systems and approved extensions thereof in urban areas.

"It is further declared to be the intent of Congress to continue during the life of this act the authorizations for roads in the Federal domain at annual rates not less than those contained in sections 3, 4, and 5 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1954 (Public Law 350, 83d Cong.).

"SEC. 2. (a) For national defense and other purposes, it is considered essential to provide for the early completion of a national system of interstate and defense highways, which system shall be understood to mean a system of highways of primary importance to the national defense and economy and welfare of the Nation, and shall be the system referred to as the National System of Interstate Highways, authorized in section 7 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1944, which act is hereby amended to substitute the term 'National System of Interstate and Defense Highways' for the term 'National System of Interstate Highways' wherever that term appears in that act or any other acts. When used herein the term 'National System' shall be understood to mean the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways described above.

"(b) For the purpose of expediting the construction, reconstruction, and improvement of the national system, including extensions, spurs, and distributing connectors thereof through, within and into urban areas, designated in accordance with the provisions of section 7 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1944 (58 Stat. 838), there is hereby authorized to be appropriated the additional sum of $1 billion for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and an additional like amount for each succeeding fiscal year to and including the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966. The sum herein authorized for each fiscal year shall be apportioned among the several States in the ratio which the estimated cost of completing the national system in each State bears to the estimated total cost of completing the national system in all of the States and the District of Columbia as set forth in the computations compiled by the Bureau of Public Roads on pages 6 and 7 of House Document No. 120, 84th Congress: *Provided further*, That the Federal share payable

on account of any project on the national system provided for by funds made available under the provisions of this section shall be increased to 90 percent of the total cost thereof, plus a percentage of the remaining 10 percent of such cost in any State containing unappropriated and unreserved public lands and nontaxable Indian lands, individual and tribal, exceeding 5 percent of the total area of all lands therein, equal to the percentage that the area of such lands in such State is of its total area: *And provided further*, That such Federal share payable on any project in any State shall not exceed 95 percent of the total cost of such project.

"(c) Any sums apportioned to any State under the provisions of this section shall be available for expenditure in that State for 2 years after the close of the fiscal year for which such sums are authorized: *Provided*, That such funds for any fiscal year shall be deemed to be expended if a sum equal to the total of the sum apportioned to the State for such fiscal year and previous fiscal years is covered by formal agreements with the Secretary for the improvement of specific projects under this section.

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

"(e) No funds authorized to be appropriated for any fiscal year by this section shall be apportioned to any State within the boundaries of which the National System may lawfully be used by vehicles with any dimension or with weight in excess of the greater of (1) the maximum corresponding dimensions or maximum corresponding weight permitted for vehicles using the public highways of such State under laws in effect in such State or regulations established by appropriate State authority effective on March 1, 1956, or (2) the maximum corresponding dimensions or maximum corresponding weight recommended for vehicles operated over the highways of the United States by the American Association of State Highway Officials in a document published by such association entitled 'Policy Concerning Maximum Dimensions, Weights, and Speeds of Motor Vehicles To Be Operated Over the Highways of the United States' and incorporating recommendations adopted by such association on April 1, 1946. Any amount which is withheld from apportionment to any State pursuant to the foregoing provisions of this section shall be reapportioned, in the same manner as provided in paragraph (b) of this section, to the States which have not been denied apportionments pursuant to such provisions: *Provided, however*, That nothing herein shall be construed to deny apportionment to any State allowing the lawful operation over the public highways within such State of any vehicles or combinations thereof that could be operated lawfully over the public highways within such State on March 1, 1956.

"(f) The Secretary is directed to take all action possible to expedite the conduct of a series of tests now planned or being conducted by the Highway Research Board of the National Academy of Sciences, in cooperation with the Bureau of Public Roads, the several States, and other persons and organizations, for the purpose of determining the maximum desirable dimensions and weights for vehicles operated on the Federal-aid highway systems and, after the conclusion of such tests, but not later than March 1, 1958, to make recommendations to the Congress with respect to such maximum desirable dimensions and weights.

"SEC. 3. Not more than 20 percent of the respective amounts apportioned to a State for any fiscal year from funds made available for expenditure under clause (a), clause (b), or clause (c) of the first section, or from funds authorized to be appropriated under section 2, may be transferred to the apportionment made to such State under any other of such clauses or under such section, except that no such apportionment may be increased by more than 20 percent by reason of transfers to it under this section: *Provided*, That such transfer is requested by the State highway department and is approved by the Governor of said State and the Secretary as being in the public interest: *Provided further*, That the Federal share payable on account of any project provided for by funds made available by transfer under the provisions of this section shall not exceed 50 percent of the costs thereof, including the costs of rights-of-way, except that in the case of any State containing unappropriated and unreserved public lands and nontaxable Indian lands, individual and tribal, exceeding 5 percent of the total area of all lands therein, the Federal share shall be increased by a percentage of the remaining cost equal to the percentage that the area of all such lands in such State is of the total area: *Provided further*, That the transfers hereinabove permitted for funds authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal years ending June 30, 1957, through the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, shall likewise be permitted on the same basis for funds which may be hereafter authorized to be appropriated for any subsequent fiscal year: *And provided further*, That nothing herein contained shall be deemed to alter or impair the authority contained in the last proviso to subparagraph (b) of section 3 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1944.

"SEC. 4. (a) In any case in which the Secretary is requested by any State to acquire any lands or interests in lands (including, within the term 'interests in lands', the control of access thereto from adjoining lands) required by such State for right-of-way or other purposes in connection with the prosecution of any project for the construction, reconstruction, or improvement of any section of the National System, the Secretary is authorized, in the name of the United States and prior to the approval of title by the Attorney General, to acquire, enter upon, and take possession of such lands or interests in lands by purchase, donation, condemnation, or otherwise in accordance with the laws of the United States (including the act of February 26, 1931; 46 Stat. 1421), if—

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

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

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

"(b) The costs incurred by the Secretary in acquiring any such lands or interests in lands may include the cost of examination and abstract of title, certificate of title, advertising, and any fees incidental to such acquisition. All costs incurred by the Secretary in connection with the acquisition of any such lands or interests in lands shall be paid from the funds for construction, reconstruction, and improvement of the National System apportioned to the State upon the request of which such lands or interests in lands are acquired and any sums paid to the Secretary by such State as its share of the costs of acquisition of such lands or interests in lands shall be deposited in the Treasury to the credit of the appropriation for Federal-aid highways or shall be deducted from other moneys due the State for reimbursement under section 2 of this act and shall be credited to the amount apportioned to such State as its apportionment of funds for construction, reconstruction, or improvement of the National System.

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

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

"SEC. 5. (a) For the purpose of facilitating the acquisition of rights-of-way in the most expeditious and economical manner and recognizing that the acquisition of rights-of-way requires lengthy planning and negotiations if it is to be done at a reasonable cost, the Secretary is hereby authorized, subsequent to fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, upon request of the State highway department, to make available to the States, funds for acquisition of rights-of-way in anticipation of construction and under such rules and regulations as the Secretary might prescribe, in amounts equal to 10 percent of the funds apportioned and available to the State within any category of any system under this act, for said acquisition of rights-of-way for roads to be constructed within a 5-year period following the fiscal year in which such request is made on the same participation basis as provided by this act for any such system.

"(b) In order to permit the initiation of this program for the National System at the earliest possible time, the Secretary, in addition to his existing authority to enter into contractual obligation, is authorized to make reimbursements or advances to the States for construction with respect to section 2 hereof, in an amount not to exceed $500 million during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956: *Provided*, That the funds expended hereunder shall be credited against sums apportioned to the State in which expended for projects under the provisions of section 2 of this act.

"SEC. 6. It is hereby declared to be the sense of Congress that all segments of the Federal-aid highway systems should be improved to standards adequate to meet the needs of national defense and the national economy at the earliest practicable date. The Secretary is hereby directed to submit to the Congress not later than February 1, 1957, and annually thereafter, a report on the progress made in attaining the foregoing objective, together with recommendations with regard to the programs herein authorized.

"SEC. 7. In addition to the purposes set forth in section 7 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1944, there shall be considered in connection with the undesignated mileage of the National System the additional purposes of eliminating bottlenecks in the evacuation routes leading from target areas, as designated by the Administrator of the Federal Civil Defense Administration, and providing such lateral feeder and distribut-

ing routes as may be required to furnish maximum utility of the system. The Secretary shall include in the annual report called for under section 6 hereof a statement showing what designations have been made during the prior calendar year.

"SEC. 8. All agreements between the Secretary and the State highway department for the construction of projects on the National System may contain a clause providing that the State will not add any points of access to, or exit from, the project in addition to those approved by the Secretary in the plans for such project, without the prior approval of the Secretary. Such agreements shall also contain such provisions as the Secretary feels necessary to insure that the users of the National System will receive the benefits of free competition in purchasing supplies and services at or adjacent to highways in such system, and such agreements shall also contain a clause providing that the State will not permit automotive service stations or other commercial establishments to be constructed or located on the right-of-way of the National System in such State.

"SEC. 9. The Secretary of Commerce shall take such action as may be necessary to insure that all laborers and mechanics employed by contractors or subcontractors on the initial construction work performed on highway projects in the National System authorized under section 2 of this act shall be paid wages at rates not less than those prevailing on similar construction in the immediate locality as determined by the Secretary of Labor in accordance with the act of August 30, 1935, known as the Davis-Bacon Act (40 U. S. C., sec. 276–a).

"SEC. 10. The Secretary is authorized to consider as part of the National System any toll road, bridge, or tunnel, now or hereafter constructed which meets the standards adopted for the improvement of projects located on this system, whenever such road, bridge, or tunnel forms a logical segment of this system as presently designated or as may be hereafter designated. Where a road on which tolls are being collected is incorporated in the National System, the Secretary is authorized to approve connecting projects under this Act to provide the necessary continuous system of highways: *Provided*, That agreement has been reached with the State prior to approval of any such project that (1) the section of toll road will become free to the public upon retirement of any bonds outstanding at the time of the agreement, (2) that all toll collections are used for maintenance and operation and debt service of the section of road incorporated into the system, and (3) that there is one or more reasonably satisfactory alternate free routes available to traffic by which the toll section of the system may be bypassed. Where a toll bridge or tunnel is incorporated in the National System, the Secretary is authorized to approve projects under this act approaching any such bridge or tunnel to a point where such project will have some reasonable use irrespective of its use for such bridge or tunnel.

"SEC. 11. The definition of the term 'construction' in section 1 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1944 is hereby amended to read as follows:

"'The term "construction" means the supervising, inspecting, actual building, and all expenses incidental to the construction of a highway, including locating, surveying, and mapping, cost of rights-of-way, cost of relocation of tenants, cost of demolition of structures or removal of usable buildings to new sites, including the cost of such sites, and the elimination of hazards of railway grade crossings.'

"SEC. 12. So much of the first section and of section 2 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1954 as authorizes appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, is hereby repealed.

"SEC. 13. The provisions of section 13 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1950 shall not be applicable to projects constructed pursuant to section 2 of this act.

"SEC. 14. All provisions of the Federal-Aid Road Act of 1916, together with all acts amendatory or supplementary thereto, not inconsistent with this act, shall remain in full force and effect and be applicable hereto. All acts or parts of acts in any way inconsistent with the provisions of this act are hereby repealed.

"SEC. 15. If any section, subsection, or other provision of this act or the application thereof to any person or circumstance is held invalid, the remainder of this act and the application of such section, subsection, or other provision to other persons or circumstances shall not be affected thereby.

"SEC. 16. This act may be cited as the 'National System of Interstate and Defense Highways Act of 1955'."

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Chairman, a point of order. I make a point of order that the substitute amendment is not in order. It is a substitute to the substitute.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will advise the gentleman from Ohio that it is offered as a substitute to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DONDERO].

Mr. McGREGOR. Then, if I understand the gentleman correctly, the gentleman from Michigan did not offer a substitute, but offered an amendment; is that correct?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DONDERO] offered a motion to strike out and insert, which is an amendment, an original amendment.

Mr. MACK of Washington. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MACK of Washington. When would the Mack amendment come to a vote or would the chairman and the ranking member accept the amendment since everybody seems to be in agreement on it?

The CHAIRMAN. The amendment offered by the gentleman from Washington, which was an amendment to the amendment, will be voted on before any other amendments are voted on.

Mr. MACK of Washington. I thank the Chairman.

Mr. THOMPSON of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the substitute be dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. THOMPSON] is recognized.

Mr. THOMPSON of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, I am sorry there seems to be an inclination on the part of some to keep this bill from being considered from all angles. I first want to say, Mr. Chairman, that I will not take up my time and the time of the membership by going back into all the details that have been argued so many times here this afternoon, and that we of the committee have labored with for over 8 weeks.

I am proud to serve on this Committee on Public Works. I think every member of the committee has made a conscientious effort to bring out a road bill that will give our motoring public and our defense forces the type of highway we should expect in a country like America.

But, Mr. Chairman, I think that perhaps we are proceeding here a little too fast. We had full hearings on the highway bill. We had no differences insofar as the need for highways are concerned, or how much it would cost to build them, but we did not use the time that I think should have been taken in committee to consider methods of financing that would have to be devised to pay for these highways.

I will say that the gentleman from Michigan, my good friend, Mr. DONDERO, has worked as hard as anyone to try to produce a program for the American people that could be realized and carried out.

I must say for my friends who take the position that they want the Clay plan, but if you do not want that, they would go along with you on something else. I do not think there are two routes we can follow at all; I think there is one that is best. It reminds me of the schoolteacher who went before the school board for examination and interview for a position. He learned that six members of the board believed in teaching that the world was round and the other six that the world was flat. So when this professor went before them, having heard of this argument, and was asked how he would teach geography, he answered: "As far as I am concerned, I am prepared to teach it either way.'

That is the position I think of too many of the membership on my left today.

This substitute amendment in effect is what has been called the Thompson bill. We have in it every perfection made by the committee that has to do with highways. We have in it the same ABC provisions that the Fallon bill contained and that the Dondero bill contained. We have in it all the factors of a realistic approach to the highway program. We want highways to be built. We do not want this program to bog down or to get a program that is way beyond our reach or something the people back home would not like. We want a highway bill, but we want one that our budget will stand.

Did any Member of this House object the other day when we cut $600 million from foreign aid appropriations? Who stood up to object?

Mr. MACHROWICZ. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMPSON of Louisiana. I yield.

Mr. MACHROWICZ. Will the gentleman explain whether the same thing which is found in the Fallon bill and which is found in the Dondero bill, namely the Davis-Bacon provisions, are also in the gentleman's bill?

Mr. THOMPSON of Louisiana. Yes, that is included. Everything is included that is in the Fallon bill except the financing.

The fact that the Appropriations Committee cut over $600 million from the foreign aid bill the other day indicates that it is the concensus of the House that we can save the $600 million from general revenues just from that one source. Now, if you have a residue that will amount to over $500 million a year for

the next 10 years in the existing highway users' taxes, why not use that, why not look back to see the billions of dollars that have previously been collected from highway users for general purposes? Why not give these highway users their due and not dig deeper into their pockets? If you vote for this substitute amendment, I assure you, Mr. Chairman, we will get a highway bill out that I feel the Senate will accept. We can then start building highways. You cannot build 1 mile more of highway in a period of 3 years with $10 billion than you can with $3 billion. The first 3 years is going to be the formative period. You cannot possibly spend the money as fast as the Fallon bill would have you do it for the first 3 years. So why not wait until the 3 years have gone by and let the then Congress pass on it. If the program can be accelerated, let us accelerate it at that time. But as a beginning, I ask you to vote for my amendment. I believe it is a good one.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, does the vote come first on the Mack amendment, including the Davis-Bacon provision, or would it come first on the substitute offered by the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. THOMPSON]?

The CHAIRMAN. The vote will come first on the so-called Mack amendment.

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Chairman I rise in opposition to the Thompson substitute amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I do not know much about this bill because it was never considered by the committee.

Mr. THOMPSON of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FALLON. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. THOMPSON of Louisiana. The bill was presented to the committee twice in the form of an amendment and considered. Of course, it was voted down.

Mr. FALLON. I am sorry to say the bill was never considered as a bill. It was offered as an amendment. It was never read. It was voted down. The committee never considered the bill, therefore I oppose the substitute.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FALLON. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, I may say to the House that I am opposed, as is the gentleman from Maryland, to the Thompson substitute.

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FALLON. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Chairman, I just want to call the attention of the membership to the fact that should this substitute prevail, as offered by the gentleman from Louisiana, you would have a highway bill without any means whatsoever of financing it. That is what you would be up against.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I am surprised to know that anyone on the Committee on Public Works, of which I am a member and on which I have been attending constantly during the hearings on a road bill, say at this late hour that no provisions of the so-called Thompson substitute were ever considered by the committee.

Well, now, let us look at the record. There are 19 sections to the Fallon bill. The Fallon bill and the Thompson bill are identical except for 4 sections. The only section deleted from the Fallon bill is section 4 and the so-called utility provisions of the bill.

The substance of the Thompson bill was indeed considered and it was offered in the form of an amendment on three specific occasions. I do not think anyone who attended the hearings of this committee can refute that statement.

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONES of Alabama. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. FALLON. Will not the gentleman see if I am correct in this statement. The first time the committee heard of this particular bill was on the last day when it was offered as a substitute?

Mr. JONES of Alabama. The gentleman knows that the numbers of the bill were changed but that the substance of the bill had been offered to the committee.

Now let me proceed.

Mr. FALLON. I was trying to ascertain the date on the bill when it was introduced, and I could not get a copy.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Of course, the contents of the bill should not take anybody by surprise because it was considered in the committee in substance on the several occasions I have mentioned.

Let us see what this bill attempts to do. In the first place, it recognizes that there must be an acceleration of the so-called interstate or defense highway system. We increased the amount from $175 million to $1 billion a year. In addition to that, we set the amount on the urban, the primary, and the secondary roads at $725 million with an acceleration of $25 million until the 10th year, at which time the interstate and the ABC roads will get an equal amount.

Let me point out again to you that in the other 2 bills you are going to spend two-thirds of the entire amount of money, 66 percent, for 40,000 miles of road which are traveled by one-seventh of the vehicular traffic. In the Thompson bill we set aside an increased amount for the interstate system, and next year, on March 1, if there is need for additional taxes, the Committee on Ways and Means can consider this problem in relationship to the fiscal policy of the Federal Government and the overall tax schedule.

I have heard a great deal from the other side of the aisle that we must be forthright and we must come forward with a pay-as-you-go plan; yet those who advocate a pay-as-you-go plan advocate that we create a corporation and issue bonds which will cost in a 30-year period $11.5 billion in interest alone. Money from the general Treasury of the United States would be used as capital reserve to pay for the highway program. How irresponsible can you get, to say that you are going to place a harness on the people of this country, a $36 billion expenditure, and you are not going to raise taxes, nor are you going to disturb the fiscal policy of the Federal Government, and that we are not going to have deficit financing?

There is a moderate and a temperate way that we can go about this program. The road bill is written every 2 years. We can review this legislation in the light of the needs after we have seen the experience of the appropriation of $1 billion a year on the interstate or defense system.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Alabama has expired.

(Mr. JONES of Alabama asked and was given permission to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Now, there are two very important sections in this bill that have not been properly covered. In section 14 of the bill we have a so-called reclassification act which upgrades the number of employees in the Bureau of Public Roads. It seems to me that if we want to create new jobs at higher classes of pay, that the department could request the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service to look into their needs.

Now I want to talk about section 7. Section 7 provides that the Bureau of Public Roads can reimburse the States up to 50 percent of the relocation costs of a utility occupying the right-of-way provided, of course, it does not exceed 2 percent of the project cost. Why was that put in this bill against the objection of every State highway director in the entire United States?

The gentleman from Texas [Mr. GENTRY] has telegrams from every director of every State highway department, and they are unanimous in their protest against that section. Why was the section written in there? Because under the present law, if a State has a statute reimbursing the utilities, the Bureau of Public Roads would recognize that contractual relationship and would make proper reimbursement. But here we are asking the States to come in and violate the contracts that they have made with the utilities and pass on an even more burdensome debt to the Federal Government.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. JONES] has expired.

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I know the Members are very tired, and I hope I can conclude what I have to say in less than the 5 minutes allotted to me.

Throughout 18 long weeks of hearings I have sat in the Committee on Public Works and listened to the viewpoints of the truckers, of the railroaders, of the laborers, and, on the other side, the contractors, listened to viewpoints of those people who had a special vantage point from which they viewed this proposed legislation.

And yet there is one viewpoint, Mr. Chairman, which I think should be expressed on this floor, and that is the

viewpoint of the person whom we are primarily responsible for representing, the average American who in the final analysis is going to pay for these roads, regardless of which of these three substitute plans is adopted, and who has every reason to expect his full dollar's worth in roads that he can use.

What is the basic difference between the three plans and their effect upon that average American? First of all, the Dondero plan embracing the Clay Commission proposal embodies, it seems to me, fiscal irresponsibility through the back door. Surely it is not the role of statesmanship for us to pass a bill which would cost the American taxpayer $1.55 for every dollar's worth of road we build him. Surely it is not the role of statesmanship for us to sit here today and approve a bill which will earmark $11½ billion, if you please, for interest payments, when that $11½ billion otherwise could be spent building some 21,000 miles of superhighway.

Surely it is not the role of statesmanship for us, Mr. Chairman, to yoke a succeeding generation 30 years hence, some of whose members are yet unborn, with the responsibility of paying for roads that we had already worn out, simply that we might have a few extra miles on which to ride in comfort now.

For those reasons I think we cannot, in fairness to that average American, support the Dondero substitute.

While I do not approve all that is in the Thompson substitute, as I expressed in my individual views in the report of the committee, I support it now for the reason that it trims down the excessive amount of money set aside both in the Dondero bill and the committee bill for this 1 percent of the roads of our country known as the interstate highway system.

I wonder how many of the Members of this House have looked at the map that delineates this interstate highway system on which each of these bills, the committee bill and the Dondero substitute, asks us to place almost three-fourths of all the Federal Highway tax funds—1 percent of the Nation's highways.

Mr. Chairman, I wonder how many of the people in this House have looked to see what a very small part this is of the highways in their own districts. There are 40 million families in this country and there is $31½ billion to be raised in the Dondero bill, which means that the average family in our districts is going to be called upon to pay something like $775 in extended taxes over 30 years' time, for improvements in 1 percent of the roads—think of it.

Some of our citizens will never drive on one of these superhighways, and many will do so only very infrequently.

What we need is a highway improvement program which will share its benefits more equitably among all of our millions of average American motorists, one which our economy can absorb and our people can afford.

Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I respectfully suggest that the Members of this House support the Thompson substitute, which brings the entire program into better alinement, which spends the same on the primary and secondary roads, but which does not make the mistake these other bills do of increasing this small 1 percent of the highway by 8,000 percent over the amount of money appropriated to it last year; and that then we dedicate ourselves to providing the funds to make this program self-liquidating on a pay-as-we-go basis. Perhaps it could be done now; perhaps early next year, but in any event before the authorized expenditures go into effect.

I tried to offer at the desk of the Speaker an amendment to the Thompson substitute. It would have cut the additional taxes imposed by the Fallon bill commensurately with the reduced appropriation and would have come nearer being a pay-as-you-go program than any of the plans that have been offered to us so far. I was informed that my amendment would have been in the third degree and therefore out of order.

It should be obvious, Mr. Chairman, that if we spend anything like the amount authorized in either the committee bill or the Dondero bill, taxes will have to be raised appreciably.

The committee bill takes cognizance of that fact, and for this reason is infinitely preferable to the Dondero proposal which does not. Yet the taxes it imposes, and they are formidable, still fall short of the amount the bill authorizes for expenditure over the 12 years.

A 50 percent increase in the Federal gasoline tax, a 100 percent increase in the diesel fuel tax, a 200 percent increase in the tax on larger tires—these are not negligible increases by any manner of means. Still they do not fully meet the cost.

I agree that those who profit most from the use of highways should pay their fair proportionate share of the cost. Yet let us not deceive ourselves. These taxes will find their way into the pocketbook of the average American through increased costs of goods and services. He will pay most of the bill, however we might devise it.

It is up to us, therefore, to see that he gets his full and complete dollar's worth. It is up to us to see that he gets roads which will be useful and serviceable to him.

It is worth noting that the less abrupt and more moderate increase provided in the Thompson formula will still be the most dynamic road-building program ever undertaken in the entire history of this Nation. I believe it is just about all our economy could absorb without inflationary dislocations.

These are the reasons, Mr. Chairman, why I believe we should support the Thompson substitute and then buttress it with a pay-as-you-go provision, to the end that we may have a reasonable and equitable highway program in the interest of the average American.

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I was extremely interested in the remarks of the gentleman from Texas who has just concluded, particularly that part dealing with splitting some of this tax proposal and applying it to the reduction of the bonds and the building of roads, because I had a similar bill prepared.

Here is where we arrive today. We are caught under a rule situation where we have to choose between the pay-as-you-go plan, the plan which provides for setting up the corporation and issuing bonds, or a program which simply authorizes the roads to be built, and then says that on a later date we may find the ways and means to pay the money.

I believe if we examine this thing in our minds for just a moment, we can recognize that if the Dondero bill is accepted, if the provisions which were set up by the Clay Commission are written into law here, that corporation then can proceed with its work and can get this highway program that everyone says is so necessary and desirable underway. This Congress in its session next year, or the next, or the next, or the next, can determine on the basis of the economic conditions of the times, can determine because of the budget situation in that existing year, what is the economic thing to do about retirement of these bonds. Certainly we do not have to be stuck with the program of paying off the bonds according to some calendar schedule. We can raise the money either from some of these taxes out of the general fund or from new levies, but retire these bonds faster.

This is the point I believe a number of the members of the committee have overlooked entirely in the consideration of this road program, and it is a simple fact that during the last fiscal year $2,300 million were extracted from the pockets of the users of our highways and the money went into the general fund. That money having been earmarked or having been linked to the highway program would have provided every mile of road that is contemplated here without any increase in any taxes and without the issuance of any bonds. I submit to you we are still paying it, and that a program as extensive as this one and a program that is going to involve billions and multiple billions of dollars is something that should be paid for over the years as a result of the deliberations of the Committee on Ways and Means so that annually, as we make every other appropriation, this program should be paid for. The way to get our roads and to get them fast is to set up this commission and let them issue the bonds and blueprint their program, and we will proceed to pay for it in a logical and economical manner as the years go by.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CORBETT. I yield.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the gentleman can tell me where the cement is going to come from to build the roads under this accelerated program? In Iowa today, I am told it is almost impossible for farmers to buy cement.

Mr. CORBETT. I cannot tell you what the productive capacity of the cement concerns of the United States is at present or what their projected capacity may be. I am sorry I cannot answer the gentleman's question.

Mr. GROSS. May I point out to the gentleman that the road building program in the State of Iowa has been retarded this year as a result of a lack of

cement. I wonder where we are going to get the material to build these roads.

Mr. CORBETT. I think, first of all, we better get the money before we try to buy the material and that we get the authorization.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the so-called Thompson substitute which is being presented to us today. I would like to call the attention of the Committee to the fact that the program is a moderate and conservative program. Even though it does have this advantage of moderation and conservativeness, it is still 4,000 percent more for the interstate system than was spent last year. Last year we spent $25 million for the interstate system. It is proposed under the Thompson bill to spend $1 billion in the forthcoming year. Certainly that is enough of an acceleration for the interstate system until we have a chance to catch our breath and find out what we are doing. The gentleman from Iowa mentioned the cement shortage which is apparent today. The cement industry recognizes that that is one of the important factors that we must take into consideration before we go too far in this program. If we spell out a program that has to be completed by a certain deadline, what are we going to do to the price of cement? There is another factor in regard to the number of highway engineers who are available. Today it is a recognized fact that we do not have a full supply. I suggest that the members of the Committee read the minority views on page 36 of the committee report and look into some of the factors that are considered here today, when we talk about the importance of taking a little closer look at this interstate highway program. There is nothing in the Thompson bill, as presented to the Committee, which would not make it possible to accelerate the program at any time within the next few years if it became apparent that it was economical and advantageous to do so, and if it became apparent that we could finance it. There are no taxes in the Thompson bill, it is true, but there is nothing to prevent whatever program is put into effect from being financed to a degree when these excise taxes have to be automatically renewed next spring.

Mr. BAKER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. I yield.

Mr. BAKER. That is my very point. The Fallon bill provides a tax revenue and the Dondero bill provides for a bond issue. How would you build the highways under the Thompson bill, which does not have either?

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. The roads would be built in the same way as we build them today. The program would be authorized and the appropriation would be made in the light of what the Congress wanted to appropriate.

We are presently spending money on highway bills that have no finance provisions in them. The gentleman's committee has the responsibility of providing the taxes.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Present taxes are now about $2.5 billion. Surely the Ways and Means Committee could find enough money to finance the bill.

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. The Dondero plan adds no new taxes.

This bill which is less ambitious would provide for less in the way of adding to the public debt than the Dondero bill, and the Thompson bill provides for a cheaper rate of interest than the Dondero bill.

The Dondero bill would provide for this grandiose corporation outside of public control which would have enormous power over the States in regard to their highway programs, a corporation that has never been considered before. We talk about what we are doing here, this is the biggest public-works program ever conceived in the history of the United States. It is far bigger than all of Roosevelt's and Harry Hopkins' added together in the way of public works, yet under the Dondero bill you would take that out of the control of Congress and give it to a corporation appointed by the President; you would not even have the congressional review which was available under the public-works program.

I suggest that you have here in the Thompson substitute a bill that is not subject to the objections that have been raised by supporters of the other types of bills, something that you can proceed under and start operations under on an accelerated interstate program.

Mr. GENTRY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I have heard some amazing things here today. You would think from some statements that have been made that the purpose of the utility provision in this bill was to deprive the utilities of something. Let me state to you that the purpose of this utility provision is to give to the utilities $970 million of money that is needed for roads.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GENTRY. I yield.

Mr. DONDERO. I do not think the gentleman intends to lead the House to believe that the utility provision is in the Clay bill. It is not in there at all.

Mr. GENTRY. It is not in the Thompson bill, either.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GENTRY. I yield.

Mr. JENSEN. Is it not a fact that the REA's and the mutual telephone companies, the small mutual telephone companies, are interested in this 50 percent provision?

Mr. GENTRY. I will say to the gentleman from Iowa that over 85 percent of the REA's and telephone lines and electric lines are either on unpaved roads or on small farm-to-market roads which will not have to be expanded and reconstructed within our lifetime. The expense to REA would be negligible.

Mr. JENSEN. I just want to say, however, that I have had a number of telegrams from REA's and telephone calls from mutual telephone companies asking me to be in favor of the provision.

Mr. GENTRY. I know the gentleman has; and I know also that most of them were induced by the big utilities who have scoured the country everywhere to get them.

Mr. JENSEN. I must say to my friend that the big companies are much better able to pay this than the little REA's.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. GENTRY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for an additional 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GENTRY. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the pending amendment and all amendments thereto close in 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

Mr. JONES of Missouri and Mr. JONES of Alabama objected.

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GENTRY. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. MEADER. I read the statement the gentleman sent around to all Members of Congress and I want to compliment him on the effort and study he put into this matter. I would like to ask a question that was not covered in that memorandum. Does the gentleman know whether or not the public utilities have set up reserves to comply with their obligations under State contracts to relocate their equipment at their own expense?

Mr. GENTRY. Outside of TVA the public utilities in this act are a very, very small percentage. Of course, the TVA pays no taxes or has to pay any taxes. It gets Government financing.

Mr. MEADER. I want to call attention to the fact that the utilities normally are very conservative in setting up a reserve for replacement of equipment and for everything they have to do, all of which goes into the computation of their rates. I want to ask the gentleman, Does he know whether or not these utilities have set aside a reserve for the relocation that they are required under State law to do?

Mr. GENTRY. Every utility in the country has such a reserve. The major power utilities have $2,200,000,000 in reserves. The American Telephone & Telegraph Co. has $800 million in reserves. All of the others have comparable reserves.

Mr. Chairman, let me read to you what the president of the American Association of State Highway Officials said about this legislation. You know they want this money, they want to build this great system of highways and it takes a lot of courage to come here and object to something that they all want.

Here is what Mr. McCoy, of California, who came here 3,000 miles, said:

The obvious inequity of paying for utility relocation costs out of highway funds is apparent if we ask ourselves this question: Why should utility relocation costs be passed on to the motorist instead of to the consumers of utility facilities, in view of the fact that the consumers have received the benefit of free rights-of-way purchased at public expense?

* * * The utilities are attempting to repudiate their contractual obligation to States, cities, and counties through Federal legislation.

That is exactly what they are attempting to do. They are trying to repudiate their contracts they have in all the States with the States by which they secure free right-of-way. They are coming here to the Congress and getting something which they have been refused in State legislation.

But the State highway officials were not satisfied with that. Only 2 weeks ago they came again before our committee and listen to what the president of the association said:

We wish to say here today for the record that we approve of your action as to providing a construction program and for financing it. We want a highway act of 1955 this session and we will appreciate anything you can do to assure action. We do, however, strongly object to the utility reimbursement feature.

That was when the legislation was practically assured. They came back here for the sole purpose of saying to the committee that we do not feel you should include this provision in the legislation.

Listen to what the American Automobile Association said:

The utilities are making an unconscionable raid to grab money sorely needed to meet critical highway deficiencies.

Now I would like to make this one statement, and I think this sets out this proposal very well. The laws permitting the utilities the use of rights-of-way under certain restrictions and conditions were enacted at the specific request of the utilities; that is, in the States. They have saved and are saving great sums of money as a result of these laws which they got passed in the State legislatures. Rights-of-way have been maintained for them at the expense and inconvenience of the highway users and without expense to the utilities. The new rights-of-way required for the interstate system will cost the highway users billion of dollars. The utilities will not pay 1 cent of it, but they expect to occupy them free of any charge. They expect them to be maintained for them also free of any charge, but the spokesmen of the utilities now demand that the highway users not only buy new rights-of-way for them and maintain them for them forever, but that they also move the utility facilities onto the new locations and pay the removal bill, and that is what they are providing for in this legislation, all without legal sanction, and in most cases in direct contravention of solemn contracts which the utilities asked the States to make with them by which they secured the valuable right to enter upon the highways in the first instance.

Now, here is exactly what this will do. This would completely and permanently change the historic and legal relationship between the parties; that is, the States and the utilities. It would make the States completely subordinate to the utilities instead of the reverse as it is at present under the States police power.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to call the attention of the House to the fact that insofar as our utility laws are concerned under which we are operating at the present time, the Federal Government does reimburse the States where the States reimburse the utility companies up to 50 percent of their moving charges. In other words, if the State pays 50 percent, the Federal Government will pay the other 50 percent on moving the utilities. Most of the States are doing that at the present time on an optional and hardship basis. There are three States in the United States that are reimbursing the utilities at the rate of 100 percent. Michigan happens to be one of those States at the present time. In my judgment I do not think this Congress should upset or change the operation of the Federal bureau as it has been doing in the past, because I am sure it is fair to the REA and the small telephone lines, because the Federal Government reimburses them, where they, the States, will share 50 percent, where it is determined it is a hardship, and the States pay the other 50 percent on moving cost. I just give that information to the House.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GEORGE. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. JENSEN. The gentleman is now referring to the Fallon bill?

Mr. GEORGE. I am referring to the law as it exists at the present time. The Fallon bill goes farther than that and says that they may, which infers, where the State reimburses none at all, they can get 50 percent Federal money if they apply and the State government O. K.'s it.

Mr. JENSEN. Let me ask the gentleman this question. Here we have a small town, a municipality, and they have sewers, water, telephone, and electric power lines, and we run a highway through that town and they have to move all of those utilities. Now, many of those small towns own their own utilities. Can the gentleman tell me how those small towns are going to pay this bill?

Mr. GEORGE. In our State that is part of the construction cost. And if they are on the streets and outside of the sidewalk line, as nearly all of them are, it is part of the construction cost and there is total reimbursement.

Mr. JENSEN. Reimbursement by whom?

Mr. GEORGE. By the State and Federal governments. If it is 50–50 money, they divide the cost 50–50. But if we pass this bill now with a provision for 90 percent Federal money and 10 percent State money, we leave the existing law alone. If we change it to 50 percent Federal money and say that the State "may," that means that the State can pay 50 percent Federal money but they do not have to put up any money of their own at all.

So what is going on at the present time is that 50 percent Federal money and 50 percent State money goes into the cost of moving utilities where the State determines that they owe an obligation so far as construction of the highway is concerned.

Mr. JENSEN. Does the gentleman say that that law is effective in every State except three?

Mr. GEORGE. Except three. And in those States they follow the policy of reimbursing 100 percent, regardless of where the utility is or what size it is.

Mr. JENSEN. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the Thompson substitute and all amendments thereto close in 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN].

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to yield the time allotted to me to Mr. PATMAN.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

INFLATION DANGER

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, I should like to mention something that has not been discussed yet—that is, I have not heard it discussed; that is, which plan will be in the interest of our country at this time?

There is real danger of inflation facing our country. Which bill would be more inflationary, the Dondero bill or the Fallon bill?

If you issue $21 billion of bonds, that is the same as creating $21 billion of money. That is inflationary. If you pay as you go, that is not inflationary.

Right now people are beginning to talk about reducing installment buying, or perhaps cutting it out, because of the danger of inflation. Installment buying amounts to an increase of only about $1 billion a year. This would be $21 billion.

There is much talk about housing being inflationary. They say we should reduce the amount of construction in the housing field because it is inflationary. But that would be a very small amount compared to $21 billion. If we have any danger of inflation in our country, this proposed $21 billion would be highly inflationary. If we were to adopt this plan, it would probably mean we would have to impose restrictions upon installment buying. It would mean that we would probably have to impose restrictions upon the construction industry—the housing industry—because of the inflationary danger.

We should not run that risk. The truth is that instead of creating more

debt paper and more Government obligations we should be reducing our national debt. We have today about $704 billion in debts. That means, of course, public debts and private debts. We cannot pay those debts off because no debts, no money. If you liquidate the debt, you liquidate the money. You do not have money to do business on. So anyone who says we ought to pay off all our debts has not thought the question through. We are going to have to have debt from now on out, and a lot more, under our capitalistic system, which is the finest and best system on earth. Nobody has found a better system. You must have debts in order to keep in business. So we are not going to be concerned too much about the debt except to keep it in line and prevent inflation.

Instead of creating more debts and more interest and more inflation, why not reduce our national debt some and then we do not have to be troubled about the installment buying or the housing construction or anything else, as long as we do not increase our overall national debt and our public debt or our aggregate debt?

So this bill that is introduced by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DONDERO], for whom I have a very high regard, is presented by him as what he believes to be the best answer to the problem, but it is an inflationary bill. It is calling for $21 billion in extra debt. To say that it is not added to the national debt is phony, absolutely phony. You cannot say that the Government is going to be responsible for $21 billion more in debt for roads or any other purpose and yet it is not added to our national debt. Possibly you will keep it out of the actual figures but the truth is it will be that much more national debt. You can call it anything you want to but it is increasing our national debt.

We have twenty-nine or thirty billion dollars of Federal Reserve notes outstanding, that currency you have in your pockets, and every one of them says the United States Government promises to pay on demand so many dollars. That is a part of our national debt but it is not carried as a part of our national debt. It is not included but it is a part. It will have to be paid off. This is debt here. You will say you are not carrying it as part of the national debt, but I do not care how you carry it, the people will owe it. It will be a liability. It will be a mortgage upon the property of all the people of our Nation and their incomes. There is no way to avoid it.

Therefore, the Dondero amendment is an inflationary amendment. It should be defeated. We should adopt a pay-as-you-go plan, and any inequalities in the taxes proposed can be adjusted in conference.

Mr. SIEMINSKI. Mr. Chairman, the Fallon bill has everything—fairness to all, fiscal responsibility, flexible implications to adjust to full-scale schedules in roadbuilding, materials consumption, high employment, steady payrolls, travel safety, fewer deaths, lower motoring costs for more miles traveled in less time, motoring benefits that can pace the economy of the Nation year after year in peace with a hum that should make the growth of our gross national product a vital and vibrant performance.

As vehicle-miles increase, so does the growth of our gross national product. The two have been synonymous over the years.

The Fallon bill gives all a chance to hold the line on the national debt as the growth of our gross national product mounts. It is an outstanding and astute accomplishment in the management of fiscal affairs. It is a magnificent tribute to fiscal responsibility in government.

The Fallon bill allows our people, for the first time in many years, to call a halt to deficit financing. It gives them a breather, time to match needs with deeds, fully paid as deeds meet needs.

Mr. Chairman, I am glad to have gone to bat a week or so ago in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, in a speech on the House floor, urging the Public Works Committee to be careful with its then reported high levies against the motorist, the trucker, and the bus operator to pay for the national interstate road network. I am glad that the Fallon bill takes counsel of that warning.

The Fallon bill is a good bill, eminently fair to all. I shall support it and vote against any bond schemes levied against our people under the cloak of congressional sanction. We were burnt in Hudson County on that bond-flotation score with the New York Port Authority. We do not propose to allow others to be burnt. We urge passage of the Fallon bill.

A capsule of my speech as reported over the wires by the Associated Press follows:

WASHINGTON (AP)—Representative SIEMINSKI appealed to Congress today to consider the tattered purse of the American car owner when it works out financing plans for a new highway building program.

SIEMINSKI, in a speech prepared for the House, called the car owner "the goose that has been laying the golden egg."

"The satisfaction of his needs puts to work tremendous numbers of people in the automotive, truck and bus manufacturing industries," he said.

Yet, he added, the car owner, bus operator and trucker are being penalized with "arbitrary and unreasonable automotive levies."

"For the past 24 years," he continued, "they have paid ever-increasing taxes on fuel and lubricating oils. They are charged with tolls on bridges and tunnels that help pay for projects not connected with their travel, not to mention the tremendous cost to them in man hours paid to keep cars, buses and trucks serviced and repaired throughout the United States with the purchase of spare parts this requires."

SIEMINSKI submitted figures showing that last year the Federal Government collected $854,666,000 in gasoline and Diesel fuel taxes and $68,441,000 in taxes on lubricating oils. In addition, he said, the States collected $2,218,097,000 in gasoline taxes.

The new highway building program will succeed, he said, if framed to fit the purse of all and "to call a halt in the foreseeable future to the mounting cost of motoring in the United States."

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SPRINGER].

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Chairman, I am happy to support the provision in this bill which will insure that wages on this tremendous Federal-highway project will be at rates not less than those prevailing on similar construction in the immediate locality where the construction is going on—all in accordance with the legislation commonly known as the Davis-Bacon Act of 1931.

Two years ago when other Federal construction legislation was before the Congress, I went back in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD to review the history of the Davis-Bacon Act. The authors of this law were Senator James L. Davis, Republican, of Pennsylvania, who was later Secretary of Labor in President Hoover's Cabinet. Representative Robert L. Bacon, Republican, of New York, had long been interested in legislation to cover such situations. This act is not new, having been passed in 1931 under a Republican Congress and a Republican administration.

At that time there was a real reason for the necessity of such legislation. On several Federal projects previous to 1931, it had been the regular procedure of some low-bid contractors to ship in cheap labor from backward areas. Many of these contractors housed their men and fed them on the project itself. I am sure the Congress can understand, in view of that unwholesome situation, why the Davis-Bacon Act was passed.

In practically all Federal construction since that date the provisions of the Davis-Bacon Act have been applied in order to assure local communities that local prevailing wage standards woudl not be endangered. The Davis-Bacon Act now applies to all direct Federal construction as well as to contracts for schools, hospitals, housing, and airport projects constructed with Federal-aid funds.

I am happy that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DONDERO], in offering the Clay committee substitute bill, asked that the House amend his substitute to include the provisions of the Davis-Bacon Act. By his amendment the gentleman from Michigan has assured the House that both the Fallon bill and the Clay bill will contain the applicable provisions of the Davis-Bacon Act.

Since by far the greatest part of the national highway system, provided for in section 2, will be financed by Federal funds, I am sure the Members of the House feel that labor standards normally applicable to Federal construction should also apply to this great arterial-highway system. This action has only the effect of preserving and affirming, rather than extending the longstanding policies of the Congress in matters of Federal expenditure and procurement. It is my understanding that in extending the application of this act to highway construction, the committee did so with the thought that all determinations made by the Secretary of Labor will be based on the prevailing wage rates on similar construction in the immediate localities.

All of this act follows the recent pattern and history of the Federal Government insofar as wage rates are concerned in local communities. It is a fair provision and is in the best interests of all of the country.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentle-

man from Washington [Mr. MACK] to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DONDERO].

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, may I inquire if the amendment offered by the gentleman from Washington is the Bacon-Davis amendment?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is in no position to reply to that, but, without objection, the amendment may be again reported.

There was no objection.

The Clerk again reported the Mack of Washington amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Washington [Mr. MACK].

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The question in on the substitute amendment offered by the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. THOMPSON].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. THOMPSON of Louisiana) there were—ayes 89, noes 178.

So the substitute amendment was rejected.

Mr. FALLON. 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. KEOGH, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 7474) 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, had come to no resolution thereon.

THE SUMMIT OF FREEDOM: ITS INDIVISIBILITY — ON THE JUST CAUSE OF UKRAINE AND OTHER CAPTIVE NON-RUSSIAN NATIONS IN THE U. S. S. R.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, the Four Power Conference in Geneva has stimulated a great deal of public discussion on the issues of war and peace, colonialism and imperialism, liberation and the continued captivity of nations in the Russian Communist empire. Fortunately, some of this discussion has been based on fundamental factors of political reality that lead us in no way to exude optimism over the outcome of that conference. On the other hand, quite discomforting are the many fallacies and myths that have cropped up in this discussion to cause serious wonderment as to the depth of our general knowledge and understanding of the recent history and political actualities of Eastern Europe.

One such fallacy is that the so-called satellite countries alone are deserving of freedom and national independence. What of the freedom and national independence of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia, that are now an illegally incorporated part of the Soviet Union? What of the freedom and national independence of Ukraine which, with its population of over 40 million people and rich industrial resources, stands not only as the largest captive non-Russian nation in the enslaved part of Europe, but also is the most strategic base for further Russian Communist aggression? What of the freedom and national independence of the many other non-Russian nations in the Soviet Union—Byelorussia, Georgia, Azerbaijan, Armenia, Cossackia, Turkestan, and others—who along with Ukraine and the Baltic States make up approximately 120 million people, exceeding the total population of the satellite countries? Are these captive non-Russian nations in the U. S. S. R. a forgotten segment of humanity to be sacrificed in the appeasement of Russian Communist imperialism and colonialism? A true and honest espousal of freedom and national self-determination cannot in moral and political principle tolerate a double standard, accommodating some degree of imperialism and colonialism, at that over a greater area of resources and population.

Another striking fallacy in current discussion is the contemplation of a peaceful coexistence of nations while the Iron Curtain continues in existence. The continued existence of the Iron Curtain is in blunt fact the very institutional contradiction to a peaceful coexistence of nations. Moreover, its elimination will not be achieved, as many mistakenly believe, by the process of liberating only the so-called satellite countries. This process would only serve to move it eastward to a territorial position where the first Iron Curtain was approximately set up about the borders of the Soviet Union in 1923. Whether to the east or west, so long as any Iron Curtain exists, the grounds for a genuine and durable peace are absent.

A very significant political work in connection with the Big Four Conference is the scholarly memorandum presented to President Eisenhower by the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America. This memorandum on The Summit of Freedom: Its Indivisibility was prepared and submitted by Dr. Lev E. Dobriansky, well-known professor of economics at Georgetown University and national chairman of the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America. On the basis of the inherent indivisibility of freedom, it advances the freedom cause of all the captive nations in the Red colonial empire, including the Russian nation, and necessarily concentrates on the just cause of Ukraine and other captive non-Russian nations in the U.S.S.R. Its objective, systematic presentation explodes the myths and fallacies to which I have referred here only in part, and offers a challenging analysis which deserves the careful examination of every American who soberly faces the problems of our foreign policy and the issue of war or peace.

Because I believe that this memorandum will be of interest to all Members of Congress, I am including it in my remarks.

THE SUMMIT OF FREEDOM: ITS INDIVISIBILITY—ON THE JUST CAUSE OF UKRAINE AND OTHER CAPTIVE NON-RUSSIAN NATIONS IN THE U. S. S. R.

I. SOME CONCRETE MEASURES OF REAL SUCCESS

"We shall never acquiesce in the enslavement of any people in order to purchase fancied gain for ourselves." (Dwight D. Eisenhower.)

In the full spirit and meaning of your quoted declaration we cannot but view the points listed below as some of the concrete measures of real success—indeed, in themselves veritable tests of the sincerity of Moscow's representation—in this conference. Surely, secure grounds and bases of genuine peace could not be achieved should this conference prove to be another expression of the cold war and merely revolve about a meeting of persons rather than a meeting of minds. In our judgment, without the consummation of such a meeting of minds on basic principles of political and social order, implemented by certain possible gestures of mutual good will in the interest of peaceable relations among nations and peoples, the outcome of this conference will only serve to justify the considered position of countless observers and analysts that this is simply another episode in the Communist strategy, staged on the highest diplomatic level, to purchase valuable time for the current genocidal consolidation of the Red colonial empire, as a necessary prerequisite for more decisive aggressions against the free world. History shows in factual abundance that wars are prepared in intervals passing for peace, and the present Russian Communist preparation is no exception.

Unless, in unbridled emotion, the peoples of the world, the free and the enslaved, are expected to pay hollow utterances to "Peace—It's Wonderful," it appears to us, as well as to other informed groups in the Soviet Union, that, ironically enough, we shall be purchasing "fancied gain for ourselves" if our resolve to "never acquiesce in the enslavement of any people" falls short of translation in the form of specific tests, political challenge, and courageous advocacy of fixed and unalterable principles. It is in the hope of witnessing the realistic translation of this moral resolve at this summit conference that we advance the following points of test and challenge:

1. In cognizance of the inherent indivisibility of freedom, a declaration on moral and political principles of national independence, sovereignty, and self-government of all nations and peoples, including Ukraine and the other captive non-Russian nations in the Soviet Union.

2. Systematic relative disarmament with airtight international control and enforceable inspection at any selected spatial point, necessarily involving the coverage of special armed security units like the MGB and the MVD in the Soviet Union.

3. Based on the fundamental conduciveness of the cultural intercourse of peoples to peaceful relations, the complete abolishment of the Iron Curtain which by definition would preclude its mere transfer eastward to the present borders of the Soviet Union.

4. In the vibrant spirit of Bandung, the rejection of imperialism and colonialism which in relation to Moscow can only be overtly demonstrated under international authority by the staging of free elections in the so-called satellite countries and the free exercise by Ukraine and the other captive non-Russian nations of the legal right reserved to them in article 17 of the Soviet constitution which reads, "The right freely to secede from the U. S. S. R. is reserved to every Union Republic."

5. Generated in a cultivated atmosphere of a universalized Declaration of Independence, proposals for the elimination of Moscow-directed agencies of infiltration and subversion and, in the interest of peaceful relations between nations and peoples, notably Ukraine and Byelorussia as now recognized by us in the United Nations, the complete liberation of 20 million people held in Russian Communist labor camps, including millions of Ukrainians and uncounted numbers of other non-Russians such as former

German, Austrian, Rumanian, and other war prisoners, all those people held in abject slavery contrary to the basic principles of the United Nations Charter which reaffirms "faith in fundamental human rights, in the dignity and worth of the human person, in the equal rights of men and women" and likewise contrary to the express provisions of the Soviet constitution which, under article 9 "precludes the exploitation of the labor of others" and under article 118 "guarantees the right to employment and payment for their work."

Careful thought and reflection devoted to each of these concrete points reveal that close correlation between peace and freedom which can emerge only in stages but which, nevertheless, is based on specific grounds of test and challenge validated both by principle and historical truth.

II. THE INDIVISIBILITY OF FREEDOM

"A house divided against itself cannot stand." (Abraham Lincoln.)

In essential truth, the summit of freedom is its indivisibility. The quoted words of one of our greatest Presidents ring truer today than even at the time they were uttered. By virtue of our miraculous technological advancements in the past century, the house today is the world. And again in the words of Lincoln, it "cannot endure permanently half slave and half free." In their own dialectical fashion all leading Communist theoreticians have substantially expressed the same idea in the cause of Communist slavery. The dynamics of historical development permit no other outcome than either the triumph of freedom or that of slavery. In upholding the torch of morality and political principle we cannot pass the unique historic opportunity provided by this conference at the summit to underscore the nature of the summit of freedom itself.

In real terms, the indivisibility of freedom is brilliantly reflected today in the patriotic struggles for the complete freedom of Korea, China, Indochina, Manchuria, Mongolia, areas in Africa, the satellite countries of Poland, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Bulgaria, Rumania, and Albania, and the captive non-Russian nations in the Soviet Union—Ukraine, Byelorussia, Lithuania, Latvia, Estonia, Georgia, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Cossackia, Turkestan, and others. Driven by the natural force of enlightened nationalism, these patriotic struggles for unified freedom, national independence, sovereignty, and self-government are intrinsically related at the summit of freedom and involve vast territories and peoples to warrant the most serious consideration in this conference at the summit.

Only perpetuated fallacies, carved in part by arid legalism, could in rational defiance of the indivisibility of freedom restrict the areas for the test and challenge of freedom. Contrary to one current fallacy, the record of Communist conquests commence in 1920 rather than in 1940, with Ukraine and the independent non-Russian republics as the first victims of Russian Communist imperialism. As in the case of later victims, the Government of Soviet Russia recognized the Ukrainian National Republic on December 17, 1917, only to subvert its independence and conquer the country shortly thereafter. Contrary to another popular fallacy, the record of broken Communist treaties also begins in the period following World War I, as in the case of its numerous treaties with independent Ukraine, Georgia, and others, rather than on the eve of World War II.

Fortunately, these and other gravely misleading fallacies have been powerfully dispelled by the official documented reports of the Select Committee on Communist Aggression of the House of Representatives. Hearings leading to the official publication of the Investigation of Communist Takeover and Occupation of the Non-Russian Nations of the U. S. S. R. and the objective scholarly presentation in Special Report No. 4 on the Communist Takeover and Occupation of Ukraine, as well as in other special reports on different non-Russian nations in the Soviet Union, have authoritatively established the permanent record on Communist aggression since 1920. The truths they reveal substantiate beyond question of doubt the indivisibility of freedom as manifested these past 35 years in the unrelenting struggle for national independence on the part of the Ukrainian and other non-Russian nations. Their official contents stand to mirror the compromise of freedom and principle that would be incurred in the fact of the cumulative sequence of Communist aggression since 1920, should arid legalism prevail to arbitrarily date this record from the 40's. The house would still be divided against itself and could not stand, especially since the largest and most resourceful non-Russian nation in Eastern Europe would remain in captivity and continue to serve as a strategic springboard for expedient Communist aggression in the future.

III. CONTROLLED RELATIVE DISARMAMENT

"I do not believe that we—or other nations—dare accept less than a truly effective enforceable system of international inspection and control. This is one case where half a loaf is not better than none." (Bernard M. Baruch.)

The emotional predication of certain arguments regarding world disarmament on the horrendous consequences of nuclear warfare upon civilization and humanity appeal more to the fear of man than to his reason. The paralyzing effects of fear may well be concessions of appeasement that could really spell the end of civilization in its true meaning. To confuse civilization with its material external expressions that in any war are vulnerable to attack and devastation, no matter what the degree, is to misconstrue its substance and meaning as revealed in the traditional wisdom, cumulative knowledge and moral evolution of man. Armaments are indeed the means of warfare and admittedly, their systematic, relative reduction would produce wholesome, conditioning effects toward real peace, but ultimately the magnitude of the means is determined by the particular ends contemplated by the parties involved, ends which can be gleaned from the record and institutions of each.

Considering the scope and magnitude of the means of warfare available today, it has been pointedly stated by one of our foremost citizens who has devoted himself to the problem that "this is one case where half a loaf is not better than none." The elements of official Communist perfidy, long records of broken promise and aggressions, and Iron Curtain protection for the execution of dishonoring maneuvers underlie the truth of this prudent statement. As attested to in the greatest measure by the long experience of Ukraine and the other captive non-Russian nations with characteristic Moscovite chicanery, proposed agreements to outlaw atomic weapons or to contribute to a peace pool or to maintain certain ratios of armament status fall far short of the present requirements of real disarmament for peace.

With the easy diversion of fissionable material for war or peace, international agreements, least of all with Moscow, are patently inadequate, unless an airtight, enforceable system of control and inspection at any selected spatial point is provided for. This control should be extended to all major means of warfare, and should include the armed security forces of the MGB and the MVD in the Soviet Union. Also, this control should be effectuated on the basis of a program of relative disarmament and so conceived as to preclude any temptation at violation of contracted agreements. In short, internationally controlled relative disarmament lifts the Iron Curtain surrounding the means of warfare and doubtlessly concealing the calculated formation of the surprise attack.

IV. ABOLISHMENT OF THE RUSSIAN IRON CURTAIN

"It is clear that this process of encroachment and consolidation by which Russia has grown in the last 500 years from the duchy of Muscovy to a vast empire has got to be stopped." (Dean Acheson.)

The historic Russian institution of the Iron Curtain does not merely surround the buildup of means of warfare. As the classic observation of the Honorable Dean Acheson indicates, the Iron Curtain has been an institutional necessity to the process of encroachment and consolidation of Russian totalitarianism, whether White or Red, over centuries of imperialist and colonial growth. In the contemporary framework, the first and original Iron Curtain was thrown about the conquered nations of Ukraine and others in 1920, and in the instant historical interval of 20 years was moved westward to envelop other hitherto independent non-Russian nations, like Poland, Hungary, Bulgaria, Lithuania, and others. Thus, to seek only the liberation and independence of the so-called satellite countries—to be sure, an admirable feat in itself—could only mean to seek the removal of the Iron Curtain roughly to the borders of the recent past, which certainly would not insure a durable and just peace.

On careful analysis, the institution of the Iron Curtain, which has served to perpetuate the centuries-old oppression of the great majority of the Russian people itself, is a proven necessity for the dual Russian Communist policy of effectuating, on the one hand, systematic genocide, political terrorism, and a continuous aggression against the many non-Russian nations already brought into the captivity of the Red colonial empire and, on the other hand, of spreading its fraudulent propaganda on "the workers' paradise," "equality and sovereignty of nations," and so forth, in gullible quarters of the free world. The Iron Curtain supports also in its institutional way the subversive and political aggressive activities of Moscow in the free world. This role is substantially by no means new, for as Mr. Acheson's classic statement shows, "The Russian rulers liked to bet on sure things: to be in a position to cut their losses when events showed that they had overreached themselves. They have not wanted to risk everything on a single throw of the dice. The Politburo has acted in this same way. It has carried on and built on the imperialist tradition. What it has added consists mainly of new weapons and new tactics—the weapons of conspiracy, subversion, psychological and ideological warfare, and indirect aggression, and tactics skillfully designed to employ these weapons." The evidence shows in abundance the fashioning and refinement of these techniques of infiltration, "intensive revolution" and subversion in the early destruction of the independent Ukrainian National Republic and those of the other non-Russian nations now held captive in the Soviet Union.

The continued existence of the Iron Curtain, situated at whatever borders, is a crass mockery to the concept of the peaceful coexistence of nations, a concept which, significantly, was first used by Lenin and his associates in relation to independent Ukraine and other non-Russian nations in the period of 1917–20. The Iron Curtain thrown about these countries, following their Russian Communist conquest, has proved so effective that many Westerners evince, even today, scarce knowledge and understanding of the long histories in the fight for freedom and independence of these non-Russian nations.

In the interests of truth and peace, one of the most challenging tests of Moscow's sincerity for peace is this proposal for the abolishment of the Iron Curtain. No force is

more fundamental to the peaceful coexistence of nations than the free cultural intercourse of peoples. The freedom envisioned here, with the nonexistence of the Iron Curtain, goes far beyond the current propaganda theatrics of select invitations and planned tours in the Soviet Union. This greatest challenge for truth and peace at this conference poses the freedom of peoples—all peoples who truly seek peace—to travel where they wish and to observe for themselves the actual conditions of life in all quarters of the globe.

V. BANDUNG, GENEVA AND THE ANTICOLONIAL CHALLENGE

"It came naturally to the United States to take a lead in this matter. We ourselves are the first colony in modern times to have won independence. We have a natural sympathy with those everywhere who follow our example." (John Foster Dulles.)

On the basis of the truth stated by our morally spirited Secretary of State, the striking example of Ukraine and other colonies in the vast Russian Communist empire unquestionably attracts our natural sympathy. The modern histories of these captive non-Russian nations are epics in the struggle against despotic Russian imperialism and colonialism. They unmistakably form integral parts of the overall movement of peoples and nations in this century, leading to the collapse of empires and the independence of nations with distinctive cultures, langages and histories. This is the moving spirit of our century which recently was crystallized at the historic Bandung conference.

The spirit of Bandung is the tremendous moral force infused into the complex of international affairs today by former colonial nations. The wholesomely impassioned representatives of these nations speak from recent experience. They speak eloquently in behalf of all remaining colonial and dependent nations, especially the many non-Russian nations reduced to this status in the past 35 years. As history well shows, Ukraine and the other captive non-Russian nations were the first to be subjected to Red colonialism with their forcible incorporation into the Soviet Union. They were the first to taste the unsurpassed colonialism of Red Moscow, savoring as it does of incomparable economic exploitation, genocide, russification, and slave labor.

The spirit of Bandung has found current expression in our own Congress, and this committee takes pride in having supported House Resolution 149 which, in unanimous passage, expresses "the sense of Congress on the maintenance of traditional United States policy in opposition to colonialism and Communist imperialism." We agree wholeheartedly with the report of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs, comparing the language of this resolution with that of the Declaration of Independence and emphasizing that "just as the Holy Scriptures are read and reread and the eternal truths which they expound are constantly proclaimed, so it is essential for a united America to proclaim to the world the fundamental principles upon which our Government, Nation, and people rest."

In fitting response to this ringing call of the people's representatives, no more propitious occasion for this proclamation of principles could be had than this conference at the summit. The spirit of Bandung cannot be stilled at Geneva: the real and most outstanding issues of this century cannot be avoided if peace with freedom is at stake. Where God-given, inalienable rights are at stake, no double standard is permissible. no half or quarter empire is thinkable, since empires, liike cancer, though in part emaciated, regrow with even greater intensity. A philosophy denying these rights cannot possibly live side by side with one cherishing them, and the Communists know this best. "Live and let live" becomes sheer rhetoric where an unrelenting struggle for the free exercise of these God-given rights of independent national existence is involved. The anticolonial challenge to Moscow's sincerity for peace can best be transmitted at this conference in proposals for free elections in the satellite areas and the exercise of the legal secession right in the captive non-Russian areas of the Soviet Union. Stalinist cynicism had always confirmed their right to secede but negated the power of exercise. Believers in freedom, however, know that this power resides in the very essence of the right.

VI. A UNIVERSALIZED DECLARATION OF INDEPENDENCE

"The right is more precious than peace, and we shall fight for the things which we have always carried nearest our hearts." (Woodrow Wilson.)

These are—"for democracy, for the right of those who submit to authority to have a voice in their own governments, for the rights and liberties of small nations, for a universal dominion of right by such a concert of free peoples as shall bring peace and safety to all nations and make the world itself at last free." Few have expresed with equal eloquence the supremacy of rights in relation to peace than this great President and ardent advocate of the national self-determination of peoples. Had this principle, which is a precious part of our American tradition, been generally applied after World War I, it is safe to say that a durable global peace could have been achieved. Certainly, there would not be today the Communist imperialist menace, the long record of Communist aggression and absorption of foreign territories, had the large and resourceful independent republics of Ukraine, Turkestan, Byelorussia and others been assisted and sustained by the powerful proponents of the principle of national self-determination.

Most ironically, this sacred principle is being widely exploited today by the Russian Communists as it had been even before they ascended to power. During the period of chaos that followed the abdication of Czar Nicholas II, the Ukrainian nation, for example, now of some 45 million people, recovered its liberty and founded its own independent and democratic state, the Ukrainian National Republic. However, it is well documented historically that to bring about the permanent collapse of the Czarist reign, Bolshevik propaganda as concocted by Lenin, Stalin, and others aimed at this very development. It viewed the colossal centrifugal force of enlightened nationalism in the non-Russian regions of the Empire as a potent instrument for this desired end; and in the same way that Moscow exploits nationalism today in various parts of the free world, so in this early period of Bolsheviks advocated the principle of national self-determination in the most unqualified terms. Then it was to break up an empire to implant themselves in power: now, as shown brilliantly in Indochina, it is to divide the free world in order to extend to the point of completion the gigantic program of empire building begun once they seized power in 1917.

Freedom's challenge to Moscow and its expedient espousal of this basic principle is the abolishment of the Iron Curtain and, under the authority of the United Nations, the conduct of free elections and the exercise of the secession right in all of the non-Russian nations of the Red colonial empire. This is the test of a real application of a principle that Moscow professes for the ears of the free world.

As Mr. Acheson declared in testimony before a congressional committee, "We are stressing here that independence is the great thing to start with. If peoples are really independent and they are not satellites of anybody, then we can begin to work with them, because they have got something which we understand." In an empire, such as the Fussian Communist empire, all neighboring nations are satellites, especially the captive non-Russian nations in the formal structure of the Soviet Union, who in geographic area, population, and resources exceed the other non-Russian nations. In relation to all of them, truly, "independence is the great thing to start with," and only a universalized declaration of independence, for which we are best fitted to initiate in order to achieve that universal dominion of right, can adequately express the force of freedom at this conference. Independence is the real, solid basis for understanding and thus peace among peoples. It is the primary requisite for a true community of nations and the logical prerequisite of any scheme of free federation of nations. Indeed, the very independence of the great part of the Russian nation, in surcease of tyranny, oppression, and economic privation sustained for centuries by absolutist Russian expansionism, is dependent on the independence of all non-Russian nations in this Red colonial empire.

VII. PEACE—FREEDOM=COMMUNIST SLAVERY

"War to the hilt between communism and capitalism is inevitable. Today, of course, we are not strong enough to attack. Our time will come in 20 or 30 years. To win we shall need the element of surprise."

The high Communist functionary, Dmitri Z. Manuilski, continues in this remarkably significant vein. "The bourgeoisie will have to be put to sleep. So we shall begin by launching the most spectacular peace movement on record. There will be electrifying overtures and unheard of concession. The capitalist countries, stupid and decadent, will rejoice to cooperate in their own destruction. They will leap at another chance to be friends. As soon as their guard is down, we shall smash them with our clenched fist." These seemingly prophetic words were uttered in 1930 to international students at the Lenin School of Political Warfare in Moscow. They embrace thoughts repeatedly asserted in other words by all high-ranking members of the Russian Communist regime. In prediction of time and circumstance they vividly picture the very exhibitions staged before our eyes today. The spectacular Communist circus on peace is on the road and a Barnum-like audience is forming in the free world, leaping at another chance to be friends.

These words, as indeed masses of others, spell out the same fixed and unalterable formula, peace—freedom=Communist slavery. As indicated before, present Communist theatricals in the ostensible interest of peace, performed by way of planned tours, ballets, sports participation, a world assembly for peace in Helsinki, misleading Austrian treaty concessions and numerous other deceptive demonstrations, furnish not an iota of real evidence in the desire for a durable and just peace. Instead, they constitute propaganda projections on a world scale of what, in 35 years of intimate experience with Russian Communist tactics and deception, every patriotic Ukrainian and other captive non-Russian in the U. S. S. R. has come to know as the Iron Curtain on true information, the verbal facade behind which the real Communist activity is feverishly pursued. At this very moment of overflowing peace talk, hundreds of thousands of Ukrainian youth and those of the other non-Russian nations are being coralled and shipped to Central Asia in the buildup of a tremendous agricultural base relatively insulated for large-scale war; Communist agents are infiltrating all sectors of Vietnam for the eventual kill in Indochina; North Korea is rapidly becoming a huge arsenal for planned things to come—to mention only a few instances of real Moscow-centered Communist activity behind its verbal facade of peace.

The most ominous aspect of the current scene is the evident Communist play for time, to consolidate within, neutralize without, attain to a striking adequacy of nuclear weapons, and finally to strike in Pearl Harbor style for the greatest stakes the world has ever known. This Communist calculus for world conquest finds open credence in the very words quoted above. It finds more than ample real credence in the entire documented course of Russian Communist history and strategy. Unless real tests, as proposed here, are advanced sooner or later, and several should be at this conference on peace and freedom, then undoubtedly the sinister formula of peace—freedom=Communist slavery will gain the time necessary for its real application.

In the nature of things, the growing psychology in some quarters of giving the people several more years of "peace" through relative inaction and endless diplomatic truck is productive only of a fatalist resignation to inevitable war and short-run losses of existing opportunities to really prevent the outbreak of a third world war. As long as the Iron Curtain exists, at whatever borders, the fulfilment of a peaceful coexistence of nations can only remain as an ideal. The only alternative opportunity open to us is not, as some mistakenly impute it, the course of preventive war, but rather a full-grown peaceful policy of liberation that, in fact, is capable of disrupting the applied Communist calculus for world conquest. The efficient cause of liberation throughout the Red colonial empire is independence and national self-determination. It is, at once, the just cause, not only of the so-called satellite nations, but also of the 120 million people in the captive Ukraine and other non-Russian nations in the U. S. S. R. It is the cause, both efficient and just, that necessarily must find expression in the conference at the summit if the summit of freedom itself is to tower above all else in the true interests of peace and all of humanity.

Our hopes and prayers are constantly with you, as those of countless other Americans cherishing firm conviction in a "universal dominion of right," a dominion that cannot but encompass Geneva, a dominion that reigns in the hearts of all in behalf of whom this memorandum is hereby respectfully submitted.

LEV E. DOBRIANSKY,
Chairman.
Ukrainian Congress Committee of America, Professor, Georgetown University.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. FEIGHAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 5 minutes today, following the legislative program of the day and the conclusion of any special orders heretofore entered.

COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Public Works may have until midnight tonight to file reports on the water pollution control bill, S. 890, and the New Orleans gulf outlet bill, H. R. 6309.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

AMENDING NATURAL GAS ACT

Mr. COLMER, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 317, Rept. No. 1445) 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. 6645) to amend the Natural Gas Act, as amended. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill, and shall continue not to exceed 3 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, 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.

PERMANENT COMMITTEE FOR THE OLIVER WENDELL HOLMES DEVISE

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 7029) to establish a Permanent Committee for the Oliver Wendell Holmes Devise, and for other purposes, with a Senate amendment thereto and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment as follows:

Page 2, line 3, strike out all after "rate" down to and including "deposit" in line 5 and insert "to be determined by the Secretary of the Treasury by estimating the average yield to maturity, on the basis of daily closing market bid quotations or prices during the month preceding the deposit on all outstanding marketable obligations of the United States having a maturity date of 15 or more years from the first day of such month."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in; and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

THE DR. JONAS E. SALK GOLD MEDAL

Mr. DAVIDSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of House Joint Resolution 278, to provide that a gold medal be coined and presented to Dr. Jonas E. Salk in honor of his achievements in the field of medicine.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I understand this has been reported unanimously by the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Mr. DAVIDSON. That is correct.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the joint resolution, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That in recognition of the great achievement of Dr. Jonas E. Salk in the field of medicine by his discovery of a serum for the prevention of poliomyelitis, the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to cause to be struck and presented to Dr. Jonas E. Salk a gold medal with suitable emblems, devices, and inscriptions to be determined by the Secretary. For such purpose there is authorized to be appropriated the sum of $2,500.

SEC. 2. The Secretary of the Treasury shall cause duplicates in bronze of such medal to be coined and sold, under such regulations as he may prescribe, at a price sufficient to cover the cost thereof (including labor), and the appropriations used for carrying out the provisions of this section shall be reimbursed out of the proceeds of such sale.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DR. JONAS E. SALK

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 am deeply moved and gratified by the unanimous action of the House in approving the bill which I introduced to present a gold medal to Dr. Jonas E. Salk. In authorizing the coining of this special medal we recognize the accomplishment which he has made. This young doctor has opened the door to the conquest of infantile paralysis. As a result of his great work, made possible by the contributions of all Americans to the National Foundation for Infantile Paralysis March of Dimes campaigns, many lives will be saved; many children, our most precious national resource, will be spared untold agony. The parents of America and the world will no longer live in fear of this dread crippling disease.

During the last 16 years the National Foundation for Infantile Paralysis has expended a total of $25,541,662.14 for direct research for the development of a poliomyelitis vaccine. The annual March of Dimes campaign, conducted by the national foundation, received the support of the entire Nation. The money so generously contributed by the people made it possible for scientists to intensively study the problem. Dr. Jonas E. Salk first entered the fight against polio in 1942 when he joined the staff of the University of Michigan as the recipient of a National Foundation for Infantile Paralysis fellowship. In 1951 he began his direct research at the virus research laboratories of the University of Pittsburgh on the vaccine now being used.

The Salk vaccine is the result of a painstaking and intensive research program in which live polio virus is treated by chemicals so that a delicate balance is struck in which the ability of the virus to cause disease is eliminated by meticu-

lously calculated chemical additions but still leaving the virus with sufficient potency to stimulate antibody production. Dr. Salk, as the name of the vaccine indicates, was able to develop this vaccine. In his tests at Pittsburgh he proved that the vaccine which he produced was able to raise the antibody level. In the nationwide field trial held by the National Foundation last year Dr. Salk's vaccine was proved highly effective in preventing paralysis. Over 1,830,000 children throughout the United States took part in this massive trial. During the last 2 years Dr. Salk wrote and published over 12 medical papers concerning immunization against poliomyelitis.

Dr. Salk is a modest man; his parents, too, have with pardonable parental pride, shown great humility. I do not think I exaggerate, however, when I say that the people of the entire Nation and of New York, particularly those who live in my district, Manhattan's west side, take great pride, as I do, in Dr. Salk's achievement. We are proud of him and of the training which he received from his parents and the New York City school system which helped mold the great scientist we know today.

I think it fitting that we express our thanks and appreciation to Dr. Salk. This modest recognition of his work and that of his fellow scientists is the very least that a grateful Nation can do.

CONVEYANCE OF CERTAIN PROPERTY TO STATE OF LOUISIANA

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 5512) to provide for the conveyance of certain property under the jurisdiction of the Housing and Home Finance Administrator to the State of Louisiana, with Senate amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 2, strike out lines 7 to 12, inclusive.

Page 2, line 13, strike out "3" and insert "2."

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, do I understand that this is agreeable to the ranking Republican minority member on the committee, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT]?

Mr. MULTER. The gentleman's statement is correct.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in; and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROGRAM FOR JULY 27

The SPEAKER. Before any more Members leave the Chamber, the Chair desires to recognize the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. ALBERT] to announce the program for tomorrow.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, in response to the statement of the Chair, when the House convenes tomorrow at 12 o'clock we will continue consideration of H. R. 7474, the highway bill. If that bill is disposed of at a reasonable hour, it is planned to begin, and if possible, finish general debate on the Natural Gas Act. The House will convene at 12 o'clock tomorrow but it is planned to convene the House at 10 o'clock on Thursday and possibly on Friday. On Thursday we will continue the consideration of the Natural Gas Act.

Mr. MARTIN. The gentleman does not know what the program is for the balance of the week?

Mr. ALBERT. I cannot advise the gentleman at this time as to the program for the balance of the week.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA ARMORY BOARD

Mr. MCMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 6259) to amend section 8 of the act entitled "An act entitled to establish a District of Columbia Armory Board and for other purposes," with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Page 1, line 5, strike out "SEC. 2–1706" and insert "SEC. 2–1708."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in; and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SALARIES OF TEACHERS, SCHOOL OFFICERS, AND OTHER EMPLOYEES OF THE BOARD OF EDUCATION, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. MCMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (S. 1093) to fix and regulate the salaries of teachers, school officers, and other employees of the Board of Education of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes, with House amendments thereto, insist upon its amendments and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs ABERNETHY, DAVIS of Georgia, JONES of North Carolina, MILLER of Nebraska, and HYDE.

AUTHORIZING SECRETARY OF SENATE TO MAKE A CERTAIN CHANGE

Mr. MCMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of Senate Concurrent Resolution 53.

The Clerk read the Senate concurrent resolution, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Secretary of the Senate be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed, in the enrollment of the bill (S. 2428) to increase the salaries of officers and members of the Metropolitan Police force, and the Fire Department of the District of Columbia, the United States Park Police, and the White House Police, and for other purposes, to make the following change, viz: On page 5, line 15, of the engrossed bill, strike out "63f–63k" and insert in lieu thereof "61f–61k."

The Senate concurrent resolution was agreed to; and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CONVEYANCE OF CERTAIN LAND TO STATE OF TEXAS

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 593) to convey by quitclaim deed certain land to the State of Texas.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman explain the bill?

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, this bill permits the Government to sell back to the State of Texas 100 acres of land near Whitney Dam and Reservoir. There will be no money expended. The bill provides that the land will be sold back for no less than the amount the Government paid for it.

Mr. MARTIN. It goes back to the State?

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. To be used as a State park.

Mr. MARTIN. And the National Government did not pay anything for it in the first instance?

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. The National Government paid something, but it will get no less than it paid for the tract of land.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, have any improvements been made by the National Government?

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. No; no improvements have been made.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Has the bill been approved by a committee?

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. By the Committee on Public Works unanimously.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Army is hereby authorized to convey by quitclaim deed to the State of Texas, for public park and recreational purposes only, such areas within the portion of Whitney Dam and Reservoir project, Texas, designated by the Corps of Engineers as Towash Park and designated by the State of Texas Parks Board as Lake Whitney State Park, as he shall deem essential to provide building sites for permanent buildings and other improvements for public park and recreational purposes, but not to exceed 100 acres, at fair market value as determined by him, which in no event shall be less than the cost to the Government of acquiring such areas, and under such terms and conditions as he shall deem advisable to assure that the use of said areas by the State will not interfere with the operation of said dam and reservoir

project and such additional terms and conditions as he shall deem to be advisable in the public interest.

The conveyance authorized by this act shall not pass any right, title, or interest in oil, gas, fissionable materials, or other minerals.

In the event actual construction of said buildings and improvements has not commenced within 5 years from the effective date of this act, or in the event said property shall cease to be used for public park and recreation purposes for a period of 2 successive years, then title thereto shall immediately revert to the United States.

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.

NATIONAL DEFENSE FACILITIES ACT OF 1950

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 2107) to amend the National Defense Facilities Act of 1950 to provide for additional facilities necessary for the administration and training of units of the Reserve components of the Armed Forces of the United States, and for other purposes, with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert "That the National Defense Facilities Act of 1950 (64 Stat. 829; 50 U. S. C. 881–886) is amended as follows:

"(a) Section 3 is amended by deleting the phrase 'in an amount not to exceed $250 million over a period of the next 5 fiscal years' and by inserting in lieu thereof 'in an amount not to exceed $500 million over a period of the next 8 fiscal years commencing with fiscal year 1951'.

"(b) Subsection 3 (b) is amended to read as follows:

"'(b) (1) contribute to any State such funds as he shall determine to be necessary to expand, rehabilitate or convert facilities owned by such State to the extent required for the joint utilization of such facilities; and

"'(2) contribute to any State such funds as he shall determine to be necessary to expand, rehabilitate or convert facilities owned by such State to the extent made necessary, or to acquire, construct, expand, rehabilitate or convert such additional facilities as he shall determine to have been made essential, by any conversion, redesignation or reorganization of a unit or units of the National Guard of the United States or the Air National Guard of the United States requested or authorized by the Secretary of the Army or the Secretary of the Air Force, respectively.'

"(c) Subsection 4 (b) is amended by deleting the words 'with regard' and substituting therefor the words 'and shall have consented'.

"(d) Subsection 4 (c) is amended by inserting after the word 'acquired' in line 7 thereof the words 'by the United States'.

"(e) Subsection 4 (d) is amended to read as follows:

"'(d) Each contribution made pursuant to section 3 (b) or 3 (c) of this act shall be subject to such terms and conditions as the Secretary of Defense, after consultation with the Armed Services Committees of the Congress, shall deem necessary to accomplish the purposes of this act: *Provided*, That except as agreed at the time the contribution is made the facilities provided through contributions made pursuant to section 3 (b) (2) or 3 (c) of this act shall be subject to joint utilization only to the extent deemed practicable by the State concerned. No contribution shall be made under section 3 (c) for any armory in an amount exceeding 75 percent of the cost of the additional or improved armories to be constructed: *And provided further*, That for the purpose of such computation the amount to be contributed by any State shall be exclusive of the cost or market value of any real estate which may be contributed by the State concerned for the purposes of section 3 (c) of this act.'

"(f) Section 6 is amended by (1) inserting immediately after 'SEC. 6.' the following: '(a)', and (2) adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"'(b) All construction, expansion, rehabilitation, or conversion of facilities in each State pursuant to section 3 (b) or 3 (c) of this act shall be done in accordance with the laws of such State and under the supervision of officials of such State, subject to the inspection and approval of the Secretary of Defense.'

"(g) Subsections 7 (b), (c), and (d) are redesignated subsections 7 (c), (d), and (e), respectively, and subsection 7 (b) is inserted to read as follows:

"'(b) "Armory" means a structure which houses a unit or units of a Reserve component and is used for the training and administration thereof, including such appurtenant structures as may house equipment used in the training and administration of such unit or units. All other facilities shall be considered nonarmory for the purposes of this act.'

"(h) Subsection 7 (d) as redesignated is amended to read as follows:

"'(d) "Reserve component" shall include:

"'(1) The National Guard of the United States;

"'(2) The Army Reserve;

"'(3) The Naval Reserve;

"'(4) The Marine Corps Reserve;

"'(5) The Air National Guard of the United States;

"'(6) The Air Force Reserve; and

"'(7) The Coast Guard Reserve; and'."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman explain what the measure does?

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, this measure was taken up by considering the Senate amendment before the Committee on Armed Services this morning, and they agreed unanimously to the Senate amendment. This bill was passed for the purpose of providing facilities for training in the Reserves in the several States throughout the United States. It supplements the original act which provided $250 million and was expendable over a 5-year period of time. This is expendable over an 8-year period of time, and the amount has been raised by the Senate. But, in consideration of the fact that the Reserve program is expanded now, the committee reviewed it this morning and unanimously approved the Senate amendment.

Mr. MARTIN. I withdraw my reservation of objection, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, was this bill passed by the House?

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Oh, yes. It passed unanimously. I think there was hardly 1 vote, perhaps, against it. The gentleman was one of those who supported it, too.

Mr. GROSS. I understand this amount has been increased.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. The Senate increased the amount but also extended the time. The House set a more limited time in which to spend the money. The Senate thought it wise to give more time to spend the money but increased the amount. That is the only difference. It provides for armories throughout the several States as well as general facilities for Reserve training throughout the several States. Every State in the Union will be affected.

Mr. GROSS. May I say to the gentleman it was my understanding at the time the bill was passed—I think I am correct in saying this—that the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON] at that time said that this appropriation was to increase the armory facilities of the country and did not take into account the needs of the Reserves.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. As I remember, I handled the bill when it came to the House originally, but I will say this: It has been in operation for 5 years, and the authorization has been exhausted, and under the terms of this bill the Government is permitted to expend so much per year over a period of time for armory construction, and the States will match the funds in certain cases.

Mr. GROSS. Well, I thought at that time that this was the forerunner of the passage of the bill which went through the House yesterday, but at that time I was assured that some other legislation would be necessary in order to provide the facilities for this new Reserve setup.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. This would have been necessary regardless of the bill that passed, the National Reserve training bill. It would have been necessary because we have been consuming the money over a period of years in helping to build armories for training under the present program, and not contemplating the bill that was passed recently.

Mr. GROSS. I withdraw my reservation of objection, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in; and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MEDALS COMMEMORATING THE 120TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE SIGNING OF THE TEXAS DECLARATION OF INDEPENDENCE

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 7244) to provide for the striking of medals in commemoration of the 120th anniversary of the signing of the Texas Declaration of Independence and the Battles of the Alamo, Goliad, and San Jacinto in the year 1836.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I understand this came out of the committee unanimously

and has been approved by the Treasury Department.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Yes.

Mr. MARTIN. One question I would like to ask. If my recollection is correct, several years ago we discontinued these medals as being an attack on private industry and that we were going out of that business. Have we been doing much of that lately?

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THORNBERRY. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. PATMAN. This is the only one that I know of that has been approved, but this was approved by the Treasury. It seems to me a new policy which, of course, is a good one.

Mr. MARTIN. I was questioning that. I withdraw my reservation of objection, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That in commemoration of the 120th anniversary of the signing of the Texas Declaration of Independence and the Battles of the Alamo, Goliad, and San Jacinto in the year 1836 the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to strike and furnish to the Texas Heritage Foundation, Inc., 2,000 medals $1\frac{5}{16}$ inches in diameter, with suitable emblems, devices, and inscriptions to be determined by the Secretary. The medals shall be considered to be national medals within the meaning of section 3551 of the Revised Statutes.

SEC. 2. (a) The Secretary of the Treasury shall cause such medals to be struck and furnished at not less than the estimated cost of manufacture, including labor, materials, dies, use of machinery, and overhead expenses; and security satisfactory to the Director of the Mint shall be furnished to indemnify the United States for the full payment of such cost.

(b) Upon authorization from the Texas Heritage Foundation, Inc., the Secretary of the Treasury shall cause duplicates in bronze of such medal to be coined and sold, under such regulations as he may prescribe, at a price sufficient to cover the cost thereof (including labor).

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.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. UTT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 hour on Friday, July 29, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered.

MR. DAIRY FARMER, YOU CAN HELP CONGRESS RAISE YOUR INCOME

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. JOHNSON] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, dairy farmers in my district, the Ninth Wisconsin District, are confronted with an economic situation which for everyone is serious. For many, the situation is outright desperate. Mr. Speaker, there are dairy farmers in my district who are being driven out of business by the ruinously low level of income resulting from the present administration's dairy price-support policy.

VETERANS HARDEST HIT

Hardest hit of all, I regret to say, are the young farm families, particularly the young veterans who began farming within the past half-dozen years or so. They bought their farms, their machinery, and livestock at high prices, in a period when dairy products were selling at 100 percent of parity. They are being squeezed out of existence by present-day prices which are permitted to rest on the very bottom of the mandatory support law.

The dairy-price situation in my district is a genuine depression for us. It has cut farm family incomes to the bone. It is cutting into the standard of living of businessmen in the cities and villages whose prosperity is tied to that of the farmers in their community.

DAIRY-FARM DEPRESSION

The dairy farming depression is the basic problem of the Ninth District of Wisconsin. It is the main problem of many other districts in this country which depend mainly upon income from the food products from manufactured milk. It is a vitally important problem to every citizen in such districts. It is vitally important to the whole Nation also, for it threatens the supply of milk, our basic food. The dairy depression threatens the prosperity of our whole economy. For these reasons, I want to discuss the causes and consequences of the dairy farming depression, and to review with you the proposal I have offered in my bill, H. R. 4360, as something we might do to cure the dairy depression. Something must be done. We cannot afford to sacrifice our dairy farmers against the wall of indifference that is raised against their distress by the administration.

DAIRY INCOME DOWN 50 PERCENT SINCE 1952

Mr. Speaker, milk for manufacturing purposes was selling for 100 percent of parity at the end of 1952, just before the present administration took office. Now, only 2½ years later, prices average only 75 percent of the same standard of parity. This means a 25-percent cut in gross income for producers of manufacturing milk. Moreover, this cut of 25 percent in gross income only begins to tell the full seriousness of the situation. At least 60 percent of gross sales receipts is required to pay production costs. This means that the 25-percent cut in gross receipts results in more than a 50-percent cut in the net income of dairy-farming families, a 50-percent cut in their "take-home pay," which is what they have to spend for family living expenses, for educating their children, for savings against their old age. The average dairy-farming family in my district, with prices at 100 percent of parity, received a monthly net family income of approximately $200 per month. They are now asked by this administration to accept a cut in take-home pay to about $100 per month. That figure is far below a decent American standard of living. I do not think this Nation can justify paying such a shamefully low return to dairy-farming families who are, I believe, about the hardest working people we have in the entire country.

The Eisenhower administration maintains that dairy income should be left at this present low level. Secretary Benson has refused to exercise his authority to give additional support to dairy product prices, and he has vigorously opposed all efforts to do so by legislation. Secretary Benson has not made any suggestions for changing the present dairy situation and, in fact, has declared it should be left exactly as it is. In this position, he has had the full support and encouragement of President Eisenhower.

ADMINISTRATION POLICY CUTS FARM PRICES

The administration's policy of favoring reduced incomes for dairy farmers is entirely consistent with its policy of forcing all farm prices downward. Mr. Speaker, I know it sounds harsh to assert that it is the policy of this administration to force farm prices down. But that is exactly what it has done, and it has been done deliberately. On every opportunity allowed him under the new law, the Secretary of Agriculture has deliberately cut the price supports on every farm commodity when doing so would result in permitting prices received by farmers to fall. There can only be one conclusion reached by observing what this administration has actually done to farm prices. That is that the administration's policy is to drive farm prices down. In addition to using every legal opportunity that has occurred to cut farm prices directly, the administration has endorsed, lobbied for, and propagandized in favor of changing the farm laws, to permit even greater reductions in farm price supports.

FOOD PROCESSOR CALLING SHOTS

Mr. Speaker, it is not my purpose today to attempt to examine the motives behind this administration policy of forcing farm prices down. Certainly the presence in high positions in this administration of many representatives of the big food-processing corporations which have profited greatly during the past 2½ years from reduced prices paid to farmers for their raw materials, while they maintained their resale prices to consumers at close to their alltime high, suggests a plausible explanation. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert at this point in the RECORD a list of some of the representatives of the big food processing companies serving in the Department of Agriculture.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BROOKS of Texas). Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the list is as follows:

USDA PERSONNEL WITH EXPERIENCE IN PROCESSING COMPANIES

James A. McConnell, Assistant Secretary: Commodity Stabilization Service: owner of Grange League Federation Exchange; executive vice president, Commercial Molasses Corp. (farm marketing association); director, Pacific Molasses Corp.; director of Farm Foundation.

Walter C. Berger, associate administrator, Commodity Stabilization Service: owner of Des Moines Oat Products Co. (feed manufacturing); president (1946–52), American Feed Manufacturers Association; director of National Grain Trade Council; director of Western Grain and Feed Association; vice president and director of Shea Chemical Co.

M. D. Smith, executive assistant to Benson: Director of National Association of Frozen Food Packers; manager of family plants—Smith Canning & Freezing Co.; Smith Frozen Foods (Oregon and Idaho).

N. R. Clark, special assistant on commodity disposal: vice president of Swift & Co. (retired).

Earl Hughes, director of Commodity Stabilization Service: Trustee of Foundation for American Agriculture and of Farm Foundation.

Also Milton Eisenhower is a member of the board of directors of Quaker Oats Co.

A Department of Agriculture representative testified before the Dairy Subcommittee of the House Agriculture Committee that the price to consumers of fluid milk has gone down only four-tenths of a cent—from 23.4 cents per quart in 1953 to 23 cents in 1954. But I will not dwell on this. My purpose is to explain what has happened and what its consequences are to dairy farmers.

EISENHOWER CAMPAIGN PROMISES

Mr. Speaker, dairy farmers in my district and in other dairy-producing areas are particularly disappointed in the Eisenhower administration's farm policy as it has developed in practice. Less than 3 years ago, dairy producers were led to believe that the Republican candidate for President intended to improve their situation, not to make it gravely more critical. I do not ask you to take my word for this. I want to read you the words of General Eisenhower himself, the promises which the Republican candidate for President made to farmers within a few miles of the borders of my district, in his major farm speech at Kasson, Minn., on September 6, 1952.

General Eisenhower said, and I quote:

I firmly believe that agriculture is entitled to a fair and full share of the national income and it must be a policy of Government to help agriculture achieve this goal in ways that minimize Government control and protect farmers' independence. And a fair share is not merely 90 percent of parity—but full parity.

We must find sound methods of obtaining greater protection for our diversified farms, our producers of perishable goods. They yield the rich variety of meat, milk, eggs, fruits, and vegetables that support our nutritious national diet. As provided in the Republican platform, then on perishable crops so important to the diversified farmer—crops such as oats, barley, rye, and soybeans—should be given the same protection as available to the major cash crops.

The Democrat planners have made the diversified farmer the forgotten man of agriculture. They keep saying, "There is no way of protecting perishables except through the Brannan plan." But we can and will find a sound way to do the job without indulging in the moral bankruptcy of the Brannan plan.

CAMPAIGN PLEDGE NOT HONORED

Mr. Speaker, the Eisenhower administration faced the first test of President Eisenhower's campaign promises to producers of perishables shortly after taking office in January 1953. Before April 1 that year it was necessary for the Secretary of Agriculture to announce the price support rate to be in effect for dairy products for the ensuing year. After much hesitation and a great deal of concern on the part of dairy farmers, and requiring the trade to transfer its inventories to Government storage, the Secretary announced that he would support prices of dairy products at 90 percent of parity, the maximum level authorized by law, and the same as had been kept in effect by the preceding Democratic administration.

Ninety percent was the promise. But, unfortunately, that promise was not observed. Although 90-percent supports were announced, the Secretary of Agriculture deliberately refused to make them effective to support dairy prices at 90 percent of parity. Prices of dairy products actually averaged only 83 percent of parity throughout the year running from April 1, 1953, to March 30, 1954. This happened because Secretary Benson refused to set the dollars-and-cents purchase price for milk products high enough to provide prices to farmers of 90 percent of parity, as he had promised.

As 1953 proceeded, the cut out of the consumers' dollar for milk products taken by the middleman was increased so much farmers no longer got 90 percent of parity. Benson refused to increase the Government purchase price of manufactured products sufficiently to make up for the larger cut taken by processors. Consequently, the farmers' share did not come up to the promised 90 percent of parity.

DAIRY FARMER CUT TO 75 PERCENT OF PARITY APRIL 1, 1954

Then, on April 1, 1954, the Secretary of Agriculture openly exercised his policy of cutting farmers' incomes to the bone. Effective on that date, Secretary Benson reduced dairy price supports to 75 percent of parity, the minimum allowed by law. This resulted in an immediate further collapse of prices for dairy products, from which they have never recovered to this day.

BENSON TINKERING CUTS DOWN DAIRY PARITY

Even though supports were slashed to the minimum allowed by law, the administration's drive for lower farm prices was not satisfied. In preparation for the next stage, the price-cutting step, Secretary Benson began to tinker with the definition of parity for manufacturing milk. He was not permitted by law to cut the percentage of parity below 75 percent, but he did have the authority to accomplish the same thing by juggling parity itself downward, and that is exactly what he proceeded to do. His predecessor in the office, Secretary Charles Brannan, had supported prices of manufactured dairy products on the basis of a parity equivalent computed as 88½ percent of the parity price for all milk sold at wholesale. Secretary Benson, as soon as he had cut price supports to the legal minimum of 75 percent of parity, took a new base period and cut parity on manufacturing milk from 88½ percent to only 84.1 percent of the parity price of all milk.

In January 1955, using the same device, Secretary Benson took a further step, reducing the parity equivalent on manufacturing milk to only 83.7 percent of parity price for all milk. This had the effect of cutting parity itself by 5½ percent, so that by the exercise of his discretionary authority, Secretary Benson has reduced the minimum price support floor protection established by law to 69½ percent of parity, or less, as it had been calculated by former Secretary Charles Brannan.

MILK PRODUCER ON SLIDING SCALE

Beginning last April 1, 1955, the price support in effect for manufacturing milk has been exactly the same, in dollars and cents, as it was in the preceding year. But because parity itself has been manipulated downward, it comes out to a higher percentage of parity. For example, prices received by farmers in June 1955 averaged 80 percent of Secretary Benson's manipulated parity. But they averaged only 75 percent of former Secretary Brannan's parity.

REPUBLICAN CAMPAIGN ORATORS TRY TO FOOL DAIRY FARMERS

Secretary Benson's manipulation of the parity formula computation for manufacturing milk has been exploited by Republican campaign orators, who point with pride to the fact that milk prices now average 80 percent of parity, without ever mentioning that parity itself has been skidded downward by Secretary Benson. In short, Benson's policy is to give the farmers percentage points without the dollars and cents. You cannot buy groceries or pay the taxes with percentage points. It takes dollars and cents to do that. The same policy of cutting the parity formula is being followed for other important commodities to manipulate their dollars and cents support prices downward.

The administration's manipulation of the parity computation for milk is, to my mind, one of the most threatening aspects of its cruel aim to drive farmers' prices down. It is, in effect, evading the intent of Congress when it declared by law that dairy products could not be supported at less than 75 percent of parity. Without ever changing the law, this loophole gives Benson the opportunity to slice off more and more from the dairy farmers' price floor. When parity has been cut far enough, he can raise the percentage points he is giving the farmers—while at the same time, the dollars and cents that go into the farmers' pockets are being reduced.

THEY ARE NOT TELLING ALL THE STORY

Mr. Speaker, I have stressed this matter of manipulation of the parity computation because it is particularly hard for our friends who are not in the dairy industry to understand it. The dairy farmers themselves are not deceived by it. They read the dollars and cents that are printed on their milk checks. But many of our friends, when they read the percentage points that are printed in newspaper headlines, or hear them discussed on the radio and television or in campaign speeches, might be led astray by this Republican policy of paying the farmers in percentage points of a downward manipulated parity computation,

instead of in the dollars and cents that it takes to provide an American standard of living.

The Eisenhower administration's cynical manipulation of parity on milk raises what to my mind is of urgent importance from the standpoint of the dairy farmer. That milk must be made a basic commodity, with a realistic parity defined and assured by law, so that it cannot be juggled and tampered with by an administration that is bent on using every posible means to force farm prices down.

Mr. Speaker, I have tried to the best of my power to achieve for milk, our basic food, the recognition in our farm legislation that it deserves—that of a basic commodity able to get equitable protection with other important farm commodities.

Mr. WHITTEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. I yield to my friend the gentleman from Mississippi, chairman of the Subcommittee on Agricultural Appropriations.

Mr. WHITTEN. I wish to commend the gentleman for his untiring efforts in behalf of the farmers of the Nation, particularly the dairy farmers. I feel that he has here pointed out the fallacies of this administration which seems to believe that reduced prices, higher costs, and reduced production will not appreciably hurt the farmer. In my opinion it is ruining the farmer and will eventually be felt in the towns and the cities. I thank the gentleman for presenting these facts.

SUPPORT OF CONGRESSMEN FROM OTHER AREAS NECESSARY TO PASS DAIRY LEGISLATION

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. The problem of our dairy farmers is far too serious to be made into a political football. It needs to be approached with hardheaded commonsense. It is not a political issue; it is an economic issue. Representatives from dairy-farming districts are obligated to treat it as an economic issue, and to refrain from injuring the interests of their dairy-farming constituents by playing politics with their welfare.

It is a simple, clear-cut fact of life that the first concern of anyone who is sincerely interested in helping the dairy farmer must be to secure and maintain unity in the ranks of agricultural Representatives. There simply are not enough Representatives from dairy districts to pass a law all by themselves. We must have allies, or we are doomed to fail. Congressmen representing the various farm commodities must hang together or we will, so to speak, all be hung separately. Our best hope for getting support for dairy farmers lies with the Representatives from other agricultural areas. Without that support, the cause of any kind of legislative help for the dairy farmers' problem is futile. Anybody from the dairy area should know that in order to get legislation through the committee, it is necessary to get support from a majority of the 34 members of the committee. At the present time, there are only 6 members of the full Agriculture Committee who represent concentrated dairy areas.

Since I came to Congress in January 1954, I have made it my primary concern to determine what is needed to win for dairy products the protection granted to the basic agricultural commodities. I have reached certain conclusions. The fundamental one is that before any measure to give basic price-support protection to dairy commodities can be passed, Congressmen representing areas that produce other agricultural commodities must agree to its support. That is a hard-boiled fact of political life, and anyone who is sincerely interested in getting a dairy price-support program through Congress has got to consider it.

YOU CAN'T SIT ON BOTH SIDES OF THE FENCE

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. I am glad to yield to my friend the vice chairman of our committee, the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. POAGE. I agree with the gentleman from Wisconsin that the logical thing for anyone to do who is seriously interested in getting 90 percent support for dairy products is to at least offer to accept the same kind of production controls which have been accepted by every one of the present basic crops.

The gentleman will remember that I have repeatedly offered to support a 90 percent support program for dairy products if the dairy people wanted to accept controls. I know the gentleman has taken a sane and reasonable position, but he has some colleagues who seem more interested in asking for something than in getting anything for the dairy farmers.

I am sure the gentleman will remember the so-called Laird amendment which this House rejected early this year. I know the gentleman voted for it, realizing that any vote against it would be misrepresented, but in all honesty, can the gentleman from Wisconsin, who is so well informed on, and deeply interested in, dairy problems, state that that amendment was either fair or practicable? Would the gentleman say that any experienced Member of this House could have expected to pass such an amendment. Would he even contend that dairy farmers should get 90 percent supports and at the same time enjoy unlimited production while every other producer in this country has to accept strict controls in order to get this support? Would the gentleman yield long enough for me to read an editorial out of the latest edition of Hoard's Dairyman?

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. I yield further.

Mr. POAGE. The editorial is as follows:

[From Hoard's Dairyman of June 10, 1955]

HOUSE SKIPS DAIRY

Perhaps one good thing came out of the bitter House of Representatives debate on farm price supports. It was clearly demonstrated that neither political party had much to offer in the way of a peacetime dairy program.

There are a few individuals within each party who know the dairy industry and have made constructive suggestions. Unfortunately, the majority of Congressmen have been unable to comprehend the complexities of the dairy industry and fail to recognize the essential ingredients of a sound dairy program.

During the most recent congressional election, northern Democrats, primarily from the big cities, promised great changes in dairy prices if their party was elected to control the Congress. From the South, however, Democratic congressional leaders cautioned the higher dairy price supports must carry with them effective production controls such as are applied to the so-called basic crops.

Most Republican candidates preferred to support the flexible price-support program rather than go to production controls.

When the showdown came in the House of Representatives, both political parties backed away from production controls and higher price supports.

There are people, of course, who believe that we can have higher price supports without production controls. When this was proposed by Representative LAIRD (Wisconsin), southern Democrats turned him down because production controls were not provided.

In our opinion, the logic of the southern Democrats is sound. The Government simply cannot continue to buy up the huge quantities of dairy products which are stimulated by higher prices on all milk and cream produced. From the dairy industry's point of view, it cannot have its cake and eat it too.

What is often overlooked is that there are different types of production-control methods, some of which are considerably more appealing than others. For example, we would strenuously object to a strict quota type of control. On the other hand, as indicated before in these columns, a two-price system is desirable, workable, and effective. There is no limitation of production but only the domestic market is supported at a given price level. The foreign, industrial, and relief markets are free-price markets and farmers receive whatever milk brings in these markets.

At one time we estimated that the application of the two-price dairy program to American dairying last year would have resulted in an increased income to dairy farmers of over $700 million. All this would have been at no cost to the Federal Government. Frankly, we regret that the Congress does not give the dairy industry a chance to handle its own stabilization program. We are convinced that it can do a far better job than the Government has done to date.

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. The gentleman is so right. When the House refused, as we certainly knew in advance it would, to give dairy commodities all the protection given to the basics without any of the responsibilities, these Republican dairy district Representatives voted against H. R. 12.

Mr. POAGE. The gentleman from Wisconsin has faithfully attended all meetings of the Agricultural Committee. Does he not know that the members who have been actually trying to solve the dairy problems have been working with the producers of other crops in an effort to get a common approach. I know that the gentleman voted for 90 percent supports for all commodities including dairy products. I know that the gentleman has offered this House a sound, constructive program of 90 percent supports for a controlled production of dairy products. I am glad to work with the gentleman or any other member who wants to treat dairy products just like cotton, wheat and tobacco, but I can't go along with, and this House won't go along with, those who ask that

the dairy farmer be given all of the benefits and none of the burdens of a 90-percent support program. The chairman of the Dairy Subcommittee tells me he expects to hold some hearings out in the gentleman's area this fall. I am not a member of that subcommittee but as a member of the full committee who is interested in dairying, I hope to be able to attend and to take part in some of these hearings.

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. The gentleman from Texas is a dairy farmer himself. I want to thank him for these remarks. I want to commend those few Republicans in this House who remained faithful to the economic interests of their farmer constituents, who placed the welfare of farmers above the dictation of the political potentates of their party. Most of the 22 Republicans, who are about one-tenth of all their party's members in this House and voted for H. R. 12, were from cash grain-producing areas, not from dairy districts.

H. R. 12 RAISED MILK SUPPORTS

But the House Committee on Agriculture is continuing to give the dairy problem a very large share of its attention. Very promising progress is being made. In passing H. R. 12, the House of Representatives went on record against any further cut in dairy farmers' prices next year by the Benson device of manipulating parity downward below the minimum allowed by law under the Brannan parity formula. H. R. 12 raised the minimum price support floor from 75 percent of parity to 80 percent. It continued for 2 more years the $15 million annual appropriation for brucellosis indemnity payments. It increased from $50 million to $75 million the annual appropriation for purchasing fluid milk for schoolchildren on which school authorities in Wisconsin particularly have done such an excellent job in the past year. This is not yet victory, and it is not enough. But it is something, and it is progress.

CONGRESSMAN JOHNSON PROMISED SUPPORT OF CONGRESSMEN FROM BASIC AREAS TO MAKE MILK A BASIC COMMODITY

My colleagues in the House from areas which produce wheat, rice, tobacco, peanuts, cotton, and other basic commodities have promised time and time again they will back my efforts to make dairy products a basic commodity if the dairy farmers will accept the same responsibility for keeping supplies in line with demand that producers of other basics have accepted.

I introduced H. R. 4360, a bill to designate dairy products as basic commodities, which provides for marketing quotas on milk, so that we could find out what dairy farmers really want. I have been told by the chairman that the Dairy Subcommittee will try to hold hearings on this bill so that dairy farmers can tell the Congress what they think of it. I have strongly urged all this session that such hearings be held. I emphasize, Mr. Speaker, that if dairy farmers do not want this bill, I would be the last one to urge it and I will immediately begin to search for another way out of the dairy farmers' dilemma.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. I yield to my chairman.

Mr. COOLEY. The gentleman from Wisconsin has made a splendid statement. Having served as a Member of this House for more than 20 years, during all of which time I have been a Member of the House Committee on Agriculture, I have, of course, seen Members of Congress come and go. I am glad to have this opportunity to commend and congratulate the gentleman from Wisconsin upon the splendid manner in which he has performed all of the duties of his high office. He has been at all times intensely interested in the problems of the dairy farmers. He thoroughly understands their problems and he has constantly had their welfare in mind. Frankly, Mr. Speaker, no Member of our great Committee with whom I have served, has been more interested in the problems of dairy farmers than has Lester Johnson. He has not only been interested in dairy farmers and in their problems, but he has been interested in the problems of all of the farmers of America.

Our Committee on Agriculture is composed of 37 Members of Congress—34 from congressional districts within the States, and in addition to these 34 Members, we have a Delegate from Hawaii, a Delegate from Alaska, and a Commissioner from the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico. As chairman of that great committee, I have appointed 16 subcommittees, and during the present session of Congress more bills have been referred to our committee in this one session than were referred to the committee during the entire 2 years of the 83d Congress.

The author of every bill referred to our committee during this session, who has requested a hearing on his bill, has been accorded a fair hearing.

In addition to attending the meetings of his own subcommittee, and the meetings of the full committee, LESTER JOHNSON has attended the meetings of other subcommittees to which legislation relating to problems other than dairy farmers has been referred. LESTER JOHNSON has tried diligently and faithfully, during his entire service on the Agriculture Committee, to learn all he possibly could about the problems of farmers, and while on other subcommittees he has had no right to vote, he has demonstrated more interest in the problems of American agriculture, generally speaking, than any other member of our committee. He knows that no segment of our agricultural economy can prosper at the expense of any other segment of our economy. He knows full well that farmers cannot be successful and prosperous if they are fighting among themselves.

LESTER JOHNSON knows that if we are to have a successful farm program, which is essential to the welfare of our Nation and to the well-being of our farmers, we must understand each others problems and that we must not fight among ourselves.

Mr. Speaker, I do not know of any Member of this House who has more conscientiously nor more consistently applied himself to the pefomance of his duties as a Repesentative in Congess than has Mr. JOHNSON.

LESTER JOHNSON has made many friends in both political parties during his brief service in the House of Representatives, and he is held in high esteem not only by the Democratic Members of this House, but also by Republicans, because all of us know that he is thoroughly trustworthy, he is honest, he is upright, he is forthright, and he is faithful. When I say that he is faithful, I do not mean even to suggest that he is merely faithful to a party. I mean only to emphasize the fact that he is faithful to the principles of a truly representative democracy.

During my entire service in Congress, while a humble member of the House Committee on Agriculture as well as during the times I have served as chairman of that very important Committee, all of the chairmen of that committee and I have tried our dead level best to keep partisan politics out of our deliberations. The problems of agriculture are paramount to all other problems. We shall never be able to solve the problems of peace until we solve the problems of agriculture. A hungry world will never be a happy world. Hungry people are easy prey to all the isms and alien concepts of government.

I am certain that the gentleman from Wisconsin who is now addressing the House has never been prompted by partisan politics, either in voting in our committee, or on the floor of this House.

The problems of agriculture are not only paramount to all other problems, for upon the good earth all mankind must of necessity depend, but these problems should at all times be above partisan politics, just as our foreign policy should at all times be above the bondages of partisan politics. The problems of agriculture and the problems of the unhappy world in which we are living cut across party lines, and State lines, and even across international boundaries. In dealing with these important problems, which are so vital to the world and to all mankind, a Member of Congress has no right to be partisan. In dealing with these problems he must be a statesman rather than a politician.

Mr. Speaker, I understand that some false accusations, some unfair innuendoes, and some unfair, inaccurate, and unwarranted statements have been leveled at LESTER JOHNSON. Merely because he has shown an interest in the welfare of all of American agriculture, and has voted for programs essential to the welfare of farmers in other sections of America, it has been suggested, in sinister fashion, that he has not been as interested as he should have been in the welfare of dairy farmers. Let me here and now nail that, and all of that, to the cross. The dairy farmers of America have no greater champion in the Congress of our country than LESTER JOHNSON. There is never an hour of the day or the night that he does not have the welfare of the dairy farmers close to his heart.

Now let us face up to the facts. As a Member of Congress I have never advocated, nor shall I ever advocate, high fixed price support levels for any agri-

culture commodity the producers of which are not willing to attempt to keep production in line with reasonable consumer demand. The producers of basic agricultural commodities have consistently indicated their willingness, by accepting acreage allotments and marketing quotas, to keep production in line with reasonable consumer demand. We have worked out a program over the years, and we have provided the machinery which has enabled, and will continue to enable, the producers of basic agricultural commodities to keep production in line with consumer demand. The producers of beef cattle have not been able to arrange or to define a program to keep the production of beef in line with consumer demand, nor have the dairymen of America offered a program to keep production down to the level of consumer demand. I appreciate the great difficulties involved in both beef cattle production and in dairy production. Both of these important segments of our agricultural economy are quite different from cotton, peanuts, and tobacco, and the other basic commodities which very readily lend themselves to production control. If the producers of beef cattle and if the dairymen of America will offer a production control program, I want to assure them that I shall be the very first to offer my cooperation in an effort to provide adequate price supports. Notwithstanding all the things that I have said, the fact remains that I voted for and our committee reported a bill to support dairy products at 80 percent of parity, and we did this at a time when the Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. Ezra Taft Benson, had dropped the boom on the heads of dairy farmers.

Although members of our committee did everything possible to assist dairy farmers in their desperate plight, we were forced by the Eisenhower administration to strike out the 80 percent of parity price support for dairy products. Although Secretary Benson for about 14 long months had the authority to lower the price supports on dairy products gradually, and to relieve the intensity of the impact and shock on dairy farmers, he waited for 14 long months and then "dropped the boom," and it was a deadly blow. I have never complained that the Secretary waited to take action, but I did complain when he dropped the price support, by one stroke of the pen, and overnight, from 90 percent to 75 percent of parity. Even President Eisenhower said publicly at a press conference that the change should be made gradually. Not Mr. Benson—who was slow to action, but finally dealt the death blow to the dairy industry.

In this situation LESTER JOHNSON, Congressman, who is now addressing the House, did everything he possibly could in behalf of dairy farmers. He voted for high price supports. Having a very personal knowledge of the problems involved, he tried to ascertain the views and the wishes of dairy farmers, and I am happy to say, Mr. Speaker, that those of us in whose districts other important agricultural commodities are produced, actually followed LESTER JOHNSON'S leadership in our efforts to aid the dairy industry of America, but I must, in fairness, repeat that I cannot even now say that I am willing to support the unlimited production of dairy products at 90 percent of parity, when my own farmers are forced to reduce their acreage and their production to keep that production in line with consumer demand and to provide the accumulation of huge surpluses.

Not knowing just what the dairy farmers of America really want in the way of a farm program, I have agreed with my friend, the distinguished gentleman from Wisconsin, LESTER JOHNSON, that our committee should give further thought and consideration to the problems involved, and I have directed our dairy subcommittee, of which the gentleman from Mississippi, Congressman THOMAS ABERNETHY, is chairman, to conduct hearings in Wisconsin and in other dairy States, during the recess of Congress, and to make every effort to ascertain the wishes and the views of our farmers who are now engaged in the dairy industry. I hope very much that I can arrange to attend these hearings, and I shall make every possible effort to do so. With 16 subcommittees working on various problems, all of which are vital to the welfare of our farmers and to the general welfare of all of our people, it would be difficult for me to arrange to attend the meetings of the subcommittees which will hold the hearings on the problems of dairy farmers. I want to assure my friend from Wisconsin that I shall do everything I possibly can to attend the meetings which will be held in his congressional district, and in other congressional districts in which dairying is of great importance.

Again I want to compliment my beloved friend, the distinguished gentleman from Wisconsin, LESTER JOHNSON, upon his efforts and his interest in all the problems which so vitally affect the welfare of the people he has so well represented.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. I yield to my friend the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. ABERNETHY], chairman of our Dairy Subcommittee.

Mr. ABERNETHY. May I say to the gentleman that I am interested in the bill he has introduced. In my judgment, it is worthy of the dairy farmers' consideration. It is not my purpose, however, to press the bill upon the dairy farmer unless the dairy farmer wants that type of legislation.

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. May I say to the gentleman that is the same attitude I have. I want to find out what the dairy farmer wants.

Mr. ABERNETHY. That is the attitude of all of us in regard to all of the farm program and particularly with regard to the basic program.

I know there is considerable interest in the gentleman's State in the work of the Dairy Subcommittee of the House Committee on Agriculture. Throughout the year I have been serving as chairman of that subcommittee. I have received numerous communications from dairy farmers in that State indicating their interest in this subject, in the legislation proposed by the gentleman, and in other legislation pending before the committee. It is the thought of our subcommittee that we may visit the gentleman's district in the State of Wisconsin sometime during the recess. I do not know yet whether we will be able to work that out or not, but I want to say to the gentleman, since he has discussed it with me, and extended the invitation, that I hope we can work it out. I am going to do my best to bring the committee up there this fall.

I commend the gentleman on the service he has rendered the people of his district. I think they were very wise the day they decided to send him here.

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. I thank my friend from Mississippi.

CONGRESSMAN O'KONSKI FROM WISCONSIN PUBLICLY GIVES SUPPORT

I am most grateful to my Republican colleague from the 10th District of Wisconsin for the support he has pledged to me in this effort to explore the wishes of the dairy farmers. I would like to refer my colleagues at this point to the exchange between myself and the gentleman from Wisconsin that occurs on page 5782 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for May 5, 1955, during the debate on H. R. 12, as follows:

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. Along with the gentleman from the 10th District of Wisconsin, I also voted last year against flexible farm price supports and for rigid supports at 90 percent of parity.

I might state to the gentleman from the 10th district that in the House Agriculture Committee meeting of March 8 we tried to get 90 percent supports for dairy products without quotas or controls. After this motion lost, I offered an amendment to support dairy products at 85 percent of parity without quotas or controls.

On the vote, which lost by 14 to 13, I had the support of 10 Democrats and 2 Republicans in addition to my own vote. Eleven Republicans and three Democratic members of the committee voted against my motion.

I have introduced a bill, H. R. 4360, which provides for quotas and controls. I shall support the present amendment for 90 percent. I am in the same position as the gentleman from the 10th District. If we are unsuccessful in passage of this amendment, I wonder if the gentleman will support me in my effort to make dairy products a basic commodity if the dairy farmers of the United States want such a program with the same procedure for controls and quotas that apply to other basic commodities.

Mr. O'KONSKI. I think so. I think one of the reasons for the illness in the dairy industry is the lack of marketing quotas. I think one of the basic reasons why the dairy industry is in the pinch and mess it is in today is because we have not had these controls.

For instance, whenever a farmer in Kansas was cut down on his wheat acreage, he turned those acres into a dairy farm. As the acreage was cut for the wheat farmer and the corn farmer and the tobacco farmer, they turned those acres into dairy farms. If we had controls to prevent those people from going into the dairy business on the side, we would not have the difficulty we have today. I do not believe we should have 90 percent of parity and pile up surplus upon surplus. I want to be reasonable about this. I think if we do have dairy products included in this bill as a basic commodity, that we also ought to have the Department of Agriculture work out a system of quotas, because it is the only way in which we could operate within reason.

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. I thank the gentleman.

My purpose in introducing that legislation was to find out what farmers in the dairy areas really wanted, so that we could have hearings and determine just what they wanted. If the dairy farmer does not want it, I would be the last one to urge it.

CONGRESSMAN JOHNSON INTRODUCES BILL TO MAKE MILK A BASIC

Mr. Speaker, I should now like to explain the provisions of my suggestion that dairy producers be authorized by law to regulate their marketings in order to qualify for basic price support legislation.

During our consideration of H. R. 12 and in the hearings of the dairy subcommittee, there has been increasing discussion of the use of marketing quotas. Most Members of Congress feel that if milk is to be given 90 percent price supports, then milk producers should agree, like wheat, rice, tobacco, peanut and cotton producers, to limit their marketings to put some controls and a top limit on the quantity of product to be supported. I have talked extensively in the past several months with many Congressmen, particularly from areas that produce basic commodities. They have assured me repeatedly that they will support my effort to give milk the recognition it deserves as a basic commodity with the same price support protection given to the other basic commodities, if dairy farmers will accept similar responsibility for keeping the supply of milk in line with the demand.

As a result of such discussion, I introduced a bill, H. R. 4360, to authorize a referendum among dairy farmers on the use of quotas. My purpose was to stimulate discussion on the subject, to get suggestions on how quotas might be applied, and to determine the sentiment of farmers themselves on such a step. Milk producers in Federal milk market areas already regulate the supplies of milk offered to the retail fluid market. My bill would extend this principle to milk used for butter, cheese, and other products.

WILL MILK PRODUCERS ACCEPT MARKETING QUOTAS?

The argument against adequate supports run in this channel. You cannot have adequate supports without control over supply. Then, it is said, milk producers won't accept marketing quotas. Thus, a false dilemma is set up and results in no action. Dairy farmers themselves need to help correct this impression. Most Congressmen appear to have been led to believe that dairy farmers are opposed to quotas. The processor groups told us that. The big dairy companies have told us that.

Mr. Speaker, I am hoping that the Agriculture Committee will take the time to go out in the country to see what the dairy farmer really wants. I realize that the processor whose income increases with each 100 pounds he processes is against limiting the supply as it may reduce his income. We in Congress need to find out what the milk producer himself thinks. He does not have the money or the time to come to Washington to tell us.

My bill, H. R. 4360, is not the final answer. No one is more willing than I to admit that. We in Congress do not have a corps of research experts in the various agricultural fields, nor thousands of employees scattered across the Nation to refine plans and report farmer opinion as are under Secretary Benson's control. We must depend in a large measure on volunteered suggestions, criticisms and reactions expressed in our mail to refine and test policy suggestions.

H. R. 4360 is performing the function I had in mind when I introduced it. Many suggestions have been made to me in regard to it. It is my hope that, after completing hearings at points throughout the dairy producing areas, the dairy subcommittee of the House Agriculture Committee will introduce a revised version of my bill which incorporates the improvements that are brought out by these hearings.

It is my feeling that dairy farmers will not oppose a reasonable combination of production payments and marketing quotas when they understand the situation and that, if Congress should couple such payment and quota system with an improved level of price supports, the plan would be accepted.

FIVE PERCENT OVER PRODUCTION CAUSED POULTRY FARMERS TO GET 19 PERCENT LESS

The nub of the dairy problem is the production of 6 to 10 billion pounds more milk annually than will clear the market at present price levels and population numbers.

This overproduction is a temporary problem because, if we could hold production steady at the present level for just another 2 years, population increase would then absorb the current total production of dairy products.

The problem is not one of an enormous and perpetual surplus, and interminable Government price support. It is one of assisting the dairy farmers while demand catches up with production at price levels fair to the farmers.

It is not fair to our farmers, Mr. Speaker, for them to take a severe economic beating just because they do their job a little too well and produce a few percent more than the market will absorb at a fair price. Look at the situation with eggs last year, for example. Farmers sold just 5 percent more eggs in 1954 than in 1953. This small increase in production knocked prices down so far that the total income from 5 percent more eggs in 1954 was 19 percent less than their total receipts from the smaller volume of eggs in 1953.

WAR YEARS WE ENCOURAGED OVERPRODUCTION

Dairy production was encouraged and stimulated in the war periods of the last decade. Improved technology has added to total output. Demand has been weakened by the failure to maintain full employment, economic conditions, the competition of tax-free colored oleomargarine, and some decline in exports.

We have the problem, as I see it, of helping dairy farmers stay solvent for 2 to 4 years while demand catches up to their normal output. It would be possible to impose drastic marketing quotas on dairy products and limit production to what the market will absorb by that device alone. Such a solution would heighten the economic distress of dairy farmers, not relieve it. It would be the scarcity solution, hard on both the farmers and the consumers. I am opposed to any such course.

BASIC AIMS OF JOHNSON DAIRY PROPOSAL

I am greatly interested, however, in the plan proposed in my bill, that we use a combination of production-adjustment payments along with marketing quotas to handle the problem. If dairy farmers generally approve the idea, I would work and vote for it.

Briefly, the basic aim of my dairy proposals are as follows:

First. That the production of milk and its products be maintained at a level that will provide fully as much as the people of this Nation need and will consume if they have the level of incomes that would be provided in an economy of full employment.

Second. That we expand consumption of dairy products sufficiently to allow everyone sufficient milk and milk products needed for adequate, healthful diets by increased use of milk in schools, the Armed Forces, welfare institutions, and through a food-stamp plan for low-income families.

Third. That farmers be authorized and enabled to regulate their sale of milk so that sales slightly in excess of the needs for adequate, healthful diets will not result in bankrupting the farmers.

Fourth. That we also give farmers the authority, if the Federal Government fails to meet its obligations under the Full Employment Act of 1946 to maintain full employment, or to expand the consumption of milk by low-income people, to regulate their marketing so as to avoid bankruptcy prices.

Fifth. That prices to farmers be protected at a fair level against fluctuations in supply and demand by the use of production-adjustment payments of the difference between the market price and the agreed-upon support price, and when a slight temporary surplus of dairy marketing occur, that this be sold in the market at lower prices to consumers with the loss to farmers made up with production payments. Doing this would eliminate the need for the Government to pay storage charges.

PRODUCTION ADJUSTMENT PAYMENTS ALONG WITH MARKETING QUOTA PLAN EXPLAINED

Essentially, the provisions of my bill, H. R. 4360, in accordance with these overall aims, are as follows:

First. That we ask the dairy farmers to reduce their marketings from 3 to 5 percent to eliminate about half of the milk and milk products which are not clearing the market at present price levels.

Second. That we let the price of milk and milk products drop a little in the market so consumers will use more butter, cheese, milk, and other dairy products; this would allow consumption of the other half of the so-called surplus.

Third. That we give the farmers a production adjustment payment of the difference between the market price and agreed-upon price-support level.

Fourth. That we eliminate totally the need for Government storage of the dairy surplus.

There has been opposition to the use of production payments in our price-support programs in the past because of the sums which would have to be appropriated to make the payments on an uncontrolled production. Such costs can be controlled and held to whatever level Congress decrees, with the use of quotas and adjustment payments in combination.

A study has been made of the possibilities and prospective costs of combined use of adjustment payments and quotas. Congress can write its own ticket. If we would add about $225 million next year to what we are paying for dairy products to go into storage, and farmers would reduce their marketing 4 to 5 percent, we could support dairy farm income at 90 percent of parity and give the consumers a considerable price break at the same time. We would also eliminate the need for the Government to pay storage charges on unused dairy products.

Support at lower levels would, of course, cost somewhat less, but in my judgment it would be very foolish to economize at the expense of farmers who are already in an economic depression dangerous to our whole national economy. Dairy farmers should not be required to take prices anything below 90 percent of parity. In my judgment, they are entitled to a full 100 percent of a fair and reasonable computation of parity.

HOW MARKETING QUOTAS WOULD WORK

I would like to describe just how the proposed marketing quotas on milk would work out for an individual farmer whose production is characteristic of most of the farmers in my district in Wisconsin.

Let us assume that Farmer Olson sold 200,000 pounds of milk in the base period, and that a 4-percent cut for 1956 is required by the quota.

This farmer would then be eligible to sell 192,000 pounds of milk and to receive production payments on them.

If the average market price for milk were 10 percent below parity on the support price in effect for the year, and the farmer's sale slips showed that he got an average of $3 per hundredweight, he would receive a gross income of $6,394. He would get $5,760 directly by sale in the market of his 192,000 pounds quota at the market price of $3 per hundredweight. In addition, he would get a direct production adjustment payment of $634, giving him a total gross income of $6,394.

If, however, he decided to sell his entire production of 200,000 pounds, he would not be eligible to receive any production adjustment payments. He would also be required to pay a penalty on the 8,000 pounds of milk sold in excess of his marketing quota. If the penalty were set at 75 percent of the support price, it would amount to $2.50 per hundred, or a total penalty on the 8,000 pounds of excess sales of $200. His gross income would then be $5,800, figured by subtracting the penalty of $200 from his market receipts of $6,000 for sale of 200,000 pounds of milk at the market price of $3 per hundredweight.

For example, it will be seen that it would be to the advantage of the farmer to comply with his marketing quota. If he did so, he would get a gross income for the year of $6,394, contrasted to only $5,800 which he would get by not complying with his quota. The $6,394 gross income under such a program would compare favorably also with the $6,000 gross income he would get in an unsupported market for his full production of 200,000 pounds of milk at the market price of $3 per hundredweight.

CONCLUSION

Mr. Speaker, in conclusion, as I have stated before, I introduced H. R. 4360 to try to find out what the dairy farmer wants. If he does not want to accept marketing quotas and is satisfied with Mr. Benson's sliding scale for dairy farmers, I want to know it. Sixty-one percent of the dairy farmers in my district voted for me in 1953, and sent me to Congress. Sixty-three percent voted for me in 1954. I would assume from this large vote they wanted me to come to Washington to help them work out a solution to their problems. Since coming to Congress in January 1954, I have tried to find a solution and have worked hard in their behalf. I can honestly say that the 6 months I have been a member of the House Committee on Agriculture and the Dairy Subcommittee we have not received one suggestion from our present Secretary of Agriculture, except when he testified before our committee and told us that the flexing of dairy farmers is working fine and he is well satisfied.

H. R. 4360 is my own brainchild and was introduced, as I have stated before, as a result of conferences with members of the Agriculture Committee from various sections of the United States. Many people have told me I am sticking my political neck out in coming forward with this plan, and already certain of the large processors have been circulating incorrect information concerning this bill.

If the dairy farmers are opposed to it, I would be the last one to urge it on them, and will immediately begin to search for another way out of the dairy farmers' dilemma. But I do not propose to have Swift & Co., Armour & Co., Beatrice Creameries, Fairmont Foods Co., or Kraft Food Products tell me what the dairy farmer wants. I hope that during the coming months it will be possible for me to determine what the dairy farmer wants. I would like to hear from them, and I want to receive their views. I also hope that before the next session convenes the Dairy Subcommittee will be able to hold hearings in all the dairy areas of the country to find out how the dairy farmers feel about this. I also hope my colleagues on the Agriculture Committee who are not members of the Dairy Subcommittee will accompany the subcommittee for these hearings so they can hear the dairy farmer's testimony as to what he wants. I further hope that if such hearings are held the farmer will appear and make his views known.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. I yield to my friend from Missouri, a member of the Agriculture Committee.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I think the gentleman from Wisconsin is to be commended on the excellent statement which he has just made, which is typical of the commonsense, realistic stand he has taken in his efforts to solve the problems of the dairy farmers whom he so effectively and intelligently represents.

To begin with he has demonstrated that he has a clearcut view of the problem and is facing it in a most realistic manner. I say this because he has recognized that in return for the benefits to be derived from any support program, the producer must agree to cooperate in that program. Those farmers who produce the so-called basic commodities that have been supported at 90 percent of parity have agreed to production controls and marketing quotas, and it is only on this basis that anyone can justify the continuation of a fixed support program which will insure to the producer at least 90 percent of parity.

I know that our colleague from Wisconsin, who has been fighting so determinedly and so persistently for the farmers of his district whose livelihood is so dependent upon a fair price for their dairy products, has done much to convince the members of the Committee on Agriculture not only of his sincerity and his determination to bring about economic relief for the people of his district, but also of his ability to make worthwhile contributions to the solution of all of the perplexing problems with which this committee is faced.

Through the introduction of legislation which would contribute immensely to relieving a situation which has been made worse through the administration of the present program conceived by an administration that has failed to live up to its promises, the gentleman from Wisconsin has brought to the attention of the committee suggestions which, if enacted into law, would undoubtedly bring about greater prosperity to those areas wherein dairying is the major industry, but would also make available to the American people abundant supplies of all dairy products at prices which would be fair to the consumer.

It is my belief that if those producers who depend upon dairying for their livlihood will continue to put their trust in this capable and energetic Representative who has so effectively been dramatizing their story to the other Members of Congress, that they will in a comparatively short time begin to see the visible results of his campaign and begin to reap the benefits from a sound workable program based upon the theory that the American farmer is entitled to a fair share of the consumer's dollar and that he is entitled to all of those benefits which come from a soundly conceived price-support program resulting not only in 90 percent of parity, but the full parity as promised by candidate Eisenhower, but which apparently has been forgotten by President Eisenhower who appears to be sitting idly by while his duly appointed Secretary of Agriculture refuses to recognize the problem, and in failing to even recognize the problem, certainly can offer no suggestions for its solution.

Mr. THOMPSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr, JOHNSON of Wisconsin. I yield to my friend the gentleman from Texas,

a member of the Committee on Agriculture.

Mr. THOMPSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I wish to commend the gentleman from Wisconsin on his fine presentation. He is an ardent champion of the dairy industry, which happens to be of great interest and importance in my district. The gentleman was kind enough to visit Texas with me earlier this summer, and if the Agriculture Committee visits Wisconsin, I shall certainly make every effort to return the courtesy to him and his people. He learned much about our rice and cotton industry, and I want to improve my knowledge of his dairy problems. Like him, I want to hear what the farmers themselves want.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. I yield to my friend, the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend the gentleman for the very fine fight he has made for the dairy farmer and the dairy industry, in Congress. I do not know of any Member who is more on the alert, to be of help and aid and assistance to the dairy industry than the gentleman from Wisconsin. Ever since he came to Congress he has been working in behalf of the dairy industry and in the interest, I will say, of the plain people particularly. I commend him for the wonderful fights he has always made here on the floor of this House in that respect. He is a real and genuine friend of small business and a valuable and effective Member of the Congress.

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my friend, the gentleman from Texas, [Mr. PATMAN], for those kind words. I would like to say to the gentleman that he was one of the first Members I met when I came to Washington, and I have valued his counsel very much.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. I yield to my friend the gentleman from Oklahoma, my colleague on the committee.

Mr. ALBERT. As a member of the Committee on Agriculture, I commend the gentleman on the statement he is making and commend his district on having a Representative in Congress who works as diligently in the interests of the dairy farmer as anyone I have even known, not only diligently but intelligently and effectively.

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. I thank my friend from Oklahoma.

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. I yield to my friend the gentleman from Virginia, my colleague on the committee.

Mr. JENNINGS. I wish to compliment the gentleman on the fine statement he has made here today. It is a real pleasure to serve on the Committee on Agriculture with him. I know of no man who is more sincere and more industrious than he, and who has the interest of all the farm families of the United States, and especially those families out in his section, the dairy families, more at heart.

May I say to the gentleman it will give me pleasure, as serving on the subcommittee with him pertaining to these dairy matters has, to meet in his district and study these problems firsthand. When the occasion arises, he may be sure I will be present.

Again I commend the gentleman on the fine and unselfish effort he is giving to the constituents of his district as well as to the other farm families and the people of the United States.

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. I thank the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. I yield to my esteemed colleague and member of the Agriculture Committee the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. MATTHEWS. I also have listened with a great deal of interest to the talk the gentleman from Wisconsin has been giving us. I remember when the gentleman came here not so long ago, he had hardly been here a month before he was in the well of the House making a talk for the farmers in his district, and he was placing particular emphasis on the problems of the dairy farmers. I have served with the gentleman on the Committee on Agriculture and on the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, and I am particularly impressed with the way the gentleman has insisted that the committee go to his district and get the grassroots problem. I hope it will be possible for me to go there and to be with him. I commend the gentleman on the stand that he is making for the dairy farmers and the other people in his great district in the State of Wisconsin.

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. I thank the gentleman and I hope he will be able to come to Wisconsin with the Committee on Agriculture.

A STUDY IN SHORT MEMORIES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, on the subject of The Great Conspiracy of 1933: A Study in Short Memories, by Paul F. Boller, Jr., that is published in the Southwest Review, spring 1954 edition, is particularly interesting now since the late Secretary of State, Cordell Hull, was instrumental in getting Russia recognized by the United States. He is mentioned very favorably a number of times in this particular article. The subject, Short Memories, is a good one. Many of the people who are now criticizing those who caused the recognition of Russia were among those who were advocating it at that time. Readers of this article will be surprised to discover some of their names.

Mr. Speaker, I will read the article as follows:

THE "GREAT CONSPIRACY" OF 1933: A STUDY IN SHORT MEMORIES

(By Paul F. Boller, Jr.)

On the 10th of October 1933—7 months after assuming office—President Franklin Roosevelt sent off a note to Mikhail Kalinin, President of the All-Union Central Executive Committee of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, calling attention to the desirability of an effort to end the present abnormal relations between 125 million people in the United States and the 160 million people of Russia. Adding that it was regrettable that the two countries should now be without a practical method of communicating with each other, Roosevelt invited Kalinin to send a representative to Washington to discuss outstanding questions at issue between the two nations. A few days later the Soviet President accepted Roosevelt's invitation and designated Maxim Litvinov, People's Commissar for Foreign Affairs, as emissary to the United States. Early the following month, Commissar Litvinov arrived in New York, proceeded to Washington where he was greeted at Union Station by Secretary of State Cordell Hull, and immediately paid a ceremonial visit to Franklin Roosevelt.

Negotiations to remove what Litvinov called "that artificial barrier which has for 16 years prevented normal intercourse between the peoples of our two countries" proceeded swiftly. There were a few days of conferences at the White House and at the State Department, interspersed with luncheons and dinners honoring Litvinov. Then, late in the night of November 16, the President and the Commissar, with State and Treasury Department officials present, brought their discussions to a close and exchanged five sets of diplomatic notes. The next day Roosevelt announced to nearly 200 correspondents who packjammed his White House office that at 10 minutes before midnight on November 16, 1933, the United States Government had finally resumed diplomatic relations with the Soviet Union after a lapse of 16 years.

In this fashion, according to a theory now being sedulously advanced in certain quarters of this country, was the great conspiracy consummated. From the day of recognition, it appears, we can trace all the present troubles of the United States and the woes of the world at large. More than any other single factor, so the new thesis now circulating runs, it was recognition of the Soviet Union in late 1933 that gave the steadily disintegrating Bolshevik regime a new lease on life and started it off on its program of worldwide imperialist expansion. And who was responsible for this great act of betrayal? Why, Franklin Roosevelt and the New Deal crowd, of course. Roosevelt "took action virtually on his own, rejecting the counsel of elder statesmen who thought we should wait awhile before opening our doors to Soviet diplomats," declared Bascom N. Timmons, columnist for the Dallas Times Herald, on November 17, 1953. "Russia was recognized solely because Franklin D. Roosevelt as President insisted upon it," stated a Dallas Morning News editorial 2 days later.

At the very least, according to present-day critics of Roosevelt's action 20 years ago, the New Deal "brain trust" was "soft" toward communism, filled with ecstasy at the prospect of doing business with Soviet leaders; at the worst, Roosevelt and his associates were coconspirators with the Kremlin, prepared to go to any lengths to welcome a pariah among nations back into the respectable world community and to facilitate the dissemination of Communist propaganda within the United States. No sensible, God-fearing, patriotic American, the theory goes, would have touched this international outlaw with a 10-foot pole in 1933. But here, as elsewhere, the American people were helpless victims of New Deal machinations. And we have been paying a heavy price for this folly—or treachery—ever since.

So far as I can discover, this new thesis regarding Soviet recognition was first put forward in the pages of the American Mercury during the campaign year of 1952. "The gravest charge against the Democratic Party," wrote Mercury Editor William Brad-

ford Huie in September 1952, "is that it allowed evil and naive men within it to convert it into a vehicle which aided the growth of Soviet Russia and the extension of Soviet power." It is a "historic fact," he observed, that it started on its iniquitous course "when it championed recognition of the Soviet Union" in 1933.

A corollary to the Roosevelt-New Deal recognition-conspiracy thesis has been developed by William F. Buckley, Jr., a recent Yale alumnus whose God and Man at Yale raised a minor tempest at his alma mater in 1951. In an article for the March 1952 Mercury entitled "The Colossal Flunk," the zealous young fact finder produced another exposé: "How our professors have betrayed the American people." The outstanding example of betrayal by the American professoriate occurred, according to Buckley, on "that day in November 1933 when the President of the United States * * * clasped the hand of Maxim Litvinoff and extended full diplomatic recognition to the Soviet Union." Buckley poses this searching question:

"Now whose responsibility was it to confront Franklin Roosevelt with the available and overwhelming evidence that this capricious act was nothing more than an invitation to the Comintern to set up in the United States hemispheric headquarters for a violent revolutionary movement * * *?"

The answer is self-evident: "The responsibility sat squarely on the shoulders of the academic community." Yet, Buckley continues sorrowfully:

"A survey of the literature of the day reveals hardly a dissenting wavelength originating from the Nation's ivory towers. The reverse, in fact, was the case: The academic journals of the period treated compassionately and even encouragingly American recognition, which served immeasurably to fortify Stalin's then faltering domestic position. * * * [This was the] academic betrayal of 1933."

Well, as Al Smith used to say, let's take a look at the record. Let's attempt to do what presumably Bascom Timmons, the anonymous Dallas News editorial writer, William Bradford Huie, and William Buckley did before citing their various charges: examine the record. We might, in fact, begin by taking a look at Al Smith's own record. True, he was a liberal of a sort, and thus suspect; but he was never actually a full-fledged New Dealer, and in 1940 he finally broke completely with Roosevelt. Furthermore, he remained a devout Roman Catholic throughout his life. He was never, so far as I know, accused of subversion or even of creeping socialism. Seven months before Roosevelt's overtures to Kalinin—a few days before Roosevelt's inauguration, to be exact—Smith appeared before the Senate Finance Committee and announced flatly: "I believe that we ought to recognize Russia; I do not know any reason for not doing it." The crowd that jammed the committee room, with spectators standing two apiece on chairs, listened intently as the popular, cigar-smoking, brown-derbied New Yorker explained his views:

"Somebody says they owe us $100 million. We kept troops in Russia for quite a while when we were not at war with them (a reference to Allied intervention in North Russia and Siberia, 1918–20), and we did some damage to them. I think we could sit around the table and settle that matter very easily.

"There is no use in trading with them under cover. We are doing it. Through the Amtorg, or whatever you call it, the Russian trading company, our material and stuff is getting into Russia.

"We might just as well be represented there and let them be represented here at Washington and let us do business with them in the open."

Smith made it clear that he had no use for the Soviet form of government, but he insisted that bolshevism presented no real threat to the American system.

"I do not think myself that they are making any headway with this communism. If there would be any place where you would see some of it, you would see it in a city like New York, and it does not mean anything down there. New York is contented. The people are satisfied. They are suffering, but they are satisfied.

"Now and then down in Union Square there are a half a dozen crackpots jump up on the platform and holler out at the people, but that has been going on down there since I was a boy."

Most newspapers appeared to agree with Smith. It is "a stupid policy that has for all these years kept the Russian market closed to us," commented the Brooklyn Daily Eagle. The Norfolk Virginian-Pilot found it "a pleasure to see Al blow away the cobwebs." Urging immediate recognition, the New York World-Telegram asserted that "Russia is the only place we can get a large foreign market quickly for so much of our surplus production—and a market which has the unusual distinction in these times of never defaulting on its trade payments." The Providence News-Tribune saw advantages from recognition going far beyond benefits to American trade:

"There is a good deal to be said for the point of view that closer connection between the people of Russia and the peoples of what are called the capitalistic countries would result in the Soviet system going under rather than otherwise. Wild blood is not tamed or taught to be man's friend instead of his enemy by being left to roam and rave through its native jungle."

Surveying newspaper response as a whole throughout the country, the Literary Digest concluded that the "majority of editors" sided with Al.

There is no question but that the generally sympathetic reaction to Smith's recommendations represented an almost complete transformation of American attitudes toward the Soviet Union from those prevailing in the years immediately following the Bolshevik Revolution. The American people, from President Wilson on down, had greeted with unanimous enthusiasm the collapse of czarist autocracy in March 1917, and its replacement by a provisional government based upon constitutional democratic principles. But their optimism had given way first to bewilderment and then to dismay when, the following November, the Bolsheviks under Lenin and Trotsky overthrew the Kerensky government and proclaimed a communistic dictatorship. As the Bolsheviks proceeded, in rapid succession, to sign a separate peace with Germany, repudiate all Russian debts, organize the Third Communist International, and consolidate their power within Russia by "Red terror," American opinion changed quickly to indignation and revulsion. Thus when the Bolsheviks attempted in June 1918, and again in March 1919, to establish formal diplomatic relations with the United States, there was general support in the country for President Wilson's stern refusal to have anything to do with them. In explaining why the United States "recoils" from recognition, Bainbridge Colby, Wilson's Secretary of State, defined the official American attitude toward the Soviet regime in August 1920:

"The existing regime in Russia is based upon the negation of every principle of honor and good faith, and every usage and convention, underlying the whole structure of international law; the negation, in short, of every principle upon which it is possible to base harmonious and trustful relations, whether of nations or of individuals."

Nonrecognition was about the only policy to survive the Harding landslide in 1920, and it became the fixed policy of the Harding, Coolidge, and Hoover administrations, despite repeated efforts by the Soviets to resume diplomatic relations with each new administration.

It is important to note, however, that diplomatic nonrecognition did not mean economic nonrecognition during these years. In 1920 Washington lifted its ban on commercial relations with the Soviets, and American business firms began at once to enter into trade agreements with unofficial Soviet representatives in the United States. Many firms negotiated contracts with Amtorg Trading Co. providing for adjustment of claims arising out of Soviet confiscations of American property during the revolution. Others, like General Electric, General Motors, Standard Oil, and International Harvester, granted sizable commercial credits to the Soviets for relatively long terms, while the Chase National Bank and Equitable Trust Co. financed short-term loans for the purchase of American cotton. Even Hamilton Fish, who in the 1930's, as Republican Congressman from New York, was to be a leading antirecognitionist, took a trip to Russia and returned to tell the New York Kiwanis that Russia offered great business opportunities. As late as March 1926 he was still interested enough to introduce a resolution in Congress urging President Coolidge to create a commission composed of representatives of—

"The manufacturing, commercial, financial, agricultural, and exporting and importing interests of the United States, together with Government officials, which would endeavor to reopen trade and commercial relations with the people of Russia with a view to the resumption of trade and commerce and for the exchange of missions, pending the settlement of political relations between the two countries."

Despite the absence of governmental encouragement, however, American-Russian trade increased steadily during the 1920's, and by 1928 the United States was exporting three times as much to Russia as it had in 1913. Then in 1928–29, when Russia launched its first 5-year plan—a program for heavy industrial development and agricultural collectivization dependent, to an important extent, on imports from abroad—there was a sharp rise in American exports to the Soviets. By 1930 the United States had become the chief exporter to the Soviet Union, and the Soviets had become the world's largest purchaser of American agricultural and industrial equipment.

Furthermore, during the late 1920's American firms began sending engineers, technicians, and industrial experts to Russia to provide technical assistance on Soviet projects; and by 1930 some 30 firms, including Du Pont, Ford, General Electric, RCA, and Sperry Gyroscope, were participating in such arrangements. Reversing the process, Henry Ford invited Russian engineers to come to America to study so that they might "perfect themselves" in the techniques of mass production. Infuriated at the friendly relations developing between American business and the Soviets, Father Charles E. Coughlin, of Detroit, accused Henry Ford, along with the Chase National Bank and J. P. Morgan ("which is not certainly an American institution"), of "subsidizing" bolshevism, while Ralph M. Easley, chairman of the American Civic Federation, began calling Standard Oil's Ivy L. Lee "comrade" and concluded angrily that the growing rapprochement between the two countries was a matter of "plain dollars and cents."

Plain dollars and cents undoubtedly played a major role in the gradual development of sentiment for recognition in the years before 1933. Ivy Lee remarked that "the most significant fact about the present Russian regime was the personal honesty of the men in charge."

Returning from a visit to Russia, James D. Mooney, vice president of General Motors, declared that "the initiation of full diplomatic relations with the Soviet Republics was necessary in the interest of the development of normal trade relations." A poll taken in May 1932 of 50 firms dealing with Russia revealed that 22 favored immediate recognition and that only 4 were definitely opposed. Among those who spoke out in favor of recognition were the presidents of Sullivan Machinery Co., of Chicago, and C. O. Bartlett & Sons Co., of Cleveland, Edward A. Filene, of William Filene's Sons Co., of Boston, and the Commonwealth Club, of San Francisco, a business organization, which passed a resolution favoring recognition. "What about Russia?" queried Business Week in June 1932. "Washington has refused consistently to deal with the question. Business is more friendly." The views of corporation lawyer Paul D. Cravath doubtless reflected those of an increasingly larger segment of the American business and financial world during the late 1920's and early 1930's. Insisting that recognition does not remotely involve approval of Soviet principle and methods, Cravath declared:

"The obvious advantages of a policy of recognition are those upon which the whole system of diplomatic relations between civilized nations is based. Our Government would be in a position through its diplomatic representatives to protect, life, liberty, and property of Americans visiting, or sojourning, in Russia, of whom there are already several thousand annually, who are now dependent upon the good offices of the diplomatic representatives of other governments. Our Government would be able by the usual diplomatic methods to encourage and protect American trade with Russia. There is much force in the view that when—our Government—encouraged American merchants and manufacturers to engage in trade with Russia, it owed our citizens the duty of protecting this trade by the usual diplomatic machinery. * * * With an Ambassador at Moscow and consuls in the principal trading centers of Russia, our Government would be able to assemble reliable information for the guidance of our merchants, manufacturers, and bankers."

As American business moved steadily in the direction of recognition during the early 1930's, it was joined by a similar movement in the press and in politics. In the spring of 1932 Roy Howard, president of Scripps-Howard Newspaper Service, began a recognition campaign in his influential newspaper chain. "I think the menace of bolshevism in the United States is about as great as the menace of sunstroke in Greenland or chilblains in the Sahara," he told the vice president of the Chase National Bank. Beginning in 1930, Senator William E. Borah, Republican, Idaho, who had been a steadfast advocate of recognition throughout the 1920's, was supported in his views by an increasing number of senatorial colleagues. Senator Burton K. Wheeler, Democrat, Montana, declared that by "all the rules of international law and practice, they are entitled to recognition." Democrats like Senators Barkley, Ladd, Pittman, and Robinson, and Republicans like Senators Cutting, Johnson, Brookhart, La Follette, Norris, and Nye added their voices to the rising chorus.

It is clear by 1933 many of the arguments against recognition had lost much of their weight. Worldwide depression had forced most European nations to join Russia in defaulting on World War I debts to the United States, and the Russian debt began to seem far less important than formerly. In addition, the dollars and cents argument for recognition took on new meaning as the depression widened throughout the United States, and the prospect of recognition and increased trade began to appear more and more attractive as a means of helping to pull the economy out of the doldrums. Trade with Russia, explained Thomas Campbell, a Montana mass production farmer, is one of the best ways to help terminate our industrial depression. Furthermore, the rise of Hitler in Germany and the threat of Japanese expansion in the Orient added a compelling new argument in favor of reconciliation with Russia: it might serve as a stabilizing factor in the precarious international situation.

Finally, fear of Communist propaganda had gradually waned throughout the period. After Stalin broke with Trotsky in 1926 and announced, "We have had enough of that idiotic slogan, the world revolution," it appeared to many Americans that Russia had abandoned its program of world revolution and was settling down to the far less menacing job of building socialism in one country. Communism in America, it was noted, was still a negligible factor; and in any case, the fundamental bulwark against communism was not nonrecognition but a strong and viable American system. "I have no sympathy with communism," said Gifford Pinchot, Republican Governor of Pennsylvania, "but I am not afraid of it nor of the recognition of Russia by this country." Senator Bronson Cutting, Republican, of New Mexico, even went so far as to welcome Communist propaganda: "In the battle of propaganda on both sides, in a battle where the facts could be made available to both sides, I have no doubt of the final issue." In January 1933, the New York Times reported that of 51 Senators polled, 22 favored recognition, 20 declined to commit themselves, and only 9 recorded their opposition. "Time and events," admitted the Times, long an opponent of recognition, "have been wearing down the obstacles standing in the way of correct relations between the United States and Soviet Russia."

It cannot be said, therefore, that Al Smith's remarks before the Senate committee in March 1933 were in any way unusual; nor is it surprising that the "majority of editors" considered his recommendations the plain commonsense of the matter. Joined by business and financial circles, the editors continued to "side with Al" as the United States moved steadily in the direction of recognition in the months following his appearance before the Senate. Early in July, Time reported that Litvinov, once accustomed to being snubbed by American Secretaries of State, "now hobnobs in friendly fashion" with Secretary Hull at the World Economic Conference then in session in London. Talk of recognition "grew serious," according to the New York Times, when it became known that William C. Bullitt, executive officer of the United States delegation, had an hour's talk with Litvinov, and that Senator James Couzens (Republican, Michigan) lunched with a second Soviet delegate, Valerie I. Mezhlank. Since this was not the first time that Bullitt had conferred with Litvinov at the London Conference, it appeared that "serious exploratory work" on the recognition problem was under way.

Out of the friendly hobnobbing in London came a "thumping deal" between Litvinov and Assistant Secretary of State Raymond Moley by which, said Time, "the soft opening wedge" for recognition was to be "a great wad of cotton." This deal was announced in Washington by Jesse Jones, Chairman of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation: an RFC loan of $4 million to the Soviet Union for the purchase of surplus cotton in the United States. This is "the first time since the World War," noted the Literary Digest, "that the Government sanctions a business deal with Russia." There was general agreement that the RFC loan constituted "informal recognition" of Russia. Within a few weeks the RFC had received some 40 requests for further loans to enable American manufacturers to sell to Russia on credit. With some amusement, the Nation, a liberal weekly which, along with the New Republic, had favored recognition since the early 1920's, printed a cartoon in which an American businessman, confronted by a Russian with hat in hand, is saying to a woman representing the American press: "Be nice to him, dear."

Both the press and the business world were extremely nice to him. So, too, were the politicians. When, on October 20, the text of the Roosevelt-Kalinin exchange was released to the press, the New York Times ran a story on the first page headed: "Roosevelt's Move Wins Wide Backing. Most of the Senators and Representatives Commenting Favor the Step." Among those expressing themselves as in favor of the move were Senators Elmer Thomas, Democrat, of Oklahoma; George McGill, Democrat, of Kansas; and Kenneth McKellar, Democrat, of Tennessee. Senator Robert Reynolds, Democrat, of North Carolina, was joined by Senator James Couzens, Republican, of Michigan, in calling for immediate and full recognition. Arriving from Europe, Senator William G. McAdoo, Democrat, of California, recalled that he had long favored recognition. His colleague, Senator Hiram Johnson, Republican, of California, thought recognition would be wise, sensible, and statesmanlike. Speaker of the House Henry A. Rainey, Democrat, of Illinois, declared the recognition would open an outlet for our surplus goods. Senator Cutting brushed aside fears of Soviet propaganda by quoting Karl Radek: "Revolutions are not carried in suitcases. They cannot be imported; they grow."

Like the Senators, American bankers and businessmen, according to the Times, were particularly interested in the development of trade relations that would follow recognition. Many of them felt that the potentialities of trade with this economically youthful country were unlimited. To reassure those who were still wavering on the recognition issue, officials of General Electric and RCA, both of which have had large dealings with the Soviet, announced that at all times their relations with Soviet Russia have been eminently satisfactory. Reversing its previous stand, the American-Russian Chamber of Commerce, whose membership included leading business and banking houses, came out for recognition. The United States Board of Trade took similar action.

The city of Seattle was especially excited by the prospects: "Seattle Sees Trade Boom" was the front-page headline in the New York Times, "Shipping men, port authorities and other business heads" forecast "the opening of a new trade era" for the city. The president of the Pacific National Bank and the Seattle Clearing House Association was quoted as saying that recognition might open the door for "large transactions" and that Seattle, the closest American post to Vladivostok, would see a revival of shipping.

Newspaper editors sided as energetically with Roosevelt in October as they had with Al Smith in March. "Sensible and sober men," said the Baltimore Sun, will regard Roosevelt's invitation to Kalinin with undivided approval. All over the country, such papers as the Hartford Courant, the Cleveland Plain Dealer, the Kansas City Star, the St. Paul Pioneer Press, the Des Moines Tribune, the San Francisco Chronicle, and the Portland Oregonian expressed similar sentiments. The United States should properly be on friendly terms with Russia and aid in its industrial development, said the Dallas News. It should enable it also to retain its place as a Pacific power, thus checking to some extent Japanese ambitions in the Far East.

In Collier's, Ray Tucker welcomed Roosevelt's move as a return to sensible relations and an important stimulant to trade. Time

saw in Kalinin's swift response to Roosevelt 2 or 3 triumphs for the President:

(1) Never before had the Soviets agreed to discuss differences with a sovereign power before their own sovereignty was recognized. (2) Upon excited Europe and the Far East * * * the drawing together of Russia and the United States must have a quieting effect. (3) The quieting effect upon United States domestic excitments was instant and undisputed.

In the Literary Digest, Ernest K. Lindley asserted that nonrecognition was an "anomaly which has seemed grotesque to an increasing number of people." "With the future of its own great domestic experiment at stake," wrote Lindley, "the Soviet influence has been overwhelmingly on the side of peace." William Phillips Simms, Scripps-Howard foreign editor, agreed with Lindley that time had vastly modified objections to recognition. "The real value of the meeting in Washington," said Business Week, "will be the agreement of the two countries to carry on trade relations on a normal basis. If this be provided, business will do much for itself in the development of trade with the Soviet Union."

The Washington Daily News summed up much of the prevailing opinion in a cartoon picturing Uncle Sam in bed, "Waking up at last," as a telephone labeled "Russia" jingles merrily to the tune of "Trade Opportunities." And the Kansas City Star ridiculed fears of Communist propaganda in a cartoon which showed Uncle Sam and Russia smiling at each other across a fence on which hangs a sign reading "Quarantine: Revolutionary Measles." Russia is pointing to the sign; but Uncle Sam, holding a brief case loaded with "Orders," beams back: "I've already had it—in a mild form." The caption: "He surely won't catch it now."

There were, to be sure, a number of vigorous protests as Litvinov arrived in Washington and went into a huddle with Roosevelt and Hull. Senator David A. Reed (Republican, Pennsylvania) was "awfully sorry" about it; the Washington Star favored recognition only if Russia promised not to carry on "subversive agitation" in the United States; the Los Angeles Times favored it only if Russia was willing to "behave in an internationally civilized manner." A group calling itself the Paul Reveres telegraphed a protest to the White House; Edward A. Hayes, national commander of the American Legion, deplored the negotiations—though Representative WRIGHT PATMAN of Texas assured Roosevelt that not more than 5 percent of the Legion membership would be antagonized by recognition—and the American Alliance, headed by Maj. Gen. Mark L. Hersey, Ely Culbertson, Bishop James E. Freeman, Martin Littleton, Nathan D. Perlman, Rabbi Abram Simon, Rev. Edmund A. Walsh, and Grover Whalen, announced a series of radio programs to oppose recognition. The American Federation of Labor sent Roosevelt a long document containing a "damning indictment" of recognition, reasserting the fixed policy of William Green, Matthew Woll, and other A. F. of L. leaders toward the Soviet Union since 1917.

But these were minor ripples compared to the tidal wave of opinion favoring Roosevelt's action. Shortly before Litvinov's arrival in Washington, the American Foundation published a long report urging recognition. Signers of the report included, among others, James D. Mooney, president of the General Motors Export Co.; Thomas S. Gates, president of the University of Pennsylvania; Thomas W. Lamont of J. P. Morgan & Co.; George M. Houston, president of Baldwin Locomotive Works; Roscoe Pound, dean of the Harvard School of Law; Gen. William N. Haskell of the National Guard of New York; J. H. Rand, Jr., president of Remington Rand Corp.; Thomas A. Morgan, president of Curtis Wright; Dr. Walter G. Alvarez of the Mayo Clinic; and Judge Curtis Bok, of Philadelphia. At the same time, the foundation announced that in a poll it had taken of 1,139 dailies in the country, 63 percent had voted for recognition, 2.6 percent favored it with qualifications, and only 26.9 percent were opposed. A breakdown of the figures indicated that the greatest sentiment for recognition was to be found in the South and in the large eastern States, with the greatest opposition appearing in New England. In an analysis of the political complexion of the newspapers, Editor and Publisher reported that the favorable vote did not reflect party lines. The position of the Dallas News may be taken as typical of the views of two-thirds of American newspapers at this time:

"President Roosevelt returns to the older theory of recognition that a government is entitled to recognition if it is in full possession of the government, if it is able to maintain order and protect life and property, and if its rule is acquiesced in by the people. Russia fulfills these conditions and all that now remains is to reach agreements respecting debts and pledges against propaganda. These agreements can be made in principle and details worked out through appointed commissions.

"Some object to recognition on the ground that Russia's system of government is communistic and in general antireligious. Internationally, however, each state in theory has the right to determine its own form of government and sphere of activity. * * * The general opinion in this country is that Russia and the United States should resume normal and diplomatic relations, since they have many common interests, especially in the Far East, and can readily develop trade relations, mutually profitable."

To the Dallas News, Russia was "Just Another Customer." A News cartoon portrayed a Russian woman waiting before the counter of a general store to make her purchases while Uncle Sam, the clerk, tells two protesting women (the A. F. of L. and the DAR): "Listen! I ain't goin' to marry the gal!"

While probably not everyone agreed with Stanley High that Litvinov was "the leading candidate for the current year's Nobel Peace Award," the Commissar met, in general, an extremely warm reception in this country. "The thing that has amazed me," commented Oswald Garrison Villard in the Nation, "is that there has been no terrific outburst of protest from the Daughters of the Revolution, the Sons of the Revolution, Ham Fish, or Ralph M. Easley. I thought they would be holding mass meetings at Carnegie Hall." Somewhat disappointedly, he added: "But there hasn't been a peep from them."

When Litvinov reached Washington, the Roosevelt administration was fully prepared to get down to brass tacks. The question of recognition had been given thoughtful and serious consideration for many months. Letters favoring or disapproving recognition had been accumulating in the right-hand drawer of Secretary Hull's desk from his very first day in office; in addition, he had been receiving one delegation after another with views to express on the matter. From the very beginning Hull had felt that "certain conditions" had arisen which had not been "fully present under previous administrations" and that the Russian question merited fresh consideration. As he told Molotov, 9 years later, after the United States had entered World War II,

"When I came to the State Department, in 1933, I recommended recognition of the Soviet Governmetnt on several important grounds. Probably the most important was the great need and opportunity for cooperation between our two Governments during the years ahead for the purpose of promoting and preserving conditions of peace in the world. My further grounds were the traditional friendship between the peoples of the 2 countries and the fact that it was contrary to the best interests of 2 great nations such as the Soviets and ourselves not to be on speaking terms diplomatically in view of the existing circumstances in the international field."

At the London Economic Conference in June and July, Hull discussed the subject elaborately with a number of Foreign Ministers attending the meeting, and he also conferred with Litvinov, whom he found a "thoroughly capable diplomat and international statesman," with an "agreeable personality." Returning from London in August, Hull outlined in a memorandum to the President the problems involved in recognition. In his Memoirs (1948), he tells us:

"In some respects we stood to gain more than Russia by a restoration of diplomatic relations. Without relations, the Russians were probably much better informed about conditions in America than we were about the situation in Russia. * * * Moreover, it was easier for the Russians to do business in the United States without diplomatic protection than it was for Americans to do business in Russia."

Four points, he told Roosevelt, would have to be settled before any agreement could be reached with the Russians: (1) The question of Communist propaganda; (2) freedom of religion for United States citizens in Russia; (3) fair treatment of American citizens in Russia; and (4) settlement of the debts, both governmental and private, which were owed by Russia.

Satisfactory settlement of all four points mentioned by Hull in his memorandum was insisted upon by Roosevelt and his advisers before they would consent to grant formal recognition to the Soviet Union. According to William Bullitt, an "ardent proponent of recognition" (Hull) and a prime mover in the events of October and November, Litvinov, "after refusing to sign such agreements so persistently that he was handed a schedule of steamship sailings and told to sign or go home, did sign them on November 16, 1933, and we established diplomatic relations with the Soviet Union." With respect to propaganda, Litvinov promised that it would be the "fixed policy" of his government to "refrain" from interference in American affairs. On the second point, Litvinov agreed that American citizens residing in Russia should be permitted "freedom of religious worship and exercise of ecclesiastical functions." In addition, Roosevelt prevailed upon Litvinov to accept, a long series of guarantees respecting the rights of Americans in Russia. The question of debts (and Russian counterclaims for damages done by American troops in northern Russia during the period of Allied intervention, 1918–20) was left to future negotiations. As a "goodwill gesture," Litvinov waived claims for damages done by American forces in Siberia during and after World War I.

Upon conclusion of the agreement, Roosevelt named William C. Bullitt, who had been working tirelessly for recognition since 1919 and who, as special assistant to Hull, had played a prominent part in the negotiations, as first Ambassador to the Soviet Union. "After 14 years his point was made" was the caption under Time's picture of the new Ambassador.

The immediate reactions to the recognition settlement were just about what we might expect. Moscow, not surprisingly, hailed it as Ochen horosho (very fine), although Pravda could not resist a dig at William Green—"that yellow trade-union bureaucrat"—for his bitter end opposition. In Episcopal Church House, Philadelphia, Archdeacon the Reverend James P. Bullitt, uncle of the new Ambassador, flared: "The United States has disgraced itself by establishing relations with a country which is beyond the

pale—a pariah among nations." Congressman Hamilton Fish denounced the "brain trust," and William Green reaffirmed AFL hostility to the Soviet regime. Most of the oppositionists, however, accepted the decision with resignation and hoped for the best. Edward Hayes, of the American Legion, received Roosevelt's announcement "with the spirit of the soldier"; the State Journal of Lincoln, Nebr., conceded that it "will be acceptable to a great majority"; and the Los Angeles Times expressed hope that it would "work out for the best interests of both countries."

In general, the American press greeted recognition with quiet satisfaction. Time reported that virtually all newspapers approved the agreement, or at least did not actively oppose it. Even such a formerly antirecognitionist paper as the New York Herald Tribune could "express nothing but approval." A Dallas News cartoon captioned "Tea for Two" showed Uncle Sam and Uncle Joe enjoying a spot of tea together from a teapot filled with "Friendship and Trade." Roosevelt, observed the News, saw the absurdity of a continued refusal to recognize a great nation with a stable government. * * * Without question, the Nation as a whole will give sanction to this decision. Russia has a people of 160 million, occupying a large fraction of this earth's surface. In its civilization, it is Western, not Oriental, and it is certain to become within the next 25 years one of the greatest in the family of nations.

"After all, sovietism is an experiment in a sort of democracy. * * * There will be the exchange of ideas and of political and cultural experiences, as a result of which each, it is to be hoped, may gain knowledge and wisdom from the other. The two peoples should be fast friends in the future as they were in the past."

On the front page, the News announced on November 18: "Recognition aid to sale of Texas cotton in Russia. Millions of bales now expected to be sold to Soviet consumers." According to the News, the reluctance of Americans to do business with the Soviets owing to absence of diplomatic relations is now removed by the character of good standing which President Roosevelt's official announcement implies. For several months Jesse H. Jones, Chairman of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, has been maneuvering to make possible large shipments of raw and manufactured products into this reservoir of trade. * * * Russia has always taken large amounts of Texas cotton which appeared to best serve its mill purposes. For instance in 1929 the Soviet bought nearly $25 million worth of Texas cotton, and in the remainder of the South, the expenditure was only $6 million. During the last 9 years Texas cotton to the value of about $150 million has been purchased by that government.

"Mr. Roosevelt's recognition of the Soviet, according to the prevailing Washington opinion, will be one of the most important accomplishments of his administration when the history is written. The step will have the approval of the business world."

On the 19th, the News reported that Dallas expected "a marked business and industrial improvement" as a direct result of recognition. C. J. Crampton, executive secretary of the Dallas Chamber of Commerce, was quoted as saying it "will certainly help our business." Others, like Sherwood H. Avery, secretary of the North Texas Foreign Trade Club, were of the same opinion.

The enthusiasm of Dallas for the economic benefits of recognition was duplicated in other parts of the country. Francis T. Cole, executive vice president of the American Manufacturers Export Association, made public a survey conducted among 400 manufacturers analyzing the promising opportunities for business expected to follow from recognition and increased trade. C. W. Linscheid, president of the Export Managers' Club of New York, referred to recognition as "a distinct step forward." Similar statements were made by Samuel M. Vauclain, chairman of the board of Baldwin Locomotive Works, and Alfred P. Sloan, Jr., president of General Motors. A news story in the New York Times stated that Michigan was "likely to reap a financial harvest because of the expected demand for products, especially automobiles," and reported that George Feehan, of the Detroit Chamber of Commerce, had forecast a boom for American trade.

In Congress, the reaction was similarly favorable. Senator Borah, dean of the recognitionists, was so pleased that he telegraphed congratulations from Boise, Idaho, to both Roosevelt and Litvinov. Typical of lawmakers who foresaw excellent results in terms of foreign trade and world peace were Democratic Senators Reynolds, Black, Thomas (both Elbert D. and Elmer), and Robinson, and Republican Senators Nye and Capper. Speaker of the House Rainey called recognition the "greatest thing in the world that has happened to bring about world peace."

Busily rounding up opinion in leftist circles, the New York Times reported that Norman Thomas' Socialist Party approved of Roosevelt's action; in the opinion of the Socialists, the Comintern had been outlawed by Litvinov's pledge and the Communist Party dealt a death blow. The Times ran into some difficulty, however, when it attempted to get a statement from leaders of the American Communist Party. Recognition left the comrades "officially mute last night." At the offices of the Daily Worker, reporters were told that Earl Browder was "out of town. We don't know where, but may be back tomorrow." William Z. Foster was also out of town and nobody knew where he was. Robert Minor was "at a beach in Virginia, but what beach was not known." Sam Don, editor of the Worker, told reporters there would be no editorial on the subject that day and declined to comment further. Since at this time Roosevelt was, in the opinion of American Stalinists, "the most effective agent Wall Street has had in several years," his Cabinet "the new Wall Street hunger and war cabinet," and the NRA an "Industrial Slavery Act," the forerunner of "American fascism," the temporary bewilderment of the Communist Party, United States of America, over the new development is perhaps understandable. On this occasion, as on many others, the Kremlin had apparently not bothered to tip the American party off in advance, and the usually garrulous comrades were forced into one of their brief periods of silence pending official adjustment to the new line.

It is part of history, of course, that the high hopes that Americans entertained generally during 1933 for the future of American-Soviet relations failed of realization. Disillusionment began almost immediately in the months following recognition, and by the middle of 1935 had become quite widespread within administration circles as well as outside. In subsequent negotiations, the Soviets failed to agree on debt payments, and as a result the Roosevelt administration refused to extend credits through the Export-Import Bank (established in 1934 for that specific purpose) for Soviet purchases in this country. Though an increase in American-Soviet trade did develop after 1933, there was nothing like the trade boom anticipated by American business interests. Nor did Soviet leaders show any disposition to honor the pledge that Litvinov had made to refrain from interference in American internal affairs.

In the clear light of hindsight, this disillusionment may appear to have been inevitable. But it is impossible to escape the conclusion that Roosevelt's action on November 16, 1933, was heartily endorsed by the American people as a whole. The sound and fury that arise periodically in this country upon occasions of major foreign policy decisions—entry into World War II, the recall of General MacArthur from the Far East, the question of recognizing Red China—seem to have been notably absent while the question of Soviet recognition was being decided.

The contention that Roosevelt "took action virtually on his own" is simply untrue. If Roosevelt had decided on recognition by September 1933, as Bullitt reports, he had been preceded in his decision by influential spokesmen in the American press, business, financial, and political circles. If we are to talk of betrayals 20 years ago, then we shall be forced to place business betrayal and newspaper betrayal at the top of the list. The lure of trade seems to have been the primary motivation for prorecognition sentiment in this country in the early 1930's; but the threat posed by Nazi Germany and imperialist Japan appears to have figured most prominently in the calculations of Roosevelt and his associates. By the early fall of 1933, according to Bullitt, "both the President and I were convinced that Hitler would eventually make war unless England, France, and the Soviet Union should stand together against Nazi aggression. It seemed in our national interest to prevent the outbreak of a Hitler war and, therefore, to resume relations somewhat skeptically with the Soviet Union. * * * The primary objective was to prevent the launching of another world war by Hitler."

It seemed nonsense, says Bullitt, for the United States to continue to snub Russia when "there seemed to be a faint possibility that we might obtain the cooperation of the Soviet Government for the preservation of peace in both Europe and Asia." It is difficult to see anything sinister in that; given the circumstances of 1933, it seemed, as isolationist Senator Hiram Johnson put it, "wise, sensible, and statesmanlike."

Maxim Litvinov's successful trip to the United States wound up on November 24 with what the Nation called "the most extraordinary dinner ever given in New York City." Some 2,500 persons paid $5.50 a plate for a farewell dinner (which included Beluge caviar spread thin on toast, borsch, and filet of beef Stroganoff) at Manhattan's Waldorf-Astoria on the eve of Litvinov's sailing for home. Although no cardinal or other Catholic official was present, Time noted that the American Apostolic Church of America sent its chief prelate and that the big warm room buzzed with the voices of General Motors' Sloan; General Electric's Gerald Swope; Ford's Sorenson; Pennsylvania's Atterbury; Baldwin Locomotive's Houston; Thomas A. Edison's son, Charles; Theodore Roosevelt's son, Kermit; Owen D. Young; Henry Morgenthau, Sr.; and dowagers galore.

Mingling with the guests could also be found S. Parker Gilbert, of the firm of J. P. Morgan; Loomis, of the Lehigh Valley Railroad; Gordon Rentschler, of the National City Bank; the head of the New York Herald Tribune, and the president of the American Chamber of Commerce. The high point of the evening undoubtedly came when the guests stood and faced a stage behind which hung a huge American flag and the Red flag with the Soviet hammer and sickle while the organ played My Country, 'tis of Thee, and then switched into the Internationale. "Not a liberal editor appeared on the dais," observed the Nation ironically, "and hardly a man or woman who battled for Russian recognition when to do so was to invite contumely, insult, and abuse."

It would be nice if the expounders of the Roosevelt-recognition-conspiracy thesis would pause long enough in their current campaign of contumely, insult, and abuse to take a look at the Waldorf-Astoria's guest list for that gemütlich evening in New York City 20 years ago.

THE RULES OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed out of order and to read some records and documents and also read from my own manuscript.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, proceedings in the House are governed by the Constitution,[1] by the precedents established by Parliament,[2] and by the rules adopted by the House as each Congress convenes.[3]

Roberts' Rules of Order, the rules of any other body, give way when in conflict with the above.

Since coming here in 1935, an earnest effort has been made to familiarize myself with the Rules of the House and the precedents. But the subject is so broad that, as we meet here from day to day, there is difficulty, both when we are in Committee of the Whole and when we are in the House, in following the correct procedure.

As the Speaker, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. RAYBURN], has so often impressed upon us, the Rules of the House—if we are to retain the respect and confidence of the people—must be adhered to.

So that the House proceedings may be orderly, progressive, and efficient, a basic, fundamental rule of Parliament, and now of this House,[4] authorizes any Member to make a point of order, and "it is a breach of order for the Speaker to refuse to put a question which is in order."[5]

On March 18, 1955, when the House had under consideration H. R. 4903, and the gentleman from Texas [Mr. RAYBURN] offered an amendment authorizing the construction of an additional fireproof office building for the use of the House of Representatives, including such necessary access facilities over or under public streets and such other appurtenant or necessary facilities as may be approved by the House Office Building Commission, the following occurred—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, pages 3204 and 3205:

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, in view of the emergency involved, and the urgent need of the facility for which the appropriation is proposed, the committee accepts this amendment and approves the expenditure.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I make the point of order against the amendment that it is legislation on an appropriation bill.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, the point of order comes too late.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order does come too late.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. How does it come too late when I was on my feet seeking recognition before the gentleman was recognized?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman, as chairman of the committee, was recognized first.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. That is to say the rule that requires recognition of the chairman of a committee would deprive another Member from making a point of order?

The CHAIRMAN. No. Did the gentleman address the Chair?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I did address the Chair before the Clerk finished reading.

The CHAIRMAN. That was not the proper time.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I was on my feet and addressed the Chair before the Clerk finished and as soon as he finished. Now, if I have to shout louder, I can do that.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair could not recognize the gentleman until the Clerk had finished reading.

The attention of my colleagues is called to the fact that one of the reasons given by the Chairman for his failure to recognize me to make the point of order was that my point of order came too late.

My contention is that the point of order did not come too late, because I was on my feet, seeking recognition, before the gentleman who objected to the point of order was recognized.

The Chairman apparently realized that to be the fact because he gave as his reason for his refusal to recognize me that the gentleman he did recognize was chairman of the committee.

Then, in reply to my inquiry as to whether that established procedure deprived another Member of the right to make a point of order, the Chairman replied in the negative and inquired as to whether I did address the Chair.

Having been advised that I had addressed the Chair, even before the Clerk finished reading, the Chairman then stated that that was not the proper time.

The Chairman was then advised that I was on my feet and addressed the Chair, not only before the Clerk finished reading but as soon as he finished.

It was apparent that I was entitled to recognition on a point of order, both while the Clerk was reading and after he finished.

It is axiomatic that one rising to a point of order and addressing the Speaker must be recognized, if orderly procedure is to prevail.

Even the reading of the Journal of the previous day's proceedings may be interrupted by a point of order.[6]

Moreover, every Member who has attended the sessions of the present Congress knows that the right to make a point of order has been recognized, not only when the Clerk is reading, when a Member is speaking, but during a rollcall.

If that were not the rule, disorder might prevent an understanding by the Members of what was transpiring on the floor.

YIELDING TIME

When, under a rule adopted by the House, the time for general debate has been fixed, control of the time is divided between the majority member in charge of the bill and the ranking minority member of the committee which reported it out.

Under the practice, the member in charge of the bill, usually the committee or subcommittee chairman, and the ranking minority member allocate the time available to those wishing to participate in the debate.

When the Committee of the Whole has a bill under consideration under the 5-minute rule, the practice has been for the Chairman to recognize members as they arose on the floor, giving priority of recognition to members of the committee which reported the bill for action and, in giving recognition, usually alternating between members of the two parties.

Thursday, June 16, the House had under consideration H. R. 6766, a very important appropriation bill. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. RABAUT], in charge of the bill, at a time when 42 Members were on their feet seeking recognition to participate in the debate on the Phillips amendment, secured, on motion, a limitation of debate to a period so brief that each had but 2 minutes.

The following proceedings then occurred:[7]

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I take this time to make a statement relative to the debate on this amendment.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I object. I demand the regular order.

The CHAIRMAN. The name of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. RABAUT] is on the list, and the Chair has recognized the gentleman.

Under this recognition, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. RABAUT] was entitled to the 2 minutes to which his motion had limited all who desired to participate in the debate on the Phillips amendment.

Immediately following that recognition, the RECORD shows the following:[8]

Mr. RABAUT. I want to announce that I shall object to anybody transferring their time.

Subsequently, in the debate on the Phillips amendment, and after the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK] had secured recognition for 2 minutes under the limitation imposed by the Rabaut motion, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BEAMER] asked unanimous consent that the time allotted to him be transferred to his colleague.

The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. RABAUT] then announced:[9]

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I made the statement before anyone started to speak that no matter what the time allotment would be I should have to object to the transfer of time. Therefore I object.

After the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK] had exhausted his 2 minutes, in answer to his parliamentary inquiry:

Mr. HALLECK. Because the pattern was set, Mr. Chairman, in respect to yielding, would it not be proper at this time for anyone who wanted to yield to me, after he was recognized, to be so recognized in order that I might complete my statement?

The Chairman announced:

The CHAIRMAN. The present occupant of the Chair has always alternated between the

[1] Jefferson Manual, secs. 1–281.
[2] Id., secs. 283–620.
[3] Id., secs. 621–950.
[4] Jefferson Manual, sec. 304.
[5] Id.
[6] Jefferson's Manual, sec. 621, p. 303.
[7] CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, p. 8475.
[8] Id.
[9] CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, p. 8477.

sides and thinks in fairness that that precedent should be followed. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. BASS].

This ruling was in accordance with the procedure adopted by the motion limiting debate on the Phillips amendment and with the precedents heretofore established by the House.

After the gentleman from Tennessee had used his 2 minutes, the Chair then recognized the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BEAMER] for 2 minutes. On request of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK], Mr. BEAMER yielded, and when 2 minutes had been used, the Chair announced that the time of the gentleman had expired.

After several Members had been recognized and used the allotted 2 minutes, the Chairman recognized the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. JONAS] who was one of those who were standing when the time for debate was limited. Then the majority leader arose and the following occurred: [10]

Mr. MCCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield for a moment, I do not want to ask him a question but I am going to ask my friend from Michigan [Mr. RABAUT] if he will state to the Members that he has no objection to Members transferring their time to other Members if they desire to do so. I hope my friend from Michigan will do that.

Mr. RABAUT. I will do it.

This concession on the part of the gentleman in charge of the bill, Mr. RABAUT, permitted any one of the 42 Members who was on his feet when the limitation was adopted and who had not used the time allotted to yield his time to any other Member who was recognized for 2 minutes.

It is my understanding that this change in the attitude of the gentleman in charge of the bill was due to the fact that, if he insisted that the leaders on my left were to be limited to 2 minutes on a bill of this importance, it might thereafter, when debate was limited, be extremely difficult for even the Speaker to obtain, under similar circumstances—as he has obtained—as much as 15 minutes to participate in debate.

Undoubtedly the desire to promote comity between the parties was a controlling factor in inducing a change in the procedure.

The change in the procedure which followed the request made by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK] was, however, subject to a point of order which might be raised by any Member.

The yielding of time by one who was, under the amendment, entitled to 2 minutes, was not, thereafter, during the debate, objected to, and the gentleman from Indiana, as did others, was able to secure additional, though limited, time.

Going back for a moment: Immediately after the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. RABAUT] had, by motion, obtained a limitation of time on debate on the Phillips amendment, the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LONG] offered a preferential motion. That motion was defeated.

A POINT OF ORDER

Then the Member from the Fourth District of Michigan, your humble servant, offered the preferential motion that the Committee rise, report the bill back to the House with a recommendation that the enacting clause be stricken. He was recognized, spoke 5 minutes in support of his motion, then asked unanimous consent to withdraw the motion. The following then occurred: [11]

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. Chairman, I wish to be recognized in opposition to the motion.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the motion.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. RABAUT] is recognized.

If the gentleman in charge of the bill, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. RABAUT], desired to speak in opposition to the preferential motion just offered, he was, under the precedents, as chairman of the committee in charge of the bill and as a member of the opposite party, entitled to prior recognition. That ruling is not subject to criticism.

The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. RABAUT] was recognized, but please note the following: When the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. RABAUT], a committee member in charge of the bill, was given a priority recognition, he rose in opposition to the preferential motion, and he added:

Mr. Chairman, I wish to address myself to the preferential motion.

The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. DAVIS] then stated:

Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. RABAUT] then yielded to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Neither the Rules of the House nor those prevailing in committee, nor the practice of either, justifies a member of the committee in yielding his time to another member.

A sound reason for this is that the efficacy of the rule or practice which entitled a member of a committee or the chairman of a committee to priority of recognition would be completely destroyed if one entitled to such priority was permitted to indiscriminately forthwith yield the time granted him. The purpose of the rule as to priority of recognition would be defeated.

One speaking in debate can, of course, yield either for a question or an observation, but if objection is made he cannot transfer his time.

It cannot be forgotten that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. RABAUT] secured his recognition on two grounds, first, that he was opposed to the preferential motion offered by the Member from Michigan, and, second, that he was a member of the committee and that it was customary in debate to alternately recognize members of the two parties.

Under the rules, the only debate permissible at the time the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. RABAUT] was recognized was in opposition to the preferential motion. The gentleman securing recognition no doubt understood this, for he specifically stated that he wished to address himself to the preferential motion.

If assuming, as we must, that at the time the only time which the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. RABAUT] could yield to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. DAVIS] was the 5 minutes to which he was entitled, the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. DAVIS] to be in order would be required to speak in opposition to the preferential motion—that if he did not speak in opposition to the preferential motion, then he was not entitled to the floor, unless he was speaking in lieu of a 2-minute talk by his colleague, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. RABAUT]. But that would not be proper, because the only question then before the committee was on the preferential motion.

The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. DAVIS], having been yielded to by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. RABAUT], then continued the debate as follows: [12]

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I should like to read as much of this argument here as I possibly can in answer.

As for Dixon-Yates, the position of the city of Memphis has, from the outset, been clear and unequivocable.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. That the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. RABAUT] has already asked that no one under the rule be permitted to yield his time to another. Under the rules he cannot do it.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is out of order. The point of order is overruled.

If the gentleman from Tennessee was not speaking in opposition to the preferential motion—and it would seem to be apparent that he was debating the Dixon-Yates contract and the position of the city of Memphis—the point of order was good.

The only argument which was permissible in the situation as it was then presented was an argument in opposition to the motion to report the bill back to the House and to strike the enacting clause.

The point of order that the gentleman was not speaking on the motion was not made by me, as perhaps it should have been, but it seems to be obvious that if the gentleman was not speaking in opposition to the motion he would only be entitled to the floor to make the argument he was making under the 2 minutes to which the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. RABAUT] was entitled, and which he had declared would not be yielded to another Member.

The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. RABAUT] should have been required to withdraw his objection to the yielding of time as he subsequently did, in answer to a request from the majority leader, a reference to which has just been made.

It is evident from the foregoing proceedings, as quoted, that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. RABAUT] secured the floor in preference to the recognition of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK] on his statement that he rose in opposition to the motion; and thereafter, in speaking in opposition to the amendment, he yielded to the gentleman from

[10] CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, p. 8481.

[11] CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, p. 8476.

[12] CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, p. 8476.

Tennessee [Mr. DAVIS], who it is apparent did not speak in opposition to the motion, nor even on the Phillips amendment, but spoke on another phase of the bill—which included many provisions other than the Dixon-Yates contract, the appropriation for the TVA.

Moreover, regardless of whether the point of order was good, or whether it was bad, I fail to find any justification for the statement of the Chairman that, when I made the point of order, I was out of order. The statement by the Chair that "The gentleman is out of order" was a gratuitous, uncalled-for observation.

READING OF PAPERS IN DEBATE

Usually in debate, either in the House or in the Committee of the Whole, when a Member has the floor he may read, without objection, his own speech or may quote from papers or documents. That is the usual, daily practice. Members, unless objection has been made, have been permitted to read either statements written by themselves or to quote from others.

However, the rule [13] is clear and the practice [13a] has, until the incident to which reference will be made, been quite uniform.

But, when objection is made, then the Member should either obtain unanimous consent, or the question should be resolved by the action of the House.

Rule XXX of the 84th Congress, section 915, page 484, provides that:

When the reading of a paper other than one upon which the House is called to give a

---

[13] Jefferson's Manual, sec. 917, p. 485.

[13a] Hinds' Precedents of the House of Representatives, vol. 5, 1907:

"The first rule on this subject dates from November 13, 1794 (3d and 4th Congresses, Journal, p. 228 (Gales and Seaton edition)), when the House adopted this rule:

"When the reading of a paper is called for which has been before read to the House, and the same is objected to by any Member, it shall be determined by a vote of the House.

"As early as 1802 this rule was changed to the following form:

"When the reading of a paper is called for, and the same is objected to by any Member, it shall be determined by a vote of the House (the rule appears first in this form in the draft of the rules printed in the Journal of January 7, 1802 (1st sess., 7th Cong., Journal, p. 39, Annals; p. 410)).

"In this form the rule continued until the revision of 1880, when the present form was adopted. In their report (2d sess. 46th Cong., RECORD, p. 202), at that time the Committee on Rules say that they amended the old rule so as to make it applicable only to papers 'other than one upon which the House is called to give a final vote.' thus reaffirming or recognizing the right of a Member to demand the reading of a paper on which he is called to vote. This is the long-established rule and practice of the English Parliament.

"5258. Under the parliamentary law every Member has the right to have a paper once read before he is called to vote on it.

"The reading of papers other than the one on which the vote is taken is usually permitted under the parliamentary law without question, but if objection is made the Speaker must take the sense of the House.

* * * * *

"A Member has not a right even to read his own speech, committed to writing, without leave. This also is to prevent an abuse of time, and therefore is not refused but where that is intended (2 Grey, 227)."

Cannon's Precedents of the House of Representatives, vol. 8, 1936:

"2602. A Member in debate usually reads or has read by the Clerk such papers as he pleases, but his privilege is subject to the authority of the House if another Member objects.

"On February 20, 1919 (3d sess., 65th Cong., RECORD, p. 3892), the bill (H. R. 16020) providing deficiency appropriation for the railroads was being considered in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

"During general debate, Mr. Edward E. Denison, of Illinois, asked that the Clerk read in his time a press report taken from a recent issue of a Washington newspaper.

"Mr. William W. Larsen, of Georgia, objected to the reading.

"Mr. James R. Mann, of Illinois, argued that under the recent practice of the House objection might not be made to the reading of a paper by a Member in his own time.

"The Chairman (John N. Garner, of Texas) said:

" 'The objection is sustained. The present occupant of the Chair was of the opinion that the gentleman from Illinois had the right to read it in his own time, but the parliamentary clerk suggested that the rule was the other way, and he is more familiar with it than the Chair. It is very plain here in the rule as cited by the parliamentary clerk. Rule XXX is very clear on that.'

"Mr. Denison himself then proposed to read the article.

"Mr. Larsen again objected, and Mr. Joseph Walsh, of Massachusetts, moved that the gentleman from Illinois be permitted to read the article in question.

"The question being taken was decided in the affirmative, and Mr. Denison read the article in the course of his remarks."

Cannon's Precedents of the House of Representatives, vol. 8, 1936:

"2603. Instance wherein the request of a Member to have read a paper not before the House for action encountered objection and was referred to the House.

"On January 20, 1920 (2d sess., 66th Congress, RECORD, p. 1782) Mr. Edward J. King, of Illinois, asked unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

"There being no objection, Mr. King sent a telegram to the desk with the request that it be read by the Clerk.

"Mr. Thomas L. Blanton, of Texas, objected to the reading of the telegram.

"The Speaker (Frederick H. Gillett, of Massachusetts) said:

" 'It can be read by the Clerk only by unanimous consent. The gentleman objects. A Member cannot read without consent of the House.'

"On motion of Mr. John I. Nolan, of California, the question was referred to the House which on a yea-and-nay vote decided, yeas 303, nays 2, that the telegram should be read."

Cannon's Precedents of the House of Representatives, vol. 8, 1936:

"2604. The reading of papers in debate is subject to the authority of the House, but a motion that a Member having the floor be permitted to read such papers as a part of his remarks is privileged.

"On February 10, 1931 (3d sess., 71st Congress, RECORD, p. 4544) during consideration of the naval appropriation bill in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, Mr. Thomas L. Blanton, of Texas, in the course of his remarks on the bill proposed to read a resolution passed by a post of the American Legion.

"Mr. Elliott W. Sproul, of Illinois, objected to the reading of the paper.

"Whereupon, Mr. William P. Connery, Jr., of Massachusetts, moved that Mr. Blanton be permitted to read the resolution as a part of his remarks.

"Mr. John Taber, of New York, made the point of order that the motion was not privileged.

"The Chairman (Frederick R. Lehlbach, of New Jersey) ruled:

" 'The gentleman from Massachusetts moves that the gentleman from Texas be permitted to read the matter which he has indicated.

" 'The motion is privileged and in order (under rule XXX). The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Massachusetts.' "

Cannon's Precedents of the House of Representatives, vol. 8, 1936:

"2605. The reading of papers other than the one on which the vote is taken is subject to the will of the House and any Member may object.

"Rule XXX, providing for taking the sense of the House on the reading of a paper in debate, applies also to proceedings in the Committee of the Whole.

"The rules of the House govern the Committee of the Whole insofar as applicable.

"A motion that a Member having the floor be permitted to read a paper objected to in debate is privileged.

"On January 16, 1931 (3d sess., 71st Congress, RECORD, p. 2377) the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union was considering the State, Justice, Commerce, and Labor Departments appropriation bill.

"During debate, Mr. John J. Boylan, of New York, began the reading of resolutions adopted by the American Federation of Labor.

"Mr. Charles L. Underhill, of Massachusetts, rose to a point of order and objected to the reading of the paper.

"The Chairman (C. William Ramseyer, of Iowa, Chairman) sustained the point of order and said:

" 'In order that the gentleman may read the paper he must get either unanimous consent or an affirmative vote of the House.

" 'There is a rule against reading a paper unless the Member gets consent to do so, Rule XXX, which reads as follows: "When the reading of a paper other than one upon which the House is called to give a final vote is demanded, and the same is objected to by any Member, it shall be determined without debate by a vote of the House.' "

"Thereupon, Mr. Charles R. Crisp, of Georgia, offered a motion that the gentleman be permitted to proceed with the reading of the resolutions in debate.

"Mr. William H. Stafford, of Wisconsin, raised the question of order that rule XXX admitting such motions was limited to proceedings in the House and did not apply to proceedings in Committee of the Whole.

"The Chairman ruled: 'In the opinion of the Chair, it is within the power of the Committee of the Whole House to determine whether or not it will permit a paper to be read. The point of order is overruled.' "

Hinds' Precedents of the House of Representatives, volume 5, 1907:

"5293. A Member may not have a report read at the Clerk's desk in his own time, if objection is made, without leave of the House; and even has been debarred from reading it himself in his place: On April 13, 1900 (1st sess., 56th Cong., RECORD, pp. 4136, 4137), the Committee of the Whole House was considering the bill (S. 1194) granting an increase of pension to John B. Ritzman, and Mr. W. Jasper Talbert, of South Carolina, asked to have read in his time a paper relating, not to the bill under consideration, but to the general subject of pensions.

"The Chairman (Charles H. Grosvenor, of Ohio, Chairman) held that this would be in order only by unanimous consent.

final vote is demanded, and the same is objected to by any Member, it shall be determined without debate by a vote of the House.

After the point of order that the gentleman in charge of the bill, Mr. RABAUT, could not yield his time to another Member was overruled, the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. DAVIS], to whom Mr. RABAUT had yielded and who was then addressing the House said: [14]

Mr. Chairman, I should like to read as much of this argument here as I possibly can in answer. As for Dixon-Yates, the position of the city of Memphis has, from the outset, been clear and unequivocable.

And he then proceeded to read as a part of his own speech the letter from the mayor of Memphis.

As he read, the Member from the Fourth District of Michigan rose and made a point of order. Permit me to quote from the RECORD:

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. The gentleman in the well is reading his speech, which is contrary to the rules.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is entitled to read his speech if he so desires.

The point of order is overruled.

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. I am quoting from a letter addressed to the Chairman of the Tennessee Valley Authority by the mayor of Memphis * * *.

Is it not clear that, under the rules of the House, when the point of order was made, it was the duty of the chairman to submit to the House the question of whether the gentleman from Tennessee should be permitted to read his speech and, as a part of that speech, the letter, or for the gentleman from Tennessee to ask for unanimous consent to read his speech and the letter from the mayor? I certainly would not have objected had the proper practice been followed.

Are the proceedings when the House is in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union to be governed and controlled by the rules of the House and the precedents?

Or are exceptions to those rules in violation of the precedents to be made by a chairman or a speaker as his individual caprice may dictate?

That is the question which is propounded to the House.

My knowledge of the rules and of the precedents does not in any degree approach that of the Speaker, the Parliamentarian, or many Members of the House, but in my respect for the House and its proceedings, Mr. Speaker, I yield to no one.

THE DEMAND FOR THE READING OF AN ENGROSSED COPY OF A BILL [15]

Last Thursday, June 16, 1955, the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration 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.[16]

The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. RABAUT] who had charge of the bill put on a drive to finish the bill and force its passage before the legislative day was over.

On one occasion during debate, the gentleman from Michigan, who was in charge of the bill, by motion, as previously stated, limited the time of 42 Members who desired to speak to 2 minutes each.

And what was the issue before the House? The issue was whether the Federal Government should grant the request of the Tennessee Valley Authority for some $6,500,000 to continue and to enlarge its efforts to produce, sell, and distribute electrical energy in competition with taxpaying private interests.

The action taken by the gentleman in charge of the bill and by the leadership of the House supporting that action was dismaying.

No charge is made that one reason for the action was to continue and approve the practice of adjourning from Thursday until Monday, then scheduling for Monday no important business or votes. That practice gives the members of the "Thursday to Tuesday Club" a 4-day recess during which they are given opportunity each weekend to leave Washington, attend to business other than as Representatives, or to reenergize themselves in delightful home surroundings. Nor do I suggest that the bill was forced to a vote at around 7:15 Thursday evening, rather than going over to Friday or to Monday, because some members of the "Thursday to Tuesday Club" could not conveniently be in attendance.

One purpose in referring to this incident is to call to the attention of the House the fact that, if the House would stay in session on Fridays and transact business on Mondays, we might possibly be able to adjourn this session of the Congress not later than the 4th or at the latest the middle of July. A most desirable objective, I think, if we consider the interests of the people, and certainly such adjournment is desired by an overwhelming majority of the House.

ENCOURAGING AN EARLY ADJOURNMENT

Inasmuch as the usual efforts to obtain a reasonable time for debate were unproductive, it occurred to me that if by some procedure the gentleman in charge of the bill and perhaps others could be convinced that the business of the House might be expedited by a greater consideration of the wishes of those who desired to debate an important issue, a useful purpose would be served.

The quickest arrival at a desired end is not always attained by riding roughshod over the wishes of Members desiring to debate the provisions of a bill. The Parliamentarian was advised that the reading of an engrossed copy of the bill would be demanded.

My purpose was to call the attention of the leadership to the fact that individual Members of the House, under the rules of the House, had the right to that form of procedure—that the exercise of that right might act as a brake or restraint upon hurried procedure such as was followed during Thursday.

Those attempting to force a bill through on a Thursday, then adjourn over until a Monday or a Tuesday, might take counsel from Churchill's statement, "The more haste, ever the worst speed"; or from Friar Lawrence's statement that "They stumble that run fast." Why ride a willing horse to death?

That my thought that we had had undue haste in connection with the passage of this bill was shared by others is evident from the statement made by the ranking minority Member from Wisconsin [Mr. DAVIS]. He said:

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. * * * I think some of the things we have heard here represent a rather shameful reflection upon the deliberations of this body. * * * Well, I submit that all these things that have been said of log rolling and pork barreling and other things are pretty true so far as what has occurred here on the floor of the House today. There ought to be a greater sense of responsibility than that among the Members. I submit that there is but one way that we can purge ourselves of the shame that has descended upon us here this afternoon, and that is to recommit this bill to the Committee on Appropriations.[17]

That statement but intensified my determination to demand the reading of an engrossed copy of the bill and so postpone the vote over to Friday or Monday so that Members might think over the situation.

I thought I understood the procedure but, to avoid a mistake, I again read rule XXI, House Manual, section 830, page 423, and found there these words:

Bills and joint resolutions on their passage shall be read the first time by title and the second time in full, when, if the previous question is ordered, the Speaker shall state the question to be: Shall the bill be engrossed and read a third time? And, if

---

"Mr. Talbert then proposed to read the paper himself.

"The Chair (Charles H. Grosvenor, of Ohio, Chairman) held that this would not be in order.

"Mr. Talbert having appealed, the decision of the Chair was sustained, ayes 52, noes 8.

"Later, the bill (H. R. 1419) relating to the pension of Annie B. Goodrich, being under consideration, Mr. Talbert asked for the reading of the report.

"The Chairman (Charles H. Grosvenor, of Ohio, Chairman) said:

" 'The gentleman from South Carolina, as the Chair understands it, can ask that this report be read in his time, he having now taken the floor upon this bill; but if objection is made to the reading of the report, it is a question for the House to say whether it shall be read or not.'

"The Committee then decided—ayes 1, nays 55—that the report should not be read.

"Mr. Talbert then proposed to read the report in his own time.

"The Chairman (Charles H. Grosvenor, of Ohio, Chairman) ruled that this was not in order, reading the rule (Jefferson's Manual, p. 147, provides: 'It is equally an error to suppose that any Member has a right, without a question put, to lay a book or paper on the table, and have it read, on suggesting that it contains matter infringing upon the privileges of the House. For the same reason, a Member has not a right to read a paper in his place, if it be objected to, without leave of the House. But this rigor is never exercised but where there is an intentional or gross abuse of the time and patience of the House. A Member has not a right even to read his own speech, committed to writing, without leave. This also is to prevent an abuse of time, and therefore is not refused but where that is intended' (2 Grey, 227)).''

[14] CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, p. 8476.

[15] Jefferson's Manual, sec. 831.

[16] CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, p. 8469.

[17] CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, p. 8538.

decided in the affirmative, it shall be read the third time by title, unless the reading in full is demanded by a Member, and the question shall then be put upon its passage.

The Parliamentarian was consulted. The precedents were examined. Some will be quoted.

When the bill came up for final consideration, I walked down the aisle to the microphone, where the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. DAVIS] was waiting with a motion to recommit.

Having the words of the rule in mind, I was on my feet, waiting, listening carefully, to hear the Speaker but the question, "Shall the bill be engrossed and read a third time?" as required by Rule XXI, or to announce, "The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill," and then to call for a vote.

Although I was within hearing distance; although I was listening attentively, I did not hear those words or their substance used, and in my opinion they were not used.

I find that the RECORD—page 8542—carries this statement:

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time and was read the third time.

Who ordered the bill to be engrossed? Certainly not the House, for there was no vote on that issue.

Nowhere, according to the RECORD, was I given an opportunity to demand a reading of an engrossed copy of the bill.

That the rule was not complied with, that the question was not put in the words required by the rule, seems to be borne out by the official printed RECORD, from which I again quote: [18]

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill and all amendments thereto to final passage.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en gross.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time and was read the third time.

Then the Speaker stated that the question was on the passage of the bill. The gentleman from Wisconsin offered his motion to recommit. The ayes and nays were refused, the motion to recommit was rejected, and the bill was then passed on a voice vote.

It is my contention:

That rule XXI was not complied with by the statement that "The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time and was read the third time."

That the intent of the rule was not complied with by the statement, "The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time and was read the third time."

That the Representative of the Fourth Michigan District was not given an opportunity to demand the reading of an engrossed copy in accordance with the provisions of rule XXI.

If it be said that, after the amendments were agreed to, the statement of the Speaker that the bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time was equivalent to the question, "Shall the bill be engrossed and read a third time?" I call attention to the fact that, on many previous occasions, that has not been the practice.

For example, in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of June 1, 1955—page 7391—when another bill was up for consideration and passage, you will find the following:

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill to final passage.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

Note the word "question" in this statement.

Before taking my place to demand the engrossment of the bill, I had, as stated, checked the rule, and I was listening carefully. Since Thursday, I have checked back and find that the House has passed a number of major bills.

On February 8, 1955—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, page 1328—on the passage of a bill, I find that the Speaker stated the question before the House. After amendments were agreed to, the RECORD shows the following:

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

That was the statement I was waiting to hear on the occasion to which reference is made.

Again, on February 18, the words of the rule were followed. The RECORD shows the following—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, page 1794:

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

On February 25, on the passage of another bill, I find the following—the rule again complied with—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, page 2180:

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

On May 5, while the Speaker did not follow the words of the rule, he did announce that the question was on the engrossment and third reading of the bill. CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, page 5805—reads:

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

On January 13, the procedure was as follows—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, page 283:

The previous question was ordered.

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.

On March 15, the procedure was as follows—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, page 2965:

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.

On March 18, the substance of the rule was followed, the procedure being—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, page 3210:

The amendment was agreed to.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

Again, on March 21, the substance of the rule was followed, the RECORD stating—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, page 3284:

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

On March 24, the substance of the rule again was followed. I quote—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, page 3685:

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

On March 28, the RECORD shows that again we seemed to be in a hurry. It reads—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, page 3881:

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.

However, on March 30, the rule—in substance at least—was again complied with, for the RECORD shows—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, page 4083:

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time.

On Thursday, April 14, when the House seemed to be anxious to follow the Thursday-to-Tuesday procedure, and adjourned until Monday, April 18, the procedure was that used last Thursday, for I find—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, page 4504:

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.

However, on another Thursday—May 12—the substance of the rule was followed—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, page 6248:

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

However, on another Thursday—May 19—the rule, in substance at least, was complied with—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, page 6679:

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

[18] CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, p. 8542.

On May 24 the intent of the rule seems to have been followed, for the Speaker said—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, page 6929:

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and the third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

But, on Thursday last, the RECORD does not show that the Speaker asked "Shall the bill be engrossed and read a third time?" Nor does it show that he put the question as to the engrossment and third reading of the bill. The RECORD shows—and this is all it shows—"The bill was engrossed and ordered to be read a third time and was read a third time."

Now, while there is no insistence that technicalities be complied with, the assertion is made that, when a Member desires an opportunity to make a request to which, under the rules, he is entitled, he should be given that opportunity.

The fact, if it be a fact, that a number of the Members desire to follow the practice of adjourning over from Thursday to Monday, with little business usually to be transacted on Monday, the House, in its discretion, can follow.

But at least those Members who might be classed as full-time Members are entitled to exercise their rights under the rules and precedents of the House. In my judgment, it might be more helpful to a larger number of the Members if we stayed here over the weekend, attended to our business, then came to an early adjournment in July.

There is another rule of the House which is disregarded. That is the rule or practice of the House which requires Members who are not present when the roll is called to qualify before voting. The practice has been for a Member to come into the Chamber after the second rollcall, if his vote be challenged, to state that he was present, listening, and did not hear his named called. That practice, to the minds of those who, sitting in the gallery, witness the procedure, brings discredit not only upon Members, but upon the House itself.

So far as I have been able to learn, that rule serves no useful purpose, except possibly to prevent a third, fourth, or other calling by the Clerk of the names of absent Members. The rule should be repealed or at least modified.

It is my hope that my colleagues will, with charity and patience, bear with me if at times I appear aggressive in attempting to obtain for myself or my colleagues privileges and rights granted by the rules.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mrs. KEE in two instances.

Mr. HESELTON in two instances, in each to include extraneous matter.

Mr. PRIEST in explanation of a bill he introduced at the request of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and include a letter from former Secretary of Welfare Hobby and an explanation of the bill.

Mr. PRIEST in explanation of two bills he has introduced.

Mr. GENTRY.

Mr. DOYLE, notwithstanding the cost is estimated by the Public Printer to be $380.

Mr. DODD.

Mr. MILLER of California in two instances, in each to include extraneous matter.

Mr. HORAN.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska in two instances.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas to revise and extend his remarks made in committee on the highway bill and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. YOUNG.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas to revise and extend his remarks made in committee and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. ASHLEY (at the request of Mr. ALBERT).

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan.

Mr. GWINN.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. AVERY (at the request of Mr. TEAGUE), for Monday, July 25, 1955, on account of official business for the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

SENATE BILLS REFERRED

Bills of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 463. An act to authorize the issuance of commemorative medals to certain societies of which Benjamin Franklin was a member, founder, or sponsor in observance of the 250th anniversary of his birth; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

S. 730. An act granting the consent of Congress to the States of Kansas and Oklahoma, to negotiate and enter into a compact relating to their interests in, and the apportionment of, the waters of the Arkansas River and its tributaries as they affect such States; to the Committee on Public Works.

S. 926. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Ventura River reclamation project, California; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. 1194. An act to provide for construction by the Secretary of the Interior of Red Willow Dam and Reservoir, Nebraska, and construction by the Secretary of the Army of the Wilson Dam and Reservoir, Kansas, as units of the Missouri River Basin project; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. 1261. An act to authorize the conveyance of certain lands within Caven Point Terminal and Ammunition Loading Pier, New Jersey, to the New Jersey Turnpike Authority; to the Committee on Armed Services.

S. 1683. An act to amend the act of June 13, 1949 (63 Stat. 172), and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. 1689. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to execute a repayment contract with the Yuma Mesa Irrigation and Drainage District, Gila project, Arizona, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. 1834. An act to authorize certain retired commissioned officers of the Coast Guard to use the commissioned grade authorized them by the law under which they retired, in the computation of their retired pay under the provisions of the Career Compensation Act of 1949, as amended; to the Committee on Armed Services.

S. 2432. An act to permit the use in the coastwise trade of the barge *Irrigon*; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

S. 2513. An act to authorize the sale of Welles Village war housing project in Glastonbury, Conn., to the Housing Authority of the town of Glastonbury; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS SIGNED

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills and joint resolutions of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 2150. An act to further amend section 106 of the Army-Navy Nurses Act of 1947 so as to provide for certain adjustments in the dates of rank of nurses and women medical specialists of the Regular Army and Regular Air Force in the permanent grade of captain, and for other purposes;

H. R. 2755. An act for the relief of Benjamin Johnson;

H. R. 2783. An act for the relief of Andrew Wing-Huen Tsang;

H. R. 2944. An act for the relief of Franziska Lindauer Ball;

H. R. 2947. An act for the relief of Emelda Ann Schallmo;

H. R. 2949. An act for the relief of Jose Armando Quaresma;

H. R. 2972. An act to require the recordation of scrip, lieu selection, and similar rights.

H. R. 3048. An act for the relief of Assuntino Del Gobbo;

H. R. 3270. An act for the relief of Giuseppa Arsena;

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

H. R. 3504. An act for the relief of Eveline Wenk Neal;

H. R. 3624. An act for the relief of Olga I. Papadopoulou;

H. R. 3625. An act for the relief of George Vourderis;

H. R. 3629. An act for the relief of Mrs. Nika Kirihara;

H. R. 3630. An act for the relief of Mrs. Uto Ginoza;

H. R. 3726. An act for the relief of Mr. Gino Evangelista;

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

H. R. 3864. An act for the relief of Mrs. Elizabeth A. Traufield;

H. R. 3871. An act for the relief of Orville Ennis;

H. R. 4044. An act for the relief of Burgal Lyden and others;

H. R. 4106. An act to authorize the crediting, for certain purposes, of prior active Federal commissioned service performed by a person appointed as a commissioned officer under section 101 or 102 of the Army-Navy Nurses Act of 1947, as amended, and for other purposes;

H. R. 4146. An act for the relief of Adelheid (Heidi) Giessner (nee Schega);

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

H. R. 4218. An act to authorize the Secretary of Defense to lend certain Army, Navy, and Air Force equipment, and to provide certain services to the Girl Scouts of the United States of America for use at the Girl Scout Senior Roundup Encampment, and for other purposes;

H. R. 4280. An act to direct the Secretary of Agriculture to release on behalf of the United States conditions in two deeds conveying certain submarginal lands to Clemson Agricultural College of South Carolina so as to permit such college, subject to certain conditions, to sell, lease, or otherwise dispose of such lands;

H. R. 4284. An act for the relief of Mrs. Mariannina Monaco;

H. R. 4289. An act for the relief of Vladislav Bevc;

H. R. 4362. An act to amend the act entitled "An act authorizing the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors for navigation, flood control, and for other purposes," approved September 3, 1954;

H. R. 4455. An act for the relief of Christa Harkrader;

H. R. 4707. An act for the relief of Duncan McQuagge;

H. R. 4717. An act to provide for the release of the express condition and limitation on certain land heretofore conveyed to the trustees of the village of Sag Harbor, N. Y.;

H. R. 4727. An act to permit the issuance of a flag to a friend or associate of the deceased veteran where it is not claimed by the next of kin;

H. R. 4747. An act to provide that reversionary interests of the United States in certain lands formerly conveyed to the city of Chandler, Okla., shall be quitclaimed to such city;

H. R. 4886. An act to provide that active service in the Army and Air Force shall be included in determining the eligibility for retirement of certain commissioned officers of the Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard;

H. R. 5283. An act for the relief of Artur Swislocki or Arthur Svislotzki;

H. R. 5875. An act to amend title 14, United States Code, entitled "Coast Guard", for the purpose of providing involuntary retirement of certain officers, and for other purposes;

H. R. 5893. An act to amend paragraph I (a), part I of Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a), as amended, to make its provisions applicable to active service on and after June 27, 1950, and prior to February 1, 1955, and for other purposes;

H. R. 6277. An act 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;

H. R. 6396. An act for the relief of Valerie Anne Peterson;

H. R. 6613. An act for the relief of Yuji Doi and Mrs. Matsuyo Yamaoka Doi;

H. R. 6980. An act providing for the conveyance of the Old Colony project to the Boston Housing Authority;

H. R. 7000. An act to provide for strengthening of the Reserve Forces, and for other purposes;

H. R. 7194. An act to authorize subsistence allowances to enlisted personnel;

H. J. Res. 251. Joint resolution to authorize the President to issue posthumously to the late Seymour Richard Belinky, a flight officer in the United States Army, a commission as second lieutenant, United States Army, and for other purposes;

H. J. Res. 359. Joint resolution to authorize the designation of October 22, 1955, as National Olympic Day; and

H. J. Res. 385. Joint resolution authorizing the printing and binding of a revised edition of Cannon's Procedure in the House of Representatives and providing that the same shall be subject to copyright by the author.

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. 473. An act to authorize an investigation and report on the advisability of a national monument in Brooklyn, N. Y.;

H. R. 605. An act to provide for the abolition of the 80-rod reserved spaces between claims on shore waters in Alaska, and for other purposes;

H. R. 914. An act for the relief of Erika Marie Dietl and her two children, Caroline Dietl and Robert Dietl;

H. R. 932. An act for the relief of Ludwika Hedy Hancock (nee Nikolajewicz);

H. R. 1180. An act for the relief of Kimiko Sueta Thompson;

H. R. 1185. An act for the relief of Jose Domingo Quintanar;

H. R. 1302. An act for the relief of Adelheid Walla Spring;

H. R. 1304. An act for the relief of Mother Amata (Marie Cartiglia), Sister Ottavia (Concetta Zisa), Sister Giovina (Rosina Vitale), and Sister Olga (Calogera Zeffro);

H. R. 1435. An act for the relief of Paul Compagnino;

H. R. 1436. An act for the relief of Ervin Benedikt;

H. R. 1439. An act for the relief of Menachem Hersz Kalisz;

H. R. 1458. An act for the relief of Rosa Edith Manns Monroe;

H. R. 1486. An act for the relief of Anna Anita Hildegard Sparwasser;

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

H. R. 1537. An act for the relief of Rogerio Santana de Franca;

H. R. 1668. An act for the relief of Frank Budman;

H. R. 1698. An act for the relief of Anne Cheng;

H. R. 1911. An act for the relief of Charlotte Schwaim;

H. R. 1927. An act for the relief of Ralph Michael Owens;

H. R. 1987. An act for the relief of Kimie Hayashi Crandall;

H. R. 1997. An act for the relief of Linda Beryl San Filippo;

H. R. 2059. An act for the relief of Edward Patrick Cloonan;

H. R. 2070. An act for the relief of Dr. Carlos Recio and his wife, Francisca Marco Palomero de Recio;

H. R. 2078. An act for the relief of Salvatore Cannizzo;

H. R. 2241. An act for the relief of Amalia Bertolino Querio;

H. R. 2242. An act for the relief of Kim Joong Yoon;

H. R. 2259. An act for the relief of Alessandra Barile Altobelli;

H. R. 2306. An act for the relief of Maria de Rehbinder;

H. R. 2307. An act for the relief of Julius, Ilona, and Henry Flehner;

H. R. 2313. An act for the relief of Mrs. Agnethe Gundhil Sundby;

H. R. 2315. An act for the relief of Antonio (Orejel) Cardenas;

H. R. 2735. An act for the relief of Inako Yokoo and her minor child;

H. R. 2738. An act for the relief of Teresa Jurjevic; and

H. R. 2749. An act for the relief of George Risto Divitkos.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 52 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, July 27, 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:

1031. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the audit of the Alaska Railroad, Department of the Interior, for the fiscal years ended June 30, 1953 and 1954, pursuant to the Budget and Accounting Act, 1921 (31 U. S. C. 53), and the Accounting and Auditing Act of 1950 (31 U. S. C. 67); to the Committee on Government Operations.

1032. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Power Commission, relative to the following publications: Typical Electric Bills, 1955, and Statistics of Electric Utilities in the United States, Publicly Owned, 1953; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1033. A letter from the Acting Director, Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to authorize the appointment in civilian position in the White House Office of Maj. Gen. John Stewart Bragdon, United States Army, retired, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1034. A letter from the Deputy for Legislative Affairs, Office of the Assistant Secretary of Defense, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to authorize the Secretaries of the military departments and the Secretary of the Treasury with respect to the Coast Guard, to incur expenses incident to the representation of their personnel before judicial tribunals and administrative agencies of any foreign nation"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1035. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a proposed award of a concession permit to Mr. Benjamin Buchanan for the purposes of operating a marina in the Kettle Falls area of Coulee Dam National Recreation Park, Washington, for a period of 8 months, from May 1, 1955, to December 1955, pursuant to the act of July 31, 1953 (67 Stat. 271); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

1036. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a proposed concession permit with Drs. Alfred M. Lueck and John A. Pearson, which will, when executed by the Superintendent, Yellowstone National Park, on behalf of the Government, authorize them to provide a medical, hospital, and dental service for the public in Yellowstone National Park during the term of 1 year from January 1, 1955, pursuant to the act of July 31, 1953 (67 Stat. 271); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

1037. A letter from the Director, United States Information Agency, transmitting a report on Federal Tort Claims paid for the fiscal year 1955, pursuant to 28 United States Code 2673; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1038. A letter from the Acting Director, Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President, transmitting a supplemental report on the operations of Bureau of the Budget Circular No. A-45 upon departments, agencies, and corporations of the Government for the year prior to November 1, 1954; to the Committee on Appropriations.

1039. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the audit of the Rural Electrification Administration, Department of Agriculture, for the fiscal years ended June 30, 1953 and 1954, pursuant to the Budget and Accounting Act, 1921 (31 U. S. C. 53), and the Accounting and Auditing Act of 1950 (31 U. S. C. 67); to the Committee on Government Operations.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar as follows:

Mr. WALTER: Committee on Un-American Activities. Report on contempt proceeding against John J. Gojack; without amendment (Rept. No. 1406). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. CELLER: Committee of conference. House Joint Resolution 157. Joint resolution to establish a Commission on Government Security (Rept. No. 1407). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. RODINO: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 5948. A bill to amend the Clayton Act by prohibiting the acquisition of assets of other banks by banks, banking associations, or trust companies when the effect may be substantially to lessen competition, or to tend to create a monopoly; with amendment (Rept. No. 1417). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas: Committee on Veterans' Affairs. H. R. 5055. A bill to provide that service of cadets and midshipmen at the service Academies during specified periods shall be considered active military or naval wartime service for the purposes of laws administered by the Veterans' Administration; without amendment (Rept. No. 1418). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. VINSON: Committee on Armed Services. H. R. 5516. A bill to amend section 306 of the Army and Air Force Vitalization and Retirement Equalization Act of 1948 to provide that service as an Army field clerk or as a field clerk, Quartermaster Corps, shall be counted for purposes of retirement under title III of that act; with amendment (Rept. No. 1419). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MILLER of New York: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 6622. A bill for the relief of certain rural carriers; without amendment (Rept. No. 1420). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee: Committee on Public Works. H. R. 6634. A bill to provide for the conveyance of 1.8 acres of land, more or less, within the Grapevine Dam and Reservoir project to the city of Grapevine, Tex., for sewage-disposal purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1421). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 7121. A bill to validate payments of mileage made to United States Army and Air Force personnel pursuant to permanent change of station orders authorizing travel by commercial aircraft, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1422). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. PATMAN: Select Committee on Small Business. Interim report pursuant to House Resolution 114, 84th Congress, 1st session, on alleged coercive and discriminatory practices against retail gasoline operators by oil-company suppliers; without amendment (Rept. No. 1423). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BURLESON: Committee on House Administration. H. R. 3084. A bill to amend certain provisions of the laws relating to the prevention of political activities to make them inapplicable to State officers and employees; without amendment (Rept. No. 1424). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. COOLEY: Committee on Agriculture. S. 1051. An act to amend section 8a (4) of the Commodity Exchange Act, as amended; without amendment (Rept. No. 1425). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. COOLEY: Committee on Agriculture. S. 2253. An act to reemphasize trade development as the primary purpose of title I of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954; without amendment (Rept. No. 1426). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. WILLIS: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 2383. A bill to authorize the establishment of an Inventive Contributions Awards Board within the Department of Defense, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 1432). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. RIVERS: Committee on Armed Services. H. R. 2430. A bill to release certain restrictions on certain real property heretofore granted to the city of Charleston, S. C., by the United States of America; with amendment (Rept. No. 1435). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana: Committee on Armed Services. H. R. 6725. A bill to provide a lump-sum readjustment payment for Reserve officers who are involuntarily released from active duty; with amendment (Rept. No. 1436). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BLATNIK: Committee on Public Works. H. R. 6309. A bill to authorize construction of the Mississippi River-Gulf outlet; with amendment (Rept. No. 1437). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. COOPER: Committee on Ways and Means. H. R. 2619. A bill to amend section 345 of the Revenue Act of 1951; without amendment (Rept. No. 1438). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. FORAND: Committee on Ways and Means. H. R. 4668. A bill to amend section 4021 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954; with amendment (Rept. No. 1439). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BOGGS: Committee on Ways and Means. H. R. 5647. A bill to repeal the manufacturers excise tax on motorcycles; without amendment (Rept. No. 1440). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BARDEN: Committee on Education and Labor. H. R. 7245. A bill to amend Public Laws 815 and 874, 81st Congress, which provide for assistance to local educational agencies in areas affected by Federal activities, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 1441). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. CHATHAM: Committee on Foreign Affairs. H. R. 2097. A bill to make certain increases in the annuities of annuitants under the Foreign Service retirement and disability system; with amendment (Rept. No. 1442). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. ENGLE: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H. R. 6808. A bill to amend section 73 (1) of the Hawaiian Organic Act; with amendment (Rept. No. 1443). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. ENGLE: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. S. 2260. An act granting the consent of Congress to the States of Arkansas, Louisiana, Oklahoma, and Texas to negotiate and enter into a compact relating to their interests in, and the apportionment of, the waters of the Red River and its tributaries; with amendment (Rept. No. 1444). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. COLMER: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 317. Resolution for consideration of H. R. 6645, a bill to amend the Natural Gas Act, as amended; without amendment (Rept. No. 1445). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. BLATNIK: Committee on Public Works. S. 890. An act to extend and strengthen the Water Pollution Control Act; with amendments (Rept. No. 1446). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

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. REED of Illinois: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 2728. A bill for the relief of Dr. Frederic S. Schleger; with amendment (Rept. No. 1404). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 7114. A bill for the relief of Frank G. Gerlock; without amendment (Rept. No. 1405). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1097. A bill for the relief of John Meredith McFarlane; with amendment (Rept. No. 1408). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Miss THOMPSON of Michigan: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 4326. A bill for the relief of Regina Dippold; without amendment (Rept. No. 1409). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Miss THOMPSON of Michigan: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 5913. A bill for the relief of Mock Jung Shee (Mock Jung Liu); without amendment (Rept. No. 1410). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FEIGHAN: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 6363. A bill for the relief of Edward Barnett; without amendment (Rept. No. 1411). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FEIGHAN: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 7221. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Gertrud Hildegard Nichols; without amendment (Rept. No. 1412). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 6741. A bill for the relief of Elfriede Rosa (Kup) Kraft; without amendment (Rept. No. 1413). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FEIGHAN: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 5866. A bill for the relief of Giovanni Lazarich; with amendment (Rept. No. 1414). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. HYDE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 3276. A bill for the relief of George E. Bergos (formerly Athanasios Kritselis); with amendment (Rept. No. 1415). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 1353. An act for the relief of Mrs. Jeannette S. Hamilton; without amendment (Rept. No. 1416). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 4602. A bill for the relief of Edward Neal Fisher; without amendment (Rept. No. 1427). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 4872. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Helen Barsa; without amendment (Rept. No. 1428). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 5285. A bill for the relief of the Imperial Agricultural Corp.; without amendment (Rept. No. 1429). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 5533. A bill for the relief of John C. Walsh; with amendment (Rept. No. 1430).

Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 6452. A bill for the relief of William H. Foley; with amendment (Rept. No. 1431). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. HYDE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 4039. A bill for the relief of Julian, Dolores, Jaime, Dennis, Roldan, and Julian, Jr., Lizardo; with amendment (Rept. No. 1433). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. Senate Concurrent Resolution 42. Concurrent resolution favoring the suspension of deportation in the case of certain aliens; with amendment (Rept. No. 1434). 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. HERLONG:

H. R. 7595. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide that a widow who loses her widow's benefit by remarriage may again become entitled to such benefit if her husband dies within 1 year after such remarriage; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BLATNIK:

H. R. 7596. A bill to provide for the disposal of federally owned property at obsolescent canalized waterways and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania:

H. R. 7597. A bill to confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon certain claims of employees of the United States Government for gratuity, holiday, or overtime compensation during the period covered by World War II; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CRAMER:

H. R. 7598. A bill to provide for the conveyance of certain lands of the United States to the Board of Public Instruction of Pinellas County, Fla.; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. DENTON:

H. R. 7599. A bill to amend the Natural Gas Act, with respect to jurisdiction over sales of natural gas by independent producers; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. PRIEST:

H. R. 7600. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to authorize the President to make the commissioned corps a military service in time of emergency involving the national defense and to authorize payment of uniform allowances to officers of the corps in certain grades when required to wear the uniform, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. GRANT:

H. R. 7601. A bill to restore to the rolls certain emergency officers heretofore granted retirement pay; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. KEOGH:

H. R. 7602. A bill to provide deductions for gifts to nonprofit voluntary health insurance plans; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. O'HARA of Illinois:

H. R. 7603. A bill to amend section 8 of the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. PRICE:

H. R. 7604. A bill amending section 21 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, relating to the privilege of the members of the Commission on Atomic Energy; to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

By Mr. PRIEST (by request):

H. R. 7605. A bill to protect the public health by amending the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to prohibit the use in food of new food additives which have not been adequately tested to establish their safety; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota:

H. R. 7606. A bill to protect the public health by amending the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to prohibit the use in food of new food additives which have not been adequately tested to establish their safety; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. PRIEST (by request):

H. R. 7607. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act for the protection of the public health, by prohibiting new food additives which have not been adequately pretested to establish their safe use under the conditions of their intended use; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 7608. A bill to improve the health of the people by encouraging the financing of construction of licensed nursing homes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey:

H. R. 7609. A bill to exempt fine-arts programs from the admissions tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TUMULTY:

H. R. 7610. A bill to amend section 8 of the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. VINSON:

H. R. 7611. A bill to establish a date of rank for pay purposes for certain Naval Reserve officers promoted to the grades of lieutenant and lieutenant commander; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. CEDERBERG:

H. R. 7612. A bill to provide for the conveyance of certain lands of the United States to the Harrisville Consolidated School District, Alcona County, Mich.; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. COON:

H. R. 7613. A bill to authorize construction by the Secretary of the Interior of the upper division of the Baker project, Oregon; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. DEVEREUX:

H. R. 7614. A bill to provide that the Secretary of the military department concerned shall employ and provide counsel qualified to practice in such foreign court, to aid in the defense of any member of the Armed Forces of the United States who is accused of a crime and is to be tried in a foreign court; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN:

H. R. 7615. A bill to facilitate and expedite the making of minimum-wage determinations and other determinations and interpretations by the Secretary of Labor under the Walsh-Healey Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HAGEN:

H. R. 7616. A bill to extend the authority contained in the act of September 3, 1954, for the admission of certain skilled alien sheepherders; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MULTER:

H. R. 7617. A bill to amend the Administrative Procedure Act, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee:

H. R. 7618. A bill to amend section 8 of the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 7619. A bill to adjust the rates of compensation of the heads of the executive departments and of certain other officials of the Federal Government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. REES of Kansas:

H. R. 7620. A bill to adjust the rates of compensation of the heads of the executive departments and of certain other officials of the Federal Government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. RAINS:

H. R. 7621. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act so as to provide for grants to State health agencies to assist Hill-Burton hospitals in providing food for their patients; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. VAN ZANDT:

H. R. 7622. A bill to provide for a suitable and distinctive lapel button which may be worn by veterans of the Korean hostilities; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. YOUNG:

H. R. 7623. A bill to amend section 1, section 6, section 7, and the title of Public Law 463, 81st Congress (ch. 72, 2d sess.), and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. KING of California:

H. J. Res. 400. Joint resolution to provide for the observance and commemoration of the 50th anniversary of the founding and launching of the conservation movement for the preservation of the natural resources of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MACHROWICZ:

H. J. Res. 401. Joint resolution to provide for the observance and commemoration of the 50th anniversary of the founding and launching of the conservation movement for the preservation of the natural resources of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. METCALF:

H. J. Res. 402. Joint resolution to provide for the observance and commemoration of the 50th anniversary of the founding and launching of the conservation movement for the preservation of the natural resources of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SISK:

H. J. Res. 403. Joint resolution to provide for the observance and commemoration of the 50th anniversary of the founding and launching of the conservation movement for the preservation of the natural resources of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey:

H. J. Res. 404. Joint resolution to provide for the observance and commemoration of the 50th anniversary of the founding and launching of the conservation movement for the preservation of the natural resources of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TUMULTY:

H. J. Res. 405. Joint resolution to provide for the observance and commemoration of the 50th anniversary of the founding and launching of the conservation movement for the preservation of the natural resources of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McDOWELL:

H. J. Res. 406. Joint resolution to provide for the observance and commemoration of the 50th anniversary of the founding and launching of the conservation movement for the preservation of the natural resources of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ADDONIZIO:

H. J. Res. 407. Joint resolution to provide for the observance and commemoration of the 50th anniversary of the founding and launching of the conservation movement for the preservation of the natural resources of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ASHLEY:

H. J. Res. 408. Joint resolution to provide for the observance and commemoration of the 50th anniversary of the founding and launching of the conservation movement for the preservation of the natural resources of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RODINO:

H. J. Res. 409. Joint resolution to provide for the observance and commemoration of the 50th anniversary of the founding and launching of the conservation movement for the preservation of the natural resources of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. ST. GEORGE:

H. J. Res. 410. Joint resolution to provide for the observance and commemoration of the 50th anniversary of the founding and launching of the conservation movement for the preservation of the natural resources of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. UDALL:

H. J. Res. 411. Joint resolution to provide for the observance and commemoration of the 50th anniversary of the founding and launching of the conservation movement for the preservation of the natural resources of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WIDNALL:

H. J. Res. 412. Joint resolution to provide for the observance and commemoration of the 50th anniversary of the founding and launching of the conservation movement for the preservation of the natural resources of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GWINN:

H. Con. Res. 194. Concurrent resolution requesting the President to issue a proclamation designating the week of January 29, 1956, through February 4, 1956, as National Junior Achievement Week; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BARDEN:

H. Res. 316. Resolution to authorize the Committee on Education and Labor to conduct studies and investigations in the United States, its Territories and possessions, and the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico; to the Committee on Rules.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Massachusetts memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to favoring the amending of the Refugee Relief Act along the lines recommended by the President to the present session of the Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON:

H. R. 7624. A bill for the relief of Cynthia W. Y. Wu; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DEROUNIAN:

H. R. 7625. A bill for the relief of Ursula Gerlinde Reinhardt Meinz; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LECOMPTE:

H. R. 7626. A bill for the relief of Viola Grace Smith; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PRICE:

H. R. 7627. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Alice Halbrook; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. VINSON:

H. R. 7628. A bill to authorize the appointment in a civilian position in the White House Office of Maj. Gen. John Stewart Bragdon, United States Army, retired, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

358. By Mr. GROSS: Petition of 30 residents of Mason City, Iowa, and vicinity favoring legislation to finance the costs of public highway construction on a pay-as-you-go basis; also favoring limiting the size and weight of motor vehicles; to the Committee on Public Works.

359. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Francisco Valle and others, Hatillo, P. R., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to endorsing the bill providing for increasing to $100 the pension to be received by each one of us—being veterans of World War I; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Invitation to Sponsors of North Atlantic Treaty To Name Delegates to a Convention

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ESTES KEFAUVER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, July 26, 1955

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a brief statement made by me yesterday before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, in support of Senate Concurrent Resolution 12.

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

STATEMENT BY SENATOR ESTES KEFAUVER BEFORE THE FOREIGN RELATIONS COMMITTEE ON SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 12, JULY 25, 1955

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I want to express my appreciation to this committee for your consideration in scheduling hearings today on Senate Concurrent Resolution 12. If adopted in its present form this resolution would provide for the President to invite the other democracies which sponsored the North Atlantic Treaty to name delegates to a convention for the purpose of exploring means of further unity among the democracies.

As the committee knows, I was joined in offering this resolution by Senators FLANDERS, HUMPHREY, JACKSON, LEHMAN, LONG, MANSFIELD, MCNAMARA, MURRAY, NEELY, NEUBERGER, O'MAHONEY, PAYNE, SCOTT, and SPARKMAN. I believe that my fellow sponsors would also join me in urging the committee to make any changes in the language in the resolution which you deem necessary in order to better define or make more precise its purposes. For instance, it is my understanding that the executive departments concerned may propose that the language be changed to have the invitation of the President issued on behalf of the Congress. Such a change would certainly be satisfactory with me and is in fact in keeping with our own constitutional history. The important thing is that we take a step now which the times demand and make such a convention possible.

The President's meeting at the summit emphasizes, in my opinion, the desirability of the step here proposed. In line with our own history of freedom in the United States and the comparable histories of freedom among our fellow democracies, these meetings of the heads of state serve to emphasize the desirability of meetings also among representatives of the people themselves.

We need now a meeting after the summit—a meeting of the sovereigns—a meeting of the people themselves from whom, under the democratic theory of government, all power derives.

I believe it to be significant that during the past few months an increasing number of the world's leaders have endorsed the plan here proposed. I have here the statement of Gen. George C. Marshall, former Secretary of State, former Secretary of Defense, and former Chief of Staff which I think is of sufficient importance to read in its entirety:

"A few days before the death of Justice Owen J. Roberts, I accepted his invitation of May 5 to become a member of the Council of the Atlantic Union Committee which he has headed since its foundation in 1949. In accepting, I wrote him May 12:

" 'I am honored to be counted among those who support the unity of free nations.'

"Justice Roberts' services to defense as well as to the judiciary were manifold, but perhaps the finest thing he did was the sacrifice he made in resigning from the Supreme Court to devote himself to the cause of Atlantic Union.

"The subject today is vitally important and the period fateful. All probably agree to the importance of Atlantic unity but few act.

"Recently a resolution calling for action was introduced in Congress by a distinguished bipartisan group from both Houses. It proposes that delegates from the United States and other NATO democracies meet in a convention 'to explore and report to what extent their peoples might further unite within the framework of the United Nations, and agree to form, federally or otherwise, a defense, economic, and political union.' This prudent proposal, which commits us only to exploration, deserves support.

"Thinking back on the development of our own Federal Union—on the doubts and difficulties which preceded the final union of the colonies, on the remarkable advance in freedom, invention, production, and living standards which followed on the solution of the early difficulties, and on the high degree to which the States have continued to maintain their individual personality and institutions—Americans should have a sympathetic understanding of this effort to overcome the limitations of national barriers in the approach to a solution for common problems.

"What I said when I addressed the conference of governors on July 14, 1947, I would repeat today: 'There is no blinking the fact that this country now stands at a turning point in its relations to its traditional friends among the nations of the Old World.'

"Either it must finish the task of assisting these countries to adjust themselves politically to the changed demands of a new age, or it must reconcile itself to seeing them move in directions which are consistent neither with their own traditions nor with those of this country. Whatever course is adopted will affect the lives and fortunes of people in every State of the Union."

This from the author of the Marshall plan.

I have here another statement from Mr. Robert Schuman, Minister of Justice in the present French Cabinet, former Premier of France, which I should like to read:

"The setting up of an Exploratory Committee (Comité d'Etude) regarding Atlantic Union which is advocated at present in the United States Congress by so many distinguished Senators and Representatives, is of the highest importance to all nations belonging to NATO.

"I have long been an ardent partisan of a European federation to be integrated itself in the Atlantic community. But certain European nations have hesitated to advance far in this direction so long as the United States, Canada, and Great Britain were not disposed to explore in common with them an eventual political, economic, and military union.

"If the American Congress accepts the Atlantic proposal of Senator KEFAUVER, all the democratic European nations should be happy to accept the invitation to send delegates to such a study commission. Should there result from the work of this conference and from later proposals the outline of an acceptable plan of union, in which each of the member nations would be attributed an equitable voting right protecting it from any eventual domination by a single nation—which should be contrary to the democratic ideal of the Union—we would then certainly have made a great step toward world peace and general prosperity."

This from the author of the Schuman plan.

Paul-Henri Spaak, Foreign Minister of Belgium said, in endorsing this proposal:

"The Atlantic exploratory convention resolution proposed in the American Congress by Senator KEFAUVER, Senator FLANDERS, and other leading Americans seems to me a most praiseworthy effort to obtain at least a preliminary examination of the advantages and disadvantages of closer cooperation among western democracies. I personally hope that such discussion will take place between the citizens of the Atlantic nations very soon."

Former Prime Minister of Belgium Paul Van Zeeland said:

"Any step leading to the acceptance or the support by the United States of the creation of a truly well-balanced and equitable Atlantic community would, in my opinion, be a great support and a strong inducement for those who are doing their best to create a European union.

"To sum up, it would be a major step towards peace and prosperity throughout the world."

Foreign Minister of Italy Gaetano Martino said of the resolution:

"I agree with Senator KEFAUVER that the peace of the world cannot be assured by methods of formal diplomacy alone; and I feel that any efforts on the part of leading citizens in different democratic countries to explore and carefully discuss the probable advantages, obstacles, and problems connected with some possible form of eventual democratic federation are very desirable, because the more discussion we have of these problems the closer is the likelihood of eventual solution."

Now just exactly what is this plan, why do I think it is necessary, and how would it work?

NATO is now the most integrated and developed international organization of the free world as well as the principal bulwark of its security. But NATO is still fundamentally a military alliance. In the military field it has created an Atlantic defense force under a unified command exercised by a supreme commander. But in the political field, power of decision still rests with 14 separate national governments which must agree unanimously before action can be taken—and NATO action is strictly limited to making recommendations. NATO has as yet no adequate machinery for the exercise of civil control over its military forces, despite the fact that civil control over military force is a basic principle of every democratic people.

The purpose of the resolution for an Atlantic Exploratory Convention is to bring about a meeting of the most competent citizens of the Atlantic democracies to determine what steps might be taken outside the military field to bring about unity of action. On behalf of the other sponsors of this resolution, I wish briefly to explain certain provisions in its enacting clause.

It requests the President to invite the other democracies which sponsored the North Atlantic Treaty—Canada, Britain, France, Belgium, the Netherlands, and Luxembourg—to name delegates to meet in a convention with similarly appointed delegates of the United States. There is no reason why the President should not, if he deemed it desirable, undertake this initiative jointly with the Prime Minister of Canada or Britain or of any other of these nations. Because these seven nations have already joined in sponsoring the North Atlantic Treaty, this exploratory convention can most appropriately be initiated by them.

But the resolution provides that the convention may invite other democracies to participate.

The delegates to the convention proposed in this resolution would be appointed by their governments, thereby insuring that men of the highest competence and experience would devote their full time to this high mission for as long a period as might be required. The delegates from the United States could appropriately be appointed by the President with the advice and consent of the Senate. They would include members of the principal political parties, a provision which clearly envisages the participation of Members of both Houses of the Congress. They would, however, as the last paragraph in the Preamble makes clear, act as individuals, in accordance with their individual convictions, just as the delegates did in Philadelphia in 1787. Under this procedure, division of the convention into national delegations, which would be instructed by their governments and would negotiate and bargain with each other as in a diplomatic conference, would be avoided.

The purpose of the convention is delineated clearly in the resolution. It is to explore and to report to what extent their delegates believe their people might further unite within the framework of the United Nations and to what extent they might agree to form, federally or otherwise, a defense, economic, and political union. After comprehensive exploration of possible courses of action within this broad framework, the delegates would draw up a public report of their joint findings and recommendations.

There is no commitment in this resolution other than to call for such exploration and recommendations by a body selected from the peoples of our democracies. There is certainly no commitment to any action which would decrease the powers of the Government of the United States. Any such action which the American people might consider wise at some future date in the light of the recommendations of the convention would necessarily be undertaken by the Congress of the United States in accordance with our constitutional processes.

Anyone who believes in our political system and ackowledges the sovereignty of the people should favor the convocation of a convention of this nature, limited in its function to exploration and recommendation. To oppose it is to say "No; we will not give the American people and other Atlantic peoples a chance to explore possible solutions of their common problems. We insist that the task of seeking solutions of these problems, even though they involve the lives of tens of millions of Americans and the future of our country, shall be entrusted solely to diplomatic officials."

This concurrent resolution opens to the democracies a new and broad road toward the attainment of our objective of peace with freedom. It provides the free nations with a means of taking the initiative in the war of ideas. We cannot win the war of ideas if we remain on the defensive. To move forward toward ultimate victory in this ideological struggle, to make possible an expansion of the frontiers of freedom which have receded so far in the last decade, we must take the offensive.

The passage of this concurrent resolution by the Congress of the United States would electrify free men everywhere, providing them with a new and tremendously dynamic idea. It would generate hope and confidence wherever people are permitted to read the news and listen freely to the radio, and some of that hope would seep through the cracks in the Iron Curtain.

The initiative depends solely upon us. In seeking closer union between free peoples, there is no limitation upon our capabilities except ourselves.

Keenotes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ELIZABETH KEE

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 26, 1955

Mrs. KEE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I should like to include my newspaper column, Keenotes, on the subject of the adjournment rush. The column follows:

KEENOTES

(By Representative ELIZABETH KEE)

Did you ever stand and marvel at the way a circus is put together from what appears to be the most fantastic jumble of confusion ever created? Out of it finally comes a planned community of tents, of Big Top and side shows and rides and refreshment stands and everything is perfect down to the last detail.

Congress in the homestretch—in the midst of an adjournment rush—reflects a little bit of the fantastic confusion of the circus grounds early in the morning hours as the tents are just going up. There seems to be no order, no rhyme or reason, no plan, no recognizable pattern of activity—just confusion. And yet, it is remarkable how, out of all of this, comes a flood of carefully drawn, intelligent legislation under which our country can then operate during the 5 months, or so, of congressional recess.

Of course, if Congress let everything go to the last minute, this kind of record could never be accomplished. The "last-minute decisions" which seem to be made in the closing days of a session are instead a final recognition by both sides of important issues that neither side will surrender on basic principles and so a compromise long under consideration will have to be agreed to. Legislation is almost always a case of compromise—but when you feel you might carry your point all the way, you are reluctant to

compromise. In the final days of a congressional session, however, you face the choice of compromise or no legislation at all. So compromises are made.

And usually they are good compromises and good law.

The session now coming to an end has been a particularly productive one, and well run. The adjournment rush is a comparatively quiet one. Usually, at this point in a session of Congress, both the House and Senate are meeting almost continually, often in round-the-clock marathons, in an effort to get everything done which has to be done before adjournment.

Yet so current have we been on our work this year that the two Houses still can dispose of the business on the calendar in normal working days, and even take an occasional Friday off, as was done last Friday.

Of course, the intensive work—the long hours and the hard grinding—takes place primarily within the committees, where the bills are whipped into final shape for House or Senate consideration. The compromises are hammered out there, and consequently when a bill comes to the floor—generally with support from both Democratic and Republican leaders of the committee—the chances are 10 to 1 that it will go through as written in committee.

If we proceed at the pace we have been following in recent weeks, adjournment will come upon us almost by surprise. In past years, adjournment usually came simultaneously with mass exhaustion by all Members—they just seemed to wear themselves out and then quit in utter weariness.

It may yet happen that way this year, too; but it doesn't seem likely.

Chemicals in Food

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. PERCY PRIEST

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 26, 1955

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced, by request, two bills designed to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act prohibiting the use in food of new food additives which have not been adequately tested with respect to their safety.

The first of the two bills, entitled "A bill to protect the public health by amending the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to prohibit the use in food of new food additives which have not been adequately tested to establish their safety," has been prepared by several organizations representing the food industries of the Nation. This bill supersedes a bill—H. R. 4099—which I introduced on February 16, 1955. The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. O'HARA] introduced a similar bill.

The second bill, entitled "A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act for the protection of the public health, by prohibiting new food additives which have not been adequately pretested to establish their safe use under the conditions of their intended use," has been prepared by the Manufacturing Chemists Association, Inc.

I have introduced these 2 bills in the hope that these bills, as well as 2 other bills dealing with the same subject now pending before the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce—H. R. 4475, introduced on February 28, 1955, by Mr. DELANEY, and H. R. 5927 introduced on April 28, 1955, by Mr. MILLER of Nebraska—will receive the careful study and consideration of all interested Government departments, groups, and individuals.

The Armed Forces Medical Library

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE P. MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 26, 1955

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, on the south side of the Mall at the corner of 7th Street and Independence Avenue stands the old red brick building which houses the Armed Forces Medical Library, the greatest medical library in the world, now in its 120th year. The library was instituted in 1836 by Joseph Lovell, Surgeon-General of the United States Army, as the Library of the Surgeon-General's Office. Known variously under that name and as the Army Medical Library, and since 1952 as the Armed Forces Medical Library, it serves for all intents and purposes as the National Medical Library of the United States. Its collection of the world's medical literature, numbering almost a million items, ranges in date from a manuscript of A. D. 1094 to the latest printed book of 1955. Besides its outstanding collections of historical works, medical theses, portraits of physicians, and its unique section of American and foreign government and statistical documents, the completeness of its holdings of medical periodicals makes it a fountainhead of information surpassed by few other libraries.

The phenomenal growth and development of this great collection was predominantly the result of the vision and efforts of the great American physician John Shaw Billings, who administered the library for 30 years between 1865 and 1895, and during his term of office the present library structure was built—in 1887. The library is world-renowned, and we can believe that Sir William Osler spoke for the entire medical profession when he said:

> For the teacher and the worker, a great library such as this is indispensable. They must know the world's best work and know it at once. They mint and make current coin the ore so widely scattered in journals, transactions, and monographs. * * * The unique opportunities of the Surgeon General's library have done much to give American medicine a thoroughly eclectic character.

The Armed Forces Medical Library carries on an active service program. Material of clinical importance flows into the library from nearly every country in the world. Russian publications, Chinese periodicals, Icelandic, Turkish, Hungarian, Portuguese, Dutch, Swedish, and Spanish monographs and journals all make their contribution to the library's collection. Over 10,000 serial titles are regularly recorded. Each year it acquires 15,000 monographs and 100,000 journal pieces, the housing of which requires over half a mile of linear shelf footage. Each year its unrivaled interlibrary loan service places 133,000 volumes in the hands of medical research workers throughout this country. Over 1,000 reference questions are answered by the library staff each month, in the course of which many long medical bibliographies are prepared. The library is carefully cataloging all of its acquisitions, and issues each year a printed record of this work for all to see and use. The library publishes a monthly index to the current periodical literature of medicine in which over 100,000 articles a year are listed by author and subject. Interlibrary loans, bibliographical and photoduplication services make it possible for the doctor, wherever he may be, to have at his beck and call all of the library's resources. It is difficult to exaggerate the important influence this library has had on the advances in the medical sciences throughout the world. Indeed, Osler once remarked that this library and its publications constituted the outstanding American contribution in the field of medicine.

The Library has long since outgrown its present quarters. As early as 1917 a lengthy report to the 65th Congress proposed a new building for the institution. The quantities of literature which the Library has amassed have become so great that since 1942 over 30,000 of its most outstanding old and rare volumes have had to be shelved in rented space in Cleveland, Ohio, at the cost of more difficult and less efficient operation, due to the divided collection. While some temporary relief has resulted from the removal of the Library's sister institution, the Armed Forces Institute of Pathology, to its recently completed new building, within 2 years the available stack space in Washington will again be full to bursting, and the collection will still be divided between Washington and Cleveland. Under such circumstances, a new building to house this irreplaceable national treasure is an absolute necessity, as a survey committee of the American Library Association declared in no uncertain terms in 1944. Since then the pressure of the Library's space problems has grown enormously until at the present time a really desperate situation is being faced which can be solved only by the provision of a new building.

In the military construction bills presently being considered by conferees of the House and Senate, the Armed Forces are presently concerned with an item for $350,000 for architects' services for a new Armed Forces Medical Library building. Eventually some $6 million additional will be required for the construction of this building. Surely no money appropriated could better serve the needs of all citizens of this country. When a recent report of the National Science Foundation tells us that during the current fiscal year the Federal Government is spending $94 million on research and development in the medical sciences, it is difficult to reach any other conclusion than that the expenditure of a relatively modest sum for proper housing of the national medical

library, the services of which are absolutely fundamental and essential to the progress of these other, vaster, enterprises, is completely justified and extremely desirable.

For over a century the Armed Forces have operated this library in the public interest, and they have operated it well. How otherwise has it become the greatest medical library in the world? It is true that the library has had many setbacks, notably during the early thirties when, along with many other institutions, it suffered from a lack of funds. But since 1940, at least, the Armed Forces have directed a program of rehabilitation and reorganization of the library's collections which has in large part overcome the deficiencies of the previous decade. The Armed Forces have, in fact, developed a forward-looking service program, widely hailed as a sound one by both the library and the medical professions. Perhaps on no other issue, indeed, is medical thought so unanimous as on this: That the Armed Forces Medical Library ought to be adequately supported in the national interest, and that the outstanding item of current adequate support must be the provision of a new building for this monumental storehouse and nerve center of medical knowledge.

Today's demands for greater medical knowledge have placed heavy responsibilities on the Armed Forces Medical Library. To meet these responsibilities and to provide proper housing for its ever-expanding collection, a new and larger building must be secured. This great medical research library must continue to build and interpret its collection in support of medicine and its dedicated workers who seek the betterment of mankind through the prevention of disease and the alleviation of human suffering.

Election Day in Israel

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS L. ASHLEY

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 26, 1955

Mr. ASHLEY. Mr. Speaker, because free elections are the symbol of a genuine democracy, I believe that all Members of this body rejoice in the fact that in one of the youngest democracies in the world, Israel, today is election day. Every citizen of Israel, over the age of 18, regardless of race, color, creed, or previous nationality, has the right to vote and it is estimated that 85 percent of the citizens of Israel will today make use of that right. The voters will go to the polls to determine the composition of the Knesset, or Parliament of Israel, the most important governmental body in the country. The current election will produce the third Knesset in the 7 years of Israel's history as a modern republic.

Mr. Speaker, here in the United States many millions of Americans have followed with pride and hope the struggle of this new nation to build a free land. It is encouraging indeed to see this vigorous people strengthening the cause of freedom and democracy in the Middle East.

Meeting With Red China To Discuss Formosa and Asia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. DODD

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 26, 1955

Mr. DODD. Mr. Speaker, last Sunday a distinguished and experienced Member of the other body of this Congress publicly suggested over certain television facilities that the Secretary of State of the United States meet soon with the so-called Foreign Minister of Red China to discuss Formosa and other questions in Asia.

Because of the prestige which this distinguished Member of the other body enjoys in this land, and because it appears that this suggestion is part of a calculated and well-planned effort to bring about recognition of the Red Chinese Government by the United States, and because the distinguished Member of the other body is a member of the Democratic Party, in which I also have membership, I am compelled to publicly state as a matter of record that this suggestion does not represent my views or the views of many other Members of Congress and that it is contrary to the best interests of the United States and of the free world.

Besides, it is opposed to the expressed will of Congress; and moreover, in conflict, I believe, with the will of a majority of the American people.

Curiously, this suggestion with respect to Red China comes from one who appears to be close to the foreign-policy makers of this administration.

Interestingly, the suggestion was made the day that the President arrived home from Geneva, and only a day before the State Department announced that the American Ambassador to Czechoslovakia would meet with Red Chinese delegates in Switzerland next week to discuss American prisoners presently confined in Communist China.

Remarkably, a similar suggestion was made by this same distinguished Member of the other body over the same facilities on the same program some months ago, and no spokesman for the administration criticized or repudiated the proposal made at that time.

In addition, and in the course of making this suggestion, it was intimated that the proposed meeting take place while Congress was not in session to avoid possible "trouble" with Congress.

Further, when it is recalled that this same distinguished Member of the other body with increasing frequency has been hailed as the congressional bipartisan spokesman on foreign policy, I feel compelled to warn the Members of this House and the public at large that there is ample evidence of a plan to rig de facto recognition of Red China now, and ultimately to obtain de jure recognition as an easy consequence of these now suggested diplomatic negotiations.

Those who would bring about the recognition of the lawless warmaking Red Chinese Government must be aware of the fact that in order to accomplish their aims, a back-door route, and devious methods and devices must be utilized.

To enter into these suggested conversations on a foreign minister level would alienate our friends in the Far East, would weaken our influence in the world, and debase our honor.

Because I fear that this suggestion will be carried into effect while the Congress is in recess, I record these words of warning and of exception today.

We Need Wheat Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALT HORAN

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 26, 1955

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, I feel it my duty to call the attention of the Congress to the urgent need for immediate consideration by the Committee on Agriculture of H. R. 1834 and other bills to exempt certain wheat producers from marketing-quota penalties under the Agricultural Act of 1938 in cases where all of the wheat crop is fed or used for seed on the farm.

As you know, the Senate on March 28 passed S. 46, which is identical with H. R. 1834. It is my understanding that these measures, together with several other bills which seek to accomplish similar ends, have been referred to a subcommittee of the House Committee on Agriculture.

An intolerable situation is developing with respect to assessment of wheat-marketing-quota penalties. With certain exceptions, the farmers who market wheat in excess of their quotas are subject to marketing penalties currently set at $1.13 per bushel. Requests for suits to collect such penalties from wheatgrowers who exceeded their quotas on the 1954 wheat crop are being filed at an increasing rate. The Department of Agriculture estimates that there may be as many as 1,500 such cases this year, involving production of wheat in 1954. Unless action is taken to collect these penalties, it appears certain that there will be many more violations in 1956, which would normally come up for legal action a year hence.

In many cases farmers who seek to avoid penalties plead that their wheat was not sold in interstate commerce, that they did not want price support, and that all of the wheat was used for feed or seed on the farm. Under the holding in *Wickard* v. *Filburn* (317 U. S. 111 (1942)), the farmer is liable whether the wheat is fed or sold if he exceeds his acreage allotment unless the planted acreage of wheat does not exceed 15

acres or an acreage from which the normal production does not exceed 200 bushels.

Another unusual example which has come to our attention involves a monastery in Georgia. The monastery has followed the policy of producing the wheat necessary for food at the monastery. None of the wheat is sold. The amount required for 1954 was in excess of the marketing quota. The monastery now finds itself liable to the Government for a penalty of $1.13 per bushel on the excess.

Congress did not contemplate situations such as this arising under the penalty provisions of the Agricultural Act of 1938.

What Is Ahead for the Members of the House on the Natural Gas Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. HESELTON

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 26, 1955

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Speaker, I suppose that every member of the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce is confronted, as I am, dozens of times each day with the entirely legitimate question, "What is going to happen on the gas bill?"

I doubt if any member of that committee has been or is able to answer that question with any certainty.

We do know that when the amended bill was before the committee back in June, the first vote was 14 to 14 and that then after reconsideration was moved and carried, H. R. 6645 was reported out by a vote of 16 to 15.

These facts are of particular significance for the following reasons:

First. The subject matter of exempting producers and gatherers of natural gas from regulation by the Federal Power Commission has been before that committee for several years but up to date the proponents of exemption have not been successful in their efforts.

Second. One of the most significant votes with reference to such exemption occurred on March 31, 1950, upon the adoption of a rule which would have taken such an exemption bill from the Speaker's table "to the end that the Senate amendment be, and the same is hereby, agreed to."

Third. Those who are still members of the House will probably recall that the rule was called up and considered at approximately 6 p. m. on Friday, March 31, 1950. The rollcall vote was 176 for the rule, 174 against it and 2 present. Thereafter this bill was vetoed by the President and there was no further consideration of the matter for obvious reasons.

Fourth. The committee held extensive hearings on H. R. 4560—the predecessor bill to H. R. 6645—during March, April, and May of this year. The printed record of the hearings includes nearly 2,000 pages.

H. R. 6645, which was reported by a majority of 1, with the full membership of the committee present and voting, was reported on June 28, 1955.

There followed a period of considerable uncertainty, even more confusion, and extensive polling of the House Members as to the possibility of passing the bill. In the interim, statements were published in the press and made over the radio and television to the effect that only President Eisenhower could bring about the passage of this bill by his active support of it.

Although this did not result in any such action by the President, a hearing was scheduled before the Rules Committee for Tuesday, July 26, 1955, at 10:30 a. m.

Fifth. If anything was demonstrated at that hearing, it was that this bill is a highly controversial one, technical in the extreme and one that cannot be considered adequately by Members of the House at this late date even though a most liberal rule for debate should be granted.

During this public hearing before the Rules Committee, the point was repeatedly brought up and emphasized that it would be most unfortunate if such a bill should be sent to the floor of the House during these closing days and hours of the current session. It was also pointed out that the morning press had quoted the acting leader of the other body as stating, after a 2-hour conference with the Democratic policy committee of that body, that this bill with one other bill was informally shelved for the session.

The question naturally arises as to why such an extraordinary effort should be made at this time to force this particular bill to a fruitless vote by the House. The answer to this question must be determined by each Member of the House who may be called upon to take any action with reference to H. R. 6645 during the next few days.

The Las Vegas High School Rhythmettes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLIFTON (CLIFF) YOUNG

OF NEVADA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 26, 1955

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure today to pay tribute to an outstanding group of Nevada young people upon the occasion of their arrival in Washington.

The 22 lovely and talented ladies of the Las Vegas High School Rhythmettes are on a nationwide tour sponsored by the Nevada State Elks. The only group of this kind in the United States, the Rhythmettes set extremely high standards of behavior and character for young people throughout the State of Nevada.

Their repertoire includes brilliant military numbers, contemporay dance production numbers, precision dance routines, and novelty production numbers.

Since leaving Nevada on July 3 the Rhythmettes have appeared on the Toast of the Town television show in New York, the national convention of the Elks in Philadelphia, and at Brooklyn's Ebbets Field. Not only have they appeared before record-breaking audiences of the general public, but they have taken the time from their crowded schedules to do special shows in service and veterans' hospitals.

The founder and director of the Rhythmettes is Miss Evelyn Stuckey and the motto of the group is "Perfection in performance reflects perfection in living."

It is my feeling that the qualifications of the Rhythmettes are particularly noteworthy:

First. Moral and behavior standards of the highest character.

Second. Maintenance of good grades.

Third. Perfect sense of rhythm and timing.

Fourth. Ability to accept responsibility.

Fifth. A highly cooperative and friendly nature.

Sixth. Excellent general appearance.

Seventh. Keen interest in school and all school activities.

Eighth. Enthusiasm—sincere desire to attain perfection.

Ninth. Excellent health.

Tenth. Creativeness.

Mr. Speaker, one of the pleasures and privileges of being a Member of the House of Representatives is being able to welcome such a fine group of young ladies to the Nation's Capital.

Address by Clarence A. Davis, Under Secretary of the Interior, Before the National Rivers and Harbors Congress, Washington, D. C., May 31, 1955

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. L. MILLER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 26, 1955

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by Hon. Clarence A. Davis, Under Secretary of the Interior, before the National Rivers and Harbors Congress:

Mr. Chairman, I feel honored indeed to be invited to participate in the very distinguished program which you have assembled for the 42d national convention of the National Rivers and Harbors Congress.

The subject of this address, however, as printed in your program is the occasion of some little embarrassment.

The President used his address to your convention last year as the occasion for announcing the appointment of a committee to study national water resources and policies. That committee consisted of the Secretaries of the Departments of Defense, Agriculture, and Interior, with several other Departments and Agencies also participating.

I am sure it is proper for me to say to you that that committee has been meeting consistently during the last 12 months, exploring not only the numerous Federal ac-

tivities relating to water resources, but also the entire problem of water.

The committee has not yet presented its report, and I am sure you will understand, therefore, that I shall not discuss it. However, I am sure it will not be amiss if I discuss with you for a few moments some of the various problems which arise in a survey of the water resources of the United States.

The thing I should like to most impress upon your minds is the fact that there is no single water problem in the United States; that there are a multitude of problems; that they are nationwide in scope; but they are not necessarily national.

I suspect that all of our minds tend to emphasize different aspects of the water problem according to our various backgrounds and our various local interests. This organization in its very nature has been primarily interested in rivers and harbors, in navigation and flood control. These are important segments of the water problem, but they are only segments.

Those of us from the West envisage the water problem as primarily one of the storage of water and its application to land—irrigation, the reclamation of arid lands, and the building of the agricultural economy of the Western States.

But that, too, is only another segment of the water problem.

In other and older parts of the country water and stream pollution are beginning to loom as major segments of the water problem.

Throughout the country there is a growing and insistent demand that more consideration be given to the preservation or enlargement of the fish and wildlife opportunities and the opportunities for public recreation.

In many places water supplies heretofore thought inexhaustible have begun to show signs of depletion, and the problem of adequate supply confronts areas and individual communities.

Let us bear in mind that we have pretty much taken water for granted in most of the United States. We have not looked upon it as a really vital matter. We have never been under the necessity of paying very much, if anything, for water, and consequently, we have neglected to find many of the facts about water, its availability, and its necessary uses.

The consumption of water in the United States has increased so tremendously even in the last 25 years, that it staggers the imagination. The industrial uses of water are almost beyond our comprehension, and as new industrial processes develop and new uses, such as air conditioning, increase and supplemental irrigation is expanded into new areas where heretofore it was not thought necessary, we are intensifying the burden that we put upon the Nation's water supply.

There is sufficient water to meet these tremendous needs, but the task of husbanding our resources will require the best efforts of us all.

Many of the things we do not know are fully as important as the things we do know. In some areas of the United States water is being withdrawn from the ground at a rate of thirty times the rate of water replenishment. In some coastal areas we have drawn down the water table to the point where the salt water of the sea has intruded under the land surface. I assume we have all noted that in the areas of both Virginia and Maryland adjacent to the District serious water problems are developing.

It is not too difficult to foresee in many regions that in the course of time water may be more valuable and more of an asset than any of the other natural resources.

I think I can foresee some future conflicts of a very basic nature.

It is obvious that domestic supplies and uses of water must be maintained in the first priority of use, and yet it is not difficult to visualize developments where providing an adequate domestic supply will cut into and curtail the industrial or agricultural use of water.

We have areas in the United States already in which the supply of water may become a limiting factor in the population growth of the area and present tremendous conflict of interest between vested uses of water and the growing demands of an expanding population.

The amounts of money involved in these problems are tremendous, and even in this day of budgets computed in billions, they are still of a magnitude worthy of careful attention. For instance, it is estimated by one of our departments that an annual expenditure of $750 million a year is necessary to merely keep abreast of the problem of stream pollution. Most of this, if not all of it, will be borne by municipalities and the industries contributing to that pollution.

It is estimated by both the public and private agencies that the capital requirements necessary to keep abreast of the hydroelectric and irrigation developments in the Pacific Northwest will require consistently some $300 million a year. I believe the last report of the Tennessee Valley Authority indicated an investment need there of some $150 million a year. And, yet, these are only small areas compared to the total national requirements.

These amounts are not only approximately double the amounts of the average appropriations to these areas during the last 10 years, but if anything like that proportion of appropriations were maintained for other sections of the country, we reach almost astronomical figures.

It seems to me we may, therefore, appropriately ask, Whose water problem? And it seems to me the necessary answer is that it is everybody's problem—Federal, State, local, and individual.

For that reason there must be the closest cooperation and coordination of the various Federal agencies entrusted with particular programs and with the States and the local interests working in this field.

The Corps of Engineers' program of work with rivers, flood control, and navigation must be coordinated with the Bureau of Reclamation's program of water storage for reclamation and irrigation, and the program of agriculture, now nationwide, with its multitude of developments of small watershed controls, including water storage, which is just in its infancy, must be coordinated with both if we are to avoid conflicts in policies and interagency rivalries, not to mention inadequate participation of States and local interests, many of which are fully able to carry a substantial proportion of the burden.

There are conflicts of interest in the very nature of the program. It is not always possible to serve the conflicting interests in water resources development. It is not possible to build a dam across a canyon and impound large amounts of water for the irrigation of land, the improvement of the economy of a region, the enhancement of the fish and wildlife resources, and the improvement of recreational facilities without at the same time altering the natural beauties of nature and the isolated, solitary aspects which many people wish to see preserved.

As our population increases and our economy develops, I suspect these conflicts will become more apparent. What will happen when increasing domestic uses of available water supplies begin to curtail agricultural development and perhaps curtail industrial uses? How will we solve the great problems that arise with relation to the diversion of water from its natural courses to other uses?

We are in the midst of serious conflicts involving profound constitutional questions of the legal rights of the Federal Government and the States and individuals with reference to the ownership and control of inland waters.

We have inherent conflicts between the water appropriation laws of the West by which the right to use water has long been considered a property right under the laws of the States where all our property rights originate and the powers of the Congress under the commerce and defense clauses.

In some areas of the country there appear to be vast reservoirs of underground water, adequate for all foreseeable uses of the overlying land, and possibly providing surpluses. In other areas limited underground waters are available, but in some of these areas we are pulling water out of the ground much faster than nature is replenishing it. This means, of course, that sooner or later such areas are not only headed toward a water shortage, but perhaps such a failure of supply as will render agriculture in the areas impossible and may seriously handicap the region.

We need much more intelligent study and much more intelligent regulation by the States with reference to the use of underground waters, yet most of the States have been reluctant to invade this field, and in many cases there is not adequate information available by which it can be intelligently invaded.

A second potentiality in which Interior is engaged is a study of the problem of saline-water conversion. The Congress has made approximately $400,000 a year available for that purpose, and the method of handling has been to make research grants to colleges, scientific and industrial organizations to attract to this problem the finest minds of the country to discover, if possible, a cheap and practical process.

I am glad to report to you that a great deal of progress has been made. While the costs are still much in excess of the amounts which you and I would like to pay and are still too high for uses in a competitive industry, they are at a point where the burden of cost could be borne for strictly limited domestic uses. All of the processes involve the use of energy, however it may be obtained. The amounts required are great. But the scientists are continuing on their way. Perhaps solar energy in areas where sunshine can be depended upon, perhaps windpower and geothermal energy offer possiblities. All these sources are being explored.

If any cheap process for desalting water could be devised, the benefits can only be measured by the scope of our imagination. There are millions of acres of land in the world, readily irrigable with only slight lifts from the oceans, if that water could be made available. Fresh water would produce the food supplies, improve the living conditions and alter the economy of large regions of the world. Such a process might work almost as great a change in the economic conditions and the standards of living of a large part of the world as will the development of atomic energy.

A third fascinating possibility is that of weather control, where exploration is still in its infancy, and our scientists are most reluctant to express opinions.

This is a thumbnail sketch of some of the water problems as I see them. It is apparent that they go far beyond any possibility of exclusive Federal action. They must be met by unified effort in a spirit of cooperation between all of the Federal agencies, the States and local interests.

While they have an effect upon the national economy, the direct benefits of most of these resource development projects are primarily local. For that reason, it would seem there should be substantial contributions by the beneficiaries, regardless of the agency constructing the project, whether it be Federal or non-Federal.

Just as all must assume some share of the responsibility, so it would seem to me that all should share the costs.

There are many auspicious signs of a general awakening of States and local interests, public and private, toward assuming responsibility in the resource field. The deauthorization of some Federal projects to permit local interests to proceed and the large number of projects in the planning and financing stages by States, public agencies, municipalities, public power districts, irrigation districts, drainage districts, and private interests are evidence of a general public awareness of their responsibilities for large parts of the program.

To many of them capital is readily available, as are the skills and technicians that are necessary. The task is great enough for all. The needs are pressing. May we all be given the vision to view these problems in their nationwide aspect, free from any personal or sectional views. May we do our part and help others to do theirs that this great and necessary program can go forward.

Emergency Military Service by Commissioned Corps of Public Health Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. PERCY PRIEST

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 26, 1955

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill "to amend the Public Health Service Act to authorize the President to make the commissioned corps a military service in time of emergency involving the national defense, and to authorize payment of uniform allowances to officers of the corps in certain grades when required to wear the uniform, and for other purposes."

In order to give the Members of Congress adequate information as to the background and purposes of this bill, I would like to make public Secretary Hobby's letter, addressed to the Speaker, requesting introduction of this legislation, and a summary of the bill prepared by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. The letter and the summary are as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF
HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE,
July 18, 1955.

Hon. SAM RAYBURN,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: We are enclosing for your consideration a draft of a bill "to amend the Public Health Service Act to authorize the President to make the commissioned corps a military service in time of emergency involving the national defense, and to authorize payment of uniform allowances to officers of the corps in certain grades when required to wear the uniform, and for other purposes."

This bill is designed to strengthen the personnel system governing the commissioned corps of the Public Health Service by providing certain authorities which are required for the effective performance of the responsibilities of the service during war and emergency periods, by authorizing the payment of uniform allowances, and by alleviating certain problems pertaining to personnel management.

A major purpose of the bill is to carry out the proposal in the President's health message of January 31, 1955 (H. Doc. No. 81), that the Congress take steps to "Strengthen the Public Health Service commissioned corps by improving its status * * *." The mission of the Public Health Service, as a major health arm of the Federal Government, is one of considerable scope and diversity. Although normally its functions are civilian in character and vital to the maintenance of the health and welfare of the civilian population, the Public Health Service through special use of its commissioned corps is available, as a standby service of the Armed Forces, to perform in time of war or national emergency, at the discretion of the President, functions and duties relating to the responsibilities of the Armed Forces and such other defense functions as may be assigned to it. Legislation, however, is necessary in order to enable the Public Health Service to perform these functions and duties more effectively during periods of national defense emergencies.

Under present law the President is authorized to convert the commissioned corps to military status in time of war only. The same considerations which underlie conversion to military status during such periods obviously may prevail during periods of emergency related to the national defense. It is therefore desirable to authorize the President to convert the commissioned corps to military status in time of national-defense emergency as well as in time of war. Authority for conversion of the commissioned corps to military status during such periods would constitute a firm basis for the full utilization of the Public Health Service, including the Inactive Reserve, in mobilization planning.

The personnel system of the Commissioned Corps needs to be strengthened in certain other respects. In the first place, as recognized by the President in his above-mentioned health message, legislation is urgently needed to provide an adequate system of survivor benefits for the dependents of deceased members of the Corps, which is now lacking. A specific proposal to accomplish this has been omitted from the enclosed draft bill only because such legislation has been reported favorably by the House Select Committee on Survivor Benefits as part of a broader proposal (H. R. 7089) covering all the uniformed services.

Another needed improvement—which is covered by the enclosed draft bill—relates to uniform allowances for members of the Corps. Existing law authorizes an allowance of $250 to commissioned officers of the Public Health Service in the lower three grades entering on active duty in time of war or so serving at the commencement of a war. No such uniform allowance is at present payable despite the fact that approximately 40 percent of such officers are now required to wear uniforms during duty hours. We recommend an amendment to section 213 of the Public Health Service Act which would authorize a one-time uniform allowance for these officers regardless of the existence or nonexistence of a state of war, but which would limit payment to those who are required by directive of the Surgeon General to wear uniforms.

The bill also contains certain other proposed amendments (more fully described in the enclosed summary) designed to simplify administration and result in better personnel management, which would extend the term of Reserve commissions; equalize the provisions for crediting prior noncommissioned service of Public Health Service officers toward retirement for age or length of service with the provisions for crediting such prior service for disability retirement purposes; and extend the present authority for extramural training assignments of Regular officers to Reserve officers and round out and otherwise amend such training provisions.

In addition, the bill contains purely technical amendments, which would clarify existing authority to make reappointments to the Regular Corps without examination, delete obsolete provisions and references, etc.

The enactment of the bill would result in increased costs to this Department, with respect to the payment of the uniform allowance, in an estimated amount of $110,000 for fiscal year 1956 and $60,000 for each fiscal year thereafter. Other potential costs, such as those arising out of the proposed authority for conversion of the Commissioned Corps to military status during defense emergencies, are not susceptible to an estimate at this time.

We should appreciate it if you would be good enough to refer the bill to the appropriate committee for consideration.

The Bureau of the Budget advises that it perceives no objection to the submission of this proposed legislation to the Congress for its consideration.

Sincerely yours,

OVETA CULP HOBBY,
Secretary.

SUMMARY OF BILL, PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE COMMISSIONED CORPS

SECTION 1

Section 216 of the Public Health Service Act at present authorizes the President, in time of war, or of emergency proclaimed by the President, to utilize the Public Health Service to such extent and in such manner as shall in his judgment promote the public interest. It further authorizes the President, in time of war only, to declare the Commissioned Corps of the Public Health Service to be a military service and a branch of the land and naval forces of the United States. And it provides that while in such military status, the Commissioned Corps shall, to the extent prescribed by regulations of the President, be subject to the Articles of War and to the Articles for the Government of the Navy. The proposed amendment, the need for which is explained in the letter of transmittal to the Congress, would authorize the President to declare the Commissioned Corps to be a military service in time of emergency involving the national defense, as well as in time of war. Furthermore, reference to the Uniform Code of Military Justice would be substituted for the now-obsolete references to the Articles of War and the Articles for the Government of the Navy.

SECTION 2

Subsection (a) would amend section 213 of the Public Health Service Act to authorize the payment of a one-time $250 uniform allowance to those Regular and Reserve officers of the Service who (i) are on active duty on, or enter on active duty after, the effective date of the amendment, (ii) are receiving the pay of the junior assistant, assistant, or senior assistant grade, and (iii) have not at any time received a uniform allowance from the Service. The general effect of this amendment would be to delete from existing law the limitations of the uniform allowance to war periods. The need for this amendment is explained in the letter of transmittal to the Congress.

Subsection (b) would repeal, as no longer necessary, section 707 of the act of July 1, 1944, as amended, which authorized the retroactive payment of uniform allowances to officers who were appointed to the Regular Corps or called to active duty in the Reserve Corps after December 7, 1941, and prior to July 1, 1944, and who would have been eligible for the uniform allowance under section 213 of the Public Health Service Act but for the fact that their appointment or call to active duty occurred prior to July 1, 1944, the effective date of such act. Eligibility under section 707 is limited to officers who

were on active duty on or after November 11, 1943. After a lapse of 11 years it can be assumed that this section has been executed.

SECTION 3

Subsections (a) and (b) would amend section 207 of the Public Health Service Act by adding a new subsection thereto which would authorize the reappointment of former officers of the Regular Corps within 2 years after the termination of their prior commission in the Regular Corps without a new examination, except as the Surgeon General may otherwise prescribe, and without regard to the numerical limitations with respect to the appointment of officers in the full grade and above. For purposes of pay, promotion, and seniority in grade, such a reappointed officer would receive the same credits for service to which he would be entitled if such reappointment were an original appointment, but in no event less than the amount of credits he held at the time his prior commission was terminated. These amendments parallel existing authority contained in Public Health Service Regulations. However, we believe that it would be desirable to make explicit in the act the basis for the existing regulation.

From time to time officers of the Regular Corps who have resigned from the Service find it desirable to return to the Service within a relatively short period of time following the termination of their commissions. These candidates are well qualified professional persons who because of former association with the Service, are familiar with the responsibilities and the mission of the Service. The amendments made by these subsections would facilitate the reappointment of these candidates.

Subsection (c) would amend section 207 (a) (2) of the Public Health Service Act so as to extend the term of Reserve commissions from 5 years to an indefinite period. This amendment would parallel the practice of the Armed Forces to grant Reserve commissions for indefinite periods. Reserve commissions in effect on the date of enactment of this subsection would not, however, be affected unless the officer consents in writing to such extension.

SECTION 4

This section would amend section 210 (d) (2) of the Public Health Service Act by striking out the words "pay period and for purposes of." The words to be deleted had reference to the Pay Adjustment Act of 1942, as amended, which provided for longevity increases in pay every 3 years. This law was superseded by the Career Compensation Act of 1949. The language to be deleted no longer has any meaning.

SECTION 5

Subsections (a) and (b) would amend subsections (a) and (b) (1) of section 211 of the Public Health Service Act to authorize the crediting of all noncommissioned service with the Public Health Service for purposes of age and length-of-service retirements without regard to the date of appointment of an officer to the Regular Corps. The term "noncommissioned service" is used to describe any employment with the Public Health Service other than in a commissioned status.

Under existing law (sec. 706 of the act of July 1, 1944, as amended), the crediting of prior noncommissioned service with the Service for the purposes of age and length-of-service retirements is limited solely to those Regular officers who were appointed prior to July 1, 1944. An officer who has been appointed since that date may not receive credit for any noncommissioned service for purposes of retirement for age or length of service, notwithstanding the fact that from the date of his appointment to the Regular Corps he is excluded from the Civil Service Retirement System and his rights thereunder terminated. While such an officer receives a return of all contributions paid into the retirement fund, he loses all credits toward retirement for his prior noncommissioned service which he had accumulated under the Civil Service Retirement Act.

These amendments would equalize the computation of service for nondisability retirement purposes with the computation of service for disability retirement purposes at present authorized under the Career Compensation Act of 1949. Under that act, Public Health Service officers may be credited for physical disability retirement purposes with their noncommissioned service with the Public Health Service regardless of the date of their appointment.

Although these amendments would grant in some few cases, a number of years of civil service credit for staff-retirement purposes, the number of officers involved would not exceed more than a small percentage of the total strength of the Regular Corps.

Subsection (c) would amend section 211 (c) of the Public Health Service Act to authorize the recall to active duty of a retired officer of the Regular Corps without his consent while the Corps has military status. Existing law authorizes such recall only in time of war. The amendment is necessary to complement the amendment to section 216 of the Public Health Service Act proposed by section 1 of the bill which would permit conversion of the corps to military status in times of national defense emergency as well as in time of war. This subsection would also incorporate into section 211 (c) of the Public Health Service Act substantive legislation contained in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare Appropriation Act, 1954 (67 Stat. 254, 42 U. S. C. 212b) which authorizes the recall to active duty of an officer of either the Regular or Reserve Corps with his consent at any time.

Subsection (d) would repeal the provision of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare Appropriation Act, 1954, referred to above, which would be incorporated into section 211 (c) of the Public Health Service Act by section 5 (c) of the bill.

Subsection (e) would repeal section 706 of the act of July 1, 1944, as amended. See discussion under subsections (a) and (b) above.

SECTION 6

Subsection (a) would amend section 218 (a) of the Public Health Service Act which at present authorizes the training of Regular officers at educational institutions.

The amendment would extend this training authority to include Reserve officers. Within the Commissioned Corps very little distinction exists between Regular and Reserve officers, both of whom have already obtained their professional degrees. They work side by side on the same projects which may require advanced professional training in order that they may keep abreast of changing times and new professional techniques. Authority to train Reserve officers on the same basis as Regular officers would be in the best interests of the Service.

The scope of subsection (a) of section 218 is somewhat ambiguous with respect to training courses and programs, both within and outside the Federal Government, which may not technically be described as training at educational institutions. Non-Federal training programs are given from time to time under the auspices of various professional associations such as the American Medical Association, the American Trudeau Association, and the American Psychoanalytic Association. Within the Federal Government, Public Health Service officers have need for training given by various Federal agencies, such as the Foreign Service Institute conducted by the Department of State and the biological warfare defense course conducted by the Department of the Army. Although such programs are normally short-term courses, they are, nonetheless, essential to the training activities of the Public Health Service. The amendment made by this subsection would, therefore, clarify the authority of the Service to train officers at educational institutions or training programs, both within and outside the Federal Government.

Subsection (b) would amend section 218 (b) of the Public Health Service Act which now provides that an officer whose tuition and fees have been paid by the service while attending an educational institution shall reimburse the service for such costs if he voluntarily leaves the service within 2 years after the cessation of such attendance. In view of the fact that 62 percent of such training is for periods of less than 3 months, and that such training assignments are, in many instances, for a period of no more than 1 week, the requirement of 2 years of subsequent service is unduly harsh on the officer and is unnecessary from the point of view of the Government.

This amendment would require an officer who receives training in excess of 30 days for which tuition and fees are paid by the service to reimburse the service for such tuition and fees if thereafter he voluntarily leaves the service within a period of time which is equal to twice the period of such training, with a minimum period of 6 months of service and a maximum of 2 years. Such period of subsequent service would commence upon the cessation of the officer's prescribed training program which may also include other training for which no tuition and fees are paid, regardless of whether such other training is in a Service facility or otherwise. The amendment would also authorize the Surgeon General to waive, in whole or in part, the recovery of tuition and fees when such recovery would be inequitable or not in the public interest.

The amendment would provide a more reasonable and equitable basis for determining the conditions under which the recovery provision would be applicable. For example, it would exclude from such provision an officer who is assigned to a training course of 30 days or less, as a training course of such short duration is mainly for the benefit of the Government and may provide only a small degree, if any, of personal benefit to the officer. Likewise, it would permit a remission, in whole or in part, of the required reimbursement when such reimbursement would be inequitable or not in the public interest.

The proposed "two for one" formula with respect to service to be performed subsequent to a prescribed training period relates to the period of training for which tuition and fees have been paid, as compared to the fixed period of 2 years of service required under existing law. This formula is more equitable from the officer's point of view and yet would sufficiently safeguard the interests of the Government.

H. R. 7474, Utility Reimbursement

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRADY GENTRY

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 26, 1955

Mr. GENTRY. Mr. Speaker, H. R. 7474 contains a provision that 50 percent of the cost of relocating utility facilities necessitated by the construction of projects on the interstate, Federal primary, secondary and urban highway system may be paid from Federal funds

whenever, under the laws of the States where the project is being constructed, the entire relocation cost is to be borne by the utilities.

Stated rather baldly, this means that even though a utility has made a solemn, written, legal contract with a State that it will relocate its facilities in consideration of being given the use of highway rights-of-way, or even though it has requested and accepted a franchise to enter upon highway rights-of-way as a result of a statute enacted by a State legislature by which it specifically obligated itself to relocate its facilities to permit highway improvement—this reimbursement provision nevertheless would induce a vitiation of the legal contract, a violation of the valid State law and shatter every principle of State sovereignty.

This provision in the bill might have been stated another way in complete truthfulness and frankness. It might have said that if a State has passed a law which is sound in morals and in equity; a law that is solely and completely within the police power of the States, and completely without the powers and jurisdiction of the Government; and if, under such law, solemn, written contracts have been made between the utilities and the States at the specific request of the utilities by which the utilities gained valuable rights that saved them great expense—all in consideration of their one contractual promise to relocate their facilities when necessary to permit highway improvement—then, in that event, will not you, Mr. Sovereign State, *vitiate* your solemn contracts, violate your valid State laws, and destroy your sovereign rights by giving the poor utilities—such as the American Telephone & Telegraph Co., Western Union, and the great electric-power companies—50 percent of their relocation costs out of this money that we have collected from your citizens, presumably to build highways, but which we now send back to you only in part.

Before considering other aspects of a provision which can result in $970 million of these road funds being given to the utilities, let us treat for a moment some of its legal aspects.

State legislatures have sovereign control over highways—a control that is ordinarily delegated to its State highway department and lesser agencies of State government. The primary use of highways is for the traveling public, but other uses that serve the public interest are generally allowed. Thus, it is generally accepted that utilities may be permitted to place their facilities on highway rights-of-way under certain considerations and restrictions—always provided, of course, that their use does not inconvenience the traveling public in its primary use. Even though a utility is allowed to do this, its rights are secondary and subordinate to the interest of the traveling public, and always remain so.

No utility ever acquires a vested right to remain in any specific location on the highway. That is true because neither the State nor its delegated agency can make any contract which impairs its police power. It is universally held that highways is a proper subject for the exercise of police power.

Every decision in courts of last resort, without exception, has held that the State, acting through its legislature, its highway department, or its local governmental units has every legal right and reason to require a utility, at its own expense, to relocate any facilities on the public rights-of-way in order to permit highway improvement. Nothing in the nature of a Federal program of highway aid alters the fact that the State, in the exercise of its police power, has every right to request the readjustment of utility facilities in order to properly serve the highway user. Federal aid to highways consists merely in the appropriation of money derived in taxes on citizens of the States, to be matched in some amount by the States, and spent on a designated system of highways, provided certain standards are met. The Federal Government does not initiate these highway projects. The States have the sole discretion of determining whether highway projects are undertaken, the nature of the project, and whether it will be financed from State funds or from both Federal and State funds.

Thus Federal participation does not prevent the State from exercising its solemn police power in connection with a highway project. And, the Federal Government exercises no such control over these projects that would make highway departments merely agents of the Government. The Federal grants recognize only that the Federal Government has legitimate national interest in the improvement of highways.

Recognizing that the police power of the States, exercised through delegated agents, is supreme in the matter of rights-of-way as against everyone, let us revert to the present situation with reference to the utility provision in the highway bill.

Why should the Congress think of doing this? What is causing all the deep solicitude for the poor utilities? Just what is the reason for this effort not only to break State laws and vitiate solemn, legal contracts which the utilities requested and signed, but also to destroy the sovereign police power of the States, even though the States are now pleading with us that they want and need no intervention in this matter by Congress?

Just what would this provision do? In cases where valid State laws have given a franchise to a utility for use of rights-of-way, conditioned on their removal to permit highway improvement, it would authorize the States, regardless of such condition under their law, to pay 50 percent of removal costs out of Federal funds. Secondly, it would authorize the States to pay 50 percent of removal costs even though the States have made, and there are in existence, valid written contracts with the utilities, entered into at the utilities' own request, whereby the utilities gain the valuable right to occupy rights-of-way, free of any charge, as a result of their contractual promise to pay their costs of removal to permit highway improvement. Thirdly, it would authorize the payment of these removal costs with Federal funds even though the State has both a legal enactment and a valid, written contract with the utilities which pledged the utilities to pay its own removal costs in return for use of rights-of-way.

Stated quite bluntly, this is no business of the Congress. A powerful lobby, over a course of 2 or 3 years, has attempted to exert a pressure which would make the Congress do something which is wrong legally, equitably, and morally. It is something which should not be legislated in this body. Its effect, under the circumstances and in the manner it is being attempted, would destroy every remaining vestige of state sovereignty. This is made no less true because of the subtle approach and the seemingly benign language of the provision in question. The language is permissive in the House bill but it is mandatory in the provision passed by the other body and it likely will be mandatory in the conference report provided we pass it in any manner here. The result sought to be attained, that of getting the money for the utilities, is the same in both measures and there is little doubt that it would bring about that result.

If Congress has determined to wipe out State capitols in their entirety and make Washington a completely all-powerful, centralized bureaucracy regardless of the laws of the States, regardless of existing legal, written contracts made by the States, and regardless of the States' sovereign police power, it has picked a perfect issue on which to do so.

What are some of the facts of this case which show the extent, the import, and the viciousness of this provision? Forty-three States either have legally enacted laws providing for the issuance of franchises permitting utilities to use highway rights-of-way under the condition that their facilities must be moved by them when highway improvement is needed or have entered into legal written contracts with the utilities, at the utilities' specific request, in which the utilities solemnly contracted to readjust and relocate their facilities in order to secure rights-of-way.

These laws were passed and these contracts were made under their sovereign State police power. Were these laws enacted by the States and the contracts entered into by the States at the request of the utilities, fair laws and fair contracts? Are they equitably and morally just? Were they entered into to protect the primary use of the traveling public on the highways? Were they a proper and just exercise of the police power of the States through their delegated agencies, the State highway departments? They would seem to be all of these. Then why should we even consider doing something which would subvert the laws passed by the States, which would vitiate contracts legally made by the States for the protection of its citizens, and, worst of all, why an effort which would effectively destroy the sovereignty of the States in the exercise of their police power?

The laws permitting utilities to use rights-of-way, under certain conditions and restrictions, were enacted because the utilities asked for them. The contracts they have made with the States

were at their own insistence. They have saved great sums of money as a result of these laws and contracts. Rights-of-way have been maintained for them at the expense and inconvenience of highway users and without expense to them. The new rights-of-way required for the interstate system will cost the highway users billions of dollars. The utilities will not pay 1 cent of it, but they expect to occupy it free of any charge. They expect it to be maintained for them, also free of charge. But the spokesmen of the utilities now demand, in this legislation, that the highway users not only build new rights-of-way for them, and maintain it for them, forever, but that they also move the facilities on to any new location and pay the removal bill, all without legal sanction, and, in most cases, in direct contravention of solemn contracts which the utilities asked the States to make with them by which they acquired the valuable right to enter upon the highways in the first instance. This would completely and permanently change the historic and legal relationship between the parties. It would destroy the States police power in regard to highway rights-of-way and would make the States completely subordinate to the utilities, instead of the reverse, as it is at present under the sovereign power of the States.

But possibly there are some who feel that the utilities are in such desperate financial straits that any action, however extreme and however destructive of State sovereignty, is justified. That could be the only possible reason by which anyone might seek to justify what is being attempted here. Let us see what the facts are in that regard.

Moody's Manual of Investments gives figures which show that the utilities will make for their owners during the 13-year period of the proposed road program clear net profits, after all taxes and expenses, of considerably more than $25 billion. Now let us say that removal costs will be $2 billion in those 13 years, a figure higher than I have heard estimated. Two billion dollars in removal expenses would cost the utilities less than $1 billion, since 52 percent of the $2 billion would otherwise be paid in taxes. Are not the removal costs, then, almost insignificant when compared with the lush guaranteed profits of the utility owners?

Now, under the facts, who actually would get the almost $1 billion handout, provided the highly benevolent and philanthropic spirit of Congress toward the utilities is expressed through the passage of this provision of the highway bill?

American Telephone & Telegraph Co., by its own statement, owns 90 percent of all telephone lines. That means it will get more than 90 percent of all reimbursements paid to telephone utilities, one of the largest of our utility groups Since it has no legal right to any payment whatever the only question that remains is whether it has any moral claim to reimbursement. That seems to be conclusively answered by the fact that it has made a great number of contracts throughout the years with the States, many of them recently, in which, in order to secure free rights-of-way for its facilities, it pledged itself in writing to remove such facilities to permit highway improvement. Every one of these agreements is a legal contract and is in full force and effect today. They have saved American Telephone & Telegraph Co. great sums of money. Does it need the money it will get under this provision? In addition to the cash yearly dividend of $9 paid for many years on each of the 50 million shares of stock owned by its stockholders, it recently reported retained earnings of almost $800 million. Does not such prosperity, practically guaranteed under present laws, give a conclusive answer as to whether it needs the approximately $200 million which could be paid to it under section 7 of the highway bill? Should we pass a law which says to the States that we are willing to have them pay A. T. & T. approximately $200 million of any highway funds we provide them? I am not willing for the States to have congressional authority to do that because A. T. & T. is not entitled to it. Certainly it does not need the benefits of this beneficient provision nearly as much as does our Treasury and our highways.

Then we have our telegraph utilities. Really it is now only one utility since Western Union, with Government approval, became a complete telegraph monopoly a few years back. Does Western Union, contrary to State laws and contrary to its legal contracts with the States by which it is obligated to pay its removal costs, need a handout? Within the last 3 years—and since it became a monopoly—its common stock has increased in value more than 800 percent. I do not believe we should suggest to the States that our Treasury be raided to give Western Union a considerable sum of taxpayers' money. In fact, I don't believe we should even say to the States that we would pay one cent to Western Union, the circumstances being what they are.

Then we come to the electric power companies. There is little need for comment as to their solvency or even as to the state of their financial prosperity. Their prosperity is guaranteed as much as anything can be guaranteed in this country of ours. The class A and B utilities alone—the biggest ones, of course—in recent reports show retained earnings of $2,200,000,000 over and above dividend payments through the years. What a nice, fat, backlog that is. Just $2,200,000,000. A conservative estimate would seem to be that the electric power companies will receive a cut of some $250 million of the bounty provided in section 7 of the highway bill. Do you want to give the States the permission to hand them all this money when you know it would not only be a violation of State laws but a vitiation of legal contracts these companies have themselves made with the States by which they secured valuable rights enabling them to save great sums of money, part of it at the expense of the highway user? I can hardly believe that you want to do that, but that is exactly what this bill does.

But there are those who say that they know of a small utility which may need a little help. It is being reported that the representatives of the major utilities, which will get at least 90 percent of the benefits from this reimbursement provision, are saying in the corridors of the Capitol and the House Office Buildings that their great interest is in some small utilities which they feel might be unduly burdened if it is not passed. Their great concern for some little man, imaginary or otherwise, is, I am sure, responsible for their tremendous effort, sustained for some time now, to pass this legislation.

It might be well to remember in this connection that employees of the State Highway Departments live and work in every section of every State of the Union. There are few counties in our country which do not have residents who are employees of the State highway department. These employees take their place in the life of their communities and they know its problems. They mix, mingle, and go to churches and clubs with the people among whom they live. Should there happen to be a small utility for which road improvement would create a burden, would not the highway department know about it? If the State felt it a highly meritorious case it would require no act of Congress for it to be helped. Certainly it would not require the payment of hundreds of millions of dollars of taxpayers' funds to the major utilities of our country in order to move a few poles for some little fellow in Podunk, Pa.

What do the State agencies exercising the State police power in the matter of States rights-of-way have to say of this reimbursement provision? They have come to Washington from great distances twice in recent months and even though they welcome the opportunity to build the great highway system which they feel the country needs, they had the courage to state their very strong opposition on each occasion to the inclusion of this provision.

The president of the American highway officials characterized it as an effort on the part of the utilities to avoid contractual obligations by Federal legislation. Could anything be stronger, or a more correct appraisal, than that?

We should remember that by this provision the Congress is saying to the States that they may do something which the States have been insisting, and are still insisting, that they do not want to do and which they feel would be very unjust for them or anbody else to do. In that position, the States seem to be on eminently sound ground.

Keenotes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ELIZABETH KEE

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 26, 1955

Mrs. KEE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD,

I should like to include my newspaper column, Keenotes, which follows:

KEENOTES

(By Representative ELIZABETH KEE)

Few really large American cities could survive a month-long strike of public mass transportation as well as Washington has done it. It has been a remarkable demonstration of a city going about its business almost as usual—but, of course, with a lot of personal inconvenience for many people.

From the very start of the transit stoppage on July 1, business and Government proceeded without any real hitch. Many were late at first getting to work or home, but they did get to work and they did get home. Traffic at peak hours was frightful, but thinned out fast, even though just about everything on wheels that was in shape to drive seemed to be on the downtown streets.

Washington was able to coexist so well with a transit strike only because of a number of distinctive features about the city and those who live and work in the Nation's Capital. (Just imagine New York without subways, buses, or street cars.)

For instance, for years Washington had more taxicabs than any city in the country, including New York City. It still has an unusually large number compared to other cities, and rates are comparatively low—particularly for group riding.

Group riding—not only in cabs but in private passenger car pools—has been an accepted and very popular thing in Washington since early in World War II. Every large Government agency has its car pools of workers living in the same part of town and taking turns driving a full car to work each day. When the strike began, car pool notices—rides needed or rides available—began going up on corner drug store bulletin boards (another Washington neighborhood phenomenon).

Many Washington workers commute by train to within walking distance of both home and work and never use the transit system.

Washington's main traffic arteries are unusually wide, accommodating greater traffic flow and providing lots more room for parking than most cities. With the start of the strike, cars were permitted to park on the trolley tracks in the middle of such wide thoroughfares as Pennsylvania and Connecticut Avenues, and parking meter restrictions were lifted to permit all-day parking in 1-hour zones. This was a bonanza for motorists who usually parked in lots or garages; if they got into town early enough, they could park free all day. So garage and lot space they used to fill then became available for shoppers and others.

Although hours in Government agencies are staggered to some extent, the city is used to a concentrated, heavy influx of private cars each morning and an equally heavy outflow each evening—usually on turn-about 1-way streets with fast-paced traffic lights and few bottlenecks. The strike merely intensified the flow.

With most traffic headed in one direction, it was customary to be offered a ride if you were waiting at the curb for a taxi. Motorists went blocks and even miles out of their way to be helpful.

But for those who traveled at other than rush hours, or were headed away from the direction of traffic, the only answer for those who did not have their own cars was the ubiquitous taxi—and that can be expensive even in a city where taxi rates are low.

One group above all others made it possible for Washington to get along so well during the strike—the city's magnificent police force. The men worked 12-hour shifts each day—in 95 and 100-degree temperatures—keeping traffic moving and streets fairly clear. The police became the city's heroes overnight.

A Move in the Right Direction

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 26, 1955

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, before Uncle Sam gets a dollar someone has to earn it and then turn it over to the tax collector.

Without those tax payments, Uncle Sam could not stir a foot nor lift a hand. Cf that fact, everyone is aware.

Nevertheless, there are those who have been able to entice some agency or department of the Federal Government to go into business in competition with taxpayers. Always the result has been to deprive some taxpayer of his opportunity to establish and continue a business, give employment, and meet tax levies.

Usually the Government has gone into competition with private business because some Congressman or some group of Congressmen, at the request of their constituents, insisted that Uncle Sam engage in a specific business so as to benefit the local community.

The 83d Congress last year passed a bill which died in the Senate, which it was my privilege to introduce, the purpose of which was to have the Government discontinue the activities of its departments which were in direct competition with individuals, or private corporations, and which could be carried on by those private interests, without injury to the national defense.

A similar bill was introduced this year, is now pending before the Committee on Government Operations, and it was hoped that it would go through Congress before adjournment.

Not waiting for the enactment of this proposed legislation, but acting on its own initiative, as is proper and commendable, the administration—and here I mean the President—has instructed the Department of Defense, wherever it can be done without impairing our national security, to discontinue its competition with the taxpayers.

The Department of Defense, notwithstanding bitter and vicious criticism from some Members of Congress, has already discontinued 143 establishments operated by the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Air Force, including tire retreading activities, cobbler shops, sawmills, bakeries, office equipment, furniture and automotive repair shops, laundries and dry-cleaning establishments, ice and cement-mixing plants, tree and garden nurseries.

The Department recently ordered the discontinuance of some 37 additional facilities, including scrap-metal baling, coffee-roasting plants, rope and paint manufacturing.

Recently, when Congress inserted in the $31 billion defense appropriations bill a provision which, if enforced, hampered the President in his effort to minimize this ruinous competition, the President asserted that under the Constitution the Congress could not prevent the use of the order which he had made, and that unless the courts ruled otherwise, he would continue to get the Government out of competition with private enterprise.

A statement of the facts shows that the President is on sound ground, both from a legal and economic standpoint.

The administration is to be commended for this forthright, effective, courageous action.

What Are the Facts About the Independent Producers Who Would Be Exempted From Regulation by the Federal Power Commission Under H. R. 6645?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. HESELTON

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 26, 1955

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Speaker, among the other confusing aspects of the testimony before the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee with reference to the exemption of producers of natural gas from regulation is the lack of anything like exact or adequate information with reference to those producers.

This cannot be attributed to any lack of interest or effort on the part of members of that committee. Rather, despite the reported $1½ million educational campaign on the part of those seeking exemption, any careful reading of the printed hearings will disclose a noticeable inadequacy of factual information from those producers themselves as to the essential facts of their activities.

However, fortunately, Members of the House who may be called upon to vote upon this bill during the last few days or even hours of this session can have certain information of considerable significance.

From data compiled by the Federal Power Commission, it appears that in 1953 there were 4,365 independent producers who sold natural gas to natural-gas companies.

Of this number, 174 such producers, with sales exceeding 2 million thousand-cubic feet per year, sold 90.74 percent of the total volume of such gas.

Conversely, 3,736 such producers sold only 2.1 percent of such gas.

The balance was devoted to other purposes.

Next, any examination of the available statistics makes it crystal clear that there is an enormous concentration in a few producers so far as natural-gas production and ownership of reserves are concerned.

According to these statistics in 1953, something over 4¼ billion thousand-cubic feet was so sold.

Twenty-nine producers accounted for sales in excess of 2¼ billion thousand cubic feet.

Turning to the sales of individual producers, it appears that Phillips Petroleum Co. was by far the leader, accounting for 457,445,147 thousand cubic feet.

The next company, Stanolind Oil & Gas Co., a subsidiary of the Standard Oil Company of Indiana, sold 202,562,446 thousand cubic feet.

The third company, Humble Oil & Refining Co., a subsidiary of the Standard Oil Company of New Jersey, sold 175,975,859 thousand cubic feet.

The fourth company, Magnolia Petroleum Co., a subsidiary of Socony-Vacuum Oil Co., sold 157,553,211 thousand cubic feet.

The fifth company was the Shell Oil Co., with sales of 156,356,923 thousand cubic feet.

In short, these 5 companies alone sold in this period 27.07 percent of all the natural gas sold by nontransporting producers to the interstate pipeline companies.

There then appear such extensive and prosperous activities as those undertaken by the Gulf Oil Co., the Atlantic Refining Co., Skelly Oil Co., the Texas Co., Sun Ray Oil Corp., Union Oil Company of California, Continental Oil Co., Pure Oil Co., Tidewater Associated Oil Co., and Sinclair Oil & Gas Co.

The conclusion has not been disputed and cannot be disputed that in this period 29 producers, mostly large oil companies, sold 63.24 percent of such natural gas.

It was because of facts such as these and because of the complaints arising as to hardships which might be placed upon small producers under Federal regulation that I introduced H. R. 4924, which would exempt approximately 96 percent of the natural-gas producers who sell less than 2 billion cubic feet a year.

It is clearly established that such a classification is entirely legal.

I wish to cite the following cases in support of that legal proposal: *Wilson* v. *New* (243 U. S. 332), and *Chicago, Rock Island & Pacific Railway Co.* v. *United States* (284 U. S. 80, 93).

Moreover, I do not think it will be disputed that the elimination of this large body of the very small independent producers would remove a most substantial administrative burden from the Federal Power Commission. Incidentally, this has been and undoubtedly will be used as an argument in favor of the overall exemption provided by H. R. 6645.

Furthermore, I do not think anyone can study these statistics without coming to the positive conclusion that these thousands of small producers could not, under any stretch of the imagination, affect or control the price of natural gas in interstate commerce.

It is my intention to offer the substance of this bill as an amendment at the proper point in the consideration of H. R. 6645 if the bill is brought up for consideration on the floor.

I hope that this brief explanation of the reasons justifying such an amendment will result in the support of all those who are interested in a realistic and effective regulation of the flow of natural gas in interstate commerce, which is clearly a congressional responsibility.

The Outrage on General Taxpayers of Federal Reclamation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH W. GWINN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 26, 1955

Mr. GWINN. Mr. Speaker, I dare say that the great majority of the Members of this House has no idea of the scandalous operations of the Bureau of Reclamation. They have been going on for 50 years. What is more, it appears that the Members from the central West and the East and South and some from the far West have been dead asleep. We hope this is not true of the present Members. While they slept in the past the Government took, mostly from their States, over $2,175,000,000 as of June 30, 1952. And they are now committed to at least $1,588,000,000 more, a total of at least $3,745,000,000, and maybe double that. No one can tell.

For example, a vast new project before Congress is called the upper Colorado storage project. Just to get started the Bureau wants an authorization of $1,093,000,000. To complete it will take 25 years or more. Goodness knows what the figure will be for our grandchildren to pay. No one can even guess that. The Bureau itself does not know and says so. Of course, Congress does not know. Yet by the logrolling, back-scratching game of politics the taxpayers have been committed for years and years to come.

The Hoover Commission task force pointed out that "the Federal Government has used water resources and power development projects, which should be undertaken exclusively for economic purposes, to accomplish indirect social and political ends. Instead of being undertaken and operated for the purposes stated, Federal water resource development projects have been used in some instances to promote collateral objectives." The Hoover task force "found that project costs are frequently underestimated, that benefits advanced by various Federal agencies as justification for projects are often exaggerated, that unsupported and unsupportable claims are made for indirect benefits. In some instances projects have been recommended and authorized without economic justification of any kind. Overestimation of irrigation benefits has reached a point where the Bureau of Reclamation has claimed justification for the expenditure of $1,000 to $2,000 an acre for the development of irrigated land which, on the basis of information available to the task force, would not be worth more than $200 an acre."

According to the Bureau of Reclamation reports, out of 34 irrigation projects, 31 would produce more hay and grass to produce more dairy products, viz, butter, cheese, and dried milk. Then more tax dollars will be required to buy them up and put them in storage. They may mold and waste away. Twenty-seven out of thirty-four projects would grow more grass and hay to grow more sheep to produce more surplus wool to put in storage at more taxpayer expense. The cost to the Nation's taxpayers will be as high as $5,000 an acre to bring water to the hay and grass fields. The land reclaimed would not be worth $200 per acre. No hay and grass fields are worth more than that. Yet, W. A. Dexheimer, Commissioner of the Bureau of Reclamation, represents to Congress and the taxpayers that these reclamation projects will not add to surplus agricultural products in his press release of May 13, 1955, when he says "most products of western irrigated farms are not under price support or acreage control and are not surplus."

This illustrates how characteristic and common misrepresentation is when bureaucrats engage in improper functions of government. And all this is an improper function of limited constitutional government. It becomes even ridiculous. For example, the Department of Agriculture calls for lower price supports for certain agricultural products we cannot use. It orders a decrease in acreage allotments so as to reduce unneeded production and the burden on taxpayers. Another bureau of Government, the Bureau of Reclamation, under Mr. Dexheimer, calls for spending billions of the same taxpayers' dollars for more Western mountainous desert acres which will grow more farm surplus products, viz, butter, milk, and wool, to buy up and put in storage. None of it makes any sense to taxpayers. But the taxpayers are unorganized. Besides they do not know about these things. Only those who get the benefits are organized and they trade their votes for these benefits. It is as bad as a shell game. It is worse because it is all so vast even Congressmen on the ground cannot fathom it.

When politicians support a project like the upper Colorado River boondoggle, they must be thinking of votes. Such a project means enormous gifts of money to a few persons; it means brief boom times for a few desert towns; it means that craftsmen and laborers must be transported at great public expense to remote areas of the mountain west; it means some wild spending; and most of all it means a successful raid on the Treasury of the United States. There is an unbroken record of "no returns" to the Federal taxpayers. The payments made by the few projects that have nearly paid out or are now paying on account are not paid back to reduce the advances by taxpayers but are paid out again for new projects. A Government that will wrongly take private property to do special favors for a group of voters in return for their votes will, of course, resort to misrepresentations and deceit to develop some more of the same. Not one of these irrigation projects started since 1902 has paid for itself.

The Bureau of Reclamation recently issued to the House Interior Committee a table purporting to show how much each State would receive back for services, materials, and equipment for the construction of the upper Colorado River project. For instance, my own State of New York, according to the Bureau,

would benefit to the extent of $77,398,000 for possibly some machinery orders. How the Bureau guesses the amount of benefits does not appear. The phony part, the deceitful part, is the careful omission of the cost to my State and to all taxpayers in each State for the whole project. For instance, New York taxpayers in order to get back $77,398,000 in business orders would be assessed $493 million as their share of the $4 billion subsidy necessary to complete the project, according to the Council of State Chambers of Commerce bulletin No. 134, June 1955. Its net contribution to Rocky Mountain farmlands would be $416,202,000. How the other States would fare is as follows:

State	Amount Bureau says it will receive	Cost to taxpayers
Arizona	$37,036,000	$20,400,000
Alabama	7,025,000	46,000,000
Arkansas	2,145,000	27,200,000
California	125,248,000	372,800,000
Colorado	47,981,000	36,400,000
Connecticut	15,181,000	69,600,000
Delaware	1,429,000	14,800,000
District of Columbia	774,000	
Florida	2,797,000	67,600,000
Georgia	8,157,000	61,200,000
Idaho	5,963,000	13,600,000
Illinois	53,463,000	276,000,000
Indiana	23,815,000	102,400,000
Iowa	5,357,000	62,000,000
Kansas	10,270,000	52,400,000
Kentucky	5,953,000	50,800,000
Louisiana	5,536,000	53,600,000
Maine	3,452,000	18,800,000
Maryland	9,108,000	102,400,000
Massachusetts	26,970,000	127,600,000
Michigan	41,556,000	196,400,000
Minnesota	8,157,000	69,600,000
Mississippi	2,382,000	26,000,000
Missouri	12,980,000	100,000,000
Montana	4,275,000	16,000,000
Nebraska	6,547,000	34,000,000
Nevada	4,667,000	6,800,000
New Hampshire	2,441,000	12,000,000
New Jersey	33,400,000	144,000,000
New Mexico	17,006,000	15,200,000
New York	77,398,000	433,600,000
North Carolina	13,158,000	66,800,000
North Dakota	1,403,000	12,000,000
Ohio	50,844,000	236,000,000
Oklahoma	7,809,000	44,800,000
Oregon	9,847,000	44,000,000
Pennsylvania	55,549,000	277,600,000
Rhode Island	5,240,000	20,800,000
South Carolina	6,370,000	34,400,000
South Dakota	2,056,000	13,200,000
Tennessee	7,681,000	55,600,000
Texas	34,575,000	194,400,000
Utah	61,716,000	16,000,000
Vermont	1,191,000	7,600,000
Virginia	8,395,000	67,600,000
Washington	14,631,000	68,400,000
West Virginia	5,299,000	35,600,000
Wisconsin	18,100,000	88,000,000
Wyoming	10,719,000	8,000,000

When the Bureau gets through with this upper Colorado River project it has a list of 269 additional projects it hopes to build in the future. The Bureau regards itself as permanently in the business of "the investigation of water resources of the West is (as) a continuous process." It has no intention that the taxpayers will ever get their money back.

If the taxpayers are going to remain so dumb as to let their Government stay in this kind of business we must expect a repetition of the past. For example, the Bureau of Reclamation admitted that on the Colorado-Big Thompson project after they got the water canals all built the water froze up and would not run. The project had to be scrapped or else cement covers had to be put on miles of canals in the frozen mountains to keep the water from freezing. Congress could not be made to look ridiculous so it appropriated $4,150,000 to try to salvage the whole project from the ice. The additional cost not now contemplated for the Frying Pan-Arkansas project will be more than $64 million when this has to be done, according to engineers' testimony before the House Interior Committee. No one can expect the taxpayers to get back a cent from such crazy schemes. They have not done so in the last 50 years. There is less reason to expect it in the next 50.

To make the picture complete a maximum of only 6 million acres could possibly be irrigated and reclaimed in the desert country by the year 1975, according to the Bureau's program. According to the Department of Agriculture that would be a little over one-half of 1 percent of the present total land in farms now in use. To reclaim western arid lands costs from 20 to 50 times that of draining and clearing ordinary farmlands in the humid areas with plenty of annual water fall. There are 20 million acres of fine crop land available when needed. Besides that, they are located much nearer the big city markets.

Congress may commit a great asset—water for four States—to grow forage crops for dairy cows and wool on sheep's backs in the mountainous uplands of the Rockies. Former Governor Miller, of Wyoming, Chairman, Natural Resources Task Force, First Hoover Commission, stated that every thousand gallons of water in this area would grow 10 cents' worth of such crops:

It could be used to produce $5 worth of industrial products.

And of course it should be preserved for that if not necessary for human consumption. Adm. Ben Moreel, Chairman of the Task Force on Water Resources and Power, said that our precious water resource "should be committed sparingly in order to retain the maximum degree of flexibility in our rapidly changing future economy."

The answer to the reclamation business is too obvious. Yet a governor of a State and the Congressmen in that State may not be reelected unless they continue to whoop it up for more and more of the same old reclamation and electric power dam projects. The Governor of Wyoming wrote asking me and other Congressmen to support the upper Colorado River project. My reply follows:

JULY 8, 1955.

Hon. MILWARD L. SIMPSON,
Governor of Wyoming,
Executive Department,
Cheyenne, Wyo.

DEAR GOVERNOR SIMPSON: Your letter of June 10 to me indicates that the enclosed Denver Post editorial of May 10 adequately states the feelings of the majority of the people in Wyoming favoring the Colorado River storage project and participating projects. It may take more presently unascertainable billions from the taxpayers. But, Governor, the majority, whoever they are, now turn out to be dead wrong on nearly all reclamation projects for the last 50 years. Of the earlier irrigation projects a very few were economically feasible. The cost per acre was low, the land was fertile, the growing season long, and high-value crops such as melons, grapes, beans, celery, tomatoes, asparagus, etc., have been grown as in the Central Valley project of California.

But in this Colorado project the Congress is being asked to provide funds to irrigate lands in the mountainous uplands, at altitudes between 5,000 and 7,500 feet. At these altitudes, as you well know, the winters are long and cold and the summer growing season short. The crops are mostly grass and hay which is of very low value, and it frosts nearly the year round.

Upper Colorado project construction costs for the hydroelectric projects per kilowatt capacity are almost 5 times higher than Hoover Dam and 6 times that of the Grand Coulee. In terms of cost per kilowatt-hour, it ranges from 4 to 6 times that of the existing hydro-electric dams. It would be cheaper to generate the power from the greatest coal deposits in the world, located in the upper Colorado region including your own State. Surely the upper Colorado is the worst possible project for the development of hydroelectric power.

The Government estimates of cost for reclamation projects has been so uniformly wrong as to indicate a deliberate intent to deceive the Congress in these undertakings. According to their own testimony before the Subcommittee To Study Civil Works, 82d Congress, 2d session, House Committee print No. 21, page 17, the Bureau of Reclamation admitted that on the basis of its present authorized construction program, actual construction costs run about 106 percent above the estimated costs prepared.

The bills call for an expenditure of $1,658,460,000. The total interest charges that will have to be absorbed by the United States taxpayer will amount to $1,153 million according to Mr. C. W. Crosthwait, acting Commissioner of the Bureau of Reclamation. Isn't it true, then, that the actual estimated cost at the moment is $2,811,460,000? But on the record of performance for the Federal agencies for over 50 years we must assume that estimates are deceptive and that the actual cost of the upper Colorado project will be 106 percent higher, making an ultimate cost of at least twice $2,811,460,000 or $5,622,920,000. That is $140 for every American family plus the deficits in operation plus the exemption of taxes on that capital which would otherwise be in private business which amounts to more billions the general taxpayers must pay because the upper Colorado projects are made tax exempt.

In the larger projects like this the deceptions are the most shocking. For example, the total estimated cost for the Missouri Basin project as originally proposed was $1,257,645,700. Some 10 years later, as set forth in the hearings before the House Appropriations Subcommittee, 83d Congress, 2d session, "Interior Department Appropriations for 1955" the estimate of cost had risen to $5,449,827,000 which was an increase of $4,192,181,300 or 333 percent. Federal agencies repeat such mistakes so regularly that lack of plain honesty is the only conclusion possible. They fool one Congress, then a new project comes before a new Congress and the same type of deception is worked over and over again.

Such is the evidence of political irresponsibility, logrolling, and buying of votes is common to all Government projects that go beyond the legitimate functioning of government. Proper government must always be defensive or protective in character. Then it can be and generally is honest. When it goes beyond that it is always dishonest and corrupt in its purposes and its means of carrying it out. To illustrate, the Hoover Commission task force on water resources and power in its report, June 15, 1955, stated that it "has been forced to the rather depressing conclusion in view of the general competence and quality of performance of the Federal agencies, that most of the weaknesses revealed by its studies are inherent in bureaucracy."

The cost of the three projects in your State on a new lands basis, including the interest on the bonds, paid not by the people to be benefited but by the general taxpayers in far distant States, is as follows: Costs of irrigation for the LaBarge project is estimated at $472 per acre. Costs of irrigation for the Seedskadee and Lyman projects, respectively, is estimated at $861 and $1,755 per acre. Since the Department's record for deliberately underestimating costs is 106 percent for 50 years, you must more than double the estimates. So on the basis of experience the costs for irrigating the 3 projects will be nearer $944, $1,722, and $3,510 per acre, respectively. In view of this record, how can you logically ask me to support these projects for new land when our most valuable farmlands for hay, grass, and silage do not exceed $250 per acre?

Stack all this alongside of the mountains of surplus agricultural products we already have: the $8 billion taken from the people to pay growers of butter, milk, wool, corn, wheat, cotton, peanuts, tobacco, etc., because there are too many acres under cultivation.

The ridiculous consequences of our own socialistic management of our economy now requires the Secretary of Agriculture to propose cuts of acreage of various crops by possibly 20 million acres. Wheat acreage has been cut from 78 to 55 million acres.

So when and if our needs for additional crop acreage increases in future years, this acreage and many other millions of unused acres can be brought into cultivation. Besides, according to the Department of Agriculture and the American Society of Agricultural Engineers, there are over 20 million acres of fertile wet or swampland nearer the markets that can be drained at less than $100 an acre without continuing annual charges for irrigation.

Surely the time has come to stop this uneconomic and immoral game of groups organizing to get theirs from the public feed trough because others are getting theirs. To do that the States legislatures must reassert the constitutional limitations on the Congress and limit its taxing and spending powers. Government must be reconfined to its true function of defending American life and property instead of managing them.

Sincerely yours,

RALPH W. GWINN.

Description of 23 Relief Portraits and 2 Paintings in the Redecorated Chamber of the United States House of Representatives

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLYDE DOYLE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 26, 1955

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, having been heretofore granted unanimous consent so to do, I am pleased to present for the information and identification of all of my colleagues and any others who read the same, the instructive information about the 23 relief portraits of historical characters in the history of legislation and lawgiving, which relief portraits occupy valuable space upon the walls above the gallery of the House of Representatives.

I also include similar information as to the two large paintings of George Washington and General Lafayette.

Some of the reasons which caused me to make the necessary inquiry and study to obtain the information and data about these relief portraits on which we look each day, and the only two paintings which occupy our working Chamber, are as follows:

First. The lettering underneath each relief portrait giving the name of the historical legislator or lawgiver is so small and indistinct that as we sit on the floor of the House, many Members cannot readily read the name of each relief portrait because they are so far away from us.

Second. I have had many inquiries about said relief portraits and have been asked many times as to who each of these historical persons are as relates to the legislative processes. I frankly state that I have not heretofore been able to satisfactorily answer such inquiries. Furthermore, I know that many Members have been similarly situated in being asked that same question.

Third. For myself, I have been sure that it would add to my information and inspiration as a Member of this great legislative body if I did know at whom I was looking when I daily sit in this great legislative body and look at these 23 portraits which appear in the marble high over the gallery doors and surrounding gallery walls of the Chamber of our House of Representatives, wherein I recognize the great privilege and honor I have of now serving my ninth year.

Fourth. I felt it would be of considerable interest to a great many American citizens and students of Congress to have this necessarily brief word picture of what is carried upon the walls of the House of Representatives.

These relief portraits were placed in the Chamber of the House of Representatives during congressional recess of the years 1949–50. You will remember, Mr. Speaker, that when we returned to our daily duties in January 1951, there were many interesting questions and many queries raised by some Members of the House in their speaking about it as to why these particular relief portraits occupied the valuable and significant space on the walls of the House of Representatives of the United States of America. Furthermore, and not least of all, queries were made by some Members of the House as to why so many of these relief portraits were those of historical characters of ancient times and from foreign nations. Well, Mr. Speaker, the text of the information I herein set forth, which was furnished me upon request by the Library of Congress, will give you some data on these relief portraits. I hope this data will not only prove of interest but of real value and assistance to Members and to their many friends who make inquiry on the subject. But before I do that, Mr. Speaker, I am sure we are all interested in that magnificent, large painting of George Washington which honors the wall of the Chamber at floor level just to your right as you stand in the Speaker's rostrum facing the membership of the House. It was painted by John Vanderlyn and was acquired by the House of Representatives in 1834 for the total sum of $2,500, by virtue of House resolutions in 1832 and 1834. The magnificent, large painting of General Lafayette was painted by the distinguished artist, Ary Scheffer, which honors the walls of the Chamber just to your left as you stand in the rostrum and was made a gift to the House of Representatives by the artist. These two paintings are the only paintings gracing the walls of the Chamber of the House of Representatives. Neither are there photographs or other paintings within the Chamber itself but in the private entrance hallway to the Chamber, which is largely limited to use by Members, are the large paintings of each of the distinguished Speakers in the history of the House of Representatives.

Mr. Speaker, behind your chair rests the flag of the United States of America, which is so beautifully draped. It is a daily inspiration to us Members as we sit in our respective places and listen to your scholarly, able, and fair parliamentary rulings and decision.

Mr. Speaker, because I am herewith endeavoring to make at least a simple word picture of the decorations of what is on the walls of the House and in the Chamber of the House itself, in addition to our seats and the 4 large mahogany tables, 2 of which are on each side of the political aisle, I herewith include a part of the text describing the mace, which rests to your right as you sit or stand facing the Members which you so ably govern in their parliamentary and legislative problems and procedures.

The mace of the House of Representatives is, aside from the flag, the only visible symbol of Federal Government authority. It has no counterpart in the United States Senate, none in the Supreme Court. It is as old as the Government itself, having been provided for in a resolution adopted by the House during the First Congress in 1789. Ever since it has served as the active symbol of authority of the Sergeant at Arms, who is charged with the duty of preserving order on the floor of the House.

The first mace used by the House was destroyed by fire when a British Army burned the Capitol in 1814. Thereafter a mace of painted wood did service until 1841, when the present mace—a fine example of the silversmith's art—was made by William Adams of New York in reproduction of the original. It is 46 inches in height and consists of a bundle of 13 ebony rods, representing the Original Thirteen States of the Union, bound together with a band of silver in imitation of the fasces originally carried by the lictors in ancient Rome. From the center of this bundle of rods protrudes the stem of a silver globe which is 4½ inches in diameter. The globe is surmounted by an eagle of solid silver with outspread wings.

When the House is called to order each day a Deputy Sergeant at Arms places the mace on a cylindrical pedestal of polished green marble at the right of the Speaker's desk. From the moment the Speaker raps for order it begins to play a silent but important part in the day's proceedings. While the House itself remains in session the mace is kept in position at the Speaker's right, but is removed to a lower pedestal by the desk of the Sergeant at Arms when the House

resolves itself into Committee of the Whole. Members can thus tell by a glance at the position of the mace whether the House is in session or in Committee. This is significant because it requires 218 Members to constitute a quorum for business in the House and only 100 when the House is sitting as a Committee of the Whole.

The cost of the mace was very small, considering its intrinsic and historic value. An interesting item in the statement of the expenditure of the contingent fund of the House of Representatives from December 1, 1841, to December 1, 1842, reads, "William Adams, a mace for hall, H. R., $400." Today its value, real and sentimental, far exceeds that figure.

It was originally proposed, following English parliamentary usage, that the mace should be placed on the Clerk's table during sittings of the House and under it when the House should be in Committee of the Whole. The proposal however, was rejected by the House, which adopted the present far more impressive practice, under which the great symbol is kept always in view of Members on the floor of the Chamber and of the ever-changing groups of visitors in the galleries.

OF ANCIENT ORIGIN

The mace is of ancient origin, deriving from the fasces of Roman antiquity. When the First Empire was overthrown and the Roman Republic was established, the fasces assumed a new civic dignity.

MACE OF THE HOUSE OF COMMONS

The mace now borne before the Speaker in the House of Commons was made in 1649 by Thomas Maundy for the Commonwealth Government of Oliver Cromwell, altered, however, in insignia. What became of the mace used prior to the Cromwell period is not recorded.

In 1880 the Speaker undertook to quell an incipient fight between two Representatives, William A. J. Sparks, of Illinois, and J. B. Weaver, of Iowa, when they used such menacing words and threatening actions toward each other that many Members rose to separate them. Whereupon the Sergeant at Arms moved about the House with his mace of office and order was restored.

HISTORIC MACES

There are two historic maces in America which antedate the mace of the House of Representatives, indeed antedate the organization of the Federal Government. The older of these, an ornate specimen, was presented to the Corporation of Norfolk, Va., in 1753. The other is still in honorable service in the House of Representatives of South Carolina and was made in London in 1756 at a cost of 90 guineas.

Mr. Speaker, while I do not herein name or identify or place each of the great seals of each of the States of the United States which surround the lower ceiling of the House, I do state that the great seal of the United States of America is in position almost directly above you as you stand facing the Members, while to the left and right thereof are the seals of the Territories of Hawaii and Alaska, and then extending further to the left and the right respectfully the beautiful seals of the States themselves.

Following is the identification of the relief portraits referred to: To the east of the Speaker's rostrum as the Speaker faces the membership: First, Jefferson; second, Napoleon; third, Blackstone; fourth, Grotius; fifth, Simon de Montfort; sixth, Innocent III; seventh, Suleiman; eighth, Maimonides; ninth, Gaius; tenth, Papinian; and eleventh, Solon.

To the west of the Speaker's rostrum as the Speaker faces the membership of the House: First, Mason; second, Pothier; third, Colbert; fourth, Edward I; fifth, Alphonso I; sixth, Gregory IX; seventh, St. Louis; eighth, Justinian; ninth; Tribonian; tenth, Lycurgus; and eleventh, Hammurabi. In the center of the north wall is Moses.

A brief biographical sketch of each of the relief portraits is as follows:

RELIEF PORTRAITS IN THE REDECORATED CHAMBER OF THE UNITED STATES HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

The redecorated Chamber of the United States House of Representatives features a series of medallions portraying 23 historic characters. These individuals were chosen as representative of the great lawgivers of the world who contributed to the American law system. An inscription that accompanies them, appearing high above and behind the Speaker's desk, reads:

"Let us develop the resources of our land, call forth its powers, build up its institutions, promote all its great interests and see whether we also in our day may not accomplish something worthy to be remembered."—Daniel Webster.

This is the only quotation or verse or saying on the walls of the House.

The subjects of these relief portraits were selected by the Architect of the Capitol, after consultation with many authorities and approval by the Special House Roof and Chamber Committee. A biographic sketch of each of these great men is attached hereto.

The statements given above and the list of subjects have been provided by the office of the Architect of the Capitol. The sketches summarize salient—and apropos—material found in the Encyclopedia Britannica (1942 edition) and the first and second editions of the Columbia Encyclopedia. Articles in these sources were found to complement one another and material from both sources was used in every sketch, with the exception of that of Pothier, who is not listed in the Columbia Encyclopedia.

The Architect of the Capitol has released a statement that serves to explain why each man was chosen for inclusion in this group. It is attached as an appendix to this report. Some of the material therein does not appear in the following biographical sketches because it does not appear in the sources used in their preparation.

HAMMURABI—FLOURISHED CIRCA 2100 B. C.

Hammurabi was a great king of Babylonia. His military and political achievement of establishing a central and efficient Government at Babylon is regarded as one of the most far-reaching events in ancient history. Henceforth Babylon was to be the political and intellectual center of West Asiatic history right down to the Christian era.

Hammurabi's name is particularly associated with the great law code which he was declared to have received from the sun god, Shamash. This is one of the greatest of ancient codes. Promulgated for the use of the courts throughout the empire, it is particularly strong in its prohibition of defrauding the helpless. It is genuinely humanitarian, although one savage feature is the retributive nature of punishment, which follows "an eye for an eye" literally.

MOSES—FLOURISHED CIRCA 1400 B. C.

The lawgiver of Israel and the founder of her nationality and religion, Moses stands out as one of the greatest figures in history.

From his infancy, according to Exodus, there were constant signs of God's selection of Moses to lead His people. His leadership in the Exodus and his prominence in the great covenant at Sinai are well known and documented. It was he who welded into one people the various kindred tribes under his leadership. But further details must be a matter of conjecture.

Not only the Ten Commandments, but the whole Mosaic Law as found in Leviticus, Exodus, and Deuteronomy are ascribed to Moses. However, close study of the Bible makes it difficult if not impossible to accept the tradition which accredits to him every detail of Israel's legal and cultural institutions. Even the earliest code of laws in the Bible (Ex. xxi–xxiii) is simply a local and national form of the civil law common to Babylonia, Assyria and the Hittites and was probably adopted by Israel after the settlement in Canaan.

LYCURGUS—FLOURISHED 7TH-9TH CENTURY B. C.

Lycurgus is the reputed founder of the Spartan Constitution. According to a standard hypothesis he lived in the seventh century B. C. He may be a mythical figure.

Tradition represents Lycurgus as finding Sparta the prey of disunion, weakness and lawlessness, and leaving her united, strong and subject to the most stable government which the Greek world had ever seen. To him we may attribute the unification of the several component parts of the State, the strict military organization and training which soon made the Spartan hoplite the best soldier in Greece, and above all the elaborate and rigid system of education.

His subordination of the individual citizen to the all-powerful state has been the model of subsequent police states, but it has yet no parallel in the history of the world.

SOLON—CIRCA 635–559 B. C.

Solon was an Athenian statesman and lawgiver. His amatory poems and patriotic and didactic verse won him inclusion among the Seven Sages. He led the Athenians in a victorious military campaign. But his enduring renown rests on his economic and constitutional reforms.

Solon was elected archon at a time when the nobles held unchecked all the governing power of Athens and the new capitalists virtually owned the entire peasant class. Receiving the unlimited powers of a dictator, he annulled all mortgages and debts, put narrow limits on the amount of land anyone could add to his holdings, outlawed contracts in which a person's liberty was pledged, and put limits on the amount one might spend on various functions, such as funerals. Other state controls included those over exports, education, the use and sinking of wells, bee-farming, the planting of olives and figs, and the cutting down of olive trees.

Solon's new constitution laid the foundations of the Athenian democracy and paved the way for its later developments. The assembly was thrown open to all freemen. He erected a whole new law code that tends toward democratization. His reforms were characterized everywhere by a moderation that made him the model of Greek statesmen.

GAIUS—CIRCA 110–180 A. D.

Gaius was a celebrated Roman jurist of the second century A. D. Of his personal history very little is known. Indeed, it is impossible to discover even his full name, Gaius being merely the given name.

Gaius is remembered for his institutes, which contributed materially to our knowledge of early Roman law, and on which much

of Justinian's work is based. The Emperor Valentinian named him, along with Papinian, Ulpian, Modestinus, and Paulus, as one of the five jurists whose opinions were to be followed by judicial officers in deciding cases.

Besides the institutes, which are a complete exposition of the elements of Roman law, Gaius was the author of several other works. His interest in the antiquities of Roman law makes his work valuable to the historian of early institutions.

PAPINIAN—DIED A. D. 212

Papinian (Aemilius Papinianus) is generally considered to be the greatest of Roman jurists. He was magister libellorum and afterwards Praetorian perfect under the emperor Septimius Severus. An intimate friend of the emperor, Papinian accompanied him to Britain and became the guardian of his two sons. In 212, one of these brothers, after committing fratricide, had Papinian put to death.

Papinian was noted not only as a jurist of wide learning and great comprehension, but as a stern moralist. His works are known to us through the numerous quotations of them in the Theodosian Code and in the Digest of the Corpus Juris Civilis (see Justinian). The constitution of Theodosius II and Valentinian named him the principal of 5 jurists set up as authorities to be cited in future decisions of the courts (see Gaius).

JUSTINIAN—A. D. 483–565

Justinian I (Flavius Anicius Justinianus), surnamed The Great, is the most famous of all emperors of the Eastern Roman (Byzantine) Empire. He recovered Africa from the Vandals and Italy from the Ostrogoths, but met with less success in fighting Persia. He insisted upon the supremacy of the emperor over the Church, not only in matters of organization, but also in matters of dogma. He engaged in various important controversies about dogma, but never succeeded in creating unity.

It is as a legislator and organizer of the law that Justinian's name is most familiar to the modern world. His greatest accomplishment was the compilation of the Corpus Juris Civilis, which has influenced all subsequent legal history. Finding the law of the Roman empire in great confusion, he ordered the preparation of this work—consisting of the Codex Constitutionum (a collection and revision of the imperial constitutions from the time of Hadrian), the Digesta or Pandectae (a revision, abridgment and rearrangement of the classical jurists), the Institutiones (a handbook for students), and the Novellae (the new laws instituted by Justinian). The Corpus was not a codification but a consolidation. Thus regarded, Justinian's work may appear to entitle him and Tribonian to much less credit than they have received.

TRIBONIAN—DIED A. D. 545

Tribonian (Tribonianus) was a famous jurist and chief legal minister to the emperor Justinian. Under the command of Justinian, he directed the compilation of the Corpus Juris Civilis, the most important collection of Roman law and the basic document of modern civil law.

It is not possible to determine exactly what Tribonian himself contributed to the Corpus Juris Civilis. In all likelihood he wrote a large part out of his encyclopedic knowledge of Roman law. Of the four parts of the Corpus, he was the most important editor of the Digest, Institutes, and Codex. Of the Novels (the new laws) he must have been a principal author, as chief legal minister. Tribonian was probably not a juridical thinker, like the great five jurists (see Gaius), but his knowledge of Roman law and his somewhat pedantic erudition was absolutely essential to the great project that he directed.

MAIMONIDES—A. D. 1135–1204

Maimonides (Rabbi Moses Ben Maimon, or Rambam) was born in Spain and migrated to Cairo, Egypt, where he became the greatest of all medieval Jewish scholars. He produced a great commentary on the six orders of Mishna[1] (where he was the first to enumerate the fundamental dogmas of Judaism), a collection of discourses, a work on logic, a treatise on the calendar, several medical books—including an important work on hygiene—and the great philosophical work, Moreh Nebukim (Guide for the Perplexed). In the latter work he explains the esoteric ideas in the Bible, formulates a proof of the existence of God, expounds the principle of creation, and elucidates baffling metaphysical and religious problems. The work has dominated Jewish thought and exerted a profound influence upon Christian and Arabian thinkers.

The greatest scholastic work of this savant-physician-philosopher was the Mishna Torah, a classified compendium of the Jewish law. This attempt to organize and systematize the vast mass of Jewish oral law became a reference book for laymen as well as rabbis and judges.

GREGORY IX—A. D. 1145–1241

The papacy of Gregory IX (Ungolino Conti de Segni) was largely devoted to hostilities against Frederick II, Emperor of the Holy Roman Empire. Gregory systematized the Medieval Inquisition. His zeal for the extirpation of heresy made him generally disliked. The people of Rome, disapproving his temporal power, exiled him for a part of his reign. He died as Frederick was invading the Papal States.

Gregory ordered the condensing of five compilations of decretals[2] into a single collection. The editor, Raymond of Pennaforte, did not attempt any original work and the Pope had no idea of codifying the whole of canon law. However, the collection was an important step toward codifying canon law.

INNOCENT III—CIRCA A. D. 1161–1216

Innocent III (Lotario de' Conti de Segni) was elected Pope at the age of 37. The effective assertion of world power is the characteristic feature of his pontificate. Working from a theory that since things of the spirit take preeminence over things of the body, and since the church rules the spirit and earthly monarchs rule the body, earthly monarchs must be in all things in subjection to the church. Innocent effectively exercised his ideal that the Pope is the political ruler of the world.

Innocent's exalted ambitions were eventually their own undoing, and had the effect of setting almost every resolute Christian prince automatically against the church. The triumph of his pontificate was the fourth Lateran council (1215), a great assembly of States that did little more than listen to and endorse the decretals read by the Pope.

The Pope's interest in law was active: he constantly held court, with a good name for impartiality. He instituted ecclesiastical reforms, centralizing the administration at Rome and his authority within the church exceeded that of his predecessors. Innocent is remembered for his abrogation of the Magna Carta. Supporting King John, against the barons who demanded the great document, Innocent declared it null as a forcibly exacted promise.

SIMON DE MONTFORT—CIRCA A. D. 1200–1265

Simon de Montfort, Earl of Leicester, spent the most active part of his life giving skillful and ruthless support to, then leading revolts against, Henry III of England. At the "Mad Parliament" of Oxford he headed the opposition. In civil war he became master of England, which was placed under a constitutional government. De Montfort was practically dictator after his victory on the battlefield at Lewes, in May 1264. However, he promulgated a scheme for establishing a thorough parliamentary control over the executive. He was killed in a resurgence of civil war.

Simon is an important figure in the history of legislative bodies because the great Parliament which he summoned in 1265 was a revolutionary assembly that established an important precedent—it contained not only knights from each shire to represent the rural nobility, but also representatives from the towns and boroughs. He left a heritage in the precedent he had established in championing the cause of the nobles and the people against the king and in calling the Parliament of 1265. For years after his death he was revered by the commons as a martyr.

LOUIS IX—A. D. 1214–1270

Saint Louis, or Louis IX, king of France, was an accomplished knight, physically strong, fearless in battle, heroic in adversity, of imperious temperament, unyielding when convinced of the justness of his cause, energetic and firm. He stands in history as the ideal king of the middle ages. Here was an ascetic who gave charity to over a hundred beggars daily, yet safeguarded the royal dignity by bringing them in at the back door—and by a courtly display greater than ever before in France. He made presents of haircloth shirts to his friends and went on two crusades. He was canonized in 1297. His reign was comparatively uneventful.

Louis was active in arbitration, adjusting territorial claims, imposing peace upon warring factions of his nobility, and setting succession disputes in neighboring countries. He simplified administration, improved the distribution of taxes, abolished the judicial duel, and sought to introduce uniform Roman law. The English barons (see Simon de Montfort) submitted their quarrels with Henry III to him, but his judgment in favor of the king led to civil war and the victory of Simon at Lewes. This judgment, known as the Mise of Amiens, was a flat denial of the parliamentary reforms known as the Provisions of Oxford. However, it expressly declared that the decision was not to invalidate the privileges and liberties of the realm of England, which had existed before the time of these provisions.

ALPHONSO X—A. D. 1221–1284

Alphonso the Wise, or Alfonso X, king of Castile and Leon, ruled from 1252 until he was deposed by the Cortes in 1282. He is perhaps the most interesting—though he was far from being the most capable—of the Spanish kings of the middle ages. As a ruler he was weak, unstable and obstinate and he ruined the economy of his lands while endeavoring to secure his election as emperor of the Holy Roman empire.

El Sabio (the Sage) is called the father of Castilian prose. Under his patronage and editorship a number of vast works were undertaken, including Las Siete partidas, the earliest known Spanish-vernacular chronicle, valuable compilations from Arabic sources such as the Alfonsine Tables in astronomy, an illustrated book of games, and one of the greatest collections of mediaeval poetry and music. Under his patronage the flow of Oriental culture into Western Europe was greatly accelerated.

Alphonso showed legislative capacity and a very commendable wish to provide his kingdoms with a code of laws and a consistent judicial system. He was largely responsible for the Siete partidas, a compilation of Roman and canon law which was promulgated by his grandson, and other

[1] The Mishna is the text of the oral law, in contradistinction to the scriptural, or written, law of the Jews.

[2] The decretals are papal decisions and decrees to be considered authoritative and binding in future decisions.

codes: The Fuero de las leyes or Fuero Real and an Espejo de Fueros.

EDWARD I—A. D. 1239–1307

Edward I, King of England, failed in the chief ambition of his life, the conquest of Scotland. (He did humiliate Scotland by removing the coronation stone of Scone to Westminster.) Yet, his conquest of Wales, his legislation, and his triumph over his barons, his ecclesiastics, and the greatest of French medieval kings indicates the strength and permanence of his work.

Edward is remembered for the developments in law and constitution that have caused him to be called the English Justinian. Before he became king he appropriated some of Simon de Montfort's ideals. The general effect of his work was to eliminate feudalism from public life. The Statutes of Westminster I and II formulated much unwritten law. The Statute of Mortmain was a landmark in his struggle with the church, resulting from his dislike of authority not emanating from himself. The Statute of Winchester established police and militia regulations. Westminster III, also called Quia emptores, prohibited subinfeudation.

Thus Edward brought within the formulated law the gains of a century of common law, supplementing them. He gave a tremendous impetus to the development of law and courts, and built up the central administration.

Some important developments were wrung from Edward against his will. The parliamentary constitution of England was established as the result of his convocation of the Model Parliament of 1295. "What touches all," ran Edward's writ of summons, "should be approved by all, and it is also clear that common dangers should be met by measures agreed upon in common." This action marks a tremendous forward step in the development of a powerful representative body. Two years later, the rising hostility of his subjects, barons, merchants, and clergy forced Edward to issue the confirmation of the charters granted by John and Henry III, including the Magna Charta.

SULEIMAN—A. D. 1494–1566

Suleiman, the Magnificent, was the most fortunate of Ottoman sultans. He lived during the most glorious period in the history of Islam and ruled without a worthy rival. He inherited a well-organized country, a disciplined army, and a full treasury. Although his campaigns were not always wisely and prudently planned, they added great territories to his realm. In his days Turkey became a first-rate seapower and attained the culminating point of her glory. Suleiman is remembered for his encouragement of learning and the arts. He wrote verses and it is from his time that historians date the rise of the occult influence of the harem on Turkish political development.

In Turkey, Suleiman is known as the Lawgiver. His claims to renown as a legislator rest mainly on his organization of the Ulema, or clerical (religious) class, in its hierarchical order. The judges belonged to this class, but all executive and administrative power remained outside it, in the hands of the military. Suleiman's administration was, relatively, one of the best of his time. His amelioration of the lot of his Christian subjects is not his least title to fame. However, his record of magnanimity was marred by the murder of his two sons, at the insistence of his favorite wife.

GROTIUS—A. D. 1583–1645

Hugo Grotius, or Huig van Groot, was a Dutch jurist and humanist. He strove vainly to reunite the Christian sects and the European countries. He wrote valuable works in theology, history and classical study, but his fame rests chiefly on the De jure belli et pacis, which he prepared in Paris after fleeing life imprisonment in his native country.

Concerning the law of war and peace, the De jure belli et pacis, is a systematic study of the bases and principles of positive natural law. Though not the first attempt in modern times to ascertain the principles of jurisprudence, it went far more fundamentally into the discussion than any one had done before. The work is startling in its originality and in the scope of its consideration of international law and international ethics. One of the great masterpieces of legal literature, it is usually considered to be the first definitive text on international law.

COLBERT—A. D. 1619–1683

Jean Baptiste Colbert was a statesman who did much for France. Nevertheless, his rule was a very bad example of overgovernment. He did not believe in popular liberty. The parlements and states-general received no support from him. The technicalities of justice he never allowed to interfere with his plans. He trafficked in public offices for profit.

Colbert became the chief power in the administration of Louis XIV, where he cleansed the financial administration ruthlessly. His ambitious scheme of encouragement of industry and trade involved subsidies, state planning and rigid control of every detail of production, including quality and price. Similar policies were applied to agriculture. His greatest and most lasting achievement was the establishment of the French Marine. (To supply oarsmen for his galleys, he required judges to sentence as many persons as possible; the convict, once chained to the bench, was seldom released at the expiration of his sentence. Colbert never thought of the long agony of those who filled his needs.) Colbert extended his scheme of paternalism to the arts and literature. His industry was colossal; he even found time for the improvement of the breed of horses.

Colbert reformed certain aspects of the legal administration and codified ordinances.

POTHIER—A. D. 1699–1772

Robert Joseph Pothier was a French judge and professor of law. He paid particular attention to the text of the Pandects, or Digests, of the Corpus Juris Civilis (see Justinian, Tribonium, etc.). His Pandectae Justinianae in novum ordinem digestae is a classic in the study of Roman law. He wrote many learned monographs on French law and much of his work was incorporated almost verbatim in the French Civil Code.

BLACKSTONE—A. D. 1723–80

The fame of Sir William Blackstone rests on his Commentaries on the Law of England. His career in Parliament, to which he was elected first in 1761, was somewhat inglorious, as he disliked attendance there. In the 10 years of his judgeship he administered the law satisfactorily but attained no special distinction. He inaugurated courses in English law at the British universities, which had previously confined themselves to Roman law.

The commentaries of Blackstone have been regarded as the most thorough treatment of the whole of English law ever produced by one man. Whether it is owing to its literary graces, or to its success in flattering the prejudices of the public to which it was addressed, the influence of the work has been extraordinary. It may be more correct to regard it as a handbook for laymen than as a legal treatise. Yet, it has been used as the standard textbook in English law for generations.

The fame of Blackstone is greatest in the United States, where the commentaries was, for many years, almost the only source of knowledge of English law.

MASON—A. D. 1725–92

George Mason exercised great influence in local and Virginia legislative bodies. As a member of the Virginia Convention, he drafted the Virginia constitution and the famous Bill of Rights, a radically democratic document which had great influence on American political institutions. This great work was extensively copied by other American States and had some influence on the French Declaration of the Rights of Man.

Mason was a member of the Federal Constitutional Convention at Philadelphia in 1787 and took an active part in drafting the Constitution. However, he objected to the large and indefinite powers given to Congress, the compromises on the tariff and slave-trade issues, and failure to include a bill of rights. He refused to sign the Constitution, and, with Patrick Henry, he led the fight in Virginia against its ratification. Failing in this, he suggested amendments, the substance of several of which was afterward embodied in the first 10 amendments—the Bill of Rights—to the American Constitution.

Mason believed that local government should be kept strong and central government weak; his democratic theories have had much influence in Southern and Western States.

NAPOLEON—A. D. 1769–1821

Napoleon I, Emperor of the French, was a spectacular military genius of unlimited ambition. One of the greatest conquerors history has ever known, he made France paramount in Europe, rearranged its map, and set his relatives upon its thrones.

In France, Napoleon consolidated the results of the Revolution and sought a new conservative balance by his reforms. He centralized the administration, established the Bank of France, inaugurated financial reforms, made peace with the church, and instituted legal reforms to pave the way for the Code Napoleon. His excessive centralization made the state supreme over the entire people—a system singularly favorable to statism.

The Code Napoleon, sometimes called the Code Civil, was the first code of French civil law. It embodies the private substantive law of France, fusing the preexisting Germanic and Roman civil law applied in France with additions resulting from the French Revolution. The code has been in force, as changed by legislative amendment, since it was first promulgated. Still in force in Belgium and Holland, it has served as a model for—and has exercised the greatest influence in—many other countries. The Spanish Civil Code was largely based on the Code Civil, as were the civil codes of most of the South American States, Quebec, and Louisiana.

JEFFERSON—A. D. 1743–1826

Thomas Jefferson is the outstanding apostle of American democracy and one of the greatest liberals of all time. He held a great range of public offices; he was prominent in many, and foremost member of several, of the most important deliberative and legislative bodies in American history. He is famous for many contributions to the American democratic system, as Governor of Virginia, member of the Continental Congresses, Minister to France, Secretary of State, Vice President, and President.

Jefferson was the chief inspirer and most ardent worker for reforms embodied in a revision of the laws of Virginia. These included the statute for religious freedom—the first law of its kind in Christendom—abolition of primogeniture, and the repeal of laws of entail. Here, he was the first American statesman to make education by the State a fundamental article of democratic faith. He gained his greatest fame as author of the Declaration of Independence. As Vice President and Presiding Officer of the Senate, he wrote the influential Manual of

Parliamentary Practice, which is still used in both Houses of Congress.

In Jefferson the Nation had a great scholar and philosopher, who was at the same time one of her most competent political managers—a leader with unlimited faith in the people. The ideas he advocated have become the very foundations of our Government. His importance as a maker of modern America is unequaled; it can hardly be overstated.

APPENDIX

RELIEF PORTRAITS IN MARBLE OVER HOUSE GALLERY DOORS

The relief portraits on the upper walls of the House Chamber are of men noted in history for the part they have played in the evolution of what has become American law. There has grown a great body of judicial tradition and a mass of legislation embodying the rules and standards by which the American people, regardless of State lines, are content to guide their lives.

The Colonists brought to this country the common law of England, its concepts of property, liberty, and justice, but they took pains to make themselves free of governmental tyranny. But though our law is mainly derived from the British system it also owes something to French law, and both of these great systems derive from Roman law, and the laws of earlier peoples.

These great lawgivers, in chronological order, are:

Hammurabi, the first King of Babylonia, reigned about 2067–2025 B. C.

The great law code bearing his name is recognized in legal literature as, perhaps, the earliest surviving, naturally characterized by its primitiveness.

Moses—circa 1571–1451 B. C.: Hebrew prophet and lawgiver. Amongst all lawgivers, founders of states, and teachers of mankind, none has excelled Moses, who transformed a horde of slaves and wanderers into a nation, disciplined a race, and breathed into it its character. To him is attributed the delivery of the Ten Commandments.

Lycurgus—circa 900 B. C.: Legislator, traditional author of laws and institutions of Sparta (by present standards a harsh code).

Solon—circa 594 B. C.: The great Athenian lawgiver, author of constitutional and legal reforms.

Gaius—circa A. D. 110–180: A celebrated Roman jurist, probably a native of the eastern empire. He was the author of numerous works on the civil law, the most noted being The Institutes.

Papinian—circa A. D. 200: A Roman, remarkable not only for his juridical genius, for his independence of judgment, lucidity, and firmness, but for his sense of right and morality by which he frequently rose above the barriers of national prejudices, and merited the highest veneration of succeeding centuries.

Justinian—A. D. 483–565: One of the most important events of the reign of this Byzantine Emperor was the publication of the Justinian Code, the body of the Roman law compiled and annotated, the most important of all monuments of jurisprudence.

Tribonian—circa A. D. 500–547: A Byzantine jurist, he was head of the commission which codified the laws under Justinian.

Maimonides—A. D. 1135–1204: Jewish philosopher of Cordova; he compiled a systematic exposition of the whole of Jewish law as contained in the Pentateuch and in Talmudic literature.

Gregory IX—circa A. D. 1147–1241: Author of a compilation of decretals on canon law; during a critical period he accomplished much in maintaining the remnants of Roman law.

Innocent III—A. D. 1161–1216: A profound student of canon and civil law, his accomplishments during a dark and critical period of human history were much the same as those of Gregory IX, preservation of the remnants of Roman law.

Simon de Montfort—A. D. 1200–1265: Celebrated English statesman, he originated the first appearance of the House of Commons of England.

St. Louis—A. D. 1214–1270: King of France, author of the Mise of Amiens.

Alphonso X, the Wise—A. D. 1221–1284: King of Leon and Castile, he was the author of the code Las Siete Partidas, the basis of Spanish jurisprudence.

Edward I—A. D. 1239–1307: King of England, founder of the parliamentary constitution of England and eliminator of feudalism from political life. "What touches all should be approved by all, and common dangers should be met by measures agreed upon in common."

Suleiman—A. D. 1494–1566: "The lawgiver," Sultan of Turkey, reformer and improver of civil and military codes. His amelioration of the lot of his Christian subjects is not his least title to fame.

Grotius—A. D. 1583–1645: Dutch statesman, advocate general of Holland and Zealand. Author of De Jure Belli et Pacis, first treatise on international law.

Colbert—A. D. 1619–1683: French statesman, codifier of the ordinances, reformer of the French legal system.

Pothier—A. D. 1699–1772: French jurist, author of Digest of the Pandects. He assembled and codified the remnants of Roman law and the prevalent French law.

Blackstone—A. D. 1723–1780: A celebrated English jurist, professor of common law at Oxford, his Commentaries on the Laws of England had considerable influence on the importation and adaptation of English common law in this country.

George Mason—A. D. 1726–1792: He drafted the Virginia Declaration of Rights, 1776, was a member of the Constitutional Convention in 1787, but led opposition to the ratification of the Constitution until the Bill of Rights was inserted in it.

Napoleon—A. D. 1769–1821: He appointed a commission which produced the Code Napoleon and saw that it was enforced. It is prevailing law even now in Louisiana, quite influential in Florida, New Mexico, and California.

Thomas Jefferson—A. D. 1743–1826: Third President of the United States, he was author of the Declaration of Independence and of the Statute of Virginia for religious freedom.

A Bill To Authorize Additional War Damage Payments in the Philippines

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE P. MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 26, 1955

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, in introducing this bill today, I am only concerned with what I believe to be the best interest of the United States. I believe that a strong Philippines is of vital importance to the United States in the Far East. Incontrovertibly this legislation will help greatly to strengthen Philippine economy.

Having been a member of the Insular Affairs Committee since the 79th Congress, it has always been my honor and privilege to have taken an active part on all legislation concerning the Philippines. I participated in the preparation and passage of the Philippine Rehabilitation Act of 1946. Indeed, in 1950, I introduced H. R. 7600 to implement the Philippine Rehabilitation Act of 1946. Hence my continued deep interest in legislation affecting the relationship of the United States and the Philippines. And I may add that it is my earnest belief, which I am sure will be shared by my colleagues who participated in that legislation, that the Philippine Rehabilitation Act and the Bell Trade Act constituted a compact between the United States and the Philippines as soon as the latter accepted the conditions therein required. So that when the Philippine Rehabilitation Act provided that the claims approved in excess of $500 should be paid up to a maximum of 75 percent, it is my best judgment that this is a commitment to the Philippine people which they took into account when they approved the amendment to their constitution and therefore the same must be met by us now.

Many have asked "why should the United States continue to assist the Philippines?" The Philippine Rehabilitation Act was enacted by Congress to fulfill promises made to the Philippine people during the dark days of the occupation. It represented a generous gesture by the people of the United States to assist their ally in the rehabilitation of their war-torn economy. Over and above all these it represented the recognition by the United States of the aid and assistance it had rendered us in the allied cause. Again, we must not forget the special and peculiar relations between our two countries during the last half century. We have labored with the Philippine people to assist in their education and self-government so that they might realize one day their own self-democratic government. Our prestige in the Far East is inescapably bound to the success of the Philippine experiment. Equally important and significant is the fact that the cause of democracy in southeast Asia is directly involved in the Philippine success, for southeast Asia today, in a fluid state, has its attention focused on the Philippines and how democracy functions there. Needless to say that with the recent development in China, militarily speaking, the Philippines has assumed an increased strategic importance. Moreover, the Philippines has been a significant factor in the foreign trade of the United States. We have there a major market for American products and a source of essential commodities, sugar, copra, Manila hemp and hardwoods. For all these reasons, in my opinion, the United States must keep its commitments to the Philippine people.

HISTORICAL BACKGROUND

The Philippine Republic is one of our most dependable allies in that area of the world where the international situation is presently so very delicate. She has made wonderful progress in combating communism, principally by demonstrating that the democratic system can provide a higher standard of living to the working class than any totalitarian method. This she has been able to do notwithstanding the still unsatisfactory condition of her economy resulting from

her loyalty to the cause of freedom in the last war.

The Philippines are, indeed, the showcase of democracy in Asia. If the Filipinos succeed in proving to the great masses of the people of Asia that under democratic practices they are able to establish, and maintain, a higher standard of living than the people of the Communist and neutralist countries, the free world will have won a battle that will be more effective than the gains effected by divisions of soldiers or billions in handouts.

PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE

In this connection, I should like to recall that on April 11 the President of the United States in a message to Congress stressed the need for intensifying our cooperation with the free nations of southeast Asia in their efforts to achieve economic development and a rising standard of living. I quote from his message:

> The motivation behind this cooperation is twofold: Our fixed belief in the worth and dignity of the human individual whatever his race or flag may be, and our dedication to the principle that the fruits of national growth must be widely shared in every society.
>
> As a people we insist that the dignity of the individual and his manifold rights require for their preservation a constantly expanding economic base. We are convinced that our continued economic, cultural, and spiritual progress are furthered by similar progress everywhere. * * *
>
> We seek to evolve a consistent and stable economic policy which will assist free nations in their efforts to achieve a sound growth for their economies.

General Eisenhower stated, upon first seeing postwar Manila, that it was the worst war torn city that he had seen, with the possible exception of Warsaw. The damage was not limited to Manila, but extended as devastatingly throughout the Archipelago.

PHILIPPINE ECONOMY: IT IS STILL FAR FROM COMPLETE RECOVERY

The Philippine Islands, which always had a favorable balance of trade with us and with the world before the war, have piled up a tremendous trade deficit during the years of reconstruction and rehabilitation. It is significant to note in this connection that, in the 8-year period before the war, 1934–41, the Philippines had a total favorable trade balance with the United States of $257 million—imports, $621 million; exports, $878 million—in the 8-year period after the war, 1946–53, the Philippines had a total negative trade balance with the United States of $1,268 million—imports, $2,861 million; exports, $1,593 million.

The country is still plagued by inflation and unemployment, and has had to adopt strict currency and import controls. These conditions prevail, even though there have been pronounced strides toward full recovery.

It is indeed fortunate that there is one nation in Asia bound to us by strong ties on which we can depend. The Republic of the Philippines has been tested in war. The blood of her heroes has mingled freely with that of our own sons on many a battlefield of World War II and in Korea.

We must preserve and protect that friendship.

Mr. Speaker, what happens to this champion of democracy in the Orient is of the greatest interest to us.

We must keep the Republic of the Philippines strong morally, militarily, and economically so she can stand side by side with us in the world conflict against communism.

The election and acceptance of President Magsaysay to lead the Republic of the Philippines is evidence of the direction in which that country lays its course.

This bill which I have introduced in the House today would authorize the appropriation of $100 million for additional war-damage payments in the Philippines. In this connection, I deem it expedient at this time to briefly relate the facts and thus refresh our memory with regard to war damage and the Philippines.

Throughout the half-century when the Philippines was a possession of the United States, there were frequent declarations by our policymakers that the Philippines would be created a free and independent nation at such time as its people were able to govern themselves—the only Christian nation in that part of the world. The Philippines had been under foreign rule for several centuries. Chinese, Dutch, British, and Spanish were among those who conquered parts or all of the 7,000-island archipelago from time to time, despite the resistance of the Filipinos and their desire for independence. In the 50 years of American control, there was no lessening of the wish for freedom which was promised at such time as the people demonstrated their ability to sustain it. Meanwhile, American teachers sought to improve the education of the youth; agricultural experts endeavored to demonstrate improved methods of crop production; technicians introduced new procedures for industries and business; and efforts were made to instruct in the sound administration of public and private enterprises.

World War II interrupted the preparation for independence by the Philippines. History records the grim events that occurred in what was then the Commonwealth between December 7, 1941, and the time of liberation in 1945. Despite the propaganda of the Japanese, the vast majority of the Philippine people remained loyal to the United States because of the bonds of friendship that had been developed in the years of American jurisdiction. They fought side by side with the forces of the United States and, during the Japanese occupation, gave aid and comfort to those nationals of the United States who were imprisoned or who waged guerrilla warfare against the invaders. Their loyalty and assistance continued, notwithstanding the havoc that was wreaked on their homes, farms, industries, and businesses, or the torture and even death to which many were subjected. When the military forces of the United States returned to the Philippines, the people again fought to overcome the Japanese.

With the conclusion of the war, the United States made ready to grant the long-awaited independence to the Philippine people. The ravages of the conflict, including the destruction caused in the battle of liberation and the tragic events of the occupation, however, had seriously disrupted the life and economy of the Philippines. Its financial condition prevented the people from embarking on a career as a free nation without assistance. The relationship between the United States and the Philippines had been unique and, during the occupation, the highest American officials had given assurances that the damage of war would be repaired and the people repaid. With the granting of independence, the time for the fulfillment of these assurances had come.

In the Senate and the House of Representatives there was overwhelming sentiment to restore damaged and destroyed public and private property in the Philippines. One of the difficulties, however, was the question of cost. Various surveys had been made, but it was a practical impossibility to obtain a detailed accounting of all destruction. On the basis of the statistics then available, it was agreed in April 1946 that the United States Government would authorize the appropriation of $400 million for the payment of claims for damage to private property. In addition, the Congress authorized the appropriation of $120 million for the restoration and improvement of public property and essential public services.

The legislation which contained these authorizations was entitled the Philippine Rehabilitation Act of 1946, and provided for the creation of the United States Philippine War Damage Commission to expend the $400 million for private claim payments. In addition, the Commission was allotted $57 million of the $120 million authorized for the restoration of public property. The balance of the latter fund was allocated as follows:

Public Roads Administration, for rehabilitation of roads and bridges, $40 million; Corps of Engineers, for restoration of ports and harbors, $18 million; and the Public Health Service, for the restoration and improvement of health services, $5 million.

THE PHILIPPINE REHABILITATION ACT OF 1946

The Philippine Rehabilitation Act of 1946 was an early implementation of the expressed purposes of Members of our Congress to take care of immediate Philippine rehabilitation problems in rough outline as quickly as possible. It was obviously not intended as blanket legislation to cover all of the vexatious challenges implicit in these problems.

The act was administered by the Honorable Frank A. Waring, of California; the Honorable John A. O'Donnell, of Pennsylvania; and the then judge, now senator, Francisco A. Delgado, of Bulacan, Philippine Islands. Senator Delgado is now chairman of the committee on foreign affairs of the Filipino Senate. In this connection, he is not unknown to the older Members of this body, who remember him as a former Resident Commissioner from the Philippines in the House of Representatives during the 74th Congress.

The Commission was to receive, investigate, approve, or disapprove, claims covering damage to property during and as a consequence of World War II in the Philippines.

Claims up to $500 were to be paid in full as quickly as allowed. Further, the successful claimants were to be paid on the basis of 1941 market prices, less depreciation of amount per year from the date of acquisition of the lost or damaged properties.

Payments made by the Philippine War Damage Commission, prorated according to law among all claimants, totaled 52.5 percent of the amount allowed on each claim in excess of $500. In contemplation of exorbitant postwar cost, of substantial disallowances on the claim as filed, and the partial payment of slightly more than half of the amount approved, it is estimated by the War Damage Commission that successful claimants probably received no more than 20 percent of the cost of the reproduction of their homes, businesses, and other property.

Finally, when all the claims had been adjudicated and it was adjudged that with the funds available the combined total would be 52.5 percent of the approved balance of any claim adjudicated for more than $500, or 22.5 percent less than the statutory maximum of 75 percent fixed by the act.

The War Damage Act aforesaid was reported by the old Committee on Insular Affairs. I had the honor to serve on this committee under the chairmanship of Judge Jasper Bell, of Missouri, affectionately known to all who were here through the 79th Congress. The committee had no precedent to guide it. In its wisdom, however, the committee wrote the following language into Report No. 1921, page 32, Committee on Insular Affairs, House of Representatives, 79th Congress, 2d session:

> While the committee feels it is urgently necessary to provide through this legislation (S. 1610) for the rebuilding and restoration of the physical plant of the Philippines, it is generally realized that additional legislation will probably be necessary in the future to augment and supplement the benefits which will be accomplished through S. 1610. * * * It is expected that proposals for additional legislation will be made from time to time by the agencies of the United States Government, by the Government of the Philippines, and the Filipino Rehabilitation Commission to meet needs for legislation as they arise.

It is fair to state that the foregoing paragraph of the report certainly was not placed in there by accident and cannot be discarded. The Philippine War Damage Commission, as the record will attest, did a most efficient and exemplary job. It not only concluded its work a month ahead of the statutory deadline, but it returned a substantial part of the money authorized for its administrative expenses to the United States Treasury.

We have a moral responsibility to the people of the Philippines. They were our wards and we their tutors in democracy for nearly half a century. We encouraged them to fight, and they responded to our request. They paid in blood and sweat and the raw red wounds and, yes, in the lives of their people for their resistance to an enemy drunk with power intent on establishing the doctrine "coprosperity sphere of Asia," another way of saying "Asia for the Asians."

The valiant resistance of our then political ward shortened the war in the Pacific by many months, if not by many years.

The Philippines are the anchor of our defense in the Pacific.

Then, too, the Philippine Republic will consume both our soft and durable goods. They have a great capacity to absorb them. Our nationally known brand names are familiar to them. Our trade with the Philippines is not a one-way street. They produce much that is essential in our economy. We use their hemp, their sugar, their hardwoods, and their pineapple. Any money we spend in the Philippines encourages the solid type of trade we so badly need.

I repeat that the Philippines present the showcase of democracy in that area, and that other countries of that region are closely watching the Philippines and everything that happens there.

Let me mention just a few more items in the structure of our connecting bridge with the Philippines:

Under our mutual defense pact with the Philippines, we have established important military, naval, and aerial bases in their country.

Under our trade agreement with them our investments are guaranteed the same protection and privileges as those of their own nationals.

Under the dynamic leadership of President Magsaysay, the Philippines is undergoing a program of development and strengthening their economy, so that they may better cope with the threat of communism.

Report on Foreign Aid to Reclamation and Power Projects in 22 Foreign Countries

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. L. MILLER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 26, 1955

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, in the past weeks, the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD has carried a number of articles under the catch line, "Bananas on Pikes Peak." The newspapers, magazines, and other advertising media have also brought to our attention the belief of certain organizations, and even Members of this Congress, that it is sheer folly to appropriate tax money to build the upper Colorado storage project.

We must assume that some of these Members recognize the benefits that follow from the irrigation and reclamation of arid land, and from using the water resources to produce power, because many of them have consistently voted for large appropriations to build such projects in foreign lands. During the life of the Marshall plan, the Foreign Operations Administration, and their successor, the International Cooperation Administration, the Congress has given more than $277 million to countries in Europe, the Far East, Near East, and Africa for irrigation, reclamation, and hydroelectric power projects. Some of the countries to receive these gifts are: Denmark, France, Greece, Iceland, Italy, the Netherlands, Portugal, Spain, Turkey, Austro-Germany, French Morocco, Korea, Formosa, Indochina, the Philippines, Thailand, Iran, Iraq, Israel, Jordan, Lebanon, Saudi Arabia, Egypt, Ethiopia, Liberia, Afghanistan, India, Nepal, and Pakistan.

We have given Italy more than $62 million to install steam plants and turbo generators.

We have given Formosa $24,474,000 for irrigation and hydro-power generators.

We have given Thailand more than $5.5 million for irrigation and reclamation, thermal power generation, rural power and surveys.

We have given Iran $3.4 million for dams, tunnels, wells, power, irrigation, and surveys.

We have given Lebanon $1,486,000 for water investigation in the Litani River Basin, wherever that is.

We have given Pakistan nearly $8.5 million for ground-water exploration and wells.

We have given India, who has both hands out, more than $57 million to build irrigation and power dams, and to conduct water surveys.

We have given Egypt over $2.5 million to investigate its underground water and to develop a desert range program.

There are, in all, 122 projects in foreign countries which owe their existence to appropriations from our Treasury.

We have given these countries, and many more, a blank check on the United States Treasury, with instructions to build what they need and write a check for it, assuring them that the United States Treasury will make it good. This single phase of the foreign giveaway program has cost the people of the State of New York over $25 million, the people of Pennsylvania have been clipped to the tune of $19.5 million, and Californians have added about $20 million to the pile. It is only a small part of the $55 billion foreign-aid program we have been asked to support for the last 10 years.

Now when Egypt wishes to build a dam or install a generating plant, the Congress simply opens the Treasury and makes the funds available. No extensive survey is necessary, no plan report is required, and no congressional review is needed. We do not even demand a repayment contract, because repayment is not asked; and very little opposition is heard.

But, when a project that will develop the land and conserve the resources of America is brought to the Congress, the cry begins; and we have difficulty in getting even small appropriations for investigating and developing our own ground water supply, power facilities, and underground water wealth. As a result, our domestic stability is often sacrificed on the foreign altar.

There are certain facts about reclamation that are unassailable.

Domestic reclamation project costs are repaid to the Treasury; foreign project costs are not.

Domestic reclamation projects increase Treasury income; foreign projects do not.

Domestic reclamation projects create new United States wealth; foreign projects do not.

But, in spite of these facts, the Government has spent and given away more money to build irrigation, reclamation, power, and related projects in the far-off countries within the foreign-aid sphere than it has invested in reclamation projects within our own continental boundaries. And many Members of Congress continue to vote for these foreign projects and then vote against the projects in our own United States. It is nearly impossible to reconcile these two votes.

You might as well try to grow corn on the Sphinx.

SENATE

WEDNESDAY, JULY 27, 1955

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

God of our fathers, facing tasks that tower above our power to achieve, with a sense of our utter inadequacy when left with our own devices, we bow for the strengthening benediction of our morning prayer. Keep our goals clear, our hearts pure, our spirits courageous, in all the tangled tragedy of our ailing world. By Thy kindly light, as we follow it patiently and obediently, lead us and all men to a realm where peace and good will shall reign, to a kingdom of human rights where mouths shall not cry for bread, where hands and feet shall not be shackled, where speech shall not be silenced, where eyes shall not be bandaged nor minds darkened by distorting lies which hide the light of truth. We ask it in the name of that One who is the truth and the way and the life. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. BIBLE, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday, July 26, 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 July 26, 1955, the President had approved and signed the following acts:

S. 26. An act for the relief of Donald Hector Taylor;

S. 36. An act for the relief of Lupe M. Gonzalez;

S. 244. An act for the relief of Anna C. Giese;

S. 467. An act for the relief of Dr. Luciano A. Legiardi-Laura;

S. 758. An act for the relief of Marion S. Quirk;

S. 1139. An act to extend the existing authority for the loan of a small aircraft carrier to the Government of France;

S. 1250. An act to declare Pike Creek above the easterly side of the highway bridge at Sixth Avenue in the city of Kenosha, Wis., a nonnavigable stream; and

S. 1464. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to acquire certain rights-of-way and timber-access roads.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its clerks, announced that the House had insisted upon its amendments to the bill (S. 1093) to fix and regulate the salaries of teachers, school officers, and other employees of the Board of Education of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes, disagreed to by the Senate; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. ABERNETHY, Mr. DAVIS of Georgia, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mr. MILLER of Nebraska, and Mr. HYDE were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

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

H. R. 2107. An act to amend the National Defense Facilities Act of 1950 to provide for additional facilities necessary for the administration and training of units of the Reserve components of the Armed Forces of the United States, 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; and

H. R. 7029. An act to establish a Permanent Committee for the Oliver Wendell Holmes Devise, and for other purposes.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 5512) to provide for the conveyance of certain property under the jurisdiction of the Housing and Home Finance Administrator to the State of Louisiana.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 53) to make a change in the enrollment of S. 2428, to increase the salaries of officers and members of the Metropolitan Police force, etc.

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

H. R. 593. An act to convey by quitclaim deed certain land to the State of Texas;

H. R. 7244. An act to provide for the striking of medals in commemoration of the 120th anniversary of the signing of the Texas declaration of independence and the Battles of the Alamo, Goliad, and San Jacinto in the year 1836;

H. R. 7289. An act to authorize the States to organize and maintain State defense forces, and for other purposes; and

H. J. Res. 278. Joint resolution to provide that a gold medal be coined and presented to Dr. Jonas E. Salk in honor of his achievements in the field of medicine.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS SIGNED

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

H. R. 5875. An act to amend title 14, United States Code, entitled "Coast Guard," for the purpose of providing involuntary retirement of certain officers, and for other purposes;

H. R. 7000. An act to provide for strengthening of the Reserve Forces, and for other purposes;

H. J. Res. 251. Joint resolution to authorize the President to issue posthumously to the late Seymour Richard Belinky, a flight officer in the United States Army, a commission as second lieutenant, United States Army, and for other purposes; and

H. J. Res. 385. Joint resolution authorizing the printing and binding of a revised edition of Cannon's Procedure in the House of Representatives and providing that the same shall be subject to copyright by the author.

HOUSE BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION REFERRED

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

H. R. 593. An act to convey by quitclaim deed certain land to the State of Texas; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 7244. An act to provide for the striking of medals in commemoration of the 120th anniversary of the signing of the Texas declaration of independence and the Battles of the Alamo, Goliad, and San Jacinto in the year 1836; and

H. J. Res. 278. Joint resolution to provide that a gold medal be coined and presented to Dr. Jonas E. Salk in honor of his achievements in the field of medicine; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H. R. 7289. An act to authorize the States to organize and maintain State defense forces, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. CLEMENTS, and by unanimous consent, the Committee on the Judiciary was authorized to meet this afternoon during the session of the Senate.

On request of Mr. CLEMENTS, and by unanimous consent, the Antimonopoly Subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary was authorized to meet this afternoon during the session of the Senate.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce be authorized to meet this afternoon during the session of the Senate.

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

Mr. MAGNUSON. I announce to Senators, and particularly Senators from the agricultural States who may be interested, that the hearing relates to the so-called boxcar shortage for the trans-