HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

SATURDAY, JULY 30, 1955

The House met at 10:30 o'clock a. m.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Thou God of all holiness and righteousness, Thou hast created and endowed us with moral sense and with capacities and powers to choose the right and to refuse the wrong.

Thou art always commanding us to cultivate these attributes and to keep them inviolate, but we penitently confess that we frequently fail and falter and are so very fickle in our faith and fortitude.

Grant that we may be honest and true with our nobler and better self which is continually calling and constraining us to seek first Thy kingdom of righteousness.

Help us to strive more earnestly to establish peace on earth and good will among all men.

Hear us in Christ's 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 a concurrent resolution of the House of the following title:

H. Con. Res. 161. Concurrent resolution providing for the printing of the song, Pledge of Allegiance to the Flag, as a House document.

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. 46. An act to authorize the conveyance to the city of Anniston, Ala., of certain real property within Fort McClellan, Ala.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bills, joint resolutions, and concurrent resolutions of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 1395. An act to amend the joint resolution entitled "Joint resolution to establish a commission for the celebration of the 200th anniversary of the birth of Alexander Hamilton," approved August 20, 1954;

S. 1512. An act to amend section 107 of title 28 of the United States Code so as to eliminate separate divisions and reduce the number of places of holding regular terms of the United States District Court for the District of Nebraska;

S. 2312. An act for the relief of certain Korean war orphans;

S. 2446. An act to permit sale of Commodity Credit Corporation stocks of cotton that are in excess supply for unrestricted use at current market prices;

S. 2511. An act to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended;

S. 2604. An act to increase the borrowing power of Commodity Credit Corporation;

S. 2624. An act to amend an act entitled "An act to provide for the sale of the Port Newark Army Base to the city of Newark, N. J., and for other purposes," approved June 20, 1936, as amended;

S. 2630. An act 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;

S. J. Res. 91. Joint resolution to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to sell the steamship *La Guardia*;

S. J. Res. 92. Joint resolution to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to sell the steamship *Monterey*;

S. Con. Res. 49. Concurrent resolution to print certain matters in connection with the acceptance by Congress of the statue of the late Chief Justice Edward Douglass White, of Louisiana; and

S. Con. Res. 51. Concurrent resolution to print for the use of the Committee on Banking and Currency additional copies of hearings entitled "Stock Market Study."

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. 6373. An act to amend the Domestic Minerals Program Extension Act of 1953 in order to extend the programs to encourage the discovery, development, and production of certain domestic minerals.

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. MURRAY, Mr. SCOTT, and Mr. MALONE 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. 100) entitled "An act 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," 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. ANDERSON, Mr. O'MAHONEY, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. KUCHEL, and Mr. GOLDWATER to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate disagrees to the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 2126) entitled "An act to extend and clarify laws relating to the provision and improvement of housing, the elimination and prevention of slums, the conservation and development of urban communities, the financing of vitally needed public works, and for other purposes"; requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. SPARKMAN, Mr. FULBRIGHT, Mr. DOUGLAS, Mr. LEHMAN, Mr. CAPEHART, Mr. BRICKER, and Mr. IVES 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. 5078) entitled "An act for the relief of the estate of Victor Helfenbein."

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the reports of the committees of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 34. An act to authorize the leasing of restricted Indian lands for public, religious, educational, recreational, residential, business, and other purposes requiring the grant of long-term leases;

S. 1093. 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, and

S. 2168. An act to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 in order to increase the national minimum wage, and for other purposes.

SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS, 1956

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H. R. 7278) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. No. 1586)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 7278) "making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, and for other purposes," having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 13, 46, 57, 65, 66, 67, 68, 69, 70, 71, 72, 73, 74, 87, 96, 99, 101, 110, 111, 112, 118, 119, 121, and 136.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 15, 17, 18, 26, 32, 36, 42, 44, 47, 51, 55, 60, 77, 90, 94, 97, 102, 106, 108, 113, 114, 120, 124, 125, 126, 129, 132, 133, 134, 135, 137, 139, 140, and 141 and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 12: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 12, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment insert:

"For an additional amount 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 amount 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 the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 14: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 14, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$350,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 16: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 16, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken out and inserted by said amendment insert:

"Office of the General Counsel

"For an additional amount for 'Office of the General Counsel', $40,000."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 21: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 21, and agree

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert "$600,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 24: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 24, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert "$37,730,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 30: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 30, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment 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 $5,500,000."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 45: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 45, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert "$50,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 52: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 52, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$825,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 53: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 53, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$10,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 54: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 54, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert "$1,500,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 63: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 63, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert "$122,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 79: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 79, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$1,200,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 81: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 81, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$750,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 91: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 91, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$250,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 100: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 100, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$220,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 103: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 103, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment insert:

"Mental Health Activities

"For an additional amount for 'Mental health activities', $250,000.

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 105: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 105, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$600,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 107: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 107, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$256,327,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 115: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 115, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$1,970,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 122: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 122, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$336,630"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 138: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 138, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment insert "Senate Document Numbered 75 and"; and the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendments numbered 2, 3, 19, 20, 22, 23, 25, 27, 28, 29, 31, 33, 34, 35, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41, 43, 48, 49, 50, 56, 58, 59, 61, 62, 64, 75, 76, 78, 80, 82, 83, 84, 85, 86, 88, 89, 92, 93, 95, 98, 104, 109, 116, 117, 123, 127, 128, 130, 131, 142, and 143.

CLARENCE CANNON,
JOHN TABER,

As to chapter I:
JAMIE L. WHITTEN,
FRED MARSHALL,
H. CARL ANDERSEN,

As to chapter II:
PRINCE H. PRESTON, Jr.,
ALBERT THOMAS,
FRANK T. BOW,

As to chapter III:
GEORGE MAHON,
HARRY R. SHEPPARD,
ROBERT L. F. SIKES,
R. B. WIGGLESWORTH,
ERRETT P. SCRIVNER,
GERALD R. FORD, Jr.,

As to chapter IV:
OTTO E. PASSMAN,
J. VAUGHAN GARY,
R. B. WIGGLESWORTH,

As to chapter V:
GEORGE ANDREWS,
GEORGE MAHON,
IVOR D. FENTON,

As to chapter VI:
ALBERT THOMAS,
SIDNEY R. YATES,
JOHN PHILLIPS,

As to chapter VII:
MICHAEL J. KIRWAN,
W. F. NORRELL,
BEN F. JENSEN,

As to chapter VIII:
JOHN E. FOGARTY,
A. M. FERNANDEZ,
T. MILLET HAND,

As to chapter IX:
LOUIS C. RABAUT,
MICHAEL J. KIRWAN,

As to chapter X:
JOHN J. ROONEY,
PRINCE H. PRESTON, Jr.,
F. R. COUDERT, Jr.,

As to chapter XI:
J. VAUGHAN GARY,
OTTO E. PASSMAN,
GORDON CANFIELD,

As to chapters XII, XIII, XIV, and XV:
LOUIS C. RABAUT,
W. F. NORRELL,
WALT HORAN,

Managers on the Part of the House.

CARL HAYDEN,
RICHARD B. RUSSELL,
DENNIS CHAVEZ,
ALLEN J. ELLENDER,
LISTER HILL (except as to amendment number 104),
JOHN STENNIS,
STYLES BRIDGES,
LEVERETT SALTONSTALL,
WM. F. KNOWLAND,
MILTON R. YOUNG,
EDWARD J. THYE,

Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 7278) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report as to each of such amendments, namely:

CHAPTER I

Department of Agriculture

Amendment No. 1: Inserts heading.

Amendment Nos. 2 and 3: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment Nos. 4 through 8: Strike out House language as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 9: Appropriates $33,000 for the Commodity Exchange Authority as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment Nos. 10 and 11: Insert headings.

Amendment No. 12: Authorizes $15,000,000 for loans under title II of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act as proposed by the Senate, with perfecting amendment.

Amendment No. 13: Eliminates $25,000,000 proposed by the Senate for farm housing loans.

Amendment No. 14: Appropriates $350,000 for salaries and expenses, Farmers Home Administration instead of $1,300,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 15: Strikes out House language as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 16: Appropriates $40,000 for the Office of the General Counsel instead of $65,000 as proposed by the Senate, and eliminates House language appropriating $36,000 to this office for the rural development program.

Amendment Nos. 17 and 18: Strike out House language as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment Nos. 19 and 20: Reported in disagreement.

CHAPTER II

Department of Commerce

Amendment No. 21: Appropriates $600,000 for operation and regulation, Civil Aeronautics Administration instead of $1,200,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment Nos. 22 and 23: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 24: Appropriates $37,730,000 for the Inter-American Highway instead of $49,730,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 25: Reported in disagreement. The motion which will be offered by the managers will recommend an additional

$500,000 to be used entirely for hurricane and tornado research.

Amendment No. 26: Inserts heading.

Amendment Nos. 27 through 29: Reported in disagreement.

CHAPTER III

Central Intelligence Agency

Amendment No. 30: Appropriates $5,500,000 for the Central Intelligence Agency headquarters installation instead of $7,000,000 as proposed by the Senate. The managers, by the action taken, are not designating any particular site nor do they preclude the selection of any particular site. Of the amount appropriated not to exceed $350,000 may be used for the purchase of a site in the event the Langley, Virginia, site is not selected; and in the event the Langley, Virginia, site (which is now Government owned) is selected not to exceed $2,500,000 of the amount appropriated may be used in connection with the taking of steps with regard to roads and other facilities.

Department of the Army—Military Construction

Amendment No. 31: Reported in disagreement for technical reasons. The motion which will be offered by the managers will recommend the sum of $485,077,000 which represents modification of the amount in the Senate bill by deletion of the item of $1,350,000 for family housing at the Black Hills Ordnance Depot, South Dakota. The increase of $200,000 proposed by the Senate for Fort Leavenworth, Kansas., and the increase of $1,265,000 proposed by the Senate for Fort Huachuca, Arizona, are included in the total appropriation agreed upon.

Department of the Navy—Military Construction

Amendment No. 32: Inserts heading.

Amendment No. 33: Reported in disagreement for technical reasons. The motion which will be offered by the managers will recommend the sum of $442,628,300, which represents modification of the amount in the Senate bill in the following respects: (1) Omission of the $2,000,000 for plans for a new drydock at the Puget Sound shipyard; (2) Restoration of the $350,000 for plans for a new Armed Services Medical Library; and (3) Restoration of $1,000,000 (allowing a total of $3,000,000) for family housing at the Marine Corps base, Quantico, Virginia. In connection with acceptance of the Senate addition of $3,800,000 for a new manufacturing building at the Naval Ordnance Plant, Macon, Georgia, the managers on the part of the Senate and the House are in agreement that this construction project shall not be undertaken unless and until the Secretary of Defense certifies in writing to the Committees on Appropriations of the House and the Senate that such project is essential to the national defense and in the best interests of the Government.

Amendment No. 34: Reported in disagreement.

Department of the Air Force—Military construction

Amendment No. 35: Reported in technical disagreement. The motion which will be offered by the managers will recommend an appropriation of $994,291,000, of which $255,000,000 shall be derived by transfer from the appropriation "Procurement and production, Army". This represents modifications of the amount in the Senate bill in the following respects: (1) omits $5,822,000 for Grand Forks Air Force Base; (2) omits $1,881,000 for Traverse City Area Air Force Base; (3) omits $155,000 additional proposed by the Senate for a second swimming pool at Lake Charles Air Force Base; (4) omits $2,667,000 additional proposed by the Senate for a hospital at Lincoln Air Force Base, and deletes language relating to this base; (5) omits $218,000 additional proposed by the Senate for a second swimming pool at Travis Air Force Base; (6) omits $129,000 additional proposed by the Senate for a second swimming pool at England Air Force Base; (7) provides $20,000,000 for the Air Academy instead of $79,527,000 as recommended by the Senate; (8) reduces the amount for classified overseas bases by $16,556,000, and (9) deletes $70,000 to correct an error in previous estimates.

The managers are agreed that the Air Force should proceed with land acquisition and construction of the Grand Forks Air Force Base with presently available funds in the amount of $6,280,000. In the event additional funds (within limit of the total authorized for this base) are required for obligation during fiscal year 1956 they may be obtained from other available funds through the regular reprograming procedures.

In providing $20,000,000 for the Air Academy the managers are of the opinion that essential preliminary construction can proceed pending further finalization of the design and plans. Request for additional funds based upon more complete design work can be presented to the Congress in the next session.

Funds were left in the bill for a second swimming pool at Hunter Air Force Base, because the existing pool at this base was constructed from nonappropriated funds.

Amendment No. 36: Inserts center heading.

Amendments Nos. 37 through 41: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will move to recede and concur.

CHAPTER IV

Department of Defense—Civil functions

Amendment No. 42: Inserts heading.

Amendment No. 43: Reported in disagreement.

CHAPTER V

General Government matters

Amendment No. 44: Inserts chapter number.

Amendment No. 45: Appropriates $50,000 for Office of Defense Mobilization instead of $100,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 46: Deletes Senate proposal to appropriate $25,000 for District of Columbia Auditorium Commission.

Amendment No. 47: Inserts heading.

Amendment No. 48: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 49: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 50: Reported in disagreement.

CHAPTER VI

Independent offices

Amendment No. 51: Changes chapter number.

Amendment No. 52: Appropriates $825,000 for the Federal Civil Defense Administration for "Operations" instead of $650,000 as proposed by the House and $1,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 53: Appropriates $10,000,000 for "Surveys, Plans, and Research" of the Federal Civil Defense Administration instead of $8,000,000 as proposed by the House and $12,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 54: Appropriates $1,500,000 for "Salaries and expenses, Civil Defense Functions of Federal Agencies" instead of $3,050,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 55: Inserts heading.

Amendment No. 56: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 57: Deletes item of $300,000 for "Acquisition of Land, District of Columbia" proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 58: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 59: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 60: Inserts heading.

Amendment No. 61: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 62: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 63: Appropriates $122,500 for "Operating Expenses, National Archives and Records Service" instead of $145,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 64: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment Nos. 65 through 74: Strike out amendments proposed by the Senate. The managers on the part of the House and Senate do not believe the additional appropriations and increased authorizations included in said amendments for the Housing and Home Finance Agency and its constituent agencies are necessary at this time. However, should housing amendments for certain new and expanded programs be enacted in the present session of the Congress, or should the need for additional funds become acute because of unanticipated increases in programs, the Director of the Bureau of the Budget may accelerate apportionments of funds presently available by minimum amounts pending the submission of supplemental estimates to the next session of the Congress.

Amendment Nos. 75 and 76: Reported in disagreement.

CHAPTER VII

Department of the Interior

Amendment No. 77: Changes chapter number.

Amendment No. 78: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 79: Appropriates $1,200,000 for Bureau of Mines, Conservation and Development of Mineral Resources, instead of $625,000 as proposed by the House and $1,450,000 as proposed by the Senate. Of the amount provided $1,000,000 is for continuation of research in mining methods at the Rifle, Colorado, oil shale plant and for putting the retorting, refining, and all other research facilities into standby condition.

Amendment No. 80: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 81: Appropriates $750,000 for Fish and Wildlife Service, Construction, instead of $325,000 as proposed by the House and $786,000 as proposed by the Senate. Of this amount provided $6,000 is for the construction of an auxiliary spillway on the James River at the Dakota Lake National Wildlife Refuge in North Dakota.

Amendment No. 82: Reported in disagreement.

Department of Agriculture

Amendment No. 83: Reported in disagreement.

Alexander Hamilton Bicentennial Commission

Amendment No. 84: Reported in disagreement.

Boston National Historic Sites Commission

Amendment No. 85: Reported in disagreement.

John Marshall Bicentennial Celebration Commission

Amendment No. 86: Reported in disagreement.

National Capital Planning Commission

Amendment No. 87: Strikes language inserted by the Senate.

Smithsonian Institution

Amendment No. 88: Reported in disagreement.

Soo Locks Centennial Celebration Commission

Amendment No. 89: Reported in disagreement.

CHAPTER VIII

Department of Labor

Amendment No. 90: Changes chapter number.

Amendment No. 91: Appropriates $250,000 for "Salaries and expenses, Office of the Solicitor" instead of $110,000 as proposed by the House and $303,800 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 92: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 93: Reported in disagreement.

Department of Health, Education, and Welfare

Amendment No. 94: Inserts heading.

Amendment No. 95: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 96: Strikes appropriation of $8,700 for "Salaries and expenses, Gallaudet College" proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 97: Inserts heading.

Amendment No. 98: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 99: Strikes appropriation of $220,000 for "salaries and expenses, Howard University" proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 100: Appropriates $220,000 for "Salaries and expenses, White House Conference on Education" instead of $50,000 as proposed by the House and $238,000 as proposed by the Senate, however, the managers on the part of the House reiterate the thought set forth in House Report No. 1116, that the legislation which authorized the White House Conference on Education does not authorize the use of Federal funds for the travel expenses of delegates to the Conference, and will expect that the Department secure an opinion on this matter from the Comptroller General before obligating any funds for such purpose. If his opinion is that the use of funds for such purpose is not so authorized, it will be expected that the Director of the Bureau of the Budget will impound $170,000 of the appropriation for this item.

Amendment No. 101: Strikes appropriations for 19 Public Health Service items totaling $1,375,000 proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 102: Appropriates $1,190,000 for "Sanitary engineering activities" as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 103: Appropriates $250,000 for "Mental health activities" for the purpose of carrying out the purposes of Public Law 182, approved July 28, 1955, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 104: Reported in disagreement for technical reasons. A motion will be made to recede from disagreement to the Senate amendment that proposed an appropriation of $60,000,000 for "Grants to States for poliomyelitis vaccination" and concur therein with an amendment to substitute the sum of $30,000,000. The managers are agreed that, if legislation is enacted which will require more than $30,000,000 in fiscal year 1956, the Director of the Bureau of the Budget should apportion these funds on a deficiency basis.

Amendment No. 105: Appropriates $600,000 for "Construction of housing facilities for animals" instead of $400,000 as proposed by the House and $685,280 as proposed by the Senate. The language of this paragraph is sufficiently broad to permit the Public Health Service to handle the construction direct or to arrange for contracts through the General Services Administration. The managers will expect the method to be employed which will assure the earliest completion of the building.

CHAPTER IX

Public works

Atomic Energy Commission

Amendment No. 106: Changes chapter number.

Amendment No. 107: Appropriates $256,327,000 for Plant and Equipment instead of $163,577,000 as proposed by the House and $270,800,000 as proposed by the Senate. None of the amount appropriated is to be used for construction of the new Reactor Training School, Argonne National Laboratory, as proposed in the Budget.

Amendment No. 108: Deletes House language.

Amendment No. 109: Reported in disagreement.

Department of the Interior

Amendments Nos. 110 through 112: Strike headings and language inserted by the Senate.

The use of $240,000 of available funds for completion of the Yellowtail-Lovell transmission line is approved.

Department of Defense—Civil Functions, Department of the Army

Amendment No. 113: Appropriates $5,551,014 for Rivers and Harbors and Flood Control Construction, General, as proposed by the Senate.

CHAPTER X

Department of State

Amendment No. 114: Changes chapter number.

Amendment No. 115: Appropriates $1,970,000 for "Salaries and expenses" instead of $1,820,000 as proposed by the House and $2,120,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 116: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 117: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 118: Deletes language proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 119: Deletes language proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 120: Appropriates $75,000 for "Salaries and expenses, International Boundary and Water Commission, United States and Mexico," as proposed by the Senate.

Department of Justice

Amendment No. 121: Deletes proposal of Senate to appropriate $500,000 for "Buildings and Facilities."

United States Information Agency

Amendment No. 122: Appropriates $336,630 for "Salaries and expenses" instead of $243,260 as proposed by the House and $430,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Funds appropriated to the President

Amendment No. 123: Reported in disagreement.

CHAPTER XI

Treasury—Post Office

Amendment No. 124: Changes chapter number.

Amendment No. 125: Appropriates $7,000,000 for Operating Expenses, Coast Guard, as proposed by the Senate instead of $5,000,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 126: Inserts heading.

Amendment No. 127: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 128: Reported in disagreement.

CHAPTER XII

District of Columbia

Amendment No. 129: Changes chapter number.

Amendment No. 130: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 131: Reported in disagreement.

CHAPTER XIII

Legislative branch

Amendment No. 132: Inserts chapter number.

Amendments Nos. 133 and 134: Insert headings.

Amendment No. 135: Appropriates $185,835 for Contingent Expenses of the Senate, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 136: Strikes out language proposed by the Senate amending Section 1311, Public Law 663, Eighty-third Congress.

CHAPTER XIV

Claims for damages, audited claims, and judgments

Amendment No. 137: Changes chapter number.

Amendments Nos. 138 and 139: Appropriate $8,117,523 as proposed by the Senate instead of $5,343,868 as proposed by the House; and insert reference to Senate Document.

CHAPTER XV

General provisions

Amendment No. 140: Inserts chapter number.

Amendment No. 141: Inserts heading.

Amendment No. 142: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 143: Reported in disagreement.

CLARENCE CANNON,
JOHN TABER,

As to chapter I:
JAMIE L. WHITTEN,
FRED MARSHALL,
H. CARL ANDERSEN,

As to chapter II:
PRINCE H. PRESTON, Jr.,
ALBERT THOMAS,
FRANK T. BOW,

As to chapter III:
GEORGE MAHON,
HARRY R. SHEPPARD,
ROBERT L. F. SIKES,
R. B. WIGGLESWORTH,
ERRETT P. SCRIVNER,
GERALD R. FORD, Jr.,

As to chapter IV:
OTTO E. PASSMAN,
J. VAUGHAN GARY,
R. B. WIGGLESWORTH,

As to chapter V:
GEORGE ANDREWS,
GEORGE MAHON,
IVOR D. FENTON,

As to chapter VI:
ALBERT THOMAS,
SIDNEY R. YATES,
JOHN PHILLIPS,

As to chapter VII:
MICHAEL J. KIRWAN,
W. F. NORRELL,
BEN F. JENSEN,

As to chapter VIII:
JOHN E. FOGARTY,
A. M. FERNANDEZ,
T. MILLET HAND,

As to chapter IX:
LOUIS C. RABAUT,
MICHAEL J. KIRWAN,

As to chapter X:
JOHN J. ROONEY,
PRINCE H. PRESTON, Jr.,
F. R. COUDERT, Jr.,

As to chapter XI:
J. VAUGHAN GARY,
OTTO E. PASSMAN,
GORDON CANFIELD,

As to chapters XII, XIII, XIV, and XV:
LOUIS C. RABAUT,
W. F. NORRELL,
WALT HORAN,

Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to speak out of order, to revise and extend my remarks, and include certain quotations.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, it is always a matter of regret when it becomes necessary to answer unwarranted statements made by a colleague and especially those of a personal nature.

The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN], during hearings relating to purchase and sale of electric power by REA

cooperatives, asked to be heard. Tentative dates were set for his convenience but he did not appear. Finally he sent in a written statement which precluded personal interrogation or reply. As the statement criticized me by name I submitted an answer showing the fallacy of Mr. JENSEN's criticism. The committee printed both Mr. JENSEN's statement and my reply in the published hearings.

Later, the private utilities, known in Missouri as the Power Trust, which had twice brought suit in the Federal courts against the farm REA cooperatives and against which the courts had both times handed down decisions in favor of the farmers, had Mr. JENSEN's statement printed as a private pamphlet and widely distributed through the mails and otherwise at their expense.

On June 15, 1955, during debate in the House, Mr. JENSEN held one of these trust-printed pamphlets aloft and shouted:

I would like to have someone stand in his place and deny a single thing in that statement.

I immediately rose and asked:

Will the gentleman also include the reply made to it? All that I ask is that the gentleman put in immediately following his statement the reply to that statement.

Mr. JENSEN refused to put in the reply and gave me no opportunity to answer. And when I got the floor and asked to have the reply included in the RECORD, Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan, standing beside him, objected, and it was impossible for me to answer the charges against me in the pamphlet.

Not only was I denied an opportunity to reply but when the transcript of the colloquy was delivered to Mr. JENSEN that afternoon he did not submit it to me and the Government Printing Office messenger did not submit it to me. Although I have served here on the floor for many years that is the only time I was not allowed an opportunity to check my remarks in any colloquy made on the floor in debate.

I was personally attacked and not allowed to reply and was denied an opportunity even to read the transcript before it went to the printer.

The Committee on Appropriations had several bills coming before the House and I dismissed the matter from mind. Everybody knew BEN JENSEN.

But for the third time, on July 26, 1955, he appeared before a subcommittee of the Committee on Government Operations, and without notice to me, and in my absence, again put the trust-printed and trust-distributed statement, criticizing me, in the record of the hearings.

There is a point, Mr. Speaker, at which tolerance ceases to be a virtue, and I am today taking the time to lay before the House and the country the statement which the enemies of REA who brought suit to wreck the farmer REA cooperatives paid to have printed and paid to have distributed. Both the Power Trust and Mr. JENSEN approved its distribution through the mails but Mr. JENSEN has refused my request to have it printed in the RECORD.

Here it is:

STATEMENT OF CONGRESSMAN BEN F. JENSEN

I have spent considerable time going over part 2 of the printed hearings on the central section of the public works appropriations for fiscal 1956. The first half of this record, pages 1 to 56, which was made the evening of May 5, 1955, is filled with misleading and questionable statements and testimony. I cannot stand idly by and permit real facts and issues to be hidden, and I want to register an emphatic protest against the members of the House and Senate committees being called gullible. It was entirely uncalled for and ill becoming of Mr. CANNON, the chairman of the full Appropriations Committee of the House, to make such erroneous and insulting remarks about any Member of Congress, let alone members of his own committee. All the misleading statements and testimony point to an attemped buildup to justify an appropriation to activate a series of contracts that were designed to further the empire building of power-hungry bureaucrats; contracts that should never have seen the light of day.

Let's look at the record, to see how these contracts were developed and just what they were supposed to do. First of all, we have to go back to 1946 when Douglas Wright, Southwestern Power Administrator, presented to Congress his grandiose scheme to create a gigantic Federal power empire with nearly 15,000 miles of transmission lines, and 770,000 kilowatts in steam plants, at an estimated cost, as of November 1945, of $200 million. At today's costs this would be nearer $300 million. Think of it, 15,000 miles of transmission lines, enough to go more than three-fifths around the world and enough steam plants to generate nearly 4 times the potential energy of all the multipurpose projects whose output SPA is now marketing? Wright even went so far as to tell the committee that he should have the whole program or none. Congress refused to go along with this fantastic proposal. The House committee at that time said in its report, "The committee does not favor the initiation of a power-development program in this area the cost of which would approximate such an enormous sum."

There can be no doubt that SPA under Douglas Wright has had through the years a burning and insatiable obsession to obtain, without regard to method, the consummation of this "comprehensive plan of power distribution" whereby he would build a gigantic power empire.

This is evident when, after the turndown by the Congress of the plan for widespread transmission-line construction and steam-plant installations, the scheme was developed by having the G. and T.'s act as cat's-paws to obtain by the back door what Congress had denied through the front door. These fantastic "lease-option" takeover contracts were dreamed up by SPA and Interior. It is apparent that the REA cooperatives were sold a bill of goods in some instances and in others were coerced into signing the contracts. Had the REA's taken the time to fully analyze the fine print in the contracts or to read between the lines they would have realized that they were being used as cat's paws and would get burned in the process.

As has been testified to by REA cooperatives officials the REA Act provides that REA funds could not be used to construct lines to serve towns of over 1,500 population, nor to serve any person that is receiving central-station service. Now would it be morally and legally proper for SPA to take over these lines constructed by REA funds, which under the law cannot be used by the REA cooperatives to serve towns of over 1,500 population or persons now receiving central-station service, and for SPA then to serve such restricted loads? I do not think the REA cooperatives are today hankering to be a party to that kind of a deal and never were. It was a reprehensible action by SPA to try to get by subterfuge that which is contrary to law, and which has resulted in a great detriment to the cooperatives and the farmers.

There can be no question but that SPA put this "takeover option" in the generating and transmission co-ops' contracts for the purpose of making possible the acquisition by SPA of that proposed great network of major transmission lines to be constructed by the G. and T. cooperatives. This was but another step toward the goal of building an electric empire.

The SPA surely knew that the proposed rates would not provide for full repayament of that portion of the investment cost of the multipurpose projects, properly allocable to power, and for operation, maintenance, administration, and other costs of the overall power and transmission system. The law, quite properly, provides for the necessary revision of rates to assure payment of these costs, so SPA, after the G. and T. lines were built, would be free to raise the rates to whatever was necessary. All protestations of Mr. Wright to the contrary notwithstanding, it now appears quite likely that power rates for SPA power will have to be raised a substantial amount, rates which may well be as high as 8 mills per kilowatt-hour of power delivered to the G. and T. cooperatives. The ultimate cost to the G. and T.'s member cooperatives will be dependent on the additional G. and T. cost of delivering the power to such member cooperatives. Rates of 10 to 13 mills per kilowatt-hour may occur. (Later I will discuss the project costs, cost allocation, and lack of proper basis for the original SPA rate and proposed method of power disposal.)

Managers of several of these G. and T. cooperatives sat in my office some time after the committee in fiscal year 1954 had refused to approve funds for implementing these "lease-option" contracts, and let me say here and now, they were far from unhappy. They said they knew they would now be in a hole, so to speak, for a while but at least they would be able to keep control of the facilities which they had borrowed REA funds to construct. They had not wanted to sign away their property. It was also admitted that there was a question as to whether they had the legal authority to enter into contracts signing away the G. and T. property without formal and legal approval of the member cooperatives.

Now let's read between the lines of the "lease-option" contract and see just what can and would happen to the REA cooperatives in regard to costs. As is now evident, the 5.6 mill rate which SPA had promised could be given to the member cooperatives is as fleeting as the morning mist when the sunlight of truth shines upon it. Of course, SPA had very generously written into the contracts that the cooperatives could make other arrangements for a power supply if they did not want to pay any increase in rates resulting from a periodic review. That was so nice of SPA. But remember the G. and T.'s had been nailed to the mast by the insidious part of the contracts which provided that SPA could take over and own the cooperatives' transmission lines at any time by paying off the balance of the REA debt or by paying $10 to the REA's at the end of 40 years when such debt had been paid up. It can readily be seen that the REA cooperatives would be at the mercy of the SPA—it would be a question of take it or leave it. While all the questionable aspects of the contract were contributory, this "option" proviso was one very good reason for the language put in the committee report in fiscal year 1954, denying use of funds to implement the lease-option takeover contracts.

The then REA Administrator certainly had read the REA act and knew the limitation on

the use of REA loan funds with respect to not being available to construct transmission facilities to serve towns of over 1,500 population or to serve persons receiving central-station service. Surely he was aware that SPA intended to use the REA lines they proposed to lease for these prohibited uses.

It seems to me that he and his Deputy Administrator, who signed some of these contracts were very derelict in their duty and have been guilty of approving questionable loans for the REA cooperatives to construct facilities way beyond their needs and present ability to use or to pay without great difficulty.

The REA Administrator and his deputy could hardly have failed to realize that the G. and T.'s would be saddled with an excessive burden if Congress refused to provide the funds required by SPA to pay the lease and operating and amortization expense on the G. and T. lines.

Now one would think, having gotten the cooperatives and the farmers into this untenable position, that the parties primarily responsible would use some effort to get them out, but no, we find several of these key figures in the forefront in trying to reinstate the old contracts and to counsel against any other proposal to get the G. and T.'s out of the predicament. Surely the G. and T. representative now knows full well that Mr. Wright has not been trying to find an alternate solution, apparently hoping his original scheme can be reinstated. Former Federal employees are now working on these matters, evading the moral if not the legal restrictions on handling matters they previously handled or obtained knowledge of while in Federal employment. Of course, that is something for their own conscience and possibly the courts to decide.

Let me make it clear here and now that I am a friend of the REA as is every Member of Congress and I know full well the needs of the farmers for adequate electric service at reasonable rates, because I was brought up on a farm. But let us look at this canned dialogue between Mr. Wright and Mr. Cannon reiterated over and over in the May 5 hearing referred to above. Were or are the distribution cooperatives in the SPA area so bad off in comparison to many other areas of the United States as Mr. Wright and Mr. Cannon would have us believe?

Let's take Missouri, for instance, and the four REA cooperatives purchasing power from the Union Electric Co. Incidentally, the Union Electric Co., far from having a monopoly on the service of electric power throughout the State of Missouri, as Mr. Cannon so emphatically proclaimed or inferred, only serves 4 percent of the area of the State and its 2 subsidiary companies an additional 20 percent or a total of 24 percent of the area of the State. I would hardly call this a statewide monopoly when 10 other private utilities operate in the balance of the State.

The REA published record for fiscal year 1953 shows that Union Electric Co. in that year sold 165 million kilowatt-hours to 4 REA's in Missouri; 13,500,000 kilowatt-hours at 9.4 mills, 67 million kilowatt-hours at 8.7 mills, 73,400,000 kilowatt-hours at 8.2 mills, and 11,100,000 kilowatt-hours at 9.7 mills.

An analysis of the loads served by these four cooperatives and the relative price per kilowatt-hour paid in 1953 by the farm and nonfarm residential customers of these and other cooperatives is very revealing and is discussed below.

The first cooperative, in addition to buying from the Union Electric Co., also purchased electric energy from the Arkansas-Missouri Power Co. (5,860,000 kilowatt-hours) and the M. & A. Electric Power Cooperative (3,865,000 kilowatt-hours) at 11.8 mills per kilowatt-hour. Of the total power purchased, 8,150,000 kilowatt-hours was sold to farm and nonfarm residential users at an average rate of 486. mills per kilowatt-hour, while 14 million kilowatt-hours was sold to commercial and industrial customers at an average rate of 15.7 mills per kilowatt-hour. In effect, all the power purchased from the Union Electric Co. was delivered to commercial and industrial customers instead of to the farmers.

The second cooperative sold a little less than 10 million kilowatt-hours for farm and nonfarm residential use at 40.3 mills, 5,700,000 kilowatt-hours to commercial and industrial customers at 26.1 mills, 28 million kilowatt-hours for service to Fort Leonard Wood at 10.6 mills, and 16,700,000 kilowatt-hours to other REA's for resale at about 9.6 mills.

The third REA purchasing power from Union Electric resold 17,150,000 kilowatt-hours for farm and nonfarm residential service at an average rate of 32.0 mills per kilowatt-hour.

The fourth REA, in addition to the purchase from Union Electric, purchased 51 million kilowatt-hours from the Southwestern Administration at 5.3 mills and generated 6,300,000 kilowatt-hours in its own plants. Of the total supply of 133 million kilowatt-hours, 9,500,000 kilowatt-hours was sold for farm and nonfarm residential service at a rate of 32.4 mills per kilowatt-hour, 10,700,000 to commercial and industrial users at 26.6 mills per kilowatt-hour, 86,700,000 kilowatt hours to other REA's at 10.1 mills, and 24 million kilowatt-hours to other utility systems at 14.4 mills.

As to whether the cooperatives in Missouri are paying excessive prices to the private utilities, comparison can be made to the rates charged the REA's in the State of Nebraska, where there can be little question that a statewide public power monopoly exists that pays no Federal taxes. Yet we hear no cries of anguish from our distinguished chairman over this monopoly. The Nebraska Public Power system sales to REA's in fiscal year 1953 total about 300 million kilowatt-hours at rates varying from a low of 8.6 mills to a high of 9.2 mills in Nebraska proper and 12.6 for 1 sale made to a South Dakota cooperative. Union electric rates to REA's also can be compared with the rates charged by the Dairyland Power Cooperative, an extensive generating and transmission cooperative, operating in Wisconsin and other adjacent States. This G. and T. cooperative generated and sold 369 million kilowatt-hours to member or other cooperatives at an average rate of 13.5 mills per kilowatt-hour.

It can easily be seen by the above figures or by an examination of the REA statistical reports that the Missouri distribution cooperatives and their farmer customers are not as bad off as some folks would have you believe. In fact, they compare favorably with numerous other sections of the country and are much better off than in many of the other States.

There is considerable evidence that the cost of power to the distribution cooperatives is a relatively small part of the rate paid by the farmer. Whether the wholesale cost is 5 mills or 10 or 12 mills seems to have little bearing on the average price paid by the farmer as shown by the following figures based on a 1953 REA published report and taken at random therefrom:

State	Price per kilowatt-hour paid by REA for energy purchased	Average charge per kilowatt-hour by REA's for farm and nonfarm residential service
Arkansas	5.2	46.8
	5.4	37.7
	10.1	45.9
Delaware	12.2	35.4
Idaho	10.0	28.5
Illinois	8.4	51.5
	8.5	30.0
Iowa	13.0	32.4
	14.3	31.5
Kansas	5.7	41.0
	7.6	37.7
Minnesota	17.4	39.8
Missouri	10.1	53.0
	7.4	26.2
Nebraska	9.1	31.2
	7.0	38.4
New York	11.1	36.0
	11.0	35.5
North Dakota	15.3	40.0
	5.2	45.6

As has been pointed out the wholesale price of electric power is a small part of the price the farmers are paying for the electric power they use. An analysis of REA reports show that the number of customers per mile of line in Missouri is relatively high yet the kilowatt-hour use per customer is comparatively low. Testimony has been given that most of the REA rates to the farmers in this area provide for the minimum used to pay 8.1 cents per kilowatt-hour for 40 kilowatt-hours per month or $3.24, while a farmer using 250 kilowatt-hours per month would pay only 3.6 cents per kilowatt-hour or $9. If this is the case, then adding as much as 4 or 5 mills to the wholesale cost of power would add but 16 to 20 cents to the monthly bill of a minimum user and $1 to $1.25 to the monthly bill of the farmer with a 250-kilowatt-hour use. In either case it would appear that there is an attempt to make a mountain out of a molehill as there is no doubling of the farmers' costs as has been inferred.

When I analyze the operations and costs of REA over the country I cannot see the justification for the numerous statements or inferences that the G. and T. and other REA cooperatives in the SPA area on the verge of going bankrupt and will do so if the rates are raised above the existing SPA rate. Surely if other areas can pay higher wholesale costs and operate efficiently in the black there should be no reason why, with proper and efficient management, the Missouri and other SPA area cooperatives should operate in the red. Of course, if there are drought and other economic conditions which have made it impossible for some of the less prosperous farmers in the SPA area to pay their bills, among them the electric-light bill, that is not a matter to be solved by subsidizing their electric-light bill by from $2 to $15 a year with Federal taxes paid by the folks in my district or in any other section of the United States.

Let us examine this lease-option business a little further. Suppose a Federal act permitted the REA to loan money to a farmer to construct a powerplant on his farm for his use only. Now along comes SPA and says, "We have some hydropower that is available part of the time which we can sell you at a price that is less than you can generate it yourself in your proposed small plant and you are entitled to buy some of it. Now, SPA continues, you borrow enough money to build a plant many times larger than necessary for your own use. After you construct the plant, we, SPA, will lease, operate and take the entire output of the plant. We, SPA, will pay all operating costs, interest, and principal payments on the loan and sell back to you whatever power you need for your own use, at a very low price, less than you can get elsewhere. Of course, you will have to give us, SPA, an option to pay for and take over the plant at any time, and we also reserve the right to raise the rates later on. (This latter item is, of course, soft-pedaled.) Now, the reason we, SPA, want to

do this is to be able to serve electric power to town A which you, by law, cannot do, and to serve farmers Brown and Jones up the road a bit, who now get power from company B, you, of course, cannot legally sell them power directly."

Now I ask each of my colleagues, how can we justify aiding and abetting this sort of thing. Is it not time that we consider the moral and legal aspect of our actions? Are we not guilty of compounding a felony when we, by our appropriations, permit by subterfuge, the doing of those things prohibited by acts of the Congress? I, for one, think it time to set an example at least for the young people of our Nation, and show them that we have a moral and spiritual obligation to uphold the law of the land and the precepts of our forefathers who fought to establish the freedom we enjoy today. If we continue to permit the further illegal extension of these Federal bureaucracies soon we will find our cherished freedoms gone.

I want to call attention to the fact that under the lease-option contracts SPA was to pick up the entire check for operation, maintenance, replacement, interest, and repayment of the transmission facilities, and would pay for the entire output of the G. and T. steam-electric plant regardless of whether SPA could find a market for such energy. Then SPA was to turn right around and deliver back to the member cooperatives of the G. and T.'s all the power they might need at an average rate of 5.6 mills per kilowatt-hour; note the year, 1946.

There can be little wonder that Mr. Wright, the SPA Administrator, testified, "I think they would have one of the best contracts any group of REA ever dreamed of in their fondest moments." And why not, with Uncle Sam picking up the check and delivering power at less than cost.

I am sure the farmers themselves in SPA area do not want subsidized power rates at the expense of the other taxpayers of the Nation. I say again and say it advisedly they were pressured into these contracts in question.

The bait used by SPA was the low rate promised, which could not be justified on the basis of proper cost figures, cost allocations, and the amount of hydropower for sale, according to information provided me by expert rate engineers who have no personal interest in this matter.

The farmers are well able to run their own systems as has been proven and I am sure they would like to continue to run their own business. The G. and T.'s are of course in a difficult position, having been enticed into expanding their facilities considerably beyond their needs for the near future.

Now what power and what energy do we have available from these multipurpose projects in the SPA area? First there is the installed capacity of the generating units, and second, the electric energy that such units can produce from the available water. As has been testified to time and time again these projects have a variable supply of water and on the average can only operate at full capacity a portion of the time varying up to about 30 percent of the time, with the average around 20 or 25 percent.

How can such power best be utilized? It has been explained to me, and the records through the years have disclosed that the greatest value for this variable or peaking capacity and energy is realized when it is used by utility systems, public or private, that are large enough to use all the capacity and energy to serve the peak portion of the loads.

SPA knew this to be true, but as there were very few public bodies or cooperatives which had generation or other sources of power large enough to permit using more than a very small part of this peaking capacity, SPA knew it had to be sold to the existing major utilities who could readily absorb it and who had offered to take all such power and pay a rate sufficient to assure repayment of all costs of the power and to pass on any benefits to the preference and other customers. SPA, knowing that this was disposing of the power under sound business principles, nevertheless knew it would not permit SPA to create the power empire it envisaged. Therefore, SPA would not agree to such a logical use of the power, claiming that it all had to be sold directly to the preference customers. Of course it strayed quite a little way from this precept when it made the contract to sell under a long-term contract a major portion of the power from Bull Shoals Dam for use by an industrial customer. Certainly this does not jibe with the SPA "line" that the power must be sold to preference customers.

Many statements have been made and much testimony given about the legal rights and obligations of SPA to assume a utility responsibility to supply all the electric energy requirements of the so-called preference customers. Here again it is my firm conviction that Mr. Wright and the other proponents of his plans for a Federal power empire are in an untenable position.

Let us look at the act that resulted in SPA being set up.

SECTION 5 OF THE FLOOD CONTROL ACT OF 1944

"Electric power and energy generated at reservoir projects under the control of the War Department and in the opinion of the Secretary of War not required in the operation of such projects shall be delivered to the Secretary of the Interior, who shall transmit and dispose of such power and energy in such manner as to encourage the most widespread use thereof at the lowest possible rates to consumers consistent with sound business principles, the rate schedules to become effective upon confirmation and approval by the Federal Power Commission. Rate schedules shall be drawn having regard to the recovery (upon the basis of the application of such rate schedules to the capacity of the electric facilities of the projects) of the cost of producing and transmitting such electric energy, including the amortization of the capital investment allocated to power over a reasonable period of years. Preference in the sale of such power and energy shall be given to public bodies and cooperatives. The Secretary of the Interior is authorized, from funds to be appropriated by the Congress, to construct or acquire, by purchase or other agreement, only such transmission lines and related facilities as may be necessary in order to make the power and energy generated at said projects available in wholesale quantities for sale on fair and reasonable terms and conditions to facilities owned by the Federal Government, public bodies, cooperatives, and privately owned companies. All moneys received from such sales shall be deposited in the Treasury of the United States as miscellaneous receipts."

If you will note, there is continued references throughout this section of the act to "such power and energy," "such energy," "power and energy generated as such projects." Note particularly the preference language which says "preference in the sale of such power and energy shall be given to public bodies and cooperatives." I maintain that the intent of the Congress is crystal clear, that the act only provides for the disposal of power generated by the multipurpose projects. There is no reference whatsoever to any other power. Surely if the Congress thought it had constitutional authority to authorize Interior to construct steam plants or to purchase steam power for resale it would have spelled out that intent in clear language.

It is realized, of course, that those persons want for obvious reasons to promote their dream of a Federal power empire are trying to read into the language of the act meanings that are not there and were never intended to be there. Mr. Wright would have you believe that because the available power and energy is not of the type to supply the normal requirements of the potential preference customers he has on obligation to obtain other power to supplement the surplus hydropower and energy. He will have you believe that definitive court action has proclaimed that right. There is no question, in my mind, nor should there be in the mind of any clear-thinking person, that the right of the Federal Government to purchase steam electric power for resale or to construct steam electric generating stations to make power for resale has not been argued on its merits all the way through to the Supreme Court of the land. Until that is done, it is poppycock for Mr. Wright or anyone else to say that this issue has been settled and the legal right to do these things are clear. In my estimation this also applies to TVA the Bureau of Reclamation and all other Federal power agencies.

It it were not so serious, it would be humorous to see the mental gymnastics and warped thinking of the protagonists of Federal electric-power empires go through in trying to justify actions that clearly have no legal authority. One of the farfetched arguments used in an attempt to justify SPA rights to construct steam plants or purchase electric energy from others for resale was given back in 1946 in the hearings on the fiscal year 1947 Interior Department appropriation bill, page 71, in an opinion presented by the SPA Chief Counsel, which was supplemented by the opinion of the Solicitor of the Department of the Interior. Section 5 of the Flood Control Act of 1944 quoted previously contains the proviso that "the Secretary of the Interior is authorized from funds to be appropriated by the Congress, to construct or acquire, by purchase or other agreement, only such transmission lines and related facilities as may be necessary in order to make the power and energy generated at said projects available in wholesale quantities for sale on fair and reasonable terms and conditions to facilities owned by the Federal Government, public bodies, cooperative and privately owned companies."

It is impossible for me to believe that anyone could argue without tongue in cheek that the authority "to construct or acquire transmission lines and related facilities as may be necessary in order to make the power and energy to be generated at said projects available to facilities owned by the Federal Government, public bodies, cooperatives, and privately owned companies," confers the authority to construct steam plants or to purchase electric energy for resale. To claim as did the SPA, Chief Counsel, that the term "related facilities" was meant to or can properly be used to cover steam electric plants is farfetched to say the least. Claims that steam electric power is needed and required by law in order to be able "to market the hydropower on a businesslike basis, and to make such power and energy available in wholesale quantities for sale on fair and reasonable terms" are other examples of the fuzzy thinking of so many Federal power proponents.

There has been much loose talk about the tremendous need for additional power in the area and at the same time statements are made that SPA power cannot otherwise be sold without integration with the G. and T. facilities and steam plants. These misstatements are so obvious that they do not merit answering. In all the testimony and discussions that I have seen to date there has not been any discussion as to what happens when the growing electric loads of the REA's and other preference customers use up all the presently available capacity. Has a real analysis been made as to just what the loads of the G. and T. cooperatives and their member cooperatives amount to as of

this date and what are the estimates of future loads, I think not. Full information also is lacking as to just what loads are presently receiving central station service, and so forth.

Rough approximations given seem to indicate the G. and T. cooperatives in the SPA area may have total peak loads of about 87,000 kilowatts which is slightly over the capacity of their steam plants. I understand that REA estimates for these 5 G. and T. cooperatives show an expected load of 214,000 kilowatts by 1965. On this basis it will be 10 years before the 130,000 kilowatts of SPA hydro capacity now being held for these 5 G. and T.'s will be fully utilized. Transmission capacity may have been overbuilt to an even greater extent.

Pamphlets that have been mailed to me which say that by taking the SPA hydro and adding it to the G. and T. steam it will produce more power and more revenue than by integrating the SPA hydro and G. and T. steam with the private utility systems facilities. Now this is a good trick if you can do it, but it sure sounds like a shell game to me.

Now, let's be specific and get away from generalities, which I dislike. I have reliable information that the G. and T.'s have 85,000 kilowatts of steam and SPA was supposed to have 195,000 kilowatts of peaking hydro contracted to the G. and T.'s, or which would give a total of 280,000 kilowatts available to the G. and T.'s. With an average load factor of the REA load of around 50 percent would require, for a peak load of 280,000 kilowatts, 100,800,000 kilowatt-hours of energy for a 30-day month. I am told that the hydro peaking carries with it 150 hours of firm energy per month for each kilowatt, or a total of 29,250,000 kilowatt-hours. Adding the 85,000-kilowatt steam-plant output at 90 percent load factor (this is on the high side) would give an additional 55,080,000 kilowatt-hours, or a total of 84,330,000 kilowatt-hours. This is 16,470,000 kilowatt-hours short of supplying all the load. Where are the G. and T.'s going to get the balance? If there is an increase in the load factor above 50 percent (which is quite probable) there will be an additional 2 million kilowatt-hours short for each percent above 50 percent.

On the basis of 130,000 kilowatts of hydro allocated to the G. and T.'s together with the 85,000 kilowatts of steam there would be a deficit of about 2 million kilowatt-hours for a month having a peak of 215,000 kilowatts.

The pamphlet Local Power Partnership in Reverse put out by the Central Electric Power Cooperative and Western Farmers Cooperative, and sent to Members of Congress, is a prime example of some of the irrational thinking and misleading and erroneous figures being used to try to persuade the Congress to reactivate the lease-option contracts between SPA and G. and T.'s The pamphlet is so replete with questionable figures and statements that I will take time to point out only a few. I am sure this pamphlet could not have been written by the clear-thinking farmers of the area, but must have been prepared by some of the same people who got the G. and T.'s into their present predicament.

I have already referred to the erroneous statement that SPA must obtain energy from steam generating plants to be able to sell the capacity available from the hydro plants. This is of course so patently false as to not warrant denial.

On page 7 of the pamphlet referred to, is a table that purports to show power and revenue available to SPA with and without the G. and T. contracts. This is the most misleading and unwarranted tabulation that could be imagined. First is the column headed "Power Available Without G. and T. Contracts" and the revenue purported to be derived therefrom. SPA firm capacity is shown to be 170,000 kilowatts.

The G. and T.'s in the February hearings reported the SPA dependable capacity to be 378,000 kilowatts. At the present time only 130,000 kilowatts of SPA hydro capacity are reported available to the G. and T.'s. Such capacity is said to carry a firm energy commitment of only 150 kilowatt-hours per kilowatt per month. If SPA sells the 130,000 kilowatts of peaking power to the G. and T.'s and the G. and T.'s use their own steam to carry 85,000 kilowatts of base load, the G. and T.'s then could carry a total of about 215,000 kilowatts without reserve. On the other hand if SPA were to buy the output of the G. and T. plants as proposed under the lease-option contracts and then resell the steam and the hydro combined back to the G. and T.'s it would produce the same results and would not add one kilowatt of dependable capacity to the load-carrying ability of the two systems. With an annual potential generation of less than 700 million kilowatt-hours from the steamplants it is difficult to understand how the firm energy can be increased by 836 million; in fact there is no increase whatsoever in the energy available to the area. The revenue comparison is even more fantastic. Without the G. and T. contract the revenue is shown to be based on a 5.6 mill rate for firm energy and 1.25 mills for nonfirm energy, while by some legerdemain, the power if used under the G. and T. contracts is to bring in revenue based on 7.16 mills for firm energy and 1.50 mills for nonfirm. This sleight of hand alone accounts for over $2,500,000 of the purported increase in revenue. Deducting the cost of generating the steam energy and the cost of leasing and operating the G. and T. transmission lines, which together cannot conceivably be less than 6 or 7 million dollars, in revenue, it can be seen that there will be a substantial annual deficit instead of the implied gain of $7,057,970. Of course the pamphlet does not say the purported gain in revenue is a net gain yet if the author had wanted to be honest this would have been made clear and he would not have used a different rate with or without the G. and T. contract and would have shown for both cases all the other costs to be incurred.

Two other statements in the pamphlet follow:

"Opponents to rural electrification have stated that SPA could construct transmission lines and do just about anything it wanted to out of this fund, thereby obviating the will of Congress. This interpretation of the continuing fund is not correct. Under the broadest language of the continuing fund, SPA could use it for only three purposes—namely (1) to take care of emergencies, (2) to purchase power, and (3) to make payments for rental.

"The restoration of the continuing fund of SPA would make it possible to restore the partnership arrangement without any annual appropriations by the Congress. It will not cost the taxpayers because the continuing fund is provided out of the operating revenue of SPA."

Now, does it matter whether SPA constructs transmission lines direct, or arranges for their construction through the medium of lease-option contracts paid for out of the continuing fund. The net result is the same. It is specious reasoning to say otherwise. To say the use of money from the continuing fund will not cost the taxpayers is just doubletalk. There can be no question that present rates will not repay cost of power projects and operating costs. So far no figures have been given to conclusively show that it will not cost more to generate power in the G. and T. steam plants and deliver it 200 miles away to member cooperatives than the rate to be charged.

Now let's talk about the rates for SPA power. Mr. Wright attempted to lay the blame for rate increases on the rise in construction costs of the multipurpose projects constructed by the Corps of Engineers. The inference was left by Wright and Chairman CANNON that the Corps of Engineers were incredibly mistaken in their estimates. The corps was able the next day to present the real facts, showing that the figures presented by Wright were full of errors.

The following excerpt from a report relative to SPA's Comprehensive Plan for Power Development that was filed by a nationally prominent engineer in the fiscal year 1947 hearings (p. 338–339) seem to indicate that SPA had no sound base for the power rate it was setting up:

"Although the Flood Control Act of 1944 requires the authorized agent for the Secretary of the Interior to base rate schedules on the cost of producing and transmitting hydroelectric power, including the amortization of the capital investment allocated to power, the authors of the report (the SPA Comprehensive Plan for Power Development) have developed a rate schedule which fails entirely to consider such costs. The excuse is given that 'cost figures' are not available at this time for proposed reservoir projects in a number of river basins, and the cost figures that are available even for authorized projects are subject to change as the design of the several projects is developed and the construction is carried out."

"It is believed that for the purposes of the report which is dated November 1945, the authors, representing a governmental agency, would have available to them the cost estimates prepared by the Army engineers for the proposed projects on the Arkansas River (survey report on Arkansas River and tributaries in Arkansas and Oklahoma, dated December 1943) and on the White River (survey report on White River and tributaries, Missouri and Arkansas, dated May 1945). The projects proposed under these two survey reports added to existing and presently authorized projects in the region will account for about 90 percent of the total annual average energy output utilized and studied under the subject report. It is to be admitted that final 'as constructed' cost figures will be different than the estimated costs and it must be understood that the estimated costs must be continuously reviewed in the light of ever-changing construction costs in order that a true economic analysis can be made. However, it is believed that the use of such estimates as do exist, corrected where necessary to reflect trends of advancing construction costs, provide a sound and, in fact, the only means of determining the cost for the production of hydroelectric capacity and energy and most certainly would result in compliance with the terms of the Flood Control Act of 1944. If the above-mentioned statement in the SPA report is accepted and no determination made of the estimated cost of hydropower until projects were completed, Congress would certainly be confronted with requests for appropriations, without any means of knowing whether or not the projects were sound."

Five years later in 1952 we still find the SPA trying to maintain a fictitious rate based on untenable cost allocation. It is only too clear that SPA and not the Corps of Engineers is responsible for the use of an erroneous rate base with the resulting need to raise SPA rates. This also is indicated by the following material taken from the House committee print No. 23 of the 82d Congress, 2d session:

"The conflicting solutions of the problem of allocation of costs of 12 dams in the Southwest are noteworthy. The Interior Department, acting through the Southwestern Power Administration, is the agency of the Government designated under section 5 of the Flood Control Act of 1944 to dispose of excess electric energy produced at projects built by the Corps of Engineers in Texas, Arkansas, Oklahoma, and Missouri.

"In January 1952, the Secretary of the Interior filed with the Federal Power Commission for rate approval a long-term contract for sale of a block of power from the 12 dams. Accompanying this were studies including the proposed allocation of costs for the 12 projects. The Federal Power Commission then requested the construction agency, the Corps of Engineers, to furnish its views on the amounts of costs and annual charges properly chargeable to power for the 12 projects. The estimates of the Southwestern Power Administration and of the corps as to the amounts which should be allocated are set forth in detail on pages 409 to 415 of the subcommittee hearings and are summarized in table 1 of this report. The Bureau of Power, Federal Power Commission, generally agreed with the methods used by the corps in allocating these costs.

"The total project construction cost was agreed generally to approximate $750 million. Including interest during construction, the total project investment was estimated at approximately $776 million. The Southwestern Power Administration recommended an allocation to power of $218 million while the Corps of Engineers recommended $418 million.

"One difference between the two computations came from the Southwestern Power Administration's failure to include interest during construction, an item amounting to over $24 million in the Corps of Engineers' allocation to power.

"Interest during construction is a valid part of the cost of the project to the Government and, therefore, should ordinarily be included in any computation of total investment costs. If exact figures are not available at the time an allocation of cost is made, a reasonable estimate could always be made subject to later revision.

"The other differences can best be understood by an examination of the different cost-allocation methods used for the 12 projects involved. Detailed statements appear on pages 406 to 426 of the published transcript of subcommittee hearings, Study of Civil Works, part 3.

"It can be seen from table 1 that the difference in allocated costs creates a large difference in the annual power charges. The greater percentage of difference in annual costs as compared to the allocated total cost comes from the fact that Southwestern Power Administration has chosen 100 years as the amortization period while the Corps of Engineers has chosen 50 years. The annual charges developed indicate that the Southwestern Power Administration can justify power rates which are less than one-half of those that would appear sound based on the methods advocated by the Corps of Engineers."

The present proposal of the G. and T.'s is not to reactivate the fantastic lease-option takeover contracts but to substitute what would be entirely different contracts and in addition they want to change existing contracts with other SPA customers to "substantially equalize the rates to all SPA customers in the area." This means, of course, to raise the rates to the other customers to pay for the required subsidy. The $64 question may be, How will the other customers react to such a deal?

Surely the Congress will not want to appropriate money for nebulous contracts without knowing the terms, effects, and cost thereof. I for one think the logical thing to do would be to extend a moratorium to these G. and T. cooperatives for say a couple or more of years. This would give them time to build up their loads and/or to make arrangements for greater utilization of the facilities through interchange contracts between themselves and the other utilities of the region. This to my notion would be preferable to a continued direct subsidizing of the G. and T.'s. There is one fact that I think the G. and T.'s should realize by now which is, that there is no possibility of the member cooperatives obtaining energy from SPA at the old rate of 5.6 mills, and that even under the lease-option contracts a rate of 8 to 10 mills was inevitable under the required rate review provision of the contract.

It also appears quite clear to me that the G. and T.'s could make some rate adjustments for justified increases in wholesale power cost and that this could be passed on to the member cooperatives. Some slight increase in cost to the farmer might be necessary, but on the basis of the rate structure reported it would appear that a concerted effort to increase the kilowatt-hour use per customer might result in lower unit costs for energy that would more than offset the increase in the wholesale rate.

In any event, I believe the Congress is ill-advised to appropriate any funds at this time to implement or reactivate any lease-option contracts. An independent investigation and report by a board of prominent and competent engineers is indicated in order that a complete professional true story on the matter be made available to the committee.

And here, Mr. Speaker, is the reply they have been keeping out of the RECORD:

STATEMENT OF CHAIRMAN CLARENCE CANNON

When Mr. BEN F. JENSEN, a member of the Appropriations Committee, requested permission to appear before the central section of the same committee, I gladly granted the request since I deemed Mr. JENSEN had some facts that he thought would be helpful to the central section. Mr. JENSEN did not appear before the committee and after some delay he submitted a written statement and requested it be placed in the record. I granted the request for the same reasons I had previously granted permission for him to appear in person.

Now let's take a look at some of the matters in his statement. First, he has gone to the graveyard to dig up some dead horses. The old comprehensive plan of SPA has been dead for years and like many other issues disposed of in the past, its consideration is not pertinent to the issues at hand. The next dead issue he debates is the opinion in original contracts whereby SPA could purchase G. and T. transmission lines. This has long since been relegated to the scrap heap, as is made clear in the testimony in the foregoing hearings. There will of course be no purchase of G. and T. lines by SPA.

Mr. JENSEN admits that the G. and T.'s were asking for reactivation of their contracts without the lease-option in them. He says this would make the contracts "nebulous." These contracts are written, and executed, and have been made a matter of public record. Would any fair-minded man say they are "nebulous"? Mr. JENSEN advocates contracts between the private power companies and the G. and T.'s. Is there a copy of one of these proposed contracts in the record? Does Mr. JENSEN have one? I challenge him to present one for the record. Who is advocating something "nebulous"?

I am surprised to find Mr. JENSEN pitched in the role of advocating higher power rates for our farmers. He says so long as these higher rates come out of the pockets of the farmers it's all right. He says, and I quote, "* * * adding as much as 4 or 5 mills to the wholesale cost of power would add but 16 to 20 cents to the monthly bill of a minimum user (small farmer) and $1 to $1.25 to the monthly bill of the farmer with a 250 kilowatt-hour use." He professes to be a friend of the REA, while at the same time he is advocating higher rates for farmers and strangulation contracts for the G. and T.'s with private power companies.

Mr. JENSEN has hand-picked a few situations to show it doesn't matter what the wholesale cost is, it won't affect the retail rates to farmers. Cooperative managers, in their testimony, showed that 30 to 45 percent of their total costs was for purchased power. They testified that in many instances a slight increase in wholesale power costs would throw them in the red and render them unable to pay debt service to REA.

I have always believed that Mr. JENSEN has a high regard for our American courts. Surely Members of Congress, above all, should respect the opinions of our courts, but again he says, "Mr. Wright, would have you believe that because the available power and energy is not of the type to supply the normal requirements of the potential preference customers, he has an obligation to obtain other power to supplement the surplus hydro power and energy. He will have you believe that definitive court action has proclaimed that right."

Now let's see what the district court of the District of Columbia had to say when these contracts were challenged in that court by the Power Trust.

"In like manner it is clear to the court, in view of the rule laid down in *Ashwander* v. *T. V. A.*,[1] that the purchase of thermal energy generated at the steam plants of the cooperatives, which purchase is reasonably incidental to the integration of hydroelectric power generated at the reservoir projects, is not prohibited by the provisions of the Flood Control Act but rather is within the scope of its provisions and in accord with its purpose. Consequently, the court finds that authority to purchase power and to pay rentals for the use of transmission facilities by SPA is contained in the terms of the Flood Control Act. The court holds, therefore, that the lease and power contracts do not violate the provisions of the Flood Control Act."

Mr. JENSEN says that SPA has no right or need to lease the G. and T. lines. Here's what Judge Charles F. McLaughlin of the Federal district court said:

"The court is of the opinion that the language of the statute justifies a holding that the Secretary of the Interior, through his marketing agent, may acquire by a lease agreement such transmission lines as may be necessary in order to accomplish the objectives of the act. Within the authority of the Secretary 'to contract or acquire by purchase or other agreement' is embraced, in the court's opinion, not only the power of acquisition by purchase, but also the power of acquisition by lease agreement. Not only is this conclusion justified by the wording of the act, but, in view of the context, any other conclusion would thwart the proper exercise of authority reposed in the Secretary of the Interior.

"In connection with the foregoing, the court has also taken into consideration the question raised by plaintiffs as to whether the leasing of these facilities is 'necessary' within the meaning of the act. It would appear that the answer to this question, initially, must be determined administratively since the Congress has imposed upon the administrative agency involved the duty to 'transmit and dispose of* * * power and energy in such a manner as to encourage the most widespread use thereof at the lowest possible rates to consumers thereof consistent with sound business principles.' The court finds that there is warrant in the record and reasonable basis in law for the Administrator's determination of the means to be adopted, that is to say, the leasing of transmission lines and accompanying facilities, for the carrying out of the congressional mandate contained in the act.

---

[1] *Ashwander* v. *Tennessee Valley Authority*, *supra* (n. 24). (See infra 7, pp. 26-29.)

Consequently, the court holds that the leasing of these facilities is 'necessary' within the terms of the act." [2]

When this case was appealed to the circuit court the judges there threw the power trust out of the court saying they had no grounds for a suit against the G. and T.'s.

Mr. JENSEN claims the G. and T.'s were forced into these contracts against their wishes. Again he says they were not too "unhappy" in their present sad plight. Look at the record. The officials of the G. and T.'s who worked hard to get these contracts set up were present at the recent hearing and to a man testified that they not only entered into the contracts without coercion but worked hard to get them and now wanted them reactivated.

It is claimed that the farmers will be subsidized $2 to $15 a year on their power bill if the original contracts are reactivated. He says they were baited into the contracts with low rates which will be increased to 10–13 mills. There is no evidence in the record to support these figures.

Let's see who is being subsidized. Mr. Wright says SPA hydropower is worth $17.85 per kilowatt-year and 1.5 mills per kilowatt-hour. Allowing 2,100 hours use the total value per year would be $21. To bait the G. and T.'s to illegally use their preference rights to buy this power for the power trust, Mr. Aandahl is offering this same power for $10.58 or $10.42 less than it is worth. On 130,000 kilowatts programed for the K. C. P. & L. under the new proposed contract between N. W. Co-op and SPA this would amount to a subsidy of $1,354,600. It could also be demonstrated that through similar contracts the Federal Government is subsidizing private companies in the Texas, Oklahoma, Aluminum and Narrows contracts.

A moratorium on the G. and T. payments of debt service to REA is proposed. This would pile up the debt resulting in heavier payments in later years. He says "This would give them time to * * * make arrangements for greater utilization of the facilities through interchange contracts between themselves and the other utilities of the region." The testimony before the committee is to the effect that further negotiations would be fruitless. In addition, the testimony of the Administrator of the REA in the hearings on the Supplemental Appropriations Act, 1955, makes it clear that this would be extremely poor management of the affairs entrusted to him.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN] waved this Power Trust-printed pamphlet around and asked anyone to deny a single thing in it. In conformity with his request, I will take it statement by statement and point out the errors he requests.

First several pages of the Power Trust-printed statement recite history back to 1946 when SPA proposed construction of steam plants for its own system and draw a picture of Mr. Wright as an empire builder.

The statements are mere personal opinions and include no evidence whatever to support ascribed motive. It is long well recognized that steam power is needed to firm up hydropower to provide firm power—in order to meet the intent of the Flood Control Act in serving preference customers. This is a dead issue and has no application to the question before us.

The trust-distributed statement accuses Wright of coercing G. and T.'s into building and leasing steam plants.

This is completely refuted by testimony on the part of the G. and T. managers in hearings on page 858, part 3, of the central section on public works.

The Power Trust-approved statement charges that the G. and T. systems would serve towns of over 1,500 in violation of REA Act.

This is a ridiculous deduction to the effect that G. and T. steam power would flow into the SPA system which is by law allowed to serve municipalities as preference customers. It is the same as saying that SPA system may not serve certain preference customers with firm power unless it buys the firming power from private utilities.

The courts have dismissed this contention. It is a matter of record.

The power-trust-cooperated statement infers that rates will go as high as 12 to 13 mills if the G. and T.'s are integrated under the original contracts.

The Administrator of SPA says 8.05 mills at most on page 64 of part 2 of hearings. And that is a maximum rate. It could be much lower.

The power-trust-sponsored statement claims the G. and T.'s signed away their property under a lease-option provision.

This is no longer an issue. The option provision is out. The statement is begging the question and seeking to divert attention from the real issues.

The Jensen statement attacks the representatives of the G. and T.'s for evading the moral, if not the legal restriction on activities of persons previously on the Federal payroll.

This is wholly unwarranted. The reference is to the Administrative Procedure Act. But it has been long since interpreted by courts as applicable only when such ex-employee is engaged in prosecuting a claim for money.

Mr. JENSEN (and presumably the power trust which cooperated in distributing the statement) insist that they are friends of REA's.

But Mr. JENSEN has voted against every motion to increase the REA appropriations. And he reported out the bill which revoked the SPA continuing fund and repudiated the Government's contract with the farm cooperatives.

The Power Trust-endorsed statement uses 1953 figures to show that Union Electric sold power to 4 co-ops in Missouri for 8.2 to 9.7 mills.

These figures are out of date and, of course, mean nothing. Union Electric was asking 10.2 in recent negotiations with Central. It is because of such figures as those quoted that G. and T.'s want to build their own steam plants or integrate with SPA.

The trust-printed and approved statement says there is no justification for talk about G. and T.'s being on the verge of bankruptcy.

Testimony—page 362 of hearings on second supplemental, 1955—of REA is that all of them operated at a deficit last year. Financial statements on pages 374 through 378 also show this.

The trust-printed statement claims that power generated at SPA dams can best be used by the large private or public systems.

This is exactly right. It is the reason Mr. Jensen and the Power Trust try, in court and otherwise, to show that the Federal Government has no legal authority to buy steam power. If such purchase could be prevented, most of the hydropower in the SPA system would have no market except to private utilities. Preference customers could not be served as intended by the flood control act. This is the crux of the campaign against the farm cooperatives.

Mr. JENSEN and his friends try to interpret the flood control act to mean that the sale of power by the Federal Government must be limited to hydropower produced at the dam, and the question of the right to buy steam power is not clear until tested in the Supreme Court.

No credence is given at all to the court decision already handed down to the effect that steam power may be purchased. It must be, of course, if the provisions of the flood control act are to be effective. But what is a court decision among friends?

He next goes through a lot of gymnastics with figures on power production and power rates.

This is extremely technical and must have been prepared. It is doubtful if any unbriefed layman understands them.

The combined statement seeks to attack the allocation of costs to the power features of dams.

All this is purely academic since FPC is responsible for and is thoroughly competent to evaluate figures given them and approve rates accordingly. Possibly he can scare some people into thinking Federal rates would be higher if FPC understood the facts as well as he does, but it is doubtful.

Summing up the whole purport of this statement, reprinted by the utility companies, Mr. JENSEN points out that the hydroelectric power generated at Federal dams in the SPA system can best be used "by utility systems, public or private, that are large enough to use all capacity and energy to serve the peak portion loads." This is correct, of course, but as he also points out there are few if any preference customers, that is public bodies or cooperatives, which have the facilities or are large enough to use this peaking power.

Mr. Wright, the Administrator of the Southwestern Power Administration said the same thing on page 79, part 2, of the Central Section Hearings on Public Works, as follows:

The Government had built projects, multipurpose projects, in the Southwest which produced a commodity which we refer to as peaking power. That is what it produces. It doesn't have any other commodity.

At the same time the Flood Control Act of 1944 provided that in the sale of that power you must give preference to cooperatives, public bodies, and Government agencies and private companies, in that order. You had a commodity that they couldn't use. They couldn't use that commodity. You had exchanges, integrations, or you had to do something with it before they could use it in the judgment of people who were trying to do something with it.

[2] See *American Power & Light Co.* v. *Securities & Exchange Commission, supra. Ashwander* v. *Tennessee Valley Authority* (297 U. S. 288 (1936)).

With all this in mind it becomes quite clear why Mr. JENSEN and the private utilities continue to attack, in and out of the courts, on the authority of the Federal Government to purchase steam firming power. If this point could be established, and the courts have said it cannot be established, it would then be possible for the large private utilities to take almost all of the power from Federal dams and practically none would be left for preference customers as intended by the Flood Control Act of 1944.

Mr. Speaker, we are dealing here with one of the vital issues of the day. Too much cannot be said in emphasizing the service rendered rural America through the establishment and operation of the Rural Electrification Administration.

It has completely reversed living conditions on the farm; it has changed the drift of population from the country to the city. It has especially brought health, happiness, and prosperity to the farm wife and mother.

REA has been practically effective in Missouri and the Southwest. Farm cooperatives were organized there and a contract was negotiated with the Southwestern Power Administration under which SPA contracted to buy the thermal power generated by the co-ops, rent their facilities, operate those facilities, firm up SPA waterpower with co-op steam power, and sell the firmed power to the distributing farm cooperatives at a price the farmer could afford to pay. With this contract as security the co-ops borrowed $70 million from the Government—good loans at a fair rate of interest and payable in installments in 40 years. This system was remarkably successful and under this contract every cooperative was meeting its annual amortization installments and service was extended to practically every farm and farm home in the territory.

But in the 1st session of the 83d Congress, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN] reported a bill under which money was denied Southwestern for the purpose of complying with the Government's contract and buying thermal power to firm up hydropower, and leasing the facilities, transmission lines, and plants in order to provide funds for the amortization payments.

As a result all these cooperatives are now operating at a deficit and it is merely a question of time before they will be unable to make their payments and in default will be thrown into bankruptcy. When they are put up and sold they will be taken over by the private utilities which have been bringing suits against them and paying for the printing and distribution of statements submitted by the gentleman from Iowa. It is these statements which I am now answering after the gentleman from Iowa declined to yield to me for that purpose.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman says I declined to yield to him. I certainly did not decline to yield to the gentleman. I asked him to point out any place in the statement that he thought were not the facts, and the gentleman did not do it.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I will read the exact quotations here:

I would like to have someone stand in his place and deny a single thing in this statement.

As I said, the statement was full of erroneous references to me. At least that was the inference thrown out by the gentleman from Iowa. I said:

Will the gentleman also include the reply in which I did the very thing he asked someone to deny?

Mr. JENSEN said:

That is your business. Your reply said nothing. It did not answer a single statement in my statement.

Mr. CANNON. All I ask is that the gentleman put in immediately following his statement the reply to that statement.

The reply contradicted most of his statement.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. JENSEN. The gentleman is possibly the best parliamentarian in the House, with the exception of our House Parliamentarian. The gentleman knew that he could insert his statement any time he wanted to in the RECORD any place he wanted to. The gentleman should not stand on the floor of this House and say that I denied him the opportunity of putting his statement in the RECORD. The gentleman did not make the request to have his statement put in the RECORD. The gentleman certainly knows that I would not have objected to having his statement put in the RECORD. Let us be fair about this thing.

Mr. CANNON. That is right, let us be fair about it.

Mr. JENSEN. Yes, indeed.

Mr. CANNON. He was inserting a statement attacking me. I asked him to put in the RECORD the reply in the committee hearings. He declined. Then I made this request:

I ask unanimous consent to put in the RECORD his statement and my statement appearing in the hearings on pages 866 through 877 of the volume entitled "Central Section, No. 3."

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. JENSEN. I did not object if the gentleman from Missouri wanted my statement and his answer to my statement in the RECORD. I hope he puts them in right now.

Mr. CANNON. At the time when the statement was made, he declined.

Mr. JENSEN. The gentleman is making a mountain out of a mole hill. The gentleman knows that he could have asked unanimous consent to put both my statement and his answer in the RECORD.

Mr. CANNON. That is exactly what I did. Here is my request:

I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD immediately following the remarks of the gentleman from Iowa his statement and my statement.

And I was denied that privilege.

Mr. JENSEN. I did not deny the gentleman that privilege. I did not object to having him put the statements in the RECORD.

Mr. CANNON. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] objected, and the gentleman did not intercede.

Mr. JENSEN. Now, the gentleman knows when Mr. HOFFMAN objected to that, that I had no recourse.

Mr. CANNON. The gentleman was standing there like Saul at the stoning of Stephen, consenting.

Mr. JENSEN. What could I have done? Tell me, what could I have done?

Mr. CANNON. It was only fair to permit me to be heard.

Mr. JENSEN. Tell me what I could have done.

Mr. CANNON. Did the gentleman suggest to Mr. HOFFMAN that I be allowed to be heard?

Yesterday the gentleman again produced the trust-print statement before the Committee on Government Operations. And when asked who prepared it and who printed it, who paid for it, the gentleman from Iowa could not remember who had it printed or who supplied the copies he was handing out.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, there is a limit to all things.

Mr. CANNON. There certainly is.

Mr. JENSEN. Now, the testimony that I gave before the committee is all printed for everybody to read, and I deny what the gentleman has said. If the gentleman will not twist my words around, I will get the statement and put it in the RECORD and show the House exactly what I said. The gentleman from Missouri is a professional, as everyone knows, in twisting words to suit himself.

Mr. CANNON. I will not ask that the gentleman's words be taken down because everybody knows the man who makes the charge. But, he was asked about it, and he said that it was reprinted by a utility company; that they paid for it; that they circulated it. But, he refused to say——

Mr. JENSEN. Now, Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON. I yield.

Mr. JENSEN. I thought the gentleman just got through saying—and the whole House heard him—that I said before the committee that I did not know who had it printed. Now the gentleman says I told the committee who had it printed.

Mr. CANNON. The gentleman said before this committee that he did not know who had it printed; he could not name all of the utilities that joined in. He said he did not know how much it cost. He said he did not know how many were circulated.

Mr. JENSEN. And that is the truth.

Mr. CANNON. It is remarkable that the gentleman did not know. He had this treasured report which he has carried around with him and shown on every possible occasion and which he held up here in the House and said: "Now, if that is not the truth, let someone rise and deny it," and then denied me the right to answer and explain it was not true.

Mr. JENSEN. The gentleman, Mr. CANNON, did not deny or take exception to a single statement in my statement of facts regarding APA, nor has anyone else, to my knowledge.

Mr. CANNON. Oh, the statement which I printed following it in the committee took issue with statement after statement in it.

Mr. JENSEN. No; it did not.

Mr. CANNON. That is all right. We are going to print it in the RECORD, print your statement and my answer to it, and let the House judge for itself.

Mr. JENSEN. Certainly. That is what I want.

Mr. CANNON. But the gentleman had a bad memory. He could not remember. He could not remember anybody that had it printed. He could not remember how much it cost. He could not remember how many copies were printed, and he could not remember who circulated it or to whom it was distributed or where he got his copies. Now, that is a remarkable lapse of memory on the part of my good friend, the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON. I yield.

Mr. JENSEN. Will the gentleman give me just a little time to answer him?

Mr. CANNON. Proceed, I will yield to the gentleman. I hope the gentleman has remembered in the meantime the answer to these questions which he could not remember when he was before the legislative committee.

Mr. JENSEN. The gentleman from Iowa always remembers facts. The gentleman from Iowa does not twist words to suit the occasion. The gentleman from Iowa inserted that statement in the hearings as the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] says. A few days after the hearings were printed, a gentleman, a member of the private utilities of the Southwest area, called me and asked if I cared if they reprinted the statement which I had made before the committee. I think it was May 5.

Mr. CANNON. Who was that who asked you that over the telephone?

Mr. JENSEN. I told the committee, I tell you today, and I swear to God that I do not remember who the man was, because if I did I would tell you.

Mr. CANNON. That is rather remarkable, that he asked if they could have it reprinted and the gentleman does not remember who it was.

Mr. JENSEN. It was a passing incident. He said to me, "Do you care if we have this statement reprinted?" I said, "It is a public document, and of course I have no objection to it at all." He said, "All right." That was the end of the conversation.

I have been a pretty busy man, as has the gentleman from Missouri. We have had a lot of things to do.

Mr. CANNON. That is all I want to know. The gentleman does not remember who asked him to have the speech reprinted or why they wanted to spend money on it.

Mr. JENSEN. I will tell the gentleman what I will do, since he has gone this far. I will run it down and find out just who that gentleman was; because the officials of the private utilities in that area in my estimation are honorable gentleman. They are hired men for a few million people, that is all. They do not own the private utility. They have nothing to cover up. They appeared before the Committees of the House and the Senate for years.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, a point of order.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. FULTON. I ask for the regular order. These gentlemen are certainly not on the subject before the House. Is this a private fight or can anybody else get in it?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] asked unanimous consent to speak out of order, and that consent was granted.

Mr. FULTON. He is certainly speaking out of order.

Mr. CANNON. But I am not making unfounded charges against a colleague and then refusing to give him an opportunity to reply. And none of the expenses are being paid by the power trust.

Mr. JENSEN. This is a private fight between us. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] and I have had a good many of them and we still respect each other. But as far as this question concerning private enterprises and Government ownership, we have some differences. But I wish the gentleman would stay with the facts.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, these private utilities brought suit against REA to declare the contract of the Government with REA invalid. The courts twice decided that the contract was valid. These private utilities that sought to destroy the contract are the people who reprinted the gentleman's statement. The statement undoubtedly was very favorable to the utilities and very unfavorable to REA or they would not have gone to the expense of paying for the printing and distribution.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON. Yes.

Mr. JENSEN. In this contract the gentleman from Missouri speaks of between Southwestern Power Administration and the REA there was a provision which read like this.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker——

Mr. JENSEN. I know the gentleman does not want to hear this.

Mr. CANNON. I would be glad to hear anything the gentleman says, especially why the power trust is printing his speeches.

Mr. JENSEN. All right. The gentleman has criticized the committee because we did not go along with a provision in the contract that he speaks of which provided that any time the Southwestern Power Administration paid the unpaid loan of the REA they could take over thousands of miles of transmission lines which were built by the REA generating and transmission companies of that area. Then it further provided that after the 40-year pay-out period and the REA had paid off their REA loan in full, the Southwestern Power Administration could pay the REA $10, and all of those thousands of miles of REA transmission lines would belong to the Government. That was the provision we objected to, and every member of the committee will tell you that is the truth. Then Mr. CANNON called the committee gullible. I looked up Webster and "gullible" according to Webster means easily duped.

Mr. CANNON. The gentleman would like to get away from the provisions of that contract. I will tell you what the contract provided. The contract provided in these words——

Mr. JENSEN. Well, listen, did not the contract have those provisions in it?

The SPEAKER. Both gentlemen in the well of the House have great respect for the House and are good parliamentarians. The Chair does trust that this matter may soon be finished.

Mr. JENSEN. I am very well satisfied, thank you Mr. Speaker.

Mr. CANNON. I will tell you what the contract provided. The contract provided that Southwestern should lease the facilities and provide power at a rate the farmers could pay. It provided that REA have enough income to meet its amortization payments; but after we adopted the provision offered in the first session of the last Congress, the REA immediately began to lose money. Every one of them is running today at a deficit. Why? Because of a bill brought in by the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. JENSEN. If the gentleman will yield, Ancher Nelsen the Administrator of REA just recently testified before our committee that every REA in the Southwestern Power area was current in payments. Congress has appropriated money to help them out over the past several years.

Mr. CANNON. Yes. They appropriated the money under a Democratic Administration, and now they are paying out. But the testimony was that every REA was running at a deficit because of this change in the bill brought in by the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. JENSEN. Yes, and by Senator HAYDEN'S committee. Is Senator HAYDEN gullible? Is Congressman MIKE KIRWAN gullible? Is Congressman W. F. NORRELL gullible? Is Congressman FENTON gullible?

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I am not going to take up more time of the House. The gentleman is circulating statements printed by the utilities which brought suit in the courts against REA in order to destroy REA.

I will extend my remarks by inserting here material which shows conclusively that was the intent.

Mr. JENSEN. Will the gentleman include my statement and his answer?

Mr. CANNON. I asked to have it inserted in the RECORD, and the gentleman objected.

In addition to pointing out the errors in the statement, I will also call attention to the discrepancies in the testimony before the Committee on Government Operations.

This necessarily includes matters previously discussed in connection with the analysis of the statement above.

At page 216 of the transcript of his testimony before the Subcommittee on Public Works and Resources, on July 26,

1955, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN] said:

He (Mr. Wright) induced the five G. and T. cooperatives in the Southwest area to sign a contract, that contract for leasing of all of the transmission lines which the G. and T.'s owned, to the Southwestern Power Administration.

On page 858 of part 3 of central section hearings on public works, under questioning by Mr. PHILLIPS, presidents of the G. and T. boards specifically denied there was coercion of any kind and explained that the contracts offered their organizations the best alternative of those available for providing service to their farmer customers.

At pages 216 and 217 Mr. JENSEN is quoted as insisting that the option-to-purchase clause is given as the reason for setting the contracts aside when Mr. JENSEN was chairman of the subcommittee.

This provision could very easily have been changed by action of the Congress without destroying the entire contract. Further, this provision, while it has now been deleted, could be considered as only reasonable protection for the Government investment. It has been taken out of the contract and need be given no further attention.

On page 218 Mr. JENSEN says: "May I say that Ancher Nelsen, the Administrator of REA, testified before our Public Works Committee about 2 months ago that all the REA's in the Southwestern Power area were current in their payment."

This does not give the whole story. On pages 374 through 378 of the hearings on the second supplemental appropriation bill, 1955, the financial status of the G. and T.'s is clearly shown. All were operating with an accrued deficit. And on page 362 of the same hearings, Mr. Cole, of the REA, testified as follows:

All of the G. and T. borrowers in the SPA area operated at a deficit last year.

At page 220 the statement is made that until the question of authority of Federal Government to purchase steam power and build steam plants is argued in the Supreme Court, Mr. JENSEN said, "It is poppycock for Mr. Wright or anyone else to say that this issue has been settled and the legal right to do these things is clear."

The district court has ruled that authority of SPA to purchase steam power is clear and unequivocal. The United States court of appeals said utilities had no right to raise the issue. REA Act in section 4 authorizes the Administrator "to make loans for the purpose of financing the construction of generating plants." The G. and T.'s built the plants—not the Federal Government.

No objection has been made to any existing contracts between SPA and the private utilities under which SPA purchases steam power from the private utility.

On pages 220–221 Mr. JENSEN's testimony implies that the only questions in suits brought by utility companies was on the matter of purchasing of steam power and building of steam plants.

The court decision in the 10-company suit is found on pages 729 through 740 of section 3 of the Central Section Hearings on Public Works. The court ruled on the following points:

First. That the contracts do not violate the Central Station Service provision of the REA Act.

Second. That the contracts do not violate the rural area provision of the REA Act.

Third. That the loan contracts were not executed for the sole benefit of SPA.

Fourth. That the loan contracts do not violate the self-liquidating provision of section 4 of the REA Act.

Fifth. That the loan contract between REA and M. & A. Electric Power Co-op is legal.

Sixth. That the lease and power contracts do not violate the provisions of the Flood Control Act.

Seventh. That the lease and power contracts are not illegal on any other grounds mentioned in the suit.

At page 221 Mr. JENSEN stated:

I don't want the Federal Government or anyone else to attempt to run their business or to acquire their property by subterfuge or any other manner, illegal manner.

However, on pages 763 and 764 of part 3, Central Section hearings on Public Works, Mr. Green, manager of Central Electric Co-op, says:

The power company (Union Electric) proposal provided that all control over the use of the capacity in the cooperatives' 161-kilowatt transmission lines and power plant be surrendered to the power company as if these facilities were leased. Earlier we had severe criticism for leasing our lines (to SPA), even from the power companies themselves. In fact, we were taken to the courts by these power companies, and one of the issues was that leasing of the lines was not a legal and proper method, but now we found in these negotiations that the power companies themselves wanted to take the place of SPA.

At pages 237 and 238 Mr. JENSEN explains that Minority Clerk George Green helped to prepare pamphlet of Mr. JENSEN's testimony in part 3 of Central Section Hearings on Public Works, and that it was printed by private utilities in Southwest area, but he cannot recall name of any of them.

Comment is unnecessary.

On page 246 Mr. JENSEN reiterates:

In that connection, since that statement was made by me and put into the hearing, not one person in this America of ours has taken exception to one statement of facts or figures in that statement, to my knowledge.

But my statement immediately following Mr. JENSEN's in the hearings at page 875, part 3. Central Section, Public Works, and which I repeatedy called to the attention of the gentleman from Iowa on the floor conclusively refutes the major points in the statement.

At pages 246 and 252 many figures are used to show there is wide difference in cost of power to ultimate consumers and the wholesale rate to the co-op. Implication is that a small difference in wholesale rate (1. e., 5.6 mils to 10.2 mils) would have no bearing on ultimate cost to consumers.

This is seriously misleading, since there will of necessity be variations in the spread between wholesale and retail prices because of customer density, terrain, average customer consumption, and other factors unique to the area served by any given co-op. And since they operate without profit, a small change in wholesale cost per kilowatt must be passed on in total to the consumer. The small charge per kilowatt becomes a substantial sum when multiplied by the number of kilowatt-hours the farmer uses.

It is precisely this small difference at the point of ultimate use that brought about the REA's in the first place.

Mr. Speaker, these proceedings have not gone unnoticed by the press. And under leave granted me to insert material in the RECORD in this connection, I include an article from the Washington Post and Times Herald of July 29, 1955, as follows:

POWER PAMPHLET HELD VIOLATION

(By Warren Unna)

One House committee yesterday took the unusual step of subpenaing another committee's staff member in an attempt to find out if an anonymously printed pamphlet on Midwest power problems was in violation of the lobbying act.

But George S. Green, 10211 Lorain Avenue, Silver Spring, minority clerk to the House Appropriations Committee, proved to be of no help.

Green, subpenaed by the House Government Operations Public Works Subcommittee, said he had "assisted" Representative BEN F. JENSEN, Republican, Iowa, in writing the "technical aspects" of the 17-page pamphlet. But he added that the first he knew that possibly hundreds of thousands of copies had been circulated in the Arkansas-Missouri-Oklahoma area was when JENSEN gave him one.

Representative EARL CHUDOFF, Democrat, Pennsylvania, subcommittee chairman, said after the hearing: "There is no question about it; this is a violation of the lobbying act."

CHUDOFF explained that the law provides that anyone spending more than $10 "for the purpose of influencing legislation" must register with the Clerk of the House. He estimated "many thousands of dollars" had been spent on this pamphlet, Facts About the Southwestern Power Problem, and said its purpose was clearly to "influence Congress and its legislation."

The pamphlet reprints remarks JENSEN made before the House Appropriations Public Works Subcommittee May 19. In it he accuses Southwestern Power Administrator Douglas G. Wright of "a burning and insatiable obsession to obtain, without regard to method * * * a gigantic power empire."

The pamphlet, under JENSEN's name, characterizes as "canned dialog" question-and-answer testimony between Representative CLARENCE CANNON (Democrat, of Missouri), House Appropriations Committee chairman, and Wright.

JENSEN's pamphlet came to public light Tuesday when he submitted it in testifying before CHUDOFF's hearing on administration power policies. He was immediately asked about its origin.

He said Green had written most of the remarks for him and then a representative of 12 private utilities in SPA's Arkansas-Missouri-Oklahoma area had phoned him for permission to reprint his speech in pamphlet form.

"It was a public document. I cannot tell anyone not to reprint it," JENSEN testified at the time. "(But) so help me God, if I die on this spot, I do not know all the private utilities that contributed to it. Maybe all of them did, I do not know."

Green was asked yesterday if he was the only one who had helped JENSEN.

"I couldn't say," he replied.

Asked if he had obtained any of his data from the 12 private utilities in the SPA

area, Green answered: "I don't believe so—in connection with this particular pamphlet."

Green, a former Federal Power Commission employee who has been working with Representative JOHN TABER (Republican, of New York), on the House Appropriations Committee staff since 1953, said JENSEN had requested his help—"I assume it was in my capacity as a minority clerk. I was instructed by Mr. TABER to assist any members of the minority of the committee."

I also include editorial comment from Labor's Daily of Saturday, July 30, 1955, as follows:

The private utilities of the Southwest have very definitely violated the Lobby Act by printing pamphlets which Representative BEN J. JENSEN (Republican, of Iowa) distributed to all Congressmen, a House committee has decided. But the pamphlets contained a statement by JENSEN in opposition to certain funds for the Southwestern Power Administration.

Also reported in the New York Times of July 28, 1955:

HOUSE UNIT SEEKS PAMPHLET BACKER—PRO-PRIVATE POWER PAPER PROMPTS ONE GROUP TO CALL CLERK OF ANOTHER

(By C. T. Trussell)

WASHINGTON, July 27.—A subpena was issued by one congressional committee today to require sworn testimony from a clerk of another.

This unusual action was taken in an effort to discover who prepared, financed, and attained Congresswide circulation of a pamphlet favorable to private utilities. It appeared just before a vote was taken on appropriations concerning both public and private power interests in the Southwest.

It appeared to be the opening of an investigation into the power of lobbies of the private power interests.

The pamphlet now at issue indicated that its author was Representative BEN F. JENSEN, Republican, of Iowa. Mr. JENSEN formerly was chairman of the Appropriations Subcommittee handling public utilities funds. It was identified, however, as having been almost wholly a reprint of a statement he had filed with a House Government Operations Subcommittee earlier this year.

Mr. JENSEN asked to be heard by the Government Operations Subcommittee now examining public-power policy. He said he had agreed to the distribution of his statement among colleagues at the request of someone he could not identify.

The subcommittee, headed by Representative EARL CHUDOFF, Democrat, of Pennsylvania, wanted to know more about this. Examination of the 17-page pamphlet gave no hint as to who financed it or who printed it. Mr. JENSEN said he did not finance it and did not know who published it.

It came out, though, under the title, "Facts About the Southwestern Power Problem * * * by BEN F. JENSEN." It dealt, to the advantage of private utilities, with the sales of power by public projects.

Suspicion seemed to center upon George Green, a minority clerk of the Appropriations Committee. Mr. Green was in the room. Representative JOHN E. MOSS, JR., Democrat, of California, asked that he be called to the stand. Representative JENSEN protested. Never, he held, had one congressional committee intruded upon the operations of the staff of another.

The chairman of the full Government Operations Committee, Representative WILLIAM L. DAWSON, Democrat, of Illinois, nevertheless, issued a subpena for Mr. Green.

And the following article from the American Public Power Association Newsletter of July 29, 1955:

POWER MYSTERY: WHO PAID FOR JENSEN PAMPHLET BLASTING SPA?

The Chudoff subcommittee this week questioned Representative BEN F. JENSEN, Republican, Iowa, and a member of the House Appropriations Committee staff regarding authorship and financial backing of an anti-public-power pamphlet which Representative EARL CHUDOFF said was distributed by the "hundreds of thousands."

The 17-page pamphlet Facts About the Southwestern Power Problem, bears no indication of its source other than that it reprints testimony by Representative JENSEN before the Appropriations Committee with respect to SPA funds.

The Iowa Congressman told the committee that he received a telephone call asking permission to reprint the testimony and that he assumed "the private utilities in the Southwest area had that statement reprinted:" He provided a copy to every Member of the House and Senate, he added.

In answer to questions from Chairman CHUDOFF, whose subcommittee has jurisdiction over public works and resources within the House Committee on Government Operations, Representative JENSEN declared, "So help me God, if I die on this spot, I don't know all the private utilities that contributed to it."

Following the Jensen testimony, Representative CHUDOFF told reporters that "there is no question about it; this is a violation of the lobbying act." He admitted the possibility that the utilities which footed the bill for the pamphlet may be registered as lobbyists and thus have complied with the law.

In an effort to track down authorship of the pamphlet, Representative CHUDOFF drew from Representative JENSEN the fact that George S. Green, minority clerk of the House Appropriations Committee, aided in its preparation. "BEN JENSEN, the old lumberman, would not be capable of going into all those details so far as rates are concerned," he explained.

The pamphlet attacks Southwestern Power Administration, whose policies are under investigation by the Chudoff group, and charges SPA Administrator Douglas Wright with "a burning and insatiable obsession to obtain, without regard to method, the 'comprehensive plan of power distribution' whereby he would build a gigantic power empire."

The SPEAKER. The question is on the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, in order to save the time of the House, I would like to make a unanimous-consent request. We have many items here which are in technical disagreement, and which are mere formalities. So I ask unanimous consent that the following amendments be considered en bloc, on which motions will be offered to recede and concur: Amendments Nos. 2, 19, 20, 28, 29, 34, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41, 43, 48, 49, 50, 58, 59, 61, 64, 78, 80, 82, 83, 85, 86, 88, 89, 92, 95, 98, 117, 127, 128, 130, 131, 142, and 143.

These are matters in technical disagreement, and I believe there is no difference of opinion on them on either side of the aisle.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the reading in detail of the amendments enumerated by the gentleman from Missouri be dispensed with and that they be printed in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The amendments in disagreement are as follows:

Amendment No. 2: Page 2, line 4, insert:

"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."

Amendment No. 19: Page 5, line 7, insert:

"Agricultural conservation program service

"Not to exceed $5 million 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."

Amendment No. 20: Page 5, line 16, 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."

Amendment No. 28: Page 8, line 19, 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."

Amendment No. 29: Page 9, line 4, 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 chairman of the Tariff Commission, for expenses of attendance at meeting of organizations concerned with the functions and activities of the said Commission."

Amendment No. 34: Page 12, line 9, 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."

Amendment No. 37: Page 37, line 24, insert:

"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)."

Amendment No. 38: Page 14, line 4, 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."

Amendment No. 39: Page 14, line 10, 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."

Amendment No. 40: Page 14, line 19, 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."

Amendment No. 41: Page 15, line 3, 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)."

Amendment No. 43: Page 15, line 11, insert:

"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 Ryukyu 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."

Amendment No. 48: Page 20, line 23, insert:

"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."

Amendment No. 49: Page 21, line 9, 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."

Amendment No. 50: Page 21, line 13, 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."

Amendment No. 58: Page 24, line 1, 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.' "

Amendment No. 59: Page 24, line 11, 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."

Amendment No. 61: Page 24, line 18, insert:

"For an additional amount for 'Expenses, general supply fund,' $1 million, 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."

Amendment No. 64: Page 26, line 1, 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))."

Amendment No. 78: Page 30, line 17, 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."

Amendment No. 80: Page 31, line 9, 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."

Amendment No. 82: Page 31, line 21, insert: "of which $455,000 shall be available for the construction of fish-cultural facilities below Norfolk Dam, Arkansas."

Amendment No. 83: Page 32, line 1, 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."

Amendment No. 85: Page 32, line 13, 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."

Amendment No. 86: Page 32, line 18, 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."

Amendment No. 88: Page 33, line 6, 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."

Amendment No. 89: Page 33, line 20, 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 Cong.), shall be available for expenses of official entertainment."

Amendment No. 92: Page 34, line 7, 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."

Amendment No. 95: Page 35, line 10, insert:

"Salaries and expenses

"For on 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."

Amendment No. 98: Page 35, line 33, insert:

"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."

Amendment No. 117: Page 41, line 3, 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."

Amendment No. 127: Page 45, line 11, insert:

"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."

Amendment No. 128: Page 45, line 17, 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."

Amendment No. 130: Page 47, line 13, 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."

Amendment No. 131: Page 47, line 20, 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 SE. (including instruments for receiving alarms and connecting said house to the fire alarm system)."

Amendment No. 142: Page 50, line 18, insert:

"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';

"Bureau of the Census: '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.'

Amendment No. 143: Page 53, line 23, 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. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered: 2, 19, 20, 28, 29, 34, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41, 43, 48, 49, 50, 58, 59, 61, 64, 78, 80, 82, 83, 85, 86, 88, 89, 92, 95, 98, 117, 127, 128, 130, 131, 142, and 143, and concur therein.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Missouri.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 3: Page 2, line 11, insert:

"Animal disease laboratory facilities

"For preparation of plans and specification 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."

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

In lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert "$250,000."

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

"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."

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. CANNON moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 22, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the first sum named in said amendment insert "100,000."

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 23: Page 7, line 1, 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'."

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. CANNON moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 23, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the second sum named in said amendment insert "$225,000."

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 25; Page 7, line 13, insert:

"WEATHER BUREAU

"Salaries and expenses

"For an additional amount for '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'."

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. CANNON moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 25, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the first sum named in said amendment insert "$500,000," and in lieu of the last sum named in said amendment insert "$4,750,000."

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 27: Page 8, line 2, insert:

"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 Distaster 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."

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. CANNON moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 27, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the first sum named in said amendment insert "$2,000,000."

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 31: Page 11, line 3, 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'."

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. CANNON moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 31, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert: $485,077,000.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 33: Page 11, line 19, insert:

"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."

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. CANNON moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 33, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert: $442,628,300.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 35: Page 12, line 22, 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, $1,081,316,000 of which $255 million 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), 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. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. CANNON moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 35, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment 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 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, $994,291,000 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)."

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 56: Page 22, line 20, insert:

"Sites and planning, purchase contract, 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 million, 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.

"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 million, in addition to the unused portion of the $5 million limitation applicable prior to July 1, 1955, under section 411 (a) of the said Public Buildings Act of 1949, as amended."

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. CANNON moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 56 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment insert:

"Sites and planning, purchase contract, 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 million, 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."

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 62: Page 25, line 1, 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 Committees of the Congress."

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House insist on its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 62.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 75: Page 29, line 1, 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 1st 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."

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. CANNON moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 75, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment 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; $40,000."

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 76: Page 29, line 17, 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."

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. CANNON moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 76, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment insert:

"Selective Service System

"Salaries and Expenses

"Not to exceed $180,000 of the amount made available under this head in the Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1956, for registration, classification, and induction activities of local boards, shall 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."

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 32, line 7, insert the following:

"ALEXANDER HAMILTON BICENTENNIAL COMMISSION

"For an additional amount for 'Alexander Hamilton Bicentennial Commission', $122,162, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That this appropriation shall become effective only upon the enactment into law of S. 1395."

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. CANNON moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 84, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert: "$120,000."

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 34, line 16, insert the following:

"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."

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. CANNON moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 93, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert "$1,500,000."

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 35, line 8, insert:

"Grants to States for poliomyelitis vaccination

"For grants to States for carrying out the purposes of the Poliomyelitis Vaccination Assistance Act of 1955, $60,000,000: *Provided*, That this appropriation shall become effective only upon the enactment into law of H. R. 7126 or S. 2501, 84th Congress."

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. CANNON moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 104, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert "$30,000,000."

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 39, line 13, after "Congress", insert a colon and the following: "*Provided*, That, in addition to transfers authorized by law, $101,000,000 of unexpended balances available under this head shall be transferred to the appropriation 'Operating expenses, Atomic Energy Commission'."

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. CANNON moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 109, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$90,000,000."

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 40, line 20, insert the following:

"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."

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. CANNON moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 116, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$1,000,000."

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 44, line 7, insert the following:

"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."

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. CANNON moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 123, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert: "$5,000,000."

The motion was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider the votes by which action was taken on the several motions was laid on the table.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have the privilege of extending their remarks at this point in the RECORD in regard to the supplemental appropriation bill just considered.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

FAIR LABOR STANDARDS AMENDMENTS OF 1955

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (S. 2168) to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 in order to increase the national minimum wage, and for other

purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT NO. 1561)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 2168) to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 in order to increase the national minimum wage, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the House amendment insert the following: "That this act may be cited as the 'Fair Labor Standards Amendments of 1955'.

"SEC. 2. Subsection (d) of section 4 of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following: 'Such report shall contain an evaluation and appraisal by the Secretary of the minimum wages established by this Act, together with his recommendations to the Congress. In making such evaluation and appraisal, the Secretary shall take into consideration any changes which may have occurred in the cost of living and in productivity and the level of wages in manufacturing, the ability of employers to absorb wage increases, and such other factors as he may deem pertinent.'

"SEC. 3. Effective March 1, 1956, paragraph (1) of subsection (a) of section 6 of such Act is amended by striking out '75 cents' and inserting in lieu thereof '$1'.

"SEC. 4. Effective July 1, 1956, subsection (a) of section 8 of such Act is amended by inserting at the end thereof the following: 'Minimum rates of wages established in accordance with this section shall be reviewed by such a committee at least once each fiscal year.'

"SEC. 5. (a) Subsection (a) of section 5 of such Act is amended by striking out 'and the administrator' in the last sentence.

"(b) Subsection (b) of section 8 of such Act is amended by striking out the second sentence and inserting in lieu thereof the following: 'The industry committee shall investigate conditions in the industry and the committee, or any authorized subcommittee thereof, shall after due notice hear such witnesses and receive such evidence as may be necessary or appropriate to enable the committee to perform its duties and functions under this Act.'

"(c) Subsection (c) of section 8 is amended by striking out 'and the Administrator' in the second sentence.

(d) Subsection (d) of section 8 of such Act is amended to read as follows:

"'(d) The industry committee shall file with the Secretary a report containing its findings of fact and recommendations with respect to the matters referred to it. Upon the filing of such report, the Secretary shall publish such recommendations in the Federal Register and shall provide by order that the recommendations contained in such report shall take effect upon the expiration of 15 days after the date of such publication.'

"(e) Subsection (e) of section 8 of such Act is amended by striking out the last sentence.

"(f) Subsection (a) of section 10 of such Act is amended to read as follows:

"'SEC. 10. (a) Any person aggrieved by an order of the Secretary issued under section 8 may obtain a review of such order in the United States Court of Appeals for any circuit wherein such person resides or has his principal place of business, or in the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia, by filing in such court, within 60 days after the entry of such order a written petition praying that the order of the Secretary be modified or set aside in whole or in part. A copy of such petition shall forthwith be served upon the Secretary, and thereupon the Secretary shall certify and file in the court a transcript of the record of the industry committee upon which the order complained of was entered. Upon the filing of such transcript such court shall have exclusive jurisdiction to affirm, modify, or set aside such order in whole or in part, so far as it is applicable to the petitioner. The review by the court shall be limited to questions of law, and findings of fact by such industry committee when supported by substantial evidence shall be conclusive. No objection to the order of the Secretary shall be considered by the court unless such objection shall have been urged before such industry committee or unless there were reasonable grounds for failure so to do. If application is made to the court for leave to adduce additional evidence, and it is shown to the satisfaction of the court that such additional evidence may materially affect the result of the proceeding and that there were reasonable grounds for failure to adduce such evidence in the proceedings before such industry committee, the court may order such additional evidence to be taken before an industry committee and to be adduced upon the hearing in such manner and upon such terms and conditions as to the court may seem proper. Such industry committee may modify the initial findings by reason of the additional evidence so taken, and shall file with the court such modified or new findings which if supported by substantial evidence shall be conclusive, and shall also file its recommendation, if any, for the modification or setting aside of the original order. The judgment and decree of the court shall be final, subject to review by the Supreme Court of the United States upon certiorari or certification as provided in section 1254 of title 28 of the United States Code.

"SEC. 6. The term 'Secretary' as used in this Act and in amendments made by this Act means the Secretary of Labor."

And the House agree to the same.

GRAHAM A. BARDEN,
AUGUSTINE B. KELLEY,
ADAM C. POWELL, Jr.,
SAMUEL K. MCCONNELL, Jr.,
RALPH W. GWINN,
Managers on the Part of the House.

PAUL H. DOUGLAS,
MATTHEW M. NEELY,
By P. H. D.
JOHN F. KENNEDY,
H. ALEXANDER SMITH,
BARRY GOLDWATER,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 2168) to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 in order to increase the national minimum wage, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

The House amendment struck out all of the Senate bill after the enacting clause and inserted a substitute amendment. The conferees have agreed to a substitute for both the Senate bill and the House amendment. Except for clerical and necessary conforming changes, the following statement explains the differences between the House amendment and the substitute agreed to in conference.

SHORT TITLE

The Senate bill provided that it may be cited as the "Fair Labor Standards Amendments of 1955." No similar provision was included in the House amendment. The House recedes and the provision is included as the first section of the substitute agreed to in conference.

REPORT BY THE SECRETARY OF LABOR

The Senate bill provided that the Secretary of Labor shall include in his annual report to Congress an evaluation and appraisal of the minimum wages established by the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, together with recommendations for any changes in amounts he deems desirable. It provided that, in making this evaluation and appraisal, the Secretary shall take into account changes in the cost of living and in productivity and wage levels in manufacturing, the ability of industries to absorb wage increases, and other pertinent factors. No similar provision was included in the House amendment.

This provision, with two changes, is included as section 2 of the conference substitute. The conferees agreed to strike the reference to recommendations for changes in the amounts of minimum wages, leaving the Secretary free to make any recommendations he deems desirable with respect to the matters covered by the act. The second change was to require that the Secretary take into account the ability of "employers" rather than "industries" to absorb wage increases. The minimum wages established by the act apply to "employers" as the term is defined in the act; the change is designed to insure that ability to absorb wage increases is determined by reference solely to the persons who must pay the increased rates.

MINIMUM WAGE RATE AND EFFECTIVE DATE

Section 3 of the conference substitute raises the minimum wage rate under section 6 (a) (1) of the act from 75 cents to $1 an hour, effective March 1, 1956. Except for technical changes in language, this provision is the same as the House amendment.

ANNUAL REVIEW OF MINIMUM WAGE RATES IN PUERTO RICO AND THE VIRGIN ISLANDS

The Senate bill provided that minimum wage rates established under the act for Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands shall be reviewed by an industry committee at least once each fiscal year. Under existing law, no such periodic review is required. The House bill contained no similar provision. The House recedes, and the provision is included as section 4 of the conference substitute.

ESTABLISHMENT OF MINIMUM WAGE RATES FOR PUERTO RICO AND THE VIRGIN ISLANDS

The Senate bill contained several provisions dealing with the establishment of minimum wage rates for Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands. These included a provision changing the procedures for review by the Secretary of Labor of industry committee recommendations, and a provision for mandatory percentage increases in such minimum wage rates. The House amendment contained no such provisions. The conferees have agreed upon a substitute for these provisions, which is included as section 5 of the conference agreement.

This substitute eliminates the Secretary of Labor's authority (now vested in him by sec. 8 (d) of the act) to approve or disapprove industry committee recommendations. Section 8 (d) is amended to require that an industry committee file a report with the Secretary of Labor, containing findings of fact

by the committee, along with its recommendations. When such report is filed with the Secretary the substitute amendment requires that he publish the committee's recommendations in the Federal Register. These recommendations will then become effective at the expiration of 15 days from the date of publication.

Section 8 (b) is amended to make certain that there will be notice and opportunity for hearings before an industry committee in its survey of wage rates for Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands.

Section 10 (a) of the present law provides for court review of wage orders for Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands. The substitute amendment changes the language of section 10 (a) to reflect the changes in the manner in which these Puerto Rican and Virgin Islands wage rates will become effective.

GRAHAM A. BARDEN,
AUGUSTINE B. KELLEY,
ADAM C. POWELL, Jr.,
SAMUEL K. MCCONNELL, Jr.,
RALPH W. GWINN,
Managers on the Part of the House.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to; a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ORRIN J. BISHOP

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H. R. 4249) for the relief of Orrin J. Bishop, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. NO. 1569)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4249) for the relief of Orrin J. Bishop, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate and agree to the same.

THOMAS J. LANE,
E. L. FORRESTER,
WILLIAM E. MILLER,
Managers on the Part of the House.
HARLEY M. KILGORE,
PRICE DANIEL,
HERMAN WELKER,
JOHN M. BUTLER,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4249) for the relief of Orrin J. Bishop submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

The bill as passed by the House would permit the payment of attorney fees not in excess of 10 percent. The Senate amended the bill by striking out this provision and stated that no part of the appropriation in this act shall be paid to any attorney or agent. At the conference the House conferees agreed to the Senate amendment.

THOMAS J. LANE,
E. L. FORRESTER,
WILLIAM E. MILLER,
Managers on the Part of the House.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to; and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

VICTOR HELFENBEIN

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H. R. 5078) for the relief of the estate of Victor Helfenbein, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. NO. 1584)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 5078) for the relief of the estate of Victor Helfenbein having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

Strike out the matter proposed to be stricken out by the amendment of the Senate, insert the matter proposed to be inserted by the amendment of the Senate, and on page 1, line 6, of the House engrossed bill strike out "$6,500" and insert in lieu thereof "$5,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

THOMAS J. LANE,
CHARLES A. BOYLE,
WILLIAM E. MILLER,
Managers on the Part of the House.
HARLEY M. KILGORE,
JOHN L. MCCLELLAN,
PRICE DANIEL,
HERMAN WELKER,
JOHN MARSHALL BUTLER,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 5078) for the relief of the estate of Victor Helfenbein, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

The bill as passed by the House would permit the payment of attorney fees not to exceed 10 percent. The Senate amended the bill by striking out this provision and stated that no attorney or agent shall receive any part of the appropriation in this act. In the conference the House conferees agreed to the Senate amendment.

As passed by the House, the bill provided authorization for $6,500 to be paid the estate of Victor Helfenbein. The Senate reduced this amount to $3,500. At the conference the amount agreed upon was $5,000.

THOMAS J. LANE,
CHARLES A. BOYLE,
WILLIAM E. MILLER,
Managers on the Part of the House.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to; and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REPORTS FROM THE COMMITTEE ON RULES

Mr. MCCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that during the remainder of this session it shall be in order to consider at any time reports from the Committee on Rules as provided in clause 21, rule XI, except that the provision requiring a two-thirds vote to consider such reports shall be waived.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

PRIVATE CALENDAR

The SPEAKER. This is Private Calendar day. The Clerk will call the first individual bill on the Private Calendar.

HAROLD SWARTHOUT AND L. R. SWARTHOUT

The Clerk called the bill (S. 476) for the relief of Harold Swarthout and L. R. Swarthout.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, (1) to Harold Swarthout the sum of $10,000, in full satisfaction of the claim of the said Harold Swarthout against the United States for compensation for permanent injuries sustained as a result of the severe burns he received when an Army practice bomb that he was examining, while playing in the yard of a neighbor on April 3, 1943, exploded when accidentally dropped, and (2) to L. R. Swarthout, of Burns, Oreg., father of the said Harold Swarthout, the sum of $4,625.20, in full satisfaction of his claim against the United States for reimbursement of medical, nursing, hospital, and other expenses incurred by him on account of the injuries so sustained by the said Harold Swarthout: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

IRENE C. (KARL) BEHRMAN

The Clerk called the bill (S. 92) for the relief of Irene C. (Karl) Behrman.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Irene C. (Karl) Behrman, the sum of $3,194.39, in full satisfaction of her claim against the United States for compensation for loss of certain

personal property resulting from her forced evacuation, on or about June 26, 1950, from Seoul, Korea, where she was serving as a service club director with the Special Services Section, United States Army Forces: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ELKAY MANUFACTURING CO.

The Clerk called the bill (S. 135) for the relief of the Elkay Manufacturing Co., of Chicago, Ill.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the Elkay Manufacturing Co., of Chicago, Ill., the sum of $5,190.15. The payment of such sum shall be in full satisfaction of all claims of the said Elkay Manufacturing Co. against the United States for additional compensation under the contract No. SAPH 55725 (NIH), between such company and the National Institutes of Health, for the construction of certain stainless steel dog and monkey cages. Such sums plus the amount of compensation heretofore received by the Elkay Manufacturing Co. represents the actual costs incurred by it in manufacturing such cages, it having submitted its bid under the erroneous impression that each unit to be manufactured was to consist of only one cage, whereas in fact each unit was to consist of two cages: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MRS. MARIA DEL MUL

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 929) for the relief of Mrs. Maria Del Mul.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Mrs. Maria Del Mul shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee.

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.

ALICE DUCKETT

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1005) for the relief of Alice Duckett.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Alice Duckett shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

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.

CHUNG FOOK YEE CHUNG

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1014) for the relief of Chung Fook Yee Chung.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Chung Fook Yee Chung shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

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.

MRS. ESTHER CHAN LEE (ETA LEE)

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1074) for the relief of Mrs. Esther Chan Lee (Eta Lee).

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Mrs. Esther Chan Lee (Eta Lee) shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

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.

GUENTHER KASCHNER

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1104) for the relief of Guenther Kaschner.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, notwithstanding the provision of section 212 (a) (9) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Guenther Kaschner may be admitted to the United States for permanent residence if he is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of that act: *Provided*, That this exemption shall apply only to a ground for exclusion of which the Department of State or the Department of Justice have knowledge prior to the enactment of this act.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 9, strike out the word "have" and substitute "had."

The committee 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.

HARRY JOHN WILSON

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1137) for the relief of Harry John Wilson.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Harry John Wilson shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

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.

MRS. ESTHER MORENO

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1208) for the relief of Mrs. Esther Moreno.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purpose of section 202 (a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Mrs. Esther Moreno shall be held to be a native of France.

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.

NUMERIANO LAGMAY

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1209) for the relief of Numeriano Lagmay.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Numeriano Lagmay shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

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.

LAURA OLIVERA MIRANDA

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1639) for the relief of Laura Olivera Miranda.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Laura Olivera Miranda shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

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.

RODOLFO PUGEDA DE LA CERNA

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1909) for the relief of Rodolfo Pugeda de la Cerna.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of sections 101 (a) (27) (A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, the minor child, Rodolfo Pugeda de la Cerna, shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of James F. de la Cerna, a citizen of 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.

MRS. MARGARETE GICK SCORDAS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2235) for the relief of Mrs. Margarete Gick Scordas.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, notwithstanding the provision of section 212 (a) (9) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Mrs. Margarete Gick Scordas may be admitted to the United States for permanent residence if she is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of that act.

With the following committee amendment:

On page 1, line 7, after the word "Act", change the period to a colon and add the following: "*Provided*, That this exemption shall apply only to a ground for exclusion of which the Department of State or the Department of Justice had knowledge prior to the enactment of this act."

The committee 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.

WILHELMUS MARIUS VAN DER VEUR

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2283) for the relief of Wilhelmus Marius Van der Veur.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Wilhelmus Marius Van der Veur shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

With the following committee amendments:

On page 1, line 10, strike out the words "quota-control."

On page 1, line 11, after the words "number from the", strike out the remainder of the bill, and substitute in lieu thereof the following: "number of visas authorized to be issued under the provision of section 4 (a) (9) of the Refugee Relief Act of 1953, as amended."

The committee amendments were 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.

MONIKA SCHEFBANKER

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2339) for the relief of Monika Schefbanker.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of sections 101 (a) (27) (A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, the minor child, Monika Schefbanker, shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of Dragoslav Novakovic, citizen of 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.

MRS. ELFRIEDA SCHOEPPE

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2916) for the relief of Mrs. Elfrieda Schoeppe.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, in the administration of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Mrs. Elfrieda Schoeppe, widow of Sgt. William E. Schoeppe, a deceased former United States citizen who served honorably in the Armed Forces of the United States, shall be deemed to be a nonquota immigrant.

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.

WILLIAM JOSEPH PERELLA

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2948) for the relief of William Joseph Perella.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That William Joseph Perella, who lost United States citizenship under the provisions of section 401 (d) of the Nationality Act of 1940, may be naturalized by taking prior to 1 year after the date of the enactment of this act, before any court referred to in subsection (a) of section 310 of the Immigration and Nationality Act or before any diplomatic or consular officer abroad, the oaths prescribed by section 337 of Immigration and Nationality Act. From and after naturalization under this act, the said William Joseph Perella shall have the same citizenship status as that which existed immediately prior to its loss.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following: "That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Guglielmo Joseph Perrella shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon the payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

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

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill for the relief of Guglielmo Joseph Perrella."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ROLF HUGO NEUMAN

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3195) for the relief of Rolf Hugo Neuman.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, notwithstanding the provision of section 212 (a) (9) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Rolf Hugo Neuman may be admitted to the United States for permanent residence if he is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of that act: *Provided*, That this exemption shall apply only to a ground for exclusion of which the Department of State or the Department of Justice had knowledge prior to the enactment of this act.

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.

CONSTANTIN DAVID ET AL.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3857) for the relief of Constantin David, Paula Marie David, Claire Edmonde David, and Ariane Constance David.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Constantin David, Paula Marie David, Claire Edmonde David, and Ariane Constance David shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fees. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such aliens as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct four members from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

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.

JOSEPH JERRY EARL SIROIS

The Clerk called the bill (S. 38) for the relief of Joseph Jerry Earl Sirois (also known as Jeremie Earl Sirois).

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, in the administration of the Immigration and Nationality Act, the Attorney General is authorized and directed to discontinue any deportation proceedings and to cancel any outstanding order and warrant of deportation, warrant of arrest, and bond, which may have been issued in the case of Joseph Jerry Earl Sirois (also known as Jeremie Earl Sirois). From and after the date of enactment of this act, the said Joseph Jerry Earl Sirois (also known as Jeremie Earl Sirois) shall not again be subject to deportation by reason of the same facts upon which such deportation proceedings were commenced or any such warrants and order have issued.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

URSULA ELSE BOYSEN

The Clerk called the bill (S. 71) for the relief of Ursula Else Boysen.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Ursula Else Boysen shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LUZIA COX

The Clerk called the bill (S. 91) for the relief of Luzia Cox.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, notwithstanding the provision of section 212 (a) (9) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Luzia Cox may be admitted to the United States for permanent residence if she is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of such act: *Provided*, That this exemption shall apply only to a ground for exclusion of which the Department of State or the Department of Justice has knowledge prior to the enactment of this act.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HERMINE LORENZ

The Clerk called the bill (S. 100) for the relief of Hermine Lorenz.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Hermine Lorenz shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DAVID WEI-DAO LEA AND JULIA AN-FONG WANG LEA

The Clerk called the bill (S. 119) for the relief of David Wei-Dao Lea and Julia An-Fong Wang Lea.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, David Wei-Dao Lea and Julia An-Fong Wang Lea shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fees. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such aliens as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct the required numbers from the appropriate quota or quotas for the first year that such quota or quotas are available.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ERNESTO DeLEON

The Clerk called the bill (S. 167) for the relief of Ernesto DeLeon.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Ernesto DeLeon shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GERDA IRMGARD KURELLA

The Clerk called the bill (S. 176) for the relief of Gerda Irmgard Kurella.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, in the administration of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Gerda Irmgard Kurella, the fiancée of Sgt. James D. Ritz, a citizen of the United States, shall be eligible for a visa as a nonimmigrant temporary visitor for a period of 3 months: *Provided*, That the administrative authorities find that the said Gerda Irmgard Kurella is coming to the United States with a bona fide intention of being married to the said Sgt. James D. Ritz and that she is found otherwise admissible under the provisions of the Immigration and Nationality Act other than the provision of section 212 (a) (9) of that act: *Provided further*, That this exemption shall apply only to a ground for exclusion of which the Department of State or the Department of Justice has knowledge prior to the enactment of this act. In the event that the marriage between the above-named persons does not occur within 3 months after the entry of the said Gerda Irmgard Kurella, she shall be required to depart from the United States and upon failure to do so shall be deported in accordance with the provisions of the Immigration and Nationality Act. In the event that the marriage between the above-named persons shall occur within 3 months after the entry of the said Gerda Irmgard Kurella, the Attorney General is authorized and directed to record the lawful admission for permanent residence of the said Gerda Irmgard Kurella as of the date of the payment by her of the required visa fee.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MANHAY WONG

The Clerk called the bill (S. 181) for the relief of Manhay Wong.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Manhay Wong shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AHMET SUAT MAYKUT

The Clerk called the bill (S. 214) for the relief of Ahmet Suat Maykut.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Ahmet Suat Maykut shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ANDREAS GEORGES VLASTOS

The Clerk called the bill (S. 238) for the relief of Andreas Georges Vlastos (Andreas Georges Vlasto).

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Andreas Georges Vlastos (Andreas Georges Vlasto) shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting

of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

KLARA ANNA MARIA FLEISCHER

The Clerk called the bill (S. 346) for the relief of Klara Anna Maria Fleischer.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, in the administration of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Klara Anna Maria Fleischer, the fiancée of Cpl. Richard Peter Maille, a citizen of the United States, shall be eligible for a visa as a nonimmigrant temporary visitor for a period of 3 months: *Provided*, That the administrative authorities find that the said Klara Anna Maria Fleischer is coming to the United States with a bona fide intention of being married to the said Cpl. Richard Peter Maille and that she is found otherwise admissible under the provisions of the Immigration and Nationality Act other than the provision of section 212 (a) (9) of that act: *Provided further*, That this exemption shall apply only to a ground for exclusion of which the Department of State or the Department of Justice has knowledge prior to the enactment of this act. In the event that the marriage between the above-named persons does not occur within 3 months after the entry of the said Klara Anna Maria Fleischer, she shall be required to depart from the United States and upon failure to do so shall be deported in accordance with the provisions of sections 242 and 243 of the Immigration and Nationality Act. In the event that the marriage between the above-named persons shall occur within 3 months after the entry of the said Klara Anna Maria Fleischer, the Attorney General is authorized and directed to record this lawful admission for permanent residence of the said Klara Anna Maria Fleischer as of the date of the payment by her of the required visa fee.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ISAAC GLICKMAN, REGHINA GLICKMAN, ALFRED CISMARU, AND ANNA CISMARU

The Clerk called the bill (S. 352) for the relief of Isaac Glickman, Reghina Glickman, Alfred Cismaru, and Anna Cismaru.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Isaac Glickman, Reghina Glickman, Alfred Cismaru, and Anna Cismaru shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fees. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such aliens as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct the required numbers from the appropriate quota or quotas for the first year that such quota or quotas are available.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PETRE AND LIUBITZA IONESCU

The Clerk called the bill (S. 388) for the relief of Petre and Liubitza Ionescu.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Petre and Liubitza Ionescu shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act upon payment of the required visa fees. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such aliens as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct two numbers from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ALI HASSAN WAFFA

The Clerk called the bill (S. 394) for the relief of Ali Hassan Waffa.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Ali Hassan Waffa shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MARIA BERTAGNOLLI PANCHERI

The Clerk called the bill (S. 397) for the relief of Maria Bertagnolli Pancheri.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Maria Bertagnolli Pancheri shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HEDWIG MARIE ZAUNMULLER

The Clerk called the bill (S. 430) for the relief of Hedwig Marie Zaunmuller.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Hedwig Marie Zaunmuller shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CAPT. GEORGE GAFOS, EUGENIA GAFOS, AND ADAMANTIOS GEORGE GAFOS

The Clerk called the bill (S. 466) for the relief of Capt. George Gafos, Eugenia Gafos, and Adamantios George Gafos.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Capt. George Gafos, Eugenia Gafos, and Adamantios George Gafos shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fees. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such aliens as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct the required numbers from the appropriate quota or quotas for the first year that such quota or quotas are available.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EDITH WINIFRED LOCH

The Clerk called the bill (S. 470) for the relief of Edith Winifred Loch.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Edith Winifred Loch, a British subject who was born in India of British parents, shall be deemed to have been born in Great Britain.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MARIA ELENA VENEGAS AND SARAH LUCIA VENEGAS

The Clerk called the bill (S. 474) for the relief of Maria Elena Venegas and Sarah Lucia Venegas.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Maria Elena Venegas and Sarah Lucia Venegas shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fees.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CIRINO LANZAFAME

The Clerk called the bill (S. 503) for the relief of Cirino Lanzafame.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, notwithstanding the provisions of section 212 (a) (9) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Cirino Lanzafame may be admitted to the United States for permanent residence if he is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of such act: *Provided*, That this exemption shall apply only to a ground for exclusion of which the Department of State or the Department of Justice has knowledge prior to the enactment of this act.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MARTIN ALOYSIUS MADDEN

The Clerk called the bill (S. 541) for the relief of Martin Aloysius Madden.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Attorney General is authorized and directed to discontinue any deportation proceedings and to cancel any outstanding order and warrant of deportation, warrant of arrest, and bond, which may have been issued in the case of Martin Aloysius Madden. From and after the date of enactment of this act, the said Martin Aloysius Madden shall not again be subject to deportation by reason of the same facts upon which such deportation proceedings were commenced or any such warrants and order have issued.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GISELA HOFMEIER

The Clerk called the bill (S. 606) for the relief of Gisela Hofmeier.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That in the administration of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Gisela Hofmeier, the fiancée of Robert E. Leonard, a citizen of the United States, shall be eligible for a visa as a nonimmigrant temporary visitor for a period of 3 months: *Provided*, That the administrative authorities find that the said Gisela Hofmeier is coming to the United States with a bona fide intention of being married to the said Sgt. Robert E. Leonard and that she is found otherwise admissible under the provisions of the Immigration and Nationality Act other than the provision of section 212 (a) (9) of that act: *Provided further*, That this exemption shall apply only to a ground for exclusion of which the Department of State or the Department of Justice has knowledge prior to the enactment of this act. In the event the marriage between the above-named persons does not occur within 3 months after the entry of the said Gisela Hofmeier, she shall be required to depart from the United States and upon failure to do so shall be deported in accordance with the provisions of sections 242 and 243 of the Immigration and Nationality Act. In the event that the marriage between the above-named persons shall occur within 3 months after the entry of the said Gisela Hofmeier the Attorney General is authorized and directed to record the lawful admission for permanent residence of the said Gisela Hofmeier as of the date of the payment by her of the required visa fee.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MECYS JAUNISKIS

The Clerk called the bill (S. 664) for the relief of Mecys Jauniskis.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, notwithstanding the provision of section 212 (a) (6) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Mecys Jauniskis may be admitted to the United States for permanent residence if he is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of such act: *Provided*, That this exemption shall apply only to a ground for exclusion of which the Department of State or the Department of Justice has knowledge prior to the enactment of this act: *Provided further*, That a suitable and proper bond or undertaking, approved by the Attorney General, be deposited as prescribed by section 213 of the said act.

With the following committee amendment:

Beginning on page 1, line 7, after the word "act", strike out the remainder of line 7, all of lines 8 and 9, and the language preceding the word "That", on line 10, and substitute in lieu thereof the following: "under such conditions and controls which the Attorney General after consultation with the Surgeon General of the United States Public Health Service, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, may deem necessary to impose: *Provided*."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CHRISTOS PAUL ZOLOTAS

The Clerk called the bill (S. 707) for the relief of Christos Paul Zolotas.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Christos Paul Zolotas shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMBROSE ANTHONY FOX

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1035) for the relief of Ambrose Anthony Fox.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Attorney General is authorized and directed to discontinue any deportation proceedings and to cancel any outstanding order and warrant of deportation, warrant of arrest, and bond, which may have been issued in the case of Ambrose Anthony Fox. From and after the date of enactment of this act, the said Ambrose Anthony Fox shall not again be subject to deportation by reason of the same facts upon which such deportation proceedings were commenced or any such warrants and order have issued.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EDWARD NAARITS

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1044) for the relief of Edward Naarits.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, notwithstanding the time limitation provided for in section 330 (a) (2) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Edward Naarits shall be deemed to be within the purview of the said section provided his petition for naturalization is filed within 1 year from the effective date of this act.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DIMITRIOS ANTONIOU KOSTALAS

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1126) for the relief of Dimitrios Antoniou Kostalas.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Dimitrios Antoniou Kostalas shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HAL A. MARCHANT

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1154) for the relief of Hal A. Marchant.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. BONNER and Mr. ROBERTS objected and, under the rule, the bill was recommitted to the Committee on the Judiciary.

IVA DRUZIANICH (IVA DRUZIANIC)

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1155) for the relief of Iva Druzianich (Iva Druzianic).

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Iva Druzianich (Iva Druzianic) shall be deemed to be the natural-born minor alien child of John Druzianich, a citizen of the United States.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

WILMA ANN SCHILLING ET AL.

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1159) for the relief of Wilma Ann Schilling and her daughter, Ingertraud Rosalita Schilling.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, in the administration of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Wilma Ann Schilling, the fiancée of Everett B. Felton, a citizen of the United States, and her minor child, Ingertraud Rosalita Schilling, shall be eligible for visas as nonimmigrant temporary visitors for a period of 3 months: *Provided*, That the administrative authorities find that the said Wilma Ann Schilling is coming to the United States with a bona fide intention of being married to the said Everett B. Felton, and that she is found otherwise admissible under all of the provisions of the Immigration and Nationality Act, other than section 212 (a) (9) of the said act: *Provided further*, That this exemption shall apply only to a ground for exclusion of which the Department of State or the Department of Justice had knowledge prior to the enactment of this act.

In the event the marriage between the above-named persons does not occur within 3 months after the entry of the said Wilma Ann Schilling and her daughter, Ingertraud Rosalita Schilling, they shall be required to depart from the United States and upon failure to do so shall be deported in accordance with the provisions of sections 242 and 243 of the Immigration and Nationality Act. In the event that the marriage between the above-named persons shall occur within 3 months after the entry of the said Wilma Ann Schilling and her daughter, Ingertraud Rosalita Schilling, the Attorney General is authorized and directed to record the lawful admission for permanent residence of the said Wilma Ann Schilling and her daughter, Ingertraud Rosalita Schilling, as of the date of the payment by them of the required visa fees.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ANTONIO JACOE

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1367) for the relief of Antonio Jacoe.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, notwithstanding the provisions of subsections (9), (17), and (19) of section 212 (a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Antonio Jacoe may be admitted to the United States for permanent residence if he is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of that act: *Provided*, That the exemption granted herein shall apply only to grounds for exclusion of which the Department of State or the Department of Justice has knowledge prior to the enactment of this act.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GARABED PAPAZIAN

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1521) for the relief of Garabed Papazian.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Garabed Papazian shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LIESELOTTE BRODZINSKI GETTMAN

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1522) for the relief of Lieselotte Brodzinski Gettman.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, notwithstanding the provisions of paragraphs (9) and (12) of section 212 (a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Lieselotte Brodzinski Gettman may be admitted to the United States for permanent residence if she is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of such act: *Provided*, That these exemptions shall apply only to grounds for exclusion of which the Department of State or the Department of Justice had knowledge prior to the enactment of this act.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

BRIG. GEN. EDWIN B. HOWARD

The Clerk called the bill (S 1271) to authorize the appointment in a civilian position in the Department of Justice of Brig. Gen. Edwin B. Howard, United States Army, retired, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. MOLLOHAN, Mr. HAYS of Ohio, and Mr. METCALF objected.

The bill was recommitted to the Committee on Armed Services.

MAJ. GEN. FRANK H. PARTRIDGE

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1272) to authorize the appointment in a civilian position in the Department of Justice of Maj. Gen. Frank H. Partridge, United States Army, retired, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. MOLLOHAN, Mr. HAYS of Ohio, Mr. METCALF, and Mr. VANIK objected.

The bill was recommitted to the Committee on Armed Services.

COL. BENNETT HILL GRIFFIN

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1516) to authorize the President of the United States to present the Distinguished Flying Cross to Col. Bennett Hill Griffin.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the President is hereby authorized to present in the name of the Congress the Distinguished Flying Cross to Col. Bennett Hill Griffin in recognition of his meritorious achievements and contributions toward the advancement of the science of aerial flight.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike all words following the word "Cross" on line 4 and substitute the words: ", with accompanying ribbon, to Col. Bennett Hill Griffin in recognition of his extraordinary achievements in aerial flight."

The committee 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.

VINCENZO SANTAGATA

The Clerk called the bill (S. 197) for the relief of Vincenzo Santagata.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That Vincenzo Santagata, who lost United States citizenship under the provisions of section 404 (a) of the Nationality Act of 1940, may be naturalized by taking prior to 1 year after the effective date of this act, before any court referred to in subsection (a) of section 310 of the Immigration and Nationality Act or before any diplomatic or consular officer of the United States abroad, the oaths prescribed by section 337 of the said act. From and after naturalization under the act, the said Vincenzo Santagata shall have the same citizenship status as that which existed immediately prior to its loss.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following: "That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Vincenzo Santagata shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FILLIPO MASTROIANNI

The Clerk called the bill (S. 198) for the relief of Fillipo Mastroianni.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That Fillipo Mastroianni, who lost United States citizenship under the provisions of section 404 (a) of the Nationality Act of 1940, may be naturalized by taking prior to 1 year after the effective date of this act, before any court referred to in subsection (a) of section 310 of the Immigration and Nationality Act or before any diplomatic or consular officer of the United States abroad, the oaths prescribed by section 337 of the said act. From and after naturalization under this act, the said Fillipo Mastroianni shall have the same citizenship status as that which existed immediately prior to its loss.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following: "That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Fillipo Mastroianni shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of

this act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available."

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GIUSSEPINA CERVI

The Clerk called the bill (S. 254) for the relief of Giussepina Cervi.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of sections 101 (a) (27) (A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, the minor child, Giussepina Cervi, shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of Sergeant John Louis Troiano, a citizen of the United States.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LEOPOLDINE MARIA LOFBLAD

The Clerk called the bill (S. 326) for the relief of Leopoldine Maria Lofblad.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, notwithstanding the provisions of section 212 (a) (3) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Leopoldine Maria Lofblad may be admitted to the United States for permanent residence if she is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of such act: *Provided*, That a suitable and proper bond or undertaking, approved by the Attorney General, be deposited as prescribed by section 213 of the said act.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ALFIO FERRARA

The Clerk called the bill (S. 714) for the relief of Alfio Ferrara.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Alfio Ferrara shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following: "That, notwithstanding the provision of section 212 (a) (9) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Alfio Ferrara may be admitted to the United States for permanent residence if he is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of that act: *Provided*, That this exemption shall apply only to a ground for exclusion of which the Department of State or the Department of Justice had knowledge prior to the enactment of this act."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HENRY DUNCAN

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1014) for the relief of Henry Duncan.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Henry Duncan shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this Act, upon payment of the required visa fee.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following: "That, notwithstanding the provisions of section 212 (a) (9) and (19) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Henry Duncan may be admitted to the United States for permanent residence if he is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of that act: *Provided*, That these exemptions shall apply only to grounds for exclusion of which the Department of State or the Department of Justice had knowledge prior to the enactment of this act."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

JOSEPH VYSKOCIL

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1337) for the relief of Joseph Vyskocil.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Joseph Vyskocil shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

JOHN AXEL ARVIDSON

The Clerk called the bill (S. 550) for the relief of John Axel Arvidson.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Attorney General is authorized and directed to discontinue any deportation proceedings and to cancel any outstanding order and warrant of deportation, warrant of arrest, and bond, which may have been issued in the case of John Axel Arvidson. From and after the date of enactment of this act, the said John Axel Arvidson shall not again be subject to deportation by reason of the same facts upon which such deportation proceedings were commenced or any such warrants and order have issued.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following: "That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, John Axel Arvidson shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

WILLIAM BADINELLI

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2729) for the relief of William Badinelli.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That William Badinelli, Bronx, N. Y., is relieved of all liability to refund to the United States the sum of $5,707.34. Such sum represents a shortage in the accounts of the post exchange on the United States Army transport *Williard A. Holbrook*, not the result of fraud or dishonesty, for which the said William Badinelli (who was serving abroad the vessel as administrative officer and special disbursing agent between July 22, 1948, and November 18, 1949, when the shortage occurred) has been held by the Army to be pecuniarly liable. In the audit and settlement of the accounts of any certifying or disbursing officer of the United States, full credit shall be given for the amount for which liability is relieved by this act.

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.

C. J. POBOJESKI

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4321) for the relief of C. J. Pobojeski.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Chief Yeoman C. J. Pobojeski, United States Navy, the sum of $356.60. The payment of such sum, together with the indemnity of $200 heretofore paid to him by the United States, shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said C. J. Pobojeski against the United States on account of damage to his electric typewriter, valued at $556.50, due to the negligent handling of such typewriter in the United States mails: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendments:

The amendments are as follows: "Page 1, line 6, strike out '$356.60' and insert in lieu thereof '$356.50'."

Page 2, line 2, strike out "in excess of 10 percent thereof."

The committee amendments were 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.

ANAKALETO MARIA DE OLIVEIRA

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1162) for the relief of Anakaleto Maria de Oliveira or Joseph Oliveira or Anacleto Oliver.

There being no objection the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Anakaleto Maria de Oliveira or Joseph Oliveira or Anacleto Oliver shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this Act upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this Act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

With the following committee amendment:

Beginning on page 1, line 8, after the words "visa fee.", strike out the remainder of the bill, through line 3, on page 2.

The committee 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.

DR. AND MRS. IVAN PERNAR

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1193) for the relief of Dr. and Mrs. Ivan Pernar.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Dr. and Mrs. Ivan Pernar shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fees. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such aliens as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct two numbers from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

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.

KENNETH K. W. LAU ET AL.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1198) for the relief of Kenneth K. W. Lau and Romana Say Soat Kheng, also known as Mrs. Anne Say Lau.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it known, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Kenneth K. W. Lau and Romana Say Soat Kheng, also known as Mrs. Anne Say Lau, shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fees. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such aliens as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct two numbers from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

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.

VASILIOS LIAKOPOULOS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1319) for the relief of Vasilios Liakopoulos.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of sections 101 (a) (27) (A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, the minor child, Vasilios Liakopoulos, shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of Gregory and Anna Liakopoulos, citizens of 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.

SISTER RAMONA MARIA

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1323) for the relief of Sister Ramona Maria (Ramona E. Tombo).

There being no objection the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Sister Ramona Maria (Ramona E. Tombo) shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

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.

MARY MANCUSO

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1641) for the relief of Mary Mancuso.

There being no objection the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of sections 101 (a) (27) (A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, the minor child, Mary Mancuso, shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of Mr. and Mrs. Paul Torcasio, citizens of 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.

LOUIS B. PRUS-LATKIEWICZ

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1657) for the relief of Louis B. Prus-Latkiewicz.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Louis B. Prus-Latkiewicz shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

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.

JOSE CANANCIA-CASTANEDO

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1666) for the relief of Jose Canancia-Castanedo.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Jose Canancia-Castanedo shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

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.

CHU HAI-CHOU

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1908) for the relief of Chu Hai-Chou.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Chu Hai-Chou shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

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.

INDUK PAHK

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2054) for the relief of Induk Pahk.

There being no objection the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Induk Pahk shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

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.

JULIAN NOWAKOWSKI

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2072) for the relief of Julian Nowakowski, or William Nowak (Novak).

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Julian Nowakowski, or William Nowak (Novak), shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read a third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

INGRID LISELOTTE POCH

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2079) for the relief of Ingrid Liselotte Poch.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of sections 101 (a) (27) (A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, the minor child, Ingrid Liselotte Poch, shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of Cpl. George Thomas Murphy, citizen of 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.

MRS. KHATOUN MALKEY SAMUEL

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2796) for the relief of Mrs. Khatoun Malkey Samuel.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Mrs. Khatoun Malkey Samuel shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

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.

CHUNG POIK CHA

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2897) for the relief of Chung Poik Cha.

There being no objection the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, in the administration of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Chung Poik Cha, the fiancée of Angelo Sacchetti, a citizen of the United States, and her minor child, Myra Poik Cha, shall be eligible for visas as nonimmigrant temporary visitors for a period of 3 months: *Provided*, That the administrative authorities find that the said Chung Poik Cha is coming to the United States with a bona fide intention of being married to the said Angelo Sacchetti and that they are found otherwise admissible under the immigration laws. In the event the marriage between the above-named persons does not occur within 3 months after the entry of the said Chung Poik Cha and Myra Poik Cha, they shall be required to depart from the United States and upon failure to do so shall be deported in accordance with the provisions of section 242 and 243 of the Immigration and Nationality Act. In the event that the marriage between the above-named persons shall occur within 3 months after the entry of the said Chung Poik Cha and Myra Poik Cha, the Attorney General is authorized and directed to record the lawful admission for permanent residence of the said Chung Poik Cha and Myra Poik Cha as of the date of the payment by them of the required visa fees.

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

The title of the bill was amended to read: "A bill for the relief of Chung Poik Cha and her child, Myra Poik Cha."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ANGELA SFOUNIS AND ALKISTA SFOUNIS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3265) for the relief of Angela Sfounis and Alkista Sfounis.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Angela Sfounis and Alkista Sfounis shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act upon payment of the required visa fees. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such aliens as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct two numbers from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

With the following committee amendments:

The amendments are as follows:

On page 1, line 4, strike out "Angela Sfounis and."

On page 1, line 7, strike out the word "fees" and substitute "fee."

On page 1, line 8, strike out the word "aliens" and substitute "a'ien."

On page 1, line 10, strike out the words "two numbers" and substitute "one number."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

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

The title of the bill was amended to read:

"A bill for the relief of Alkista Sfounis."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

VLADIMIR AND SVATAVA HOSCHL

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4612) for the relief of Vladimir and Svatava Hoschl.

There being no objection the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Vladimir and Svatava Hoschl shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon the payment of the required visa fees and head taxes. Upon the granting of such permanent residence to such aliens as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct two numbers from the number of displaced persons who shall be granted the status of permanent residence pursuant to section 4 of the Displaced Persons Act, as amended (62 Stat. 1011; 64 Stat. 219; 50 U. S. C. App. 1953).

With the following committee amendments:

On page 1, line 10, strike out the words "quota-control."

Beginning on page 1, line 11, after the words "the number of", strike out the remainder of line 11, and all of the language on page 2, and substitute in lieu thereof the following:

"visas authorized to be issued pursuant to the provisions of section 4 (a) (2) of the Refugee Relief Act of 1953, as amended."

The committee amendments were 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.

MRS. JOHANNA ECKLES

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5908) for the relief of Mrs. Johanna Eckles.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, notwithstanding the provision of section 212 (a) (9) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Mrs. Johanna Eckles may be admitted to the United States for permanent residence if she is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of that act: *Provided*, That this exemption shall apply only to a ground for exclusion of which the Department of State or the Department of Justice had knowledge prior to the enactment of this act.

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.

JOHN DANIEL POPA

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 930) for the relief of John Daniel Popa.

There being no objection the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, John Daniel Popa shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

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.

NICOLA TEODOSIO

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 944) for the relief of Nicola Teodosio.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, notwithstanding the provisions of section 212 (a) (9), (17) and (19) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Nicola Teodosio may be admitted to the United States for permanent residence if he is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of that act: *Provided*, That these exemptions shall apply only to a ground for exclusion of which the Department of State or the Department of Justice have knowledge prior to the enactment of this act.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 8, strike out "ground" and insert "grounds."

Page 1, line 10, strike out "have" and insert "had."

The committee amendments were 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.

SALVADOR, MERCEDES, AND MIGUEL CHOFRE

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1232) for the relief of Salvador, Mercedes, and Miguel Chofre.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Salvador, Mercedes, and Miguel Chofre shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fees. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such aliens as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct three numbers from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

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.

VERA GREGOVICH KENTER

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1235) for the relief of Vera Gregovich Kenter.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of sections 101 (a) (27) (A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, the minor child, Vera Gregovich Kenter, shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of Mr. and Mrs. Sam Kenter, 3246 Scott Street, San Francisco, Calif., citizens of the United States.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 7, strike out "3246 Scott Street, San Francisco, Calif."

The committee 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.

SANTIAGO GONZALEZ TRIGO

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1402) for the relief of Santiago Gonzalez Trigo.

There being no objection the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Santiago Gonzalez Trigo shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following: "That the Attorney General is authorized and directed to discontinue any deportation proceeding and to cancel any outstanding order and warrant of deportation, any warrant of arrest and bond which may have been issued in the case of Santiago Gonzalez Trigo, and the said Santiago Gonzalez Trigo shall not again be subject to deportation by reason of the same facts upon which any such deportation proceedings were commenced or any such warrants of arrest have issued."

The committee 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.

GIOVANNA SCANO ET AL.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1410) for the relief of Giacomo Scano, Giovanna Scano, Guido Scano, and Valerio Scano.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Giacomo Scano, Giovanna Scano, Guido Scano, and Valerio Scano shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fees. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such aliens as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct four numbers from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

With the following committee amendments:

On page 1, line 4, after the word "act", strike out the name "Giacomo Scano."

On page 1, line 4, after the name "Giovanna Scano", strike out the remainder of line 4.

On page 1, line 5, strike out the name "Valerio Scano."

On page 1, line 8, strike out the word "fees" and substitute "fee."

On page 1, line 9, strike out the word "aliens" and substitute "alien."

On page 2, line 2, strike out the words "four numbers" and substitute the words "one number."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

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

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill for the relief of Giovanna Scano."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

KRSEVAN SPANJOL

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1492) for the relief of Krsevan Spanjol.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Krsevan Spanjol shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

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.

ANE KARLIC VLASICH

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1920) for the relief of Ane Karlic Vlasich.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of sections 101 (a) (27) (A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, the minor child, Ane Karlic Vlasich, shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of Mr. and Mrs. Charles Vlasich, citizens of 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.

KEVIN MURPHY

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1923) for the relief of Kevin Murphy.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of section 202 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Kevin Murphy shall be held to have been born in England.

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.

MARIE LIM TSIEN

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2285) for the relief of Marie Lim Tsien.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Marie Lim Tsien shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of

the date of enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

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.

JEAN HENRI BUCHET

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2345) for the relief of Jean Henri Buchet.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Jean Henri Buchet shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 6, after the word "act", change the comma to a period and strike out the remainder of the bill.

The committee 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.

HEINRICH WOLFGANG

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2347) for the relief of Heinrich Wolfgang.

Their being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, notwithstanding the provision of section 212 (a) (9) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Heinrich Wolfgang may be admitted to the United States for permanent residence if he is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of that act: *Provided*, That this exemption shall apply only to a ground for exclusion of which the Department of State or the Department of Justice had knowledge prior to the enactment of this act.

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.

KAZUKO IWATA RAUSCH

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2704) for the relief of Kazuko Iwata Rausch.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, notwithstanding the provision of section 212 (a) (9) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Kazuko Iwata Rausch may be admitted to the United States for permanent residence if she is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of that act: *Provided*, That this exception shall apply only to a ground for exclusion of which the Department of State or the Department of Justice had knowledge prior to the enactment of this act.

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.

DR. BIENVENIDO L. BALINGIT

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3057) for the relief of Dr. Bienvenido L. Balingit.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Dr. Bienvenido L. Balingit shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number grom the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

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.

GEORGE MIKROULIS ET AL.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3201) for the relief of George Mikroulis, his wife, Dora Mikroulis, and his daughter, Madonna G. Mikroulis.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, George Mikroulis, his wife, Dora Mikroulis, and his daughter, Madonna G. Mikroulis, shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fees. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such aliens as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota control officer to deduct three numbers from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 2, line 1, strike out "quota control."

Page 2, strike out "appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available" and insert "number of visas authorized to be issued pursuant to the provisions of section 4 (a) (7) of the Refugee Relief Act of 1953, as amended."

The committee amendments were 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.

JOSEF AND PERLA NATANSON

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3527) for the relief of Josef and Perla Natanson.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Josef and Perla Natanson shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fees. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such aliens as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct two numbers from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

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.

ESTHER LEDEA ESCOBEDO

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3869) for the relief of Esther Ledea Escobedo.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, notwithstanding the provision of section 212 (a) (9) and (19) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Esther Ledea Escobedo may be admitted to the United States for permanent residence if she is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of that act: *Provided*, That this exemption shall apply only to a ground for exclusion of which the Department of State or the Department of Justice have knowledge prior to the enactment of this act.

With the following committee amendments:

On page 1, line 3, strike out "provision" and substitute "provisions."

On page 1, lines 7 and 8, strike out the words "this exemption" and substitute "these exemptions."

On page 1, line 8, strike out the words "a ground" and substitute "grounds."

On page 1, line 9, strike out the word "have" and substitute "had."

The committee amendments were 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.

ASHOT MNATZAKANIAN AND OPHELIA MNATZAKANIAN

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3963) for the relief of Ashot Mnatzakanian and Ophelia Mnatzakanian.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Ashot Mnatzakanian and his wife Ophelia Mnatzakanian, shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fees. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such aliens as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct two numbers from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

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.

MAX MOSKOWITZ

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3965) for the relief of Max Moskowitz.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, notwithstanding the provision of section 212 (a) (9) of the

Immigration and Nationality Act, Max Moskowitz may be admitted to the United States for permanent residence if he is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of that act: *Provided*, That this exemption shall apply only to a ground for exclusion of which the Department of State or the Department of Justice have knowledge prior to the enactment of this act.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 9, strike out "have" and insert "had."

The committee 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.

MRS. DONALD A. HOWARD

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4025) for the relief of Mrs. Donald A. Howard (nee Miss Elsa Ursula Kuchinke).

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, notwithstanding the provision of section 212 (a) (12) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Mrs. Donald A. Howard (nee Miss Elsa Ursula Kuchinke) may be admitted to the United States for permanent residence if she is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of that act: *Provided*, That this exemption shall apply only to a ground for exclusion of which the Department of State or the Department of Justice had knowledge prior to enactment of this act.

With the following committee amendments:

On page 1, line 3, strike out the word "provision" and substitute the word "provisions."

On page 1, line 3, after "212 (a)", insert "(9) and."

On page 1, line 8, strike out the words "this exemption" and substitute the words "these exemptions."

On page 1, line 8, strike out the words "a ground" and substitute "grounds."

The committee amendments were 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.

ANDREW CARRIGAN

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4544) for the relief of Andrew Carrigan.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That a reentry permit issued pursuant to section 223 of the Immigration and Nationality Act for Andrew Carrigan, born on May 4, 1952, who is the adopted minor child of Mr. and Mrs. James Carrigan, shall be valid until such time as Andrew Carrigan becomes 10 years of age, or until such time as his adoptive father, James Carrigan, resumes permanent residence in the United States, whichever date occurs earlier.

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.

MICHELE PICA

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4548) for the relief of Michele Pica.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, notwithstanding the provision of section 212 (a) (9) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Michele Pica may be admitted to the United States for permanent residence if he is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of that act: *Provided*, That this exemption shall apply only to a ground for exclusion of which the Department of State or the Department of Justice had knowledge prior to the enactment of this act.

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

MRS. LEE SHEE YEE

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4643) for the relief of Mrs. Lee Shee Yee (also known as Lee Lai Koon).

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, in the administration of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Mrs. Lee Shee Yee (also known as Lee Lai Koon) shall be held to be classifiable as nonquota returning resident under the provisions of section 101 (a) (27) (B) of that act.

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.

MISS BLANCA LINA RIONEGRO

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5074) for the relief of Miss Blanca Lina Rionegro.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Miss Blanca Lina Rionegro shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, beginning in line 7, after the words "visa fee,", strike out the remainder of the bill.

The committee 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.

TOM WONG (FOO TAI NAM)

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5079) for the relief of Tom Wong (Foo Tai Nam).

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Tom Wong (Foo Tai Nam) shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

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.

MRS. KOTO NAKAGAWA

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5082) for the relief of Mrs. Koto Nakagawa.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That in the administration of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Mrs. Koto Nakagawa shall be held to be classifiable as a nonquota returning resident under the provisions of section 101 (a) (27) (B) of that act.

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.

ANDREAS (OR ANDREW) VOUTSINAS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5869) for the relief of Andreas (or Andrew) Voutsinas.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Andreas (or Andrew) Voutsinas shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

"That the Attorney General is authorized and directed to discontinue any deportation proceeding and to cancel any outstanding order and warrant of deportation, any warrant of arrest and bond which may have been issued in the case of Andreas (or Andrew) Voutsinas, and the said Andreas (or Andrew) Voutsinas shall not again be subject to deportation by reason of the same facts upon which any such deportation proceedings were commenced or any such warrants of arrest have issued."

The committee 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.

JESAJAHU BRAUN

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5870) for the relief of Jesajahu Braun.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act,

Jasajahu Braun shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

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.

MRS. MARY CHRISTINE DOWDY

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 7197) for the relief of Mrs. Mary Christine Dowdy.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Mrs. Mary Christine Dowdy shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee.

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.

DR. FREDERIC S. SCHLEGER

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2728) for the relief of Dr. Frederic S. Schleger.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Dr. Frederic S. Schleger, New York, N. Y., the sum of $2,000. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said Dr. Frederic S. Schleger against the United States for compensation for the loss of his aircraft (an 85 Luscombe, registration number N1661K), which was totally destroyed at Miller Field, Staten Island, N. Y., on March 8, 1952, when it crashed while being flown on a flight mission of the Civil Air Patrol (New York City Group): *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 2, line 3, strike out "in excess of 10 percent thereof"

The committee 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.

FRANK G. GERLOCK

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 7114) for the relief of Frank G. Gerlock.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Frank G. Gerlock, 14845 Garden Drive, Miami, Fla., the sum of $929.65, in full satisfaction and final settlement of his claim against the United States for destruction of his household goods and personal effects as the result of being inundated and smashed while being transported by the Government in shipment from Trieste, Italy, to Avon Park, Fla., incident to his change of station while on active duty in the Army of the United States, such amount being in addition to the amount of $2,500 already administratively paid to him under the provisions of the Military Personnel Claims Act of 1945, as amended (31 U. S. C. 222c): *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

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.

JOHN MEREDITH McFARLANE

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1097) for the relief of John Meredith McFarlane.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, John Meredith McFarlane shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

"That the Attorney General is authorized and directed to discontinue any deportation proceeding and to cancel any outstanding order and warrant of deportation, any warrant of arrest and bond which may have been issued in the case of John Meredith McFarlane, and the said John Meredith McFarlane shall not again be subject to deportation by reason of the same facts upon which any such deportation proceedings were commenced or any such warrants of arrest have issued."

The committee 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.

REGINA DIPPOLD

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4326) for the relief of Regina Dippold.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of sections 101 (a) (27) (A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, the minor child, Regina Dippold, shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of Edwin and Helen Dippold, citizens of 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.

MOCK JUNG SHEE (MOCK JUNG LIU)

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5913) for the relief of Mock Jung Shee (Mock Jung Liu).

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Mock Jung Shee (Mock Jung Liu) shall be held and considered to be classifiable as a returning resident as defined by section 101 (a) (27) (B) of that act.

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.

EDWARD BARNETT

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6363) for the relief of Edward Barnett.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, notwithstanding the provision of section 212 (a) (9) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Edward Barnett may be admitted to the United States for permanent residence if he is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of that act: *Provided*, That this exemption shall apply only to a ground for exclusion of which the Department of State or the Department of Justice had knowledge prior to the enactment of this act.

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.

MRS. GERTRUD HILDEGARD NICHOLS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 7221) for the relief of Mrs. Gertrud Hildegard Nichols.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MILLS). Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that a similar Senate bill, S. 2575, be considered in lieu of the House bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the Senate bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, notwithstanding the provision of section 212 (a) (9) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Mrs. Gertrud Hildegard Nichols may be admitted to the United States for permanent residence if she is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of that act: *Provided*, That this exemption shall apply only to a

ground for exclusion of which the Department of State or the Department of Justice had knowledge prior to the enactment of this act.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

A similar House bill (H. R. 7221) was laid on the table.

ELFRIEDE ROSA (KUP) KRAFT

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6741) for the relief of Elfriede Rosa (Kup) Kraft.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, notwithstanding the provision of section 212 (a) (9) and (12) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Elfriede Rosa (Kup) Kraft may be admitted to the United States for permanent residence if she is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of that act: *Provided*, That this exemption shall apply only to a ground for exclusion of which the Department of State or the Department of Justice had knowledge prior to the enactment of this act.

The bill was ordered to be engrosed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GIOVANNI LAZARICH

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5866) for the relief of Giovanni Lazarich.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Giovanni Lazarich shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 9, strike out "quota-control."

Page 1, line 10, strike out "appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available" and insert "number of visas authorized to be issued pursuant to section 4 (a) (5) of the Refugee Relief Act of 1953, as amended."

The committee amendments were 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.

GEORGE E. BERGOS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3276) for the relief of George E. Bergos (formerly Athanasios Kritselis).

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, George E. Bergos (formerly Athanasios Kritselis) shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 8, beginning with "Upon", strike out the remainder of the bill.

The committee 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.

MRS. JEANNETTE S. HAMILTON

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1353) for the relief of Mrs. Jeannette S. Hamilton.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, notwithstanding the provision of section 212 (a) (3) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Mrs. Jeannette S. Hamilton may be admitted to the United States for permanent residence if she is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of that act: *Provided*, That this exemption shall apply only to a ground for exclusion of which the Department of State or the Department of Justice has knowledge prior to the enactment of this act.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EDWARD NEAL FISHER

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4602) for the relief of Edward Neal Fisher.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of all laws of the United States, Edward Neal Fisher, Effingham, Ill., shall be held and considered to have served continuously on active duty with the United States Army during the period beginning May 20, 1898, and ending May 2, 1899, both dates inclusive, and to have received an honorable discharge from such service.

SEC. 2. No benefits shall be payable by reason of this act to any person for any period prior to the date on which an application for such benefits is filed subsequent to the date of enactment of this act.

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.

MRS. HELEN BARSA

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4872) for the relief of Mrs. Helen Barsa.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $1,000 to Mrs. Helen Barsa, of Detroit, Mich., in full settlement of all claims against the United States as a refund for security bonds posted for Maria Sofie Farah and Jorge Farah which were declared forfeited March 15, 1954: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

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.

IMPERIAL AGRICULTURAL CORP.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5285) for the relief of the Imperial Agricultural Corp.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the Imperial Agricultural Corp., a corporation of the State of Connecticut, the sum of $67,713.60. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of such corporation against the United States for reimbursement of actual expenses incurred as a result of the failure in 1951 of a crop of Kenaf seed which had been obtained from the Commodity Credit Corporation and planted in the State of Florida under the terms of a contract (dated July 6, 1951) between the United States and the Imperial Agricultural Corp.: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contract notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

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.

JOHN C. WALSH

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5533) for the relief of John C. Walsh.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to John C. Walsh, of New York, N. Y., the sum of $5,800. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said John C. Walsh against the United States on account of professional services rendered by him as a special assistant to the Attorney General of the United States for the period beginning February 3, 1953, and ending June 30, 1953, both dates inclusive, his claim therefor (claim No. 21568787) having been disallowed by the General Accounting Office as exceeding a salary limitation which was established for such position, but of which he was not informed: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be un-

lawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 2, line 5, strike out "in excess of 10 percent thereof."

The committee 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.

WILLIAM H. FOLEY

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6452) for the relief of William H. Foley.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That sections 15 to 20, inclusive, of the Federal Employees' Compensation Act are hereby waived in favor of William H. Foley, Waterford, Conn., and his claim for compensation for personal injuries sustained on October 11, 1929, while in the performance of his duties as a pipefitter at the United States submarine base, New London, Conn., shall be acted upon under the remaining provisions of such act if he files such claim with the Bureau of Employees' Compensation, Department of Labor, within 60 days after the date of the enactment of this act.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

"That sections 15 to 20, inclusive, of the Federal Employees' Compensation Act, as amended, are hereby waived in favor of William H. Foley, Waterford, Conn., and his claim for compensation for disability resulting from personal injuries alleged to have been sustained while in the performance of his duty as a pipefitter at the United States submarine base, New London, Conn., shall be considered and acted upon under the remaining provisions of such act in the same manner as if such claim had been timely filed, if such claim is filed within 90 days after the enactment of this act: *Provided*, That no benefits shall accrue for any period prior to the enactment of this act except such medical expenses as may be found to be reimbursable."

The committee 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.

JULIAN, DOLORES, JAIME, DENNIS, ROLDAN, AND JULIAN, JR., LIZARDO

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4039) for the relief of Julian, Dolores, Jaime, Dennis, Roldan, and Julian, Jr., Lizardo.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Julian, Dolores, Jaime, Dennis, Roldan, and Julian, Jr., Lizardo, shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fees. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such aliens as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct six numbers from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 4, strike out "Jaime, Dennis".

Page 2, line 1, strike out "six" and insert "four"

At the end of section 1, page 2, insert:

"SEC. 2. Upon the enactment of this act Jaime and Dennis Lizardo, shall be classifiable as nonquota immigrants under the provisions of the Immigration and Nationality Act."

The committee amendments were 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.

FAVORING SUSPENSION OF DEPORTATION IN THE CASE OF CERTAIN ALIENS

The Clerk called the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 42) favoring the suspension of deportation in the case of certain aliens.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the concurrent resolution, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Congress favors the suspension of deportation in the case of each alien hereinafter named, in which case the Attorney General has suspended deportation pursuant to the provisions of section 244 (a) (5) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (66 Stat. 214; 8 U. S. C. 1254 (c)):

A-5981713, Dickel, Junior, Wlater.
E-078565, Fontes, Sebastiano De.
A-2553452, Garcia, Nicolas.
E-47368, Gasca-Sardina, Juan.
E-069249, Lozano, Jose Pascual.
A-5845821, Maniscalco, Giuseppe.
E-16323, Mercadante, Rocco.
E-069259, Sweedler, Hilda.
A-2266360, Triana-Aguilar, Lucas.
A-1116968, Watchinsky, Samuel.
A-1552531, Lopez-Chavez, Juan.
E-057379, Manouskos, James George.
E-89257, Ciaccia, Catello Charles.
E-069558, Lucio-Leon, Felipe.
A-5988306, Rudy, George.
E-078638, Capozzi, Francesco.
E-069474, Castaneda, Juana Ponce-Rosales de.
A-1894829, Slojkowski, John Anthony.
E-057816, Solano, Ramon.
E-077119, Garcia, Antonio Menendez.
A-4595749, Jakubiak, Frank Anthony.
A-2236659, Jarger, Junior, George.
A-4608159, Maniscalco, Samuel.
E-054983, Mayo, Walter John.
E-058681, Ortiz-Gonzalez, Faustino.
A-4747607, Schmidt, Karl.
A-5149973, Schmitt, Joseph Otto.
A-4793952, Wagner, Sam.
A-3167418, Dippner, Hermann.
A-2744439, Kuprashewithz, Wladimir.
A-1168565, Silverio, Caroline Lucca Di Pietro.
A-4100237, Woislaw, Stanslaw.
A-3939724, Woislaw, Felikcia Anna.
A-5624707, Yen, Lok.
A-2590255, Bakovich, Nick.
E-053681, Barlow, Enid.
1200-43511, Chadwick, Ann Betancourt.
A-1339656, Doolittle, Immacolatina.
A-1437231, Mark, Zef.
E-076774, Porcello, Vincenzo.
A-4777524, Ramirez-Medel, Anastacio.
E-47358, Salazar-Aguilar, Jesse Robert.
E-89260, Shaw, Norman Howard.
A-1109526, Stephens, George Saunders.
A-5932871, Torowis, Jurko.
A-1644860, Wengorowski, Ignatz.
A-5914114, Wolck, Vladimir.
A-5844626, Firetto, Paolo.
A-4948601, Schmidt, Frederick.
A-1153640, Woishnis, Frances Victoria.
A-5339974, Bostrom, Iver August.
E-075816, Castro, Stephen.
A-3322617, Cromie, Thomas Wilfred.
E-076879, Dujuambi, Monte Alfonso Carmett.
A-4167829, Garbus, Abraham.
T-2682534, Mercier, Lucien Treffle.
A-5969128, Michelson, Robert.
A-3231388, Morgan, Charlotte.
A-3900018, Vicklund, Knut Oskar.
A-5753722, Lupino, Louis.
A-5849321, Rostowsky, Frances Catherine (nee Vaiciunas).
A-1595525, Sevagian, Avedis.
A-1604070, Bosky, Paul Adam.
A-2452366, Bungard, Leonard Joseph.
E-47592, Martinez-Luna, Hipolito.
A-1631944, Psaros, Speros.
A-3972039, Walker, Gerardo Verdugo.
A-2146407, Wineman, Sam.
E-131755, Wolfson, Abe Bernard.
A-2176896, Wood, James Archibald.
A-4348492, Badalmenti, Dominick.
A-3814987, Caldera-Roldan, Joaquin.
A-2303530, Fryza, George.
A-3554030, Gaytan-Ybarra, Angel.
A-4945116, Grossman, Carmelina.
A-3043634, Duchin, Abraham.
A-2544643, Lande, Ove John.
A-1745616, Litwak, Jake.
A-3042362, Luteron, Illes.
A-5024257, Odder, Toufic.
A-5541581, Russell, Rose Agnes.
A-3774200, Weinstein, Catherine.
A-3433019, Weissman, Hyman.
A-4038929, Culotta, Vincent.
A-4091431, Franicevich, Frank Marija.
A-3243585, Wasserman, Aron Harry.
A-4961731, Wiersch, Rose.
A-8280922, Bartnik, Andrew.
A-4402553, Calish, Ben.
A-8447000, Camiolo, Cristoforo.
A-4749433, Cooper, Benjamin.
A-2608947, Davitto, Bernardo Vercoglic
A-7361922, Dobrovich, John.
E-080681, Galdikas, Anthony Constance.
A-4819163, Goldberg, Joseph Benjamin.
A-545825, Goldenberg, Scoocher.
A-1738912T, Greenfield, Philip.
A-1165031, Harishuk, James Frederick.
A-1953490, Jacob, Leo Carl.
A-1224861, Kubis, John Joseph.
A-5571019, Maciejewski, Floryian.
A-4088212, Maloff, Carl.
A-1038887, Mordos, Aniela.
A-3773694, Nockowitz, Charles.
E-078680, Paukstys, Vincent.
1415-3776, Paz-Lucio, Isaac De La.
A-2256143, Rojas-Guzman, Pedro.
A-3607468, Schwarz, John.
0402/8161, Smith, Walter.
A-3130901, Telles-Mejia, Tomas.
A-1011263, Valdez, Patricio.
A-5634530, Vito, Liborio.
A-5160088, Zech, John.
A-2390285, Zielinski, Frank.
T-303059, Bartolini, Alberto.
8511-A-1274, Caramanlau, Gheorghe.
E-053084, Cepeda Teran, Aurelio.
A-3042474, Chaykowski, Michael.
A-1427387, Chervinski, Charles.
E-89265, Chillemi, Giovanni.
A-5934786, Cimino, Jean.
0800-106472, Cobos, Tomas.
A-1459543, Cowart, Harry Fuller.
E-069328, Dem, Louise.
A-2888771, Drownowski, Czeslaw.
A-1847251, Elber, Isadore.
A-5524604, Feldman, Pal.
A-4724104, Ferro, Pete.
A-2174885, Figiolia, Louis Jack.
A-3740609, Grado, Luigi Di.

A-4705290, Gutstein, Albert.
A-5343594, Holody, Martin.
A-2194350, Honkamaa, Charles.
A-3155214, Irla, Anthony Stanley.
A-3237162, Kalinovik, Alexander Paul.
A-1028748, Kaplan, Abraham.
A-2518778, Kashigian, Artin.
A-5918920, Kauth, Kurt Max.
A-3132325, Knowles, Ann Eirwen.
A-7858221, Kryczka, John.
A-5402770, Lamars, Pete.
A-3623367, Latarski, Sigmund.
A-4963675, Lukac, John.
A-2941249, Maneniskis, Joseph.
A-5151675, Matheson, Wilfred Laurier (William Matheson).
A-3017074, Medoway, Sam.
E-070997, Novak, Bela.
A-5720885, Nowak, John.
A-3818026, Ostrashelski, Constantine.
E-083290, Pong, Soon.
A-8116357, Reed, John David.
A-4755643, Richter, Walter.
A-5753580, Rocco, Louis.
A-2671145, Rucienski, Aleksander.
2770-P-142631, Sandler, Josel David.
A-1853190, Sandor, Victor.
E-086512, Schwar, Klara.
0800-84629, Simon Aurif.
A-5862381, Slater, Frank.
E-47365, Sosa Paz, Luz.
A-1840646, Torres, Jose Buenaventura.
A-1815668, Tuchet, Frank.
A-4967148, Walonce, Stanley Francis.
A-2935138, Wilkas, Julius.
A-1704536, Ziegenhirt, Joseph Francisco.
A-3122325, Forsbacka, Johannes Alfred.
A-5967839, Hovanec, John.
A-1985254, Jurlin, Daniel D.
A-7485159, Keefe, Everett Vernon.
E-057815, Moreno Aguilar, Conrado.
A-4727339, Proch, John Alexander.

With the following committee amendment:

Beginning on page 6, line 14, strike out the remainder of the concurrent resolution.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The concurrent resolution was concurred in.

CONVEYANCE OF CERTAIN LANDS ON TURTLE MOUNTAIN INDIAN RESERVATION

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6927) providing for the conveyance to St. Louis Church of Dunseith, Dunseith, N. Dak., of certain lands on the Turtle Mountain Indian Reservation.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to substitute for H. R. 6927 an identical Senate bill, S. 1397.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the Senate bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior is authorized and directed to transfer, with the consent of the Turtle Mountain Advisory Committee, to St. Louis Church of Dunseith, Dunseith, N. Dak., all right, title, and interest of the United States and of the Turtle Mountain Band of Chippewa Indians in and to the following-described lands: The east half of the southeast quarter of the southeast quarter of the southwest quarter, and the west half of the southwest quarter of the southwest quarter of the southeast quarter, of section 18, township 162 north, range 72 west, fifth principal meridian, excepting and reserving therefrom 100 feet along the section line for highway purposes.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

A similar House bill, H. R. 6927, was laid on the table.

MRS. BARBARA (PEARSON) BOYCOTT

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4769) for the relief of Mrs. Barbara (Pearson) Boycott.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, notwithstanding the provisions of paragraphs (9) and (10) of section 212 (a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Mrs. Barbara (Pearson) Boycott may be admitted to the United States for permanent residence if she is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of that act.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

"That, notwithstanding the provision of section 212 (a) (9) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Mrs. Barbara (Pearson) Boycott may be admitted to the United States for permanent residence if she is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of that act: *Provided*, That this exemption shall apply only to a ground for exclusion of which the Department of State or the Department of Justice had knowledge prior to the enactment of this act."

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.

ROSETTA ITTNER

The Clerk called the bill (S. 85) for the relief of Rosetta Ittner.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, notwithstanding the provisions of section 212 (a) (9) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Rosetta Ittner may be admitted to the United States for permanent residence if she is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of such act: *Provided*, That this exemption shall apply only to a ground for exclusion of which the Department of State or the Department of Justice has knowledge prior to the enactment of this act.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

WILHELMINE SCHELTER

The Clerk called the bill (S. 86) for the relief of Wilhelmine Schelter.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, notwithstanding the provisions of section 212 (a) (9) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Wilhelmine Schelter may be admitted to the United States for permanent residence if she is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of such act: *Provided*, That this exemption shall apply only to a ground for exclusion of which the Department of State or the Department of Justice had knowledge prior to the enactment of this act.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PAULINE ELLEN REDMOND

The Clerk called the bill (S. 141) for the relief of Pauline Ellen Redmond.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Pauline Ellen Redmond shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MARY FREIDA POELTL SMITH

The Clerk called the bill (S. 223) for the relief of Mary Freida Poeltl Smith.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, notwithstanding the provisions of paragraphs (9) and (12) of section 212 (a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Mary Freida Poeltl Smith may be admitted for permanent residence if she is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of such act: *Provided*, That these exemptions shall apply only to grounds for exclusion of which the Department of State or the Department of Justice has knowledge prior to the enactment of this act.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MELANIE SCHAFFNER BAKER

The Clerk called the bill (S. 235) for the relief of Melanie Schaffner Baker.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, notwithstanding the provisions of section 212 (a) (6) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Melanie Schaffner Baker may be admitted to the United States for permanent residence if she is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of such act, under such conditions and controls which the Attorney General, after consultation with the Surgeon General of the United States Public Health Service, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, may deem necessary to impose: *Provided*, That a suitable and proper bond or undertaking, approved by the Attorney General, be deposited as prescribed by section 213 of the said act.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MRS. HELENA PLANINSEK

The Clerk called the bill (S. 240) for the relief of Mrs. Helena Planinsek.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, notwithstanding the provisions of section 212 (a) (6) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Mrs. Helena Planinsek may be admitted to the United States for permanent residence if she is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of such act, under such conditions and controls which the Attorney General, after consultation with the Surgeon General of the United States Public Health Service, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, may deem necessary to impose: *Provided*, That a suitable and proper bond or undertaking, approved by the Attorney General, be deposited as prescribed by section 213 of the said act.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MISS CECILE PATRICIA CHAPMAN

The Clerk called the bill (S. 293) for the relief of Miss Cecile Patricia Chapman.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, notwithstanding the provisions of section 101 (b) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Miss Cecile Patricia Chapman shall be held and considered to be within the purview of section 101 (a) (27) (A) of the said act.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ELSA ALWINE LARSEN

The Clerk called the bill (S. 518) for the relief of Elsa Alwine Larsen.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, notwithstanding the provisions of paragraph (9) of section 212 (a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Elsa Alwine Larsen may be admitted to the United States for permanent residence if she is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of such act: *Provided*, That this exemption shall apply only to a ground for exclusion of which the Department of State or the Department of Justice has knowledge prior to the enactment of this act.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GERDA GRAUPNER

The Clerk called the bill (S. 843) for the relief of Gerda Graupner.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, in the administration of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Gerda Graupner, the fiancée of Sgt. Haden Wilson Pierce, a citizen of the United States, shall be eligible for a visa as a nonimmigrant temporary visitor for a period of 3 months: *Provided*, That the administrative authorities find that the said Gerda Graupner is coming to the United States with a bona fide intention of being married to the said Sgt. Haden Wilson Pierce and that she is found otherwise admissible under the provisions of the Immigration and Nationality Act other than the provision of section 212 (a) (9) of that act: *Provided further*, That this exemption shall apply only to a ground for exclusion of which the Department of State or the Department of Justice has knowledge prior to the enactment of this act. In the event that the marriage between the above-named persons does not occur within 3 months after the entry of the said Gerda Graupner, she shall be required to depart from the United States and upon failure to do so shall be deported in accordance with the provisions of sections 242 and 243 of the Immigration and Nationality Act. In the event that the marriage between the above-named persons shall occur within 3 months after the entry of the said Gerda Graupner, the Attorney General is authorized and directed to record the lawful admission for permanent residence of the said Gerda Graupner as of the date of the payment by her of the required visa fee.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GABOR LANYI

The Clerk called the bill (S. 884) for the relief of Gabor Lanyi.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, notwithstanding the provisions of paragraphs (1) and (4) of section 212 (a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Gabor Lanyi may be admitted to the United States for permanent residence if he is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of such act. The provisions of this act shall apply only to grounds for exclusion under such paragraphs known to the Secretary of State or the Attorney General prior to the date of enactment of this act: *Provided*, That a suitable and proper bond or undertaking, approved by the Attorney General, be deposited as prescribed by section 213 of the said act.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HELENE MARGARETA JOBST

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1266) for the relief of Helene Margareta Jobst.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, notwithstanding the provisions of section 212 (a) (6) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Helen Margareta Jobst may be admitted to the United States for permanent residence if she is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of such act, under such conditions and controls which the Attorney General, after consultation with the Surgeon General of the United States Public Health Service, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, may deem necessary to impose: *Provided*, That a suitable and proper bond or undertaking, approved by the Attorney General, be deposited as prescribed by section 213 of the said act.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MARIA ANNA COONE

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1296) for the relief of Maria Anna Coone.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That notwithstanding the provisions of paragraph (9) of section 212 (a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Maria Anna Coone may be admitted to the United States for permanent residence, if she is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of such act. The provisions of this act shall apply only to grounds for exclusion under such paragraph known to the Secretary of State or the Attorney General prior to the date of enactment of this act.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RURIKO HARA

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1496) for the relief of Ruriko Hara.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of section 101 (a) (27) (A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, the minor child, Ruriko Hara, shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of Masaki Toshi, a citizen of the United States.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ERNST FRAENKEL AND HIS WIFE, HANNA FRAENKEL

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1541) for the relief of Ernst Fraenkel and his wife, Hanna Fraenkel.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, in the administration of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Ernst Fraenkel and his wife, Hanna Fraenkel, naturalized citizens of the United States, shall be permitted to reside in Germany until 3 years following the date of the enactment of this act without losing their Unied States citizenship under section 352 (a) of such act.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CONSTANTINOS PANTERMALIS

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1581) for the relief of Constantinos Pantermalis.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Constantinos Pantermalis shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair announces that Calendar Nos. 771 and 772 are not available at the desk, and will be passed over.

MUALLA S. HOLLOWAY

The Clerk called the bill (S. 2269) for the relief of Mualla S. Holloway.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, notwithstanding the provisions of paragraph (12) of section 212 (a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Mualla S. Holloway may be admitted to the United States for permanent residence, if she is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of such act. The provisions of this act shall apply only to grounds for exclusion under such paragraph known to the Secretary of State or the Attorney General prior to the date of enactment of this act.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

NADIA NOLAND AND SAMIA OUAFA NOLAND

The Clerk called the bill (S. 2270) for the relief of Nadia Noland and Samia Ouafa Noland.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, notwithstanding the provisions of paragraphs (9) and (12) of section 212 (a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Nadia Noland may be admitted to the United States for permanent residence, if she is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of such act. The provisions of this act shall apply only to grounds for exclusion under such paragraphs known to the Secretary of State or the Attorney General prior to the date of enactment of this act.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of sections 101 (a) (27) (A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, the minor child, Samia Ouafa Noland, shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of RMC Paul F. Noland, a citizen of the United States.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Calendar No. 775 is not available at the Clerk's desk and will likewise be passed over.

UNITED STATES COURT OF CLAIMS

The Clerk called the resolution (H. Res. 309) providing for sending to the United States Court of Claims the bill H. R. 7453.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the bill (H. R. 7453) entitled "A bill for the relief of Richard M. Taylor and Lydia Taylor," together with all accompanying papers, is hereby referred to the United States Court of Claims pursuant to sections 1492 and 2509 of title 28, United States Code; and said court shall proceed expeditiously with the same in accordance with the provisions of said sections and report to the House, at the earliest practicable date, giving such findings of fact and conclusions thereon as shall be sufficient to inform the Congress of the nature and character of the demand, as a claim legal or equitable against the United States, and the amount, if any, legally or equitably due from the United States to the claimant.

The resolution was agreed to; and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FRANCES IRENE SMART

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1514) for the relief of Frances Irene Smart.

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Calendar Nos. 778 and 779 are not available at the desk and will be passed over.

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bills beginning with Calendar No. 778 and extending to and including Calendar No. 796 be passed over, because reports are not available.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The last three bills on the Private Calendar are not at the desk, either, so they will be passed over.

CONSENT CALENDAR

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that in the call of the Consent Calendar today the provision of the rules requiring bills to be on that calendar 3 legislative days in order to be considered be waived.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

WORK OF SUBCOMMITTEE ON IMMIGRATION AND NATIONALITIES OF THE COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, we have just witnessed the perfect team work that exists in the consideration of private bills, and we have seen the confidence of the entire Membership of the House in the work of the subcommittee, as evidenced by the fact that close to two hundred bills, if not more, have been passed by the House within the past few hours. These are private bills coming out of that committee, and which mean so much to the individuals who benefit by them. Mr. Speaker, while it takes only a second or two, if there is no objection, to have a bill passed—that bill represents many hours of thoughtful consideration by the members of the subcommittee, as well as by the members of the staff of the subcommittee. I want to particularly express my thanks to the chairman and the members of the subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary for the excellent work they have done this year and the excellent work they have done in past years. This year many, many hundreds of bills have come out of the subcommittee and passed the House of Representatives by unanimous consent. To the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALTER], the chairman of the subcommittee, and the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FEIGHAN], the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. CHELF], the gentlewoman from Michigan [Miss THOMPSON], the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. HYDE], who are members of the subcommittee, I want to express my deep thanks for the hard work they have done and the great sacrifices they have made with reference to this type of legislation, and although their work seldom receives publicity, they have accomplished a great deal for many hundreds of individuals who benefit from the passage of these bills.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield.

Mr. JACKSON. I should like to associate myself, Mr. Speaker, with the remarks made by the gentleman from Massachusetts in respect to this hard-working committee. As the gentleman has so ably expressed it, the work of this committee in a large part goes unnoticed, without any fanfare of publicity. In fact, as many Members of the House have done, I have appeared before the subcommittee in support of one or another pieces of legislation having to do with private bills. The unfailing courtesy of the chairman, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALTER], and of every Member of the subcommittee, has been such, I think, that the thanks of every Member of this body is due to them for the manner in which they conduct the work of this subcommittee.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, I just wanted to say that I want to compliment the staff of the committee because they certainly have done well.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, this subcommittee only yesterday made public a very important report on international migration problems. It is a monumental document and a credit to the chairman and members of the subcommittee. Each Member of the House of Representatives should read the report, the number of which is 1570.

THE WORK OF THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON CLAIMS OF THE COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, the remarks I have just made also apply to the Subcommittee on Claims of which my very good friend the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. LANE] is the chairman. I also extend my thanks to him and all the members of his subcommittee—the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. FORRESTER], the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. DONOHUE], the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BOYLE], the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. REED], the gentleman from New York [Mr. MILLER], and the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. BURDICK].

And to the staff of both of these subcommittees, hard-working, efficient, and courteous, their service means so much to any committee, but particularly on these two subcommittees.

I also want to extend my sincere thanks and with it I know goes the thanks of the membership of the House

to Mr. Walter R. Lee, clerk of the Subcommittee on Claims, and to Mr. Walter M. Besterman, clerk of the Subcommittee on Immigration and Nationalities, and to their able assistants, Mrs. Violent T. Benn, Mrs. Frances F. Christy, Miss Velma Smedley, and particularly to Mrs. Bessie Dick, director of the staff of the Committee on the Judiciary.

I also want to thank the members of the Objectors Committee who have given voluntarily of their time and worked over and above the call of duty on the Consent Calendar, consisting of the gentleman from North Carolina, Mr. DEANE; the gentleman from Colorado, Mr. ASPINALL; the gentleman from Massachusetts, Mr. BOLAND; the gentleman from Iowa, Mr. CUNNINGHAM; the gentleman from Wisconsin, Mr. BYRNES; the gentleman from Michigan, Mr. FORD.

Also I wish to thank the members of the Objectors Committee on Private Claims, the gentleman from Alabama, Mr. ROBERTS; the gentleman from Oklahoma, Mr. JARMAN; the gentleman from Massachusetts, Mr. BOLAND; the gentleman from Illinois, Mr. SHEEHAN; the gentleman from Wisconsin, Mr. VAN PELT; and the gentleman from Kansas, Mr. AVERY.

I wish also to include the legislative clerk, Mr. Joseph F. Feeney, of Massachusetts.

To each and every one I extend my sincere thanks for a wonderful job done during this session of Congress.

LISELOTTE WARMBRAND

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 191) for the relief of Liselotte Warmbrand.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, notwithstanding the provisions of section 212 (a) (9) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Liselotte Warmbrand may be admitted to the United States for permanent residence if she is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of such act: *Provided*, That this exemption shall apply only to a ground for exclusion of which the Department of State or the Department of Justice has knowledge prior to the enactment of this act.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

APOSTOLOS VASILI PERCAS

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 239) for the relief of Apostolos Vasili Percas.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Apostolos Vasili Percas shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MRS. LIESELOTTE EMILIE DAILEY

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 1105) for the relief of Mrs. Lieselotte Emilie Dailey.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, notwithstanding the provision of section 212 (a) (9) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Mrs. Lieselotte Emilie Dailey may be admitted to the United States for permanent residence if she is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of that act: *Provided*, That this exemption shall apply only to a ground for exclusion of which the Department of State or the Department of Justice has knowledge prior to the enactment of this act.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SPYRIDON SAINTOUFIS AND HIS WIFE EFROSSINI SAINTOUFIS

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 1706) for the relief of Spyridon Saintoufis and his wife Efrossini Saintoufis.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Spyridon Saintoufis and his wife Efrossini Saintoufis shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fees. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such aliens as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct the required numbers from the appropriate quota or quotas for the first year that such quota or quotas are available.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ANNA MARIE HITZELBERGER SCHEIDT, AND HER MINOR CHILD, ROSANNE HITZELBERGER

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 1730) for the relief of Anna Marie Hitzelberger Scheidt, and her minor child, Rosanne Hitzelberger.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, notwithstanding the provisions of paragraphs (9) and (12) of section 212 (a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Anna Marie Hitzelberger Scheidt may be admitted to the United States for permanent residence if she is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of such act: *Provided*, That these exemptions shall apply only to grounds for exclusion of which the Department of State or the Department of Justice has knowledge prior to the enactment of this act.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of sections 101 (a) (27) (A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, the minor child, Rosanne Hitzelberger, shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of Peter J. Scheidt, a citizen of the United States.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

STATUS OF PERMANENT RESIDENCE GRANTED TO CERTAIN ALIENS

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table House Concurrent Resolution 167, approving the granting of the status of permanent residence to certain aliens, 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 17, after line 9, insert:
"A-10141545, Chao, Chang Hsiang.
"A-7782852, Huang, Pao-Chen.
"A-7202750, Lin, Shang Wu.
"A-7418222, Ma, Yiew Min."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in; and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

STATUS OF PERMANENT RESIDENCE GRANTED TO CERTAIN ALIENS

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table House Concurrent Resolution 168, favoring the granting of the status of permanent residence to certain aliens, 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 5, after line 16, insert:
"A-6808711, Milinovic, Branko.
"A-7863464, Nizinski, Wladyslaw.
"0501-19023, Nizinski, Henryka Zofia Kula."

The Senate amendment was concurred in; and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ERWIN S. DE MOSKONYI

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 1034) with a Senate amendment and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Line 4, strike out "DeMoskonyi" and insert "de Mocskonyi."

Amend the title so as to read: "An act for the relief of Erwin S. de Mocskonyi."

The Senate amendments were concurred in; and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GRACE CASQUITE HWANG

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 1060) for the relief of Grace Casquite Hwang, 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:

Line 7, strike out all after "fee." down to and including line 11.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in; and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

KARLIS ABELE

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 1301) for the relief of Karlis Abele, with 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 10, strike out all after "Act." over to and including line 3 on page 2.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in; and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DALISAY LOURDES CRUZ

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 1552) for the relief of Dalisay Lourdes Cruz, with 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:

Line 6, strike out "and Mrs. Antonio Cruz, citizens" and insert: Antonio Cruz, a citizen".

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in; and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

INGEBORG LUISE FISCHER

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 1958) for the relief of Ingeborg Luise Fischer, 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:

Line 5, strike out "Fischer" and insert "Walling."

Amend the title so as to read: "An act for the relief of Ingeborg Luise Walling."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in; and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SADA ZARIKIAN

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 2065) for the relief of Sada Zarikian, with Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment with an 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, in the administration of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Sada Zarikian shall be held and considered to be within the purview of section 354 (a) (5) of that act."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. WALTER moves to strike out "section 354 (a) (5)" and substitute in lieu thereof "section 354 (5)."

The motion was agreed to.

The Senate amendment, as amended, was concurred in; and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GERALDINE GEAN HUNT AND LINDA MARIE HUNT

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 2753) for the relief of Geraldine Gean Hunt and Linda Marie Hunt with 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:

Line 8, strike out all after "fees," down to and including line 12.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in; and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

OFELIA MARTIN

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 2791) for the relief of Ofelia Martin, with 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:

Line 6 and 7, strike out "and Mrs. Gentry Martin, citizens" and insert: "Gentry Martin, a citizen."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in; and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DOROTHY CLAIRE MAURICE

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 3189) for the relief of Dorothy Claire Maurice.

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Dorothy Claire Maurice shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

With 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:

Line 7, strike out all after "fee." down to and including line 12.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in; and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LUISE PEMPFER

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 3507) for the relief of Luise Pempfer (now Mrs. William L. Adams) with 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:

Line 3, strike out "(2)" and insert "(a)."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in; and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LUISE ISABELLA CHU

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the

Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 3628) for the relief of Luise Isabella Chu, also known as Luise Schneider, with 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:

Line 8, strike out all after "fee.", down to and including line 12.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in; and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

BIRGIT CAMARA

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 3635) for the relief of Birgit Camara, also known as Birgit Heinemann, with 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:

Line 8, strike out all after "fee.", down to and including line 12.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in; and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MARGARETHE BOCK

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 4468) for the relief of Margarethe Bock, with 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:

Amend the title so as to read: "An act for the relief of Margarethe Bock and her son, Robert Harald Bock."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in; and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FRANCISCA ALEMANY

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 5546) for the relief of Francisca Alemany, 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, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act Francisca Alemany shall be held and considered to be the minor child of her parents, Mr. and Mrs. Rafael Alemany, lawful permanent residents of the United States."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ROSA BIRGER

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to return for immediate consideration to Private Calendar No. 772, the bill (S. 1974) for the relief of Rosa Birger.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, notwithstanding the provisions of paragraphs (6) and (19) of section 212 (a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Rosa Birger may be admitted to the United States for permanent residence, if she is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of such act, under such conditions and controls which the Attorney General, after consultation with the Surgeon General of the United States Public Health Service, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, may deem necessary to impose: *Provided*, That a suitable and proper bond or undertaking, approved by the Attorney General, be deposited as prescribed by section 213 of the said act. The provisions of this act shall apply only to grounds for exclusion under such paragraphs known to the Secretary of State or the Attorney General prior to the date of enactment of this act.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DOMESTIC MINERALS PROGRAM EXTENSION ACT OF 1953

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 6373) to amend the Domestic Minerals Program Extension Act of 1953 in order to extend the programs to encourage the discovery, development, and production of certain domestic minerals with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California? The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. ENGLE, ASPINALL, ROGERS of Texas, SAYLOR, and YOUNG.

CONSENT CALENDAR

The SPEAKER. This is Consent Calendar day. The Clerk will call the first bill on the Consent Calendar.

PASSPORT FEES

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5844) to increase the fee for executing an application for a passport from $1 to $3.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the first proviso of section number 1 of the act entitled "An act making an appropriation for the Diplomatic and Consular Service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1921," approved June 4, 1920 (22 U. S. C., sec. 214), is amended by striking out "the fee of $1" and by inserting in lieu thereof "a fee of $3."

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.

APPOINTMENTS TO THE UNITED STATES MILITARY ACADEMY AND THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE ACADEMY

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5269) to increase the number of cadets that the President may personally select for appointment to the United States Military Academy and the United States Air Force Academy.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. WIER, Mr. YATES, and Mr. BAILEY objected.

VETERANS REGULATIONS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1614) to amend the Veterans Regulations to provide an increased statutory rate of compensation for veterans suffering the loss or loss of use of an eye in combination with the loss or loss of use of a limb.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill may be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

VETERANS' AFFAIRS LEGISLATION

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1821) to provide that checks for benefits provided by laws administered by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs may be forwarded to the addressee in certain cases.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill may be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

REVISION AND CODIFICATION OF LAWS RELATING TO ARMED FORCES

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 7049) to revise, codify, and enact into law title 10 of the United States Code entitled "Armed Forces," and title 32 of the United States Code entitled "National Guard."

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I should like to inquire of the gentleman in charge of the bill whether there is anything in the bill which will have the effect of changing the present law which gives Reserve and National Guard officers retired under

title III of the act of June 29, 1948, the right to draw their retired pay without regard to section 212 of the Economy Act of 1932.

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, I assure the gentleman there is no change in that.

Mr. HALEY. I withdraw my reservation of objection, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, does the legislation now being approved in anywise affect section 38 adopted in 1901?

Mr. WILLIS. I have an amendment which I believe will cover the subject.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, will the gentleman state what the amendment means so that the Members will be advised?

Mr. WILLIS. The amendment does this: The act to which the gentleman refers was adopted in 1901, as the gentleman knows, having to do with the sale of alcohol at Military Establishments. Then, in 1951, the law was restated, and there is some diversity of opinion as to whether the act of 1951 repeals the law of 1901. Frankly, it is the opinion of the staff on the Committee on the Judiciary and the people with whom we collaborated on the subject, that the act of 1951 supersedes the act of 1901. But since our job is not in any way to effect substantive law but simply to restate the law in code form, we have the provision carrying out the legal opinion and thus repealing the statute of 1901. But to be sure and satisfy the gentleman that we are not altering substantive law, the amendment that we have sent to the desk would take away the repeal, so that the law as it stands today will continue to stand. It is doubtful which of the two acts prevails, but we will not repeal the act of 1901. Both statutes will remain on the books.

Mr. REES of Kansas. In any event, you do not in anywise change the statute to which you have referred?

Mr. WILLIS. We definitely do not.

Mr. McCORMACK. You do not take a step back toward prohibition, do you.

Mr. WILLIS. We do not.

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WILLIS. I yield.

Mr. LANHAM. When the gentleman says that both laws will stay on the books, will both laws appear in the codification, the law of 1951, and the other? Will the 1951 law appear in the codification?

Mr. WILLIS. I think the latest law, the 1951 law, will be in the code.

Mr. LANHAM. But the older law will not?

Mr. WILLIS. It will still be in the statutes, it will not be repealed.

Mr. LANHAM. But it will not appear in the code?

Mr. WILLIS. That is correct.

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Speaker, I object.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman withhold his objection for a moment? If we do not pass this today and it goes over until the next session, there will have to be another complete recodification. It would cost probably another $25,000 to do it. This is a very difficult task. We have been working on this codification, I am informed, for 8 years. I do hope the gentleman will not object. There are no substantive changes in the law.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Speaker, I object.

INCLUSION OF ACCREDITED SERVICE TOWARD CIVIL SERVICE RETIREMENT

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1041) to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, to provide for the inclusion in the computation of accredited service of certain periods of service rendered States or instrumentalities of States, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 5 of the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, is amended by inserting after the first paragraph thereof the following:

"Subject to the conditions contained in this paragraph, there shall be included, in determining for the purposes of this act the aggregate period of service rendered by an officer or employee who is serving in a position within the purview of this act (other than a position described in this paragraph) at the time of his retirement or death, all periods of service rendered by him as an employee of a State, or any instrumentality thereof, exclusively or primarily in the carrying out of—

"(1) the program of a State Rural Rehabilitation Corporation created for the purpose of handling rural relief the funds for which were made available by the Federal Emergency Relief Act of 1933 (48 Stat. 55), the act of February 15, 1934 (48 Stat. 351), and the Emergency Appropriation Act, fiscal year 1935 (48 Stat. 1055), and any laws or parts of laws amendatory of, or supplementary to, such acts;

"(2) the Federal-State cooperative program of agricultural experiment stations research and investigation authorized by the act of March 2, 1887, as amended and supplemented (7 U. S. C., ch. 14);

"(3) the Federal-State cooperative program of vocational education authorized by the act of February 23, 1917, as amended and supplemented (20 U. S. C., ch. 2);

"(4) the Federal-State cooperative program of agricultural extension work authorized by the act of May 8, 1914, as amended and supplemented (7 U. S. C., secs. 341–348);

"(5) the Federal-State cooperative program of forest and watershed protection authorized by section 2 of the act of March 1, 1911 (16 U. S. C., sec. 563), and by the act of June 7, 1924, as amended and supplemented (16 U. S. C., secs. 564–568b);

"(6) the Federal-State cooperative program for the control of plant pests and animal diseases authorized by the provisions of law set forth in chapters 7 and 8 of title 7 and in section 114a of title 21 of the United States Code.

"The period of any service specified in this paragraph shall be included in computing length of service for the purposes of this act of any officer or employee only upon compliance with the following conditions:

"(A) the performance of such service is certified, in a form prescribed by the Civil Service Commission, by the head, or by a person designated by the head, of the department, agency, or independent establishment in the executive branch of the Government of the United States which administers the provisions of law authorizing the performance of such service;

"(B) the officer or employee shall have to his credit a total period of not less than 5 years of allowable service under this act, exclusive of service allowed by this paragraph;

"(C) the officer or employee shall have deposited with interest at 4 percent per annum to December 31, 1947, and 3 percent per annum thereafter, compounded on December 31 of each year, to the credit of the civil-service retirement and disability fund a sum equal to the aggregate of the amounts which would have been deducted from his basic salary, pay, or compensation during the period of service claimed under this paragraph if during such period he had been subject to this act;

"(D) such period of service is excluded from credit for the purposes of any annuity received by such officer or employee from a State.

"As used in this paragraph the term 'State' includes Alaska, Hawaii, and Puerto Rico."

SEC. 2. The annuity of any person who shall have performed service described in the second paragraph of section 5 of the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as added by this act, and who before the date of enactment of this act shall have been retired on annuity under the provisions of the act of May 22, 1920, as amended, section 8 (a) of the act of June 16, 1933, or the act of May 29, 1930, as amended, shall, upon application filed by such person within 1 year after the date of enactment of this act and compliance with the conditions prescribed by such second paragraph, be adjusted, effective as of the first day of the month following the date of enactment of this act, so that the amount of such annuity will be the same as if such paragraph had been in effect at the time of such person's retirement.

With the following committee amendments:

(1) Page 1, line 9, after the word "employee", insert "of the United States Government or the Municipal Government of the District of Columbia."

(2) Page 2, lines 1 and 2, strike out "(other than a position described in this paragraph)."

(3) Pages 5 and 6, strike out all of section 2.

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FEDERAL EMPLOYEES' GROUP LIFE INSURANCE ACT OF 1954

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1792) to amend the Federal Employees' Group Life Insurance Act of 1954.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That (a) section 5 (c) of the Federal Employees' Group Life Insurance Act of 1954 is amended to read as follows:

"(c) The sums withheld from employees under subsection (a) and the sums contributed from appropriations and funds under subsection (b) shall be deposited in the Treasury of the United States to the credit of a fund which is hereby created. Said fund is hereby made available without fiscal year limitation for premium payments under any insurance policy or policies purchased as authorized in sections 7 and 10 of this act, for the payment of any obligations under agreements assumed pursuant to section 10 of this act, and for any expenses incurred by the Commission in the administration of this act within such limitations as may be specified annually in appropriation acts: *Provided*, That appropriations available to the Commission for salaries and expenses for

the fiscal year 1955 shall be available on a reimbursable basis for necessary administrative expenses of carrying out the purposes of this act until said fund shall be sufficient to provide therefor. The income derived from any dividends or premium rate adjustments received from insurers shall constitute a part of said fund."

(b) Section 5 of said act is amended by adding the following subsection at the end thereof:

"(d) The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized to invest and reinvest the moneys in the fund created by section 5 (c), or any part thereof, in interest-bearing obligations of the United States and to sell such obligations of the United States for the purposes of the fund. The interest on and the proceeds from the sale of any such obligations shall become a part of the fund."

SEC. 2. (a) The third proviso of section 7 (d) of said act is hereby repealed.

(b) Section 7 (e) of said act is amended to read as follows:

"(e) The companies eligible to participate as reinsurers, and the amount of insurance under the policy or policies to be allocated to each issuing company or reinsurer, may be redetermined by the Commission for and in advance of any policy year after the first, on a basis consistent with subsections (c) and (d) of this section, with any modifications thereof it deems appropriate to carry out the intent of such subsections, and based on each participating company's group life insurance in force in the United States on the most recent December 31 for which information is available to it, excluding that under any policy or policies purchased under this act, and shall be so redetermined in a similar manner not less often than every 3 years or at any time that any participating company withdraws from participation: *Provided*, That if, upon any such redetermination, in the case of any issuing company or reinsurer which insured employees of the Federal Government on December 31, 1953, under policies issued to an association of Federal employees, the amount which results from the application of the formula referred to in subsection (d) of this section is less than the total decrease, if any, since December 31, 1953, in the amount of such company's insurance under such policies, the amount allocated to such company shall be increased to the amount of such decrease: *Provided further*, That any increase in the amount allocated to such company by application of the preceding proviso shall be reduced by the amount or amounts of any policy or policies purchased from such company under the authorization of section 10 of this act, and in force on the date of such redetermination."

SEC. 3. Section 10 of said act is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 10. (a) The Commission is authorized to arrange with any nonprofit association of Federal or District of Columbia employees for the assumption by the fund created by section 5 (c) of all life insurance agreements, including all benefits contained therein, obtained or provided by such association for its members.

"(b) The Commission is authorized without regard to other sections of this act and without regard to section 3709 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, to purchase from one or more life insurance companies, as determined by the Commission, a policy or policies of group life insurance to insure all or any portion of the life insurance agreements obtained or provided by an association for its members and assumed under this section: *Provided*, That any such company must be either (1) the company then insuring such members under a policy or policies issued to such association; or (2) a company which is an insurer or a reinsurer under section 7 of this act. The Commission may at any time discontinue any policy or policies it has purchased from any insurance company.

"(c) Any association accepting such arrangement shall, in consideration therefor, pay over and transfer to the Commission (1) an amount equal to the actuarial value, as determined by the Commission, of the insurance obligations assumed by the fund created by section 5 (c), or (2) the total assets of the life insurance fund of such association, whichever is the lesser. Such payment and transfer shall be a premium for the purchase of the Government insurance arrangement, shall be deposited in the fund created by section 5 (c), and shall be accomplished in accordance with the procedures and conditions prescribed by the Commission, and in accordance with the requirements of applicable law.

"(d) The arrangements authorized by this section shall be made within 6 calendar months following the date of enactment of this amending act, or such later date as the Commission may agree when there are extenuating circumstances, but not later than August 17, 1957, and such arrangements shall apply only to life insurance agreements existing on both the date of the approval of this amendment and on the date of the respective arrangement.

"(e) Any such arrangement shall provide that the continuation of the insurance coverage of such members shall be conditioned upon their payment to the fund created by section 5 (c), in such manner and under such conditions as the Commission may prescribe, of premium payments equal to the premiums or dues previously payable by them for such insurance coverage.

"(f) The members of such associations shall not by reason of any such arrangements be disqualified from any other insurance benefits provided by this act if otherwise eligible therefor."

With the following committee amendments:

Page 2, after line 21, insert a new section 2 to read as follows:

"SEC. 2. (a) Section 6 of said act is amended to read as follows:

"'SEC. 6. Each policy purchased under this act shall contain a provision, in terms approved by the Commission, to the effect that any insurance thereunder on any employee shall cease upon his separation from the service or 12 months after discontinuance of his salary payments, whichever first occurs, subject to a provision which shall be contained in the policy for temporary extension of coverage and for conversion to an individual policy of life insurance under conditions approved by the Commission, except that if upon such date as the insurance would otherwise cease the employee retires on an immediate annuity and (a) his retirement is for disability or (b) he has completed 15 years of creditable service, as determined by the Commission, his life insurance only may, under conditions determined by the Commission, be continued without cost to him in the amounts for which he would have been insured from time to time had his salary payments continued at the same rate as on the date of cessation. Periods of honorable active service in the Army, Navy, Air Force, Marine Corps, or Coast Guard of the United States shall be credited toward the required 15 years provided the employee has completed at least 5 years of civilian service.'

"(b) The amendments made by subsection (a) shall be effective as of August 17, 1954.

Page 2, line 22, strike out "SEC. 2. (a)" and insert "SEC. 3 (a)."

Page 4, line 5, strike out "SEC. 3." and insert "SEC. 4."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENDING FREE MAILING PRIVILEGES

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 7125) to extend to June 30, 1956, the free mailing privileges granted by the act of July 12, 1950, to members of the Armed Forces of the United States.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 2 of the act entitled "An act to provide free postage for members of the Armed Forces of the United States in specified areas", approved July 12, 1950, as amended (64 Stat. 336; 67 Stat. 7; 50 App. U. S. C., sec. 892), is hereby further amended by striking out "until June 30, 1955" and inserting in lieu thereof "until June 30, 1956."

SEC. 2. The amendment made by the first section of this act shall take effect as of June 30, 1955.

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.

FURNISHING A VETERAN A CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE AT NO FEE

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6274) to provide that no fee shall be charged a veteran for furnishing him a copy of his discharge or a copy of his certificate of service.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. FORD. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I wish to state on the record that I have in the past requested that this bill be passed over without prejudice. I should like to make perfectly clear the reason for my action in that regard.

First, the Department of Defense could administratively provide the veteran who is released from service with a wholly adequate certificate indicating satisfactory service. Various veterans organizations for good reasons have bitterly complained because the Department of Defense has repeatedly and consistently issued veterans who were released from active duty a certificate which is on flimsy paper with unrecognizable typing. The Department of Defense cannot justify this action. I repeat that the Department if it wanted and had the initiative could correct that problem administratively.

Second, I have also stated to a number of Members of Congress and various veteran organization representatives that I would have no objection to an amendment to this bill which would provide that a veteran could get one duplicate discharge free of charge from the Department of Defense. I am wholly in accord with such an amendment. It should be pointed out in addition that veterans can under the present law for $1.50 each get an unlimited number of duplicate discharge certificates.

I am fully agreeable to an amendment which would give those who lose their original discharge certificate a duplicate free of charge. Those who are repeatedly careless and consistently lose their certificates certainly ought to be willing to pay $1.50 for their continued negligence.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection, and ask that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, speaking to the first point made by the gentleman from Michigan, of course if they were issued a discharge certificate made of better paper it would make it much more expensive. The biggest problem is not a discharge that is worn out but one that has become lost. Therefore, whether or not the point that a more expensive discharge certificate should be issued is a valid one for opposing this bill I very seriously doubt.

To the second point made by the gentleman from Michigan, that a veteran should be issued only one free copy of discharge certificate may I say that this bill has been very carefully considered by a subcommittee of the Committee on Armed Services and by a number of Members of Congress. The Department of Defense said that rather than have the bookkeeping problem that would be imposed on it by checking to see whether or not a veteran had already been issued one certificate, and writing him afterward to say, "You have had one certificate, now you have to pay for the second," they would prefer just to be given authority to issue certificates.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I do not consider the objections of the gentleman from Michigan at all valid, and I object to his request.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. SHORT. It would be much cheaper for them to grant an extra certificate.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. All you do is impose extra bookwork. It would be much cheaper to give them that extra certificate.

Mr. SHORT. It would be much cheaper. The gentleman from Michigan serves on the Committee on Appropriations. This would save the taxpayers money. I think the gentleman should not object.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. FORD. The most recent data from the Department of Defense refutes the statement that it is a burden to the Department of Defense to go through this process of telling the veteran that he has to pay $1.50 for his own carelessness. As I say, I think my position is very fair and reasonable. Under those circumstances I must renew my request. Unfortunately, we cannot come to a compromise, but that is just one of the difficulties we run into at this late hour in the session.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I object to the request of the gentleman from Michigan.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. FORD. I object, Mr. Speaker.

UNITED NATIONS

The Clerk called the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 186) expressing the sense of Congress that certain countries should be granted membership in the United Nations.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this resolution be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PRIEST). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

CONNECTICUT RIVER

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1577) to amend the acts granting the consent of Congress to the State of Connecticut, acting by and through any agency or commission thereof, to construct, maintain, and operate toll bridges across the Connecticut River.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 2 of the act approved August 7, 1939 (53 Stat. 1234), entitled "An act granting the consent of Congress to the State of Connecticut, acting by and through any agency or commission thereof, to construct, maintain, and operate a toll bridge across the Connecticut River at or near Hartford, Conn.," and section 2 of the act approved April 24, 1946 (60 Stat. 122), entitled "An act granting the consent of Congress to the State of Connecticut, acting by and through any agency or commission thereof, to construct, maintain, and operate a toll bridge across the Connecticut River at or near Old Saybrook, Conn.," are each amended to read as follows:

SEC. 2. The last sentence of section 4 of such act of March 23, 1906, shall not be applicable to the bridge constructed pursuant to the provisions of this act."

SEC. 2. Nothing in this act shall be construed as amending any provision of existing federal law relating to the expenditure of Federal-aid highway funds.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LAKE TAHOE, TRUCKEE, CARSON AND WALKER RIVERS

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1391) granting the consent of Congress to the States of California and Nevada to negotiate and enter into a compact with respect to the distribution and use of the waters of Truckee, Carson and Walker Rivers, Lake Tahoe, and the tributaries of such rivers and lake in such States.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the consent of Congress is hereby given to the States of California and Nevada to negotiate and enter into a compact with respect to the distribution and use of the waters of the Truckee, Carson, and Walker Rivers, Lake Tahoe, and the tributaries of such rivers and lake in such States.

SEC. 2. Such consent is given upon the following conditions:

(1) A representative of the United States, who shall be appointed by the President of the United States, shall participate in such negotiations and shall make a report to the President and to the Congress of the proceedings and of any compact entered into; and

(2) Such compact shall not be binding or obligatory upon either of such States unless and until it has been ratified by the legislature of each of such States and consented to by the Congress of the United States.

SEC. 3. The right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

NEW YORK CITY NATIONAL SHRINES

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3120) to promote public cooperation in the rehabilitation and preservation of the Nation's important historic properties in the New York City area, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. TUMULTY. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, may I inquire of the distinguished gentleman from California whether this bill relates to the disposition of historic properties like Ellis Island in the harbor of New York.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, this bill provides for the authorization of an advisory board of 11 members to study the problem and to coordinate the activities and make it possible for private donations and contributions to be brought into the program by those people who are interested in the preservation of historic sites in the city of New York.

Mr. TUMULTY. Mr. Speaker, there has been considerable interest in the matter of the disposition of Ellis Island. I, myself, have introduced a bill for the purpose of having Ellis Island retained by the Federal Government as a hall of fame for American citizens of foreign extraction. The States of New York and New Jersey are currently bidding to get that property to determine which one of them may utilize it, either in the case of New York for an alcoholic center, or by New Jersey, for a museum. I note that H. R. 3120 requires the Secretary of the Interior to appoint 1 member of this advisory board representing the city of New York, 1 member representing the State of New York, and 1 member representing the Borough of Manhattan, and after the consideration of such recommendations as may be made by the mayor of New York City, the Governor of New York State, and the president of the Borough of Manhattan, and so on. And my point is that the State of New Jersey has a very large interest in this very same matter and there is no provision whatsoever for the appointment of any citizens from the State of New Jersey. While I do not wish to prevent the passage of this worthy bill, I do want to protect the interests of my own State in legislation in which the State of New Jersey has an interest. I wonder if there is not some way in which that can be accomplished.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, this only has to do with historic sites in the city of New York, and the board is to be appointed only to handle sites in the city of New York.

Mr. TUMULTY. I am not going to prolong the discussion, but Jersey City claims that Ellis Island, in particular, is within the confines of Jersey City.

Mr. SAYLOR. I assure the gentleman that this has nothing to do with Ellis Island.

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Speaker, I see nothing in the bill relating to Ellis Island.

Mr. TUMULTY. With that understanding, Mr. Speaker, so long as the disposition of Ellis Island is not involved—you assure me definitely that Ellis Island is in no way affected by this bill?

Mr. SAYLOR. I note that Bedloe's Island on which the Statue of Liberty is located is mentioned in the bill.

Mr. TUMULTY. I know that. I happen to live not far from there. New Jersey also has and should have an opportunity to participate in this matter relating to Statue of Liberty and Ellis Island. Under the circumstances, I regret I must object to passage of this bill now.

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of an identical bill, S. 732.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. TUMULTY. Mr. Speaker, I object.

CASTLE PINCKNEY NATIONAL MONUMENT, S. C., ABOLISHED

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4391) to abolish the Castle Pinckney National Monument, in the State of South Carolina, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Castle Pinckney National Monument, S. C., is hereby abolished and the property contained therein is hereby authorized to be disposed of in accordance with the laws relating to the disposition of surplus Federal property.

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.

RECONVEYANCE OF CERTAIN OIL, GAS, AND MINERAL INTERESTS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 7097) to provide for the reconveyance of oil and gas and mineral interests in a portion of the lands acquired for the Demopolis lock and dam project, to the former owners thereof, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, upon application filed within 3 years after the date of the enactment of this act by or on behalf of any person from whom lands or interests therein were acquired for the purposes of the Demopolis lock and dam project on the Tombigbee River and upon approval of that application by the Secretary of the Army whose determination shall be final, the Secretary of the Interior shall convey to such person all oil and gas and mineral interests acquired from him by the United States (excepting oil and gas and mineral interests in land areas to be designated by the Secretary of the Army surrounding or adjacent to the lock, dam, disposal area, dikes, abutments, and other necessary project facilities, and excepting lands to be designated by the Secretary of the Interior as needed for use as a public park or recreational facilities, or needed for facilities for the protection and management of migratory birds and fishing resources as provided in the act of August 14, 1946 (60 Stat. 1018)), upon payment by such person of a purchase price therefor equal to the fair market value of such oil and gas and mineral interests as determined by the Secretary of the Interior.

SEC. 2. Each conveyance of oil and gas and mineral interests to a former owner under this act shall contain such reservations and restrictions as in the opinion of the Secretary of the Army are necessary in the construction, operation, and maintenance of the Demopolis lock and dam project and as may otherwise be in the public interest.

SEC. 3. All proceeds from the sale of oil and gas and mineral interests under this act shall be deposited in the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts.

SEC. 4. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as are necessary to carry out the purposes of this act.

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.

REVIEW AND DETERMINATION OF CLAIMS REGARDING CERTAIN LANDS IN HAWAII

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 7186) to provide for the review and determination of claims for the return of lands, in the Territory of Hawaii, conveyed to the Government during World War II by organizations composed of persons of Japanese ancestry.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That any organization or group made up of persons of Japanese ancestry, which, prior to World War II, held lands, with or without improvements, in the Territory of Hawaii for eleemosynary purposes and which lands were conveyed by such organization or group during World War II to the Territory of Hawaii or any political subdivision thereof, may, notwithstanding any other provision of law pertaining to statutory limitations of actions or laches, make a claim for the return thereof. Such claim shall be made within 2 years after the date of approval of this act by filing a verified petition in the circuit court of the Territory in which the property was situated at the time the same was originally conveyed to the Territory or its political subdivision.

SEC. 2. The Governor of the Territory shall, within 60 days after the date of approval of this act, cause to be published at least once a week for a period of 3 weeks in a newspaper of general circulation in the Territory a notice stating in general terms the purpose of this act, the period in which claims may be filed, and where such claims may be filed.

SEC. 3. The rules of the circuit court of the Territory of Hawaii pertaining to civil procedure, including rules relating to appeals, shall be applicable to the proceedings authorized by this act. All court costs and fees, both in the circuit and appellate courts, shall be assessed and paid in the same manner as in civil cases. The courts shall advance on their dockets and expedite the disposition of all claims filed therein pursuant to this act. The attorney general of Hawaii may intervene in any proceeding instituted under the provisions of this act.

SEC. 4. The petition shall allege and it shall be shown—

(a) that during World War II a conveyance of lands, with or without improvements, was made to the Territory of Hawaii, or a political subdivision thereof, by an organization or group made up of persons of Japanese ancestry theretofore holding such property for eleemosynary purposes;

(b) that such conveyance was made without monetary consideration other than the assumption of mortgages or other encumbrances, or was made upon a nominal consideration;

(c) that such conveyance was not lawfully authorized under the laws, constitution, by-laws or the like governing the same, or alternatively that such conveyance was made or procured in such a manner as to cause such conveyance to be voidable;

(d) that the petitioner is, or the petitioners are, the real parties in interest, and that no assignment or transfer of the claim, or of any part thereof or interest therein, has been made except as stated in the petition;

(e) that the return of the property is sought for the purpose of resuming the eleemosynary use for which the property was held prior to the conveyance to the Territory or a political subdivision thereof, or alternatively, if the petitioner does not intend to resume the eleemosynary use of the property for which it was held prior to the conveyance to the Territory or political subdivision thereof, the petitioner shall indicate in its petition whether there are some other purposes for its seeking the return of the property and what disposition it intends to make of the property, if the same is returned; and

(f) that the respondents named in the petition include and constitute the grantee or grantees and their successors in title, if any, who received the original conveyance and all other persons or Government bodies having or claiming any interest therein or occupancy thereof; and all such respondents shall be personally served with the petition.

SEC. 5. If the allegations required by section 4 hereof are contained in the petition, the circuit court shall hear and determine the claim as a court of equity, without a jury, and may, in the exercise of its sound discretion and within the principles hereinafter set forth, either direct the return of the property to the petitioner, if the allegations of the petition are sustained, or make such other order as it shall deem appropriate.

SEC. 6. In the disposition and determination of such claims, the circuit court shall, in addition to the general principles of equity, be governed by the following principles:

(a) In case of an assignment or transfer of a claim, or any part thereof or interest therein, the claim, or so much thereof as is involved in the assignment or transfer, shall be denied and disallowed unless it shall be shown that the assignment or transfer was made for a good and sufficient reason without any motive of speculation.

(b) If the allegations of the petition are proved, and if the property is then being used by the Territory or a political subdivision thereof, the court may direct that the property be retained for a reasonable time so as to allow the Territory or political subdivision thereof using the property to obtain other accommodations. The use of the property during such period of time shall be without charge to the Territory or political subdivision thereof, as the case may be.

(c) No vested rights or interest of any person, whether held in fee simple or for a term of years or otherwise, shall be impaired by the disposition of any such claim. If the property has been sold, the court may direct payment by the Territory or political subdivision thereof to the persons who

would have been entitled to the return of the property had it not been sold. Such payment shall not exceed the consideration received for the property, and such payment shall be without interest.

(d) In respect of property which has been improved during the tenure of the Territory or political subdivision thereof, either by the making of new improvements or by betterment of the property in any form, it shall be a condition to the granting of the claim that the Territory or political subdivision thereof be reimbursed, without interest, for such improvements.

(e) In respect of mortgages, tax liens, or other encumbrances upon the property at the time of the original conveyance, which by reason of the conveyance were assumed or have been discharged, it shall be a condition to the granting of the claim that the Territory or political subdivision thereof be relieved of the obligations so assumed, and to the extent that the same shall have been discharged, that the Territory or political subdivision thereof, as the case may be, be reimbursed without interest therefor.

(f) The court shall not make any pecuniary award to any petitioner for rents or damages or for any other cause, and the redress of petitioners shall be confined to the return or proper disposition of the property according to the principles herein set forth, except as stated in paragraph (c) of this subsection.

SEC. 7. The Territory of Hawaii may appropriate funds for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this act.

SEC. 8. Nothing contained in this act shall preclude the Territory of Hawaii from exercising the power of eminent domain.

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.

ADMINISTRATION OF CERTAIN LANDS BY DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

The Clerk called the bill (S. 72) to provide that certain lands acquired by the United States shall be administered by the Secretary of Agriculture as national forest lands.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, does this give the Secretary of Agriculture additional duties he does not already now have in regard to lands that are not in his Department?

Mr. COOLEY. I understand it takes these lands in New Mexico which are not now in the national forest and makes them officially part of the national forest.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Who is administering these lands now?

Mr. COOLEY. The Federal Government is now administering the land involved. This makes it officially part of the national forest.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. What Department is administering them now?

Mr. COOLEY. Technically, the Department of the Interior; practically, the Department of Agriculture. The report states:

Although the original intent of Congress in authorizing the exchange was that the lands so acquired should become a part of the national forest, because of technicalities involved in this exchange, this legislation is needed to actually give the land national forest status.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Who is administering this land now? Interior, Agriculture, or who?

Mr. COOLEY. Interior. We have a communication from Mr. True D. Morse, Acting Secretary.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, this bill was heard by a subcommittee. The Department of the Interior is now presently charged with that responsibility, but the lands were originally intended to be part of this forest. I think our colleague from New Mexico can explain this situation and how it developed.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Mr. Speaker, this is a tract of land which the State of New Mexico owned within Forest Service land, or within large Forest Service tracts. The State of New Mexico exchanged those lands with the Government for outside lands which were under the jurisdiction of the Interior Department, the Taylor Grazing Act administration. The purpose of passing this bill is to put those tracts of land which are within national forests under the administration of the forest department and take it away from the Department of the Interior. They are very small tracts.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Is that what the gentleman wants?

Mr. FERNANDEZ. That is what the State of New Mexico wants, yes.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. I withdraw my reservation of objection. I made it because I think the Secretary of Agriculture is doing such a poor job with what he has that I did not want to give him any additional powers.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PRIEST). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

LAND TITLE CLARIFICATION WITHIN STANISLAUS NATIONAL FOREST, CALIF.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 374) to authorize the adjustment and clarification of ownership to certain lands within the Stanislaus National Forest, Tuolumne County, Calif.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, can someone tell us what this bill does?

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Speaker, this is simply correction of a survey which was erroneously made in the Stanislaus National Forest years ago when they sent survey crews out into those areas. Those gentlemen spent most of their time in camp and dreamed up this survey line. As a consequence, these people have occupied that piece of land which they thought they owned, but when the survey lines were checked they found out they were on the wrong land. This swaps territory or areas of the same character so that they can remain on the land that they have been on for 50 years. It seems to me the family has been on this land for nearly a half century.

Mr. SAYLOR. This is still forest land. If they have been erroneously on the land, that gives them no right to it.

Mr. ENGLE. It is a correction of a description in a deed. When they got their patent the patent described the wrong land. This corrects it.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, are they on the right land now that they want?

Mr. ENGLE. They are not going to move. They are going to get the deed corrected. They are staying where they are, where they have been for 50 years. When the deed was issued, due to an erroneous survey, they did not get a proper description of their property. This will simply save the expense of quieting title under adverse possession.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, as I understand it, there were two tracts of land originally involved. The draftsman described the wrong tracts in the deed. So it is a question of straightening out the record title and avoiding a possible lawsuit. The only way it could be corrected would be by going into court and having the deeds corrected. The original intention of the Government and the grantees in each of these deeds was to receive actual possession of the property they wanted. The Government has the land it intended to purchase but the deed describes another tract. But the record title is confused.

Mr. SAYLOR. In other words, the land they are in possession of is within the confines of a national forest?

Mr. COOLEY. One is and one is not in the national forest.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SAYLOR. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. POAGE. As a matter of fact, there were 2 tracts of land involved, as the chairman pointed out. Tract A was described by metes and bounds, as was tract D. The Government finally acquired tract D, but it was described by the metes and bounds of tract A. The deed to the land of the owner of tract A was described by metes and bounds which actually designated land belonging to the Government. The Government has the land that it intended to buy but its deed describes another tract. It is in the national forest, but the technical title is in the individual. The title to the Government land lies in private hands. The title to the individual's land is in the Government. This simply allows them to correct an error that was made about 50 years ago.

Mr. SAYLOR. With that explanation, I have no objection. I withdraw my reservation of objection, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PRIEST). Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That in order to clarify and adjust the ownership of certain tracts of land situated within the exterior boundaries of the Stanislaus National Forest, Calif., the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized on behalf of the United States to accept from the persons claiming title under patent from the State of California a deed of conveyance of the lands described as follows: South half northwest quarter and north half southwest quarter of section 29, and south half northeast quarter, south half northwest quarter, northeast quarter southwest quarter, northwest quarter southeast quarter, and northeast quarter southeast quarter of section 30, township 4 north, range 19 east, Mount Diablo meridian, California, which lands are a part of the Stanislaus National Forest and subject to all laws and regulations applicable to said national forest, and the Secretary of Agriculture is further authorized to thereupon quitclaim and convey to the grantors of the lands described above all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to the lands described as follows: South half southeast quarter of section 25, and northeast quarter northeast quarter of section 36, township 4, north, range 18 east, and south half south half of section 30, and north half north half of section 31, township 4 north, range 19 east, Mount Diablo meridian, California, subject, however, to reservations of such easements for road rights-of-way as the Secretary of Agriculture may determine to be necessary for the protection and administration of the Stanislaus National Forest.

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.

ESTABLISHMENT OF TOWNSITES

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 426) to provide for the establishment of townsites and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That areas of not to exceed 640 acres for any one application may be set aside and designated by the Secretary of Agriculture as a townsite from any national forest land or land administered by the Secretary of Agriculture under title III of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, upon application and satisfactorily showing of need therefor by any county, city, or other governmental subdivision. Areas so designated may be divided into townlots and offered for sale by the Secretary of Agriculture at public sale to the highest bidder: *Provided*, That any of such lots as may be offered for sale at a public sale and for which there is no satisfactory bid may be disposed of by the Secretary of Agriculture at private sale for not less than the appraised value thereof: *Provided further*, That any person now occupying any of such lands and having constructed improvements thereon pursuant to a permit or other authorization from the Federal Government shall be given the opportunity of purchasing such lands at the appraised value.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 8, after "application and", insert ", after public notice."

Page 1, line 9, after "other", insert "local."

Page 2, line 1, strike out the colon and insert "for no less than the appraised value thereof."

Page 2, lines 6 and 7, strike out "and having constructed improvements thereon" and insert "on which improvements have been constructed by him or his predecessor."

Page 2, line 9, strike out the period at the end of the bill and add "*And provided further*, That no more than three such town lots may be sold at either public or private sale to any person or private corporation, firm, or agency."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that a correction be made on page 1, line 8, in the spelling of the word "satisfactorily."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

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.

PORT OF ENTRY ON THE ALASKA HIGHWAY

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 604) to provide port of entry and related facilities on the Alaska Highway at the Alaska-Canadian border in the Territory of Alaska, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, may we have an explanation of this bill?

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Speaker, this bill simply authorizes the Secretary of the interior to make a study and report to the Congress in respect to the establishment of facilities for Government agencies on the Alaska Highway at the Canadian boundary. At the present time these Government officers are located in ramshackle buildings almost 100 miles from the border, a very undesirable situation, and all this bill would do would be to have the Secretary of the Interior make a study of a site and buildings closer to the border of the United States for Government purposes.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. The Secretary has that authority now, and I do not understand why it is necessary to have additional legislation to give him authority that he already has.

Mr. BARTLETT. I might say to the gentleman that the bill in its original form came up by way of an Executive communication. It contemplated actual construction, authorization of construction. That was amended in committee to restrict this merely to a study. The Secretary of the Interior, I might add, is to make the study not only for the Interior Department agencies but for all the other departments of the Government concerned; Immigration, for instance.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill may be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

COOPERATIVE FOREST SERVICE RESEARCH

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1855) to amend the act approved April 24, 1950, entitled "An act to facilitate and simplify the work of the Forest Service, and for other purposes."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I should like an explanation of the bill.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, this bill, by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN] is recommended by the Department of Agriculture. It permits the making of advance payments on cooperative research projects for the purpose of fostering and stimulating participation with the Forest Service in forest, range, and watershed management research through investigations, experiments, and so forth, as the Secretary may deem advisable in order to aid in obtaining the fullest cooperation from States and other public and private agencies.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, the language that is in this bill is contained in the Department of Agriculture appropriation bill and has been in that bill for the past 4 years. It was the feeling of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN], who is on the Appropriations Sucommittee, that it would be better to put this in authorizing language, to make it permanent legislation, instead of being carried in the appropriation bill as it has been for the past 4 years.

Mr. COOLEY. It merely provides legislative authority for the appropriation.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the act of April 24, 1950 (64 Stat. 82), is amended by adding thereto a new section to read as follows:

"SEC. 20. (a) For the purpose of fostering and stimulating participation with the Forest Service in forest, range, and watershed management research through investigations, experiments, tests, or such other means as he may deem advisable, and in order to aid in obtaining the fullest cooperation from States and other public and private agencies, organizations, institutions, and individuals, in effectuating such research the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized in accordance with such regulations as he may issue:

"(1) To require, whenever it is determined to be in the public interest, that satisfactory cooperative arrangements be made with respect to any proposed research activity as a prerequisite to the undertaking of such activity by the Forest Service.

"(2) To establish a Forest and Range Research National Advisory Committee consisting of not less than 5 nor more than 12 members, which may include representatives from public and private agencies, organizations, or institutions, or others, interested in research in the production, conservation, and use of forest, range, and watershed resources and their products, or of related resources and their products; such committee shall be appointed and serve under such regulations, and its duties shall be to advise on program formulation, orientation to current needs, balance of program, and coordination of and cooperation in Federal and related non-Federal programs.

"(3) When in his judgment such cooperative work will be stimulated or facilitated to make funds available to the cooperators without regard to the provisions of section

3648, Revised Statutes, prohibiting advances of public moneys.

"(b) The travel and subsistence expenses of members of the Forest and Range Research National Advisory Committee necessary in connection with their attendance at meetings for the purpose of performing their duties, may be paid from funds made available to the Forest Service for its research activities."

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 5, strike out "(a)".

Page 2 at the end of line 3, strike out "issue:" and insert "issue,".

Page 2 beginning with line 4, strike out through and including line 20.

Page 2, line 21, strike out "'(3) When" and insert "and when".

Page 2, line 24, strike out "moneys." and insert "moneys." "

Page 2 beginning with line 25, strike out the rest of the bill.

The committee amendments were 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.

CONVEYANCE OF CERTAIN LANDS OF UNITED STATES TO SAVANNAH BEACH, TYBEE ISLAND, GA.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5889) to provide for the conveyance of certain lands of the United States to the town of Savannah Beach, Tybee Island, Ga.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, it is my understanding from a conversation I had with the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PRESTON] this morning, that he has an amendment to provide for reimbursement on the same basis on which the Government purchased the property in the original instance.

Mr. PRESTON. If the gentleman will yield to me, I do have such an amendment, and if the gentleman will withhold his reservation of objection, I shall offer the amendment.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I withdraw my reservation of objection, Mr. Speaker.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to convey by quitclaim deed to the town of Savannah Beach, Tybee Island, Ga., all of the right, title, and interest of the United States in and to the tracts of land more particularly described as follows:

1. All those certain lots, tracts, or parcels of land lying and being in the State of Georgia, county of Chatham, on Tybee Island known and designated on the map or plan of the town of Tybee (now Savannah Beach), made by Percy Sugden, civil engineer, July 20, 1928, as lots numbered 8–A and 8–B of block 2, Bay Ward, said lots lying contiguous and having a combined frontage of one hundred and eighty feet, more or less, on the west side of Stone Street, a frontage of eighty feet, more or less, on the north side of Estill Avenue, and being bounded on the north by Bay Street, on the east by Stone Street, on the south by Estill Avenue, and on the west by a lot numbered 7 of block 2, Bay Ward; also

2. All that certain lot, tract, or parcel of land lying and being in the State of Georgia, county of Chatham, on Tybee Island, known and designated on the map or plan of the town of Tybee (now Savannah Beach) made by Percy Sugden, civil engineer, July 20, 1928, as lot numbered 1 of block 3, Bay Ward, said lot having a frontage of ninety feet, more or less, on the east side of Stone Street and a frontage of fifty feet, more or less, on the south side of Bay Street, and being bounded as follows: On the north by Bay Street, on the east by lot numbered 2 of block 3, Bay Ward, on the south by lot numbered 10 of block 3, Bay Ward, and on the west by Stone Street; also

3. All that certain lot, tract, or parcel of land lying and being in the State of Georgia, county of Chatham, on Tybee Island, opposite to lots numbered 6, 7, and 8 in block 2, Bay Ward, to lot numbered 1, in block 3, Bay Ward, and to a street sixty feet in width known as Stone Street, said lots and street being known and designated on a map or plan of the town of Tybee (now Savannah Beach) made by Percy Sugden, civil engineer, July 20, 1928, the southerly side of said lot or parcel of land being three hundred and fifty feet, more or less, in width, bounded by a street known as Bay Street, seventy-five feet in width, said Bay Street separating said lot or parcel of land from the lots aforesaid; and the western and eastern sides of said lot or parcel of land being projections of the western side of said lot numbered 6 and of the eastern side of lot numbered 1 aforesaid, each beginning at said street seventy-five feet in width, and extending northwardly to the low-water mark of the Savannah River.

Mr. PRESTON. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. PRESTON: On page 1, line 5, after the word "Georgia" insert the following: "for a monetary consideration equal to that paid by the United States to such town therefor."

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.

CONVEYANCE OF CERTAIN LAND TO BROWNSVILLE NAVIGATION DISTRICT OF CAMERON COUNTY, TEX.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3675) to authorize the conveyance by quitclaim deed of certain land to the Brownsville Navigation District of Cameron County, Tex.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill (S. 1340), a similar bill, be considered in lieu of H. R. 3675.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to have an explanation of the bill.

Mr. KILGORE. I will say to the gentleman that this bill revests title to lands in the Brownsville Navigation District, which lands were conveyed without cost to the Federal Government, for the improvement of the channel entrance to the port of Brownsville. There are no Federal improvements on the land, but the Brownsville Navigation District has permitted Cameron County to build a park facility on this property. They have spent about $2¾ million on it.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I just wanted to make sure that there was no attempt at socialization in that county, such as public housing. Apparently this will not socialize anything in the county. I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Army is hereby authorized and directed to reconvey, by quitclaim deed, to the Brownsville Navigation District of Cameron County, Tex., for a monetary consideration equal to that paid by the United States to such district therefor, all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to those lands located on Brazos and Padre Island, Cameron County, Tex., including accretions thereto, which were conveyed to the United States by the Brownsville Navigation District by two deeds, both dated October 25, 1932, and recorded in volume 243, pages 260–262, and volume 244, pages 101–103 of the deed records of Cameron County, Tex., except for such portions of the lands or interests therein as the Secretary of the Army may determine are needed in connection with river and harbor improvement works at the location.

SEC. 2. The conveyance authorized by this act shall contain such terms and conditions as the Secretary of the Army, with the concurrence of the Secretary of the Treasury, determines advisable to assure that the use of the land by the Brownsville Navigation District or its transferees will be compatible with the operations of the United States Coast Guard. Such conveyance shall also contain such terms and conditions as the Secretary of the Army determines advisable in the public interest, and particularly such terms and conditions as he determines advisable—

(a) to assure that the use of the land by the Brownsville Navigation District or its transferees will be compatible with the construction, maintenance, and operation of the river and harbor project at the location; and

(b) to assure that the United States, and its employees, agents, and contractors shall have the right to utilize the existing causeway, constructed by Cameron County, Tex., for access to Padre Island, Tex., in connection with governmental activities, without charge.

SEC. 3. The conveyance authorized by this act shall reserve to the United States all right, title, and interest in source material (as defined in the Atomic Energy Act of 1954) in the lands conveyed.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

A similar House bill (H. R. 3575) was laid on the table.

CORREGIDOR BATAAN MEMORIAL COMMISSION

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5469) to extend the authority of the Corregidor Bataan Memorial Commission, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the act entitled "An act to create a Commission to be known

as the Corregidor Bataan Memorial Commission", approved August 5, 1953 (67 Stat. 366; 36 U. S. C. 426), is amended as follows:

(1) By inserting immediately after the word "salary" at the end of the first sentence of the first paragraph a comma and the following: "except that the members of such Commission shall be reimbursed for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred by them in the performance of the duties vested in the Commission. Service of an individual as a member of the Commission shall not be considered as service or employment bringing such individual within the provisions of section 190 of the Revised Statutes (5 U. S. C. 99) or section 283 or 284 of the United States Code."

(2) By inserting, in the second sentence of the first paragraph, immediately after the words "erection on Corregidor Island of" the following: "a building and other structures, including."

(3) By striking out, in the second paragraph, the words "a replica of the Statue of Liberty on Corregidor Island" and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "A suitable memorial on Corregidor Island, which may include buildings, tunnels, roads, and a replica of the Statue of Liberty."

(4) By inserting immediately after the second paragraph the following new paragraph:

"(a) To accept, in its discretion, from any source, public or private, money or other gifts to be used for the purpose of making surveys and investigations, formulating, preparing and considering plans and estimates for the construction of as well as for the actual construction of such memorial or other expenses of such memorial.

"(b) To secure directly from any executive department or independent establishment information, suggestions, estimates, and assistance, and each such department or independent agency is authorized to furnish such help as may be requested by the Commission.

"(c) To decide, after consultation with a similar commission in the Philippines, as to the type of memorial, including all structures, repairs, roads, and improvements on Corregidor Island; and to decide as to the manner in which any money shall be raised in gifts, public subscriptions, or otherwise, and to decide how any and all funds received by the Commission shall be expended for the development and completion of a memorial on Corregidor Island.

"(d) To establish offices in the District of Columbia or elsewhere, in or outside of the United States, and procure the necessary supplies and equipment for the operation of any such office.

"(e) To contract for work, supplies, materials, and equipment inside and outside of the United States and engage, by contract or otherwise, the services of architects and other technical and professional personnel.

"(f) To adopt a seal which shall be judicially noticed."

(5) By striking out, in the last paragraph, the words "a replica of the Statue of Liberty" and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "a memorial."

(6) By inserting at the end of the last paragraph the following: "Thereafter the Commission shall annually submit to the President a report of the progress of the work of the Commission and a statement of its financial transactions during the preceding year, and the President shall transmit such report to the Congress of the United States. Before the conclusion of its work, the Commission shall promptly submit a final report, and the Commission shall cease to exist 90 days after such submission of such final report. The records and archives of the Commission shall, when no longer required by the Commission, be deposited with the National Archives.".

(7) By inserting at the end of such act the following new paragraph:

"There are authorized to be appropriated such sums of money not to exceed $100,000 as may be necessary for the expenses of the Commission.".

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.

UNITED NATIONS EDUCATIONAL, SCIENTIFIC, AND CULTURAL ORGANIZATION

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5894) to amend the act providing for membership and participation by the United States in the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization to provide for the acceptance of gifts, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. GROSS. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, it is my understanding this bill provides for gifts to UNESCO and tax writeoffs on those gifts. Is that correct?

Mr. ZABLOCKI. The gentleman is correct. The United States at present is a member of UNESCO and participates in UNESCO. The bill permits gifts or bequests to be accepted by the Commission and provides that these gifts be exempted from District of Columbia taxes and from Federal income, State, and gift taxes as gifts to or for the United States.

Mr. GROSS. The administrative record of UNESCO in the past has been bad, as was amply attested by testimony before Congress this year. I say that this organization is not in condition now to accept gifts on which there are tax writeoffs. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

INDIANS OF THE FIVE CIVILIZED TRIBES IN OKLAHOMA

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 7218) to extend the period of restrictions on lands belonging to Indians of the five civilized tribes in Oklahoma, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that an identical Senate bill (S. 2198) be considered in lieu of the House bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, it is my understanding that the Senate bill is a different bill from the one we had in the House. Perhaps the gentleman from Florida [Mr. HALEY] or the gentleman from California [Mr. ENGLE] might clarify that. I do not have the Senate bill before me. I do not want to object to the consideration of this bill, but I wonder if it may not go to the bottom of the calendar so we may have an opportunity to see this Senate bill.

Mr. EDMONDSON. If the gentleman will yield, the Senate bill is identical with the House bill reported out of the committee. There were some amendments adopted in committee which made the House bill identical with the Senate bill. They are identical word for word at this time.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. In that case, Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That subject to the provisions of section 2 of this Act, the period of restrictions against alienation, lease, mortgage, or other encumbrance of lands belonging to Indians of the Five Civilized Tribes in Oklahoma of one-half degree or more Indian blood, which period was extended to April 26, 1956, by the act of May 10, 1928 (45 Stat. 495), is hereby extended for the lives of the Indians who own such lands subject to such restrictions on the date of this act.

SEC. 2. (a) Any Indian of the Five Civilized Tribes may apply to the Secretary of the Interior for an order removing restrictions. Within 90 days from the date of the application, the Secretary shall either issue the order or disapprove the application. The order shall be issued if in the judgment of the Secretary the applicant has sufficient ability, knowledge, experience, and judgment to enable him, or her, to manage his, or her, business affairs, including the administration, use, investment, and disposition of any property turned over to such person and the income or proceeds therefrom, with such reasonable degree of prudence and wisdom as will be apt to prevent him, or her, from losing such property or the benefits thereof.

(b) The Secretary of the Interior is authorized and directed to issue, without application, to any Indian of the Five Civilized Tribes, who in the judgment of the Secretary is able to manage his, or her, own affairs, in accordance with the standard specified in subsection (a) of this section, an order removing restrictions that will become effective 6 months after notice of the order is given to such Indian, unless it is set aside by a county court in accordance with proceedings initiated prior to such time pursuant to subsection (c) of this section. The timely initiation of such proceedings shall stay the effective date of an order until the proceedings are concluded. When the Secretary issues an order pursuant to this subsection, he shall notify the board of county commissioners for the county in which the Indian resides.

(c) If the Secretary of the Interior disapproves, or fails either to approve or disapprove, an application within the 90-day period prescribed in subsection (a) of this section, the Indian affected may apply to the county court for the county in which he, or she, resides for an order removing restrictions. If the Secretary issues an order removing restrictions without application therefor in accordance with the provisions of subsection (b) of this section, either the Indian affected or the board of county commissioners may apply to the county court for the county in which the Indian resides for an order setting aside such order. The court shall set a hearing date not less than 30 days from the day it receives the application, and, under rules adopted by the court, notify

the board of county commissioners, the welfare departments of the State and county governments, the local representative of the Commissioner of Indian Affairs, and any other persons the court considers appropriate. At the hearing the court shall examine the Indian and may require the persons who appear before the court to give testimony in the matter of the ability of the Indian to manage his, or her, own affairs. The Secretary of the Interior, and the attorney for the county in which such court is located, shall be given an opportunity to appear at such hearings and to participate in the examination of the Indian and other witness. The evidence taken at the hearing shall be transcribed and filed of record in the case. In determining capability, the court shall apply the standard specified in subsection (a) of this section with respect to determinations by the Secretary. If the court finds that the Indian is able to manage his, or her, own affairs, it shall issue an order removing restrictions or deny the application for an order to set aside an order of the Secretary issued without application therefor, as the case may be. If the court does not find that the Indian is able to manage his, or her, own affairs, it shall deny the application for an order removing restrictions, or set aside an order of the Secretary issued without application therefor, as the case may be. The court shall furnish to the Secretary and to the applicant one certified copy of any final order issued by it. Any final order of the court shall be subject to appeal by the applicant, by the Secretary, or by the board of county commissioners in accordance with the probate laws of the State of Oklahoma, except that no appeal bond shall be required in an appeal by the Secretary.

(d) When an order removing restrictions becomes effective, the Secretary shall cause to be turned over to the applicant full ownership and control of any money and property that is held in trust for him or that is held subject to a restriction against alienation imposed by the United States, issuing, in the case of land, such title document as may be appropriate: *Provided*, That the Secretary may make such provisions as he deems necessary to insure payment of money loaned to any such Indian by the Federal Government or by an Indian tribe: *Provided further*, That nothing herein contained shall abrogate the interest of any lessee or permittee in any lease, contract, or permit that is outstanding when an order removing restrictions becomes effective.

SEC. 3. Section 23 of the act of April 26, 1906 (34 Stat. 137), as amended by section 8 of the act of May 27, 1908 (35 Stat. 312), which expires on April 26, 1956, is continued in force with respect to the restricted properties of Indians of the Five Civilized Tribes as long as such properties remain restricted.

SEC. 4. Except as provided in section 2 of this act, nothing in this act shall be construed to repeal or to limit the application of the act of August 4, 1947 (61 Stat. 731), the provisions of which shall continue in effect until otherwise provided by Congress.

SEC. 5. Any existing exemption from taxation that constitutes a vested property right shall continue in force and effect until it terminates by virtue of its own limitations.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

A similar House bill (H. R. 7218) was laid on the table.

AMENDING THE SOIL CONSERVATION AND DOMESTIC ALLOTMENT ACT

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1167) to amend the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, may we have an explanation of this bill?

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, the bill provides soil conservation payments to persons who in order to benefit their own lands carry out conservation practices on federally owned lands. Under the law now, there is some question as to the right of one engaged in making these conservation improvements on federally owned land to participate in this program.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, does that also apply to military reservations where they may be farming and where soil conservation practices are applied to those areas?

Mr. COOLEY. I think it applies to all federally owned lands on which soil conservation practices are carried out.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. HOPE. With reference to the inquiry of the gentleman from Nebraska, there is existing law which applies to federally owned property. This applies to noncrop land so that the question which the gentleman asks has already been taken care of by existing legislation.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That subsection (e) of section 8 of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, as amended (16 U. S. C. 590h (e)), is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sentence: "Persons who carry out conservation practices on federally owned noncropland which directly conserve or benefit nearby or adjoining privately owned lands of such persons and who maintain and use such Federal land under agreement with the Federal agency having jurisdiction thereof and who comply with the terms and conditions of the agricultural conservation program formulated pursuant to sections 7 to 17 of this act, as amended, shall be entitled to apply for and receive payments under such program to the same extent as other producers."

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ORANGEBURG COUNTY, S. C.

The Clerk called the resolution (H. J. Res. 112) to release reversionary right to improvements on a 3-acre tract in Orangeburg County, S. C.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That upon the written consent of the directors of the South Carolina Rural Rehabilitation Corporation, the United States of America, acting through the Administrator of the Farmers' Home Administration, is hereby authorized and directed to convey by quitclaim deed to the board of trustees of Orangeburg School District No. 5 (successor in interest to the board of trustees of Jamison School District No. 28) in Orangeburg County, S. C., and unto the successors and assigns of said board of trustees, all of the reversionary and other right, title, or interest retained in the buildings, improvements, and other equipment by the quitclaim deed dated October 31, 1946, and recorded in book No. 141, page 44, in the office of the clerk of court for Orangeburg County, S. C., under which deed the United States of America conveyed said buildings, improvements, and other equipment to the said board of trustees of Jamison School District No. 28 for educational and other related community purposes.

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.

DELAWARE–MARYLAND BOUNDARY

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4093) to authorize the Secretary of Commerce, acting through the Coast and Geodetic Survey, to assist the States of Maryland and Delaware to reestablish their common boundary.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to substitute an identical Senate bill, S. 987.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I did not understand what the gentleman's request was going to be. Has the Speaker gotten an answer to the inquiry as to whether or not there was objection to the bill?

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. I might state, Mr. Speaker, so that you will understand why I make this request, the Department of Commerce opposes the enactment of the bill stating that the proposed survey is a matter of primary concern to the two States involved and that it is not a matter of concern for the United States Government, and that the cost of this survey should not be borne by the United States, but should be borne by the States themselves.

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. Speaker, I am advised that there is no proposal to have the Government bear the cost of the survey. Of course, I have no personal interest in this matter and the bill does not affect my State.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. The report states that it will cost the Government about $68,000.

Mr. WILLIS. That is the cost for the survey, which is mentioned in the report, but the States are to pay for it—that is my information.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. That is not according to the information I have, and not according to the report from the Department of Commerce.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I object.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] objects to the present consideration of the bill.

DREDGING PROJECT AT LOS ANGELES AND LONG BEACH HARBORS, CALIF.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4734) to amend the provisions of the River and Harbor Act of 1954 which authorize the Secretary of the Army to reimburse local interests for work done on a dredging project at Los Angeles and Long Beach Harbors, Calif., during a period ending July 1, 1953, by extending that period to November 7, 1953.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object. It is my understanding that under this legislation local interests who have contributed to the dredging of a channel are now to be reimbursed.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. I yield.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, I introduced a similar bill, as did Mr. KING. This is just to provide the extension of the date by which time reimbursement can be made for work done by the city of Los Angeles in Los Angeles harbor. The money has already been spent.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. In other words, the city has spent the money and this will permit them to be reimbursed?

Mr. McDONOUGH. The original authorization bill, which provided for the spending of the money, and for the city to proceed, provided that they could not be reimbursed for any money spent after July 1, 1953. It so happened that the contract could not be completed by that time and it was extended over to a further date, and this will extend the authorization for reimbursement to November 7, 1953.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. And the money will go back to the city?

Mr. McDONOUGH. That is correct.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, this is a very good bill. I disapprove of any local interests contributing to any dredging projects. This disapproval applies particularly to the deeper Delaware project, but also to all others. It is the responsibility of the Federal Government to maintain all navigable waters.

Mr. McDONOUGH. In other words, the gentleman does not object to this bill?

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. I have no objection and I withdraw my reservation of objection, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the paragraph of section 101 of the River and Harbor Act of 1954 which begins "Los Angeles and Long Beach Harbors, Calif.:" is amended by striking out "July 1, 1953" and inserting in lieu thereof "November 7, 1953."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDMENTS TO PERISHABLE AGRICULTURAL COMMODITIES ACT

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5337) to amend the provisions of the Perishable Agricultural Commodities Act, 1930, relating to practices in the marketing of perishable agricultural commodities.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 2 (5) of the Perishable Agricultural Commodities Act, 1930 (7 U. S. C., sec. 499b (5)), is amended to read as follows:

"(5) For any commission merchant, dealer, or broker to misrepresent by word, act, mark, stencil, label, statement, or deed, the character, kind, grade, quality, quantity, size, pack, weight, condition, degree of maturity, or State, country, or region of origin of any perishable agricultural commodity received, shipped, sold, or offered to be sold in interstate or foreign commerce;".

SEC. 2. Section 4 (d) of such act (7 U. S. C., sec. 499b (d)) is amended to read as follows:

"(d) The Secretary may withhold the issuance of a license to an applicant, for a period not to exceed 30 days pending an investigation, for the purpose of determining (a) whether the applicant is unfit to engage in the business of a commission merchant, dealer, or broker because the applicant, or in case the applicant is a partnership, any general partner, or in case the applicant is a corporation, any officer or holder of more than 10 percent of the stock, prior to the date of the filing of the application engaged in any practice of the character prohibited by this act or was convicted of a felony in any State or Federal court, or (b) whether the application contains any materially false or misleading statement or involves any misrepresentation, concealment, or withholding of facts respecting any violation of the act by any officer, agent, or employee of the applicant. If after investigation the Secretary believes that the applicant should be refused a license, the applicant shall be given an opportunity for hearing within 60 days from the date of the application to show cause why the license should not be refused. If after the hearing the Secretary finds that the applicant is unfit to engage in the business of a commission merchant, dealer, or broker because the applicant, or in case the applicant is a partnership, any general partner, or in case the applicant is a corporation, any officer or holder of more than 10 percent of the stock, prior to the date of the filing of the application engaged in any practice of the character prohibited by this act or was convicted of a felony in any State or Federal court, or because the application contains a materially false or misleading statement made by the applicant or by its representative on its behalf, or involves a misrepresentation, concealment, or withholding of facts respecting any violation of the act by any officer, agent, or employee, the Secretary shall refuse to isue a license to the applicant."

SEC. 3. Section 4 of such act is further amended by adding at the end thereof the following subsection:

"(e) The Secretary shall refuse to issue a license to an applicant if he finds that the applicant, or in case the applicant is a partnership, any general partner, or in case the applicant is a corporation, any officer or holder of more than 10 percent of the stock, has, within 3 years prior to the date of the application, been adjudicated or discharged as a bankrupt, or was a general partner of a partnership or officer or holder of more than 10 percent of the stock of a corporation adjudicated or discharged as a bankrupt, unless the applicant furnishes a bond of such nature and amount as may be determined by the Secretary or other assurance satisfactory to the Secretary that the business of the applicant will be conducted in accordance with this act."

SEC. 4. Section 8 (b) of such act (7 U. S. C., sec. 499h (b)) is amended to read as follows:

"(b) The Secretary may, after 30 days' notice and an opportunity for a hearing, suspend or revoke the license of any commission merchant, dealer, or broker who, after the date given in such notice, continues to employ in any responsible position any individual whose license has been revoked or is under suspension or who was responsibly connected with any firm, partnership, association, or corporation whose license has been revoked or is under suspension. Employment of an individual whose license has been revoked or is under suspension for failure to pay a reparation award or who was responsibly connected with any firm, partnership, association, or corporation whose license has been revoked or is under suspension for failure to pay a reparation award after one year following the revocation or suspension of any such license may be permitted by the Secretary upon the filing by the employing licensee of a bond, of such nature and amount as may be determined by the Secretary, or other assurance satisfactory to the Secretary that its business will be conducted in accordance with the provisions of this act;".

SEC. 5. Section 13 (a) of such act (7 U. S. C., sec. 499m (a)) is amended to read as follows:

"(a) The Secretary or his duly authorized agents shall have the right to inspect all accounts, records, and memoranda of any commission merchant, dealer, or broker, and if any such commission merchant, dealer, or broker refuses to permit such inspection, the Secretary may publish the facts and circumstandes and/or, by order, suspend the license of the offender until permission to make such inspection is given. The Secretary or his duly authorized agents shall have the right to inspect any lot of any perishable agricultural commodity covered by this act, and if any commission merchant, dealer, or broker having ownership of or control over such lot fails or refuses to authorize or allow such inspection, the Secretary may, after 30 days' notice and an opportunity for a hearing, publish the facts and circumstances and/or, by order, suspend the license of the offender for a period not to exceed 90 days."

With the following committee amendments:

Page 2, following line 2, add the following new section:

"SEC. 2. Section 3 (b) of such act (7 U. S. C., sec. 499c (b)) is amended by striking out in the third sentence the words 'of $15' and inserting 'not to exceed $25.'"

Page 2, line 3, change "SEC. 2" to "SEC. 3."

Page 3, line 13, strike out "shall" and insert "may."

Page 3, line 15, change "SEC. 3" to "SEC. 4."

Page 3, line 17, strike out "shall" and insert "may."

Page 4, line 5, change "SEC. 4" to "SEC. 5."

Page 5, line 1, change "SEC. 5" to "SEC. 6."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the next committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 5, beginning on line 3, strike out all of the first sentence through and including "given." on line 10, and insert:

"The Secretary or his duly authorized agents have the right to inspect such accounts, records, and memoranda of any commission merchant, dealer, or person, as may be required (1) in the investigation of complaints under this act; or (2) to the determination of ownership, the control factors

in the State, country, or region of origin in connection with the commodity inspection; or (3) to ascertain whether the provisions of this act are being complied with and if such commission merchant shall refuse permission for inspection, the Secretary may publish the facts and circumstances or order suspended the licenses which the permission gives."

Mr. McINTIRE. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment to the committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. McINTIRE to the committee amendment:

Page 5, line 13, insert "shall" after "agents."

Page 5, line 17, strike out "the" and insert a comma after "control."

Page 5, line 18, strike out "factors in the state" and insert "packer" and insert thereafter a comma followed by the words "or state" followed by a comma.

Page 5, line 20, strike out "the provisions" and insert "Sec. 9" and strike out "are" and insert "is."

The amendment to the committee amendment was agreed to.

The committee amendment as amended 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.

ISSUANCE OF PATENTS FOR CERTAIN LANDS BORDERING UPON INDIAN RIVER, FLA.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6101) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to issue patents for certain lands in Florida bordering upon Indian River.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill (S. 464) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to issue patents for certain lands in Florida bordering on Indian River, an identical Senate bill, be considered in lieu of the House bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior shall issue patents for the public lands erroneously omitted from the survey which are situated between the position of the record meander line represented on the plat approved March 10, 1845, and the actual shoreline of the Indian River in sections 11, 13, 14, 23, 24, 25, and 36, township 27 south, range 37 east, Tallahassee Meridian, Fla., to persons who hold such public lands in good faith and in peaceful adverse possession, if they or their predecessors in interest have been issued patents, prior to January 1, 1954, for the upland tracts adjoining such erroneously omitted lands. Payment to the United States shall be made for lands so patented at the same price per acre as that at which the land included in the original patent was purchased, but in no case less than $1.25 per acre. No patent shall issue for any tract unless application for the tract is made by a qualified person within 1 year from the date of enactment of this act. The Secretary shall issue no patents until the conclusion of such period. The Secretary may, by public sale at not less than the appraised value or under any appropriate public land law, dispose of any tract of public land subject to this act which is not applied for by a qualified person within the 1-year period.

SEC. 2. Upon the filing of a plat of resurvey under section 1 of this act, the Secretary shall give such notice as he finds appropriate by newspaper publication or otherwise of the opening of the lands to purchase under this act.

SEC. 3. Nothing in this act shall affect valid existing rights.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

A similar House bill (H. R. 6101) was laid on the table.

LAND EXCHANGES FOR COLONIAL NATIONAL HISTORICAL PARK, VA.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5280) to authorize land exchanges for purposes of Colonial National Historical Park, in the State of Virginia, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That for the purpose of preserving more effectively for the public benefit the historic properties within Colonial National Historical Park, Va., the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to consummate desirable land exchanges, as hereafter prescribed, and thereby to reduce and adjust the boundaries of the park. Any lands eliminated from the park hereunder shall not subsequently be added to the park except by act of Congress.

In furtherance of these purposes, the Secretary is authorized on behalf of the United States to accept from grantors title to non-Federal land and interests in land, together with the improvements thereon, situated within the authorized park boundaries, and in exchange therefor, to convey by deed on behalf of the United States to the aforesaid grantors land or interests therein, together with the improvements thereon, situated within Colonial National Historical Park that may be used advantageously for exchange purposes. The aforesaid exchanges are authorized to be made without additional compensation by either party to the exchange when the properties to be exchanged are of approximately equal value. When, however, the properties are not of approximately equal value, as may be determined by the Secretary, an additional payment of funds shall be required by the Secretary or by the grantor of non-Federal properties, as the case may be, in order to make an equal exchange. The Secretary is authorized to use any land acquisition funds relating to the National Park System for such purposes. The Secretary may consummate land exchanges herein authorized upon such terms, conditions, and procedures as he may find to be necessary or desirable in carrying out the purposes of this act; and in evaluating non-Federal properties to be acquired hereunder, he is authorized to make such allowance as he may find to be equitable for the value of any residential properties that may be situated upon land to be acquired pursuant to this act. If expedient and in the public interest to do so, he may assist in the removal of structures from property to be acquired hereunder through the exchange procedure, and he may cooperate with public or private agencies and persons in the securing of housing for the aforesaid grantors who may require new housing accommodations or facilities as a result of the land exchanges herein authorized.

In the event that suitable land exchanges cannot be agreed upon in all cases for purposes of this act, the Secretary is authorized to sell those parcels of park land that otherwise would have been offered and conveyed through exchange procedures herein authorized. The Secretary is authorized to retain in a special receipt account and to expend any funds that he may obtain from such sales of property for the acquisition of non-Federal properties within the authorized boundaries of the Colonial National Historical Park.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 3, strike all of lines 10 to 19 inclusive.

Page 3, add the following new section:

"SEC. 2. The Secretary is further authorized to transfer without compensation up to 15 acres of the Colonial National Historical Park, Va., to the Commonwealth of Virginia for use by agencies of the Commonwealth in the establishment of a State park in furtherance of the purposes of the Colonial National Historical Park."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

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

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to authorize land exchanges for purposes of Colonial National Historical Park, in the State of Virginia; to authorize the transfer of certain lands of Colonial National Historical Park, in the State of Virginia, to the Commonwealth of Virginia, and for other purposes."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ACP WATER CONSERVATION PRACTICES

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 7236) to amend section 8 (b) of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act with respect to water-conservation practices.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the second sentence of section 8 (b) of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, as amended (16 U. S. C., sec. 590h (b)), is amended by striking out of said sentence "in arid or semiarid sections," and inserting in lieu thereof "Clauses."

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.

EXPORT SALES OF SURPLUS STORABLE COMMODITIES

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 7252) to permit sale of Commodity Credit Corpiration stock of basic and storable nonbasic agricultural commodities without restriction where similar commodities are exported in raw or processed form.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I object.

PROVIDING RUNNING MATES FOR CERTAIN STAFF CORPS OFFICERS IN THE NAVAL SERVICE

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4229) to provide running mates for certain staff officers in the naval service and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will a member of the committee explain this bill?

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Speaker, this bill is for the purpose of adjusting and really rectifying the present system of promotions for the Staff Corps of the Navy. It would affect members of the Staff Corps only at the time they are promoted from midshipman to lieutenant, junior grade. At the present time, there is what is known, of course, as the running-mate system, which has been in existence for many years. Promotion from midshipman to lieutenant, junior grade, is automatic. At that time, therefore, the individual acquires his running mate. Under the present system it is possible for the man who came out of the Naval Academy at the very top or very high in his class to acquire a running mate who was very junior to him at the time they graduated from the Academy. This would eliminate that disparity and permit the party ranking with him or in his regular precedence at the time of graduation.

Mr. YATES. Does this bill eliminate the fanning system as far as junior officers are concerned?

Mr. KILDAY. That is the purpose of the bill.

Mr. YATES. The purpose of it will be also to give a greater break to members of the Staff Corps?

Mr. KILDAY. That is correct.

Mr. YATES. Permit their being considered for promotion to higher ratings at an earlier time than they are being considered for promotion under present law?

Mr. KILDAY. Yes; at an earlier time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That paragraph (3) of section 311 (d) of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947, as amended, is further amended by—

(a) inserting in the first sentence after the comma which follows the parenthetical phrase "(Public Law 347, 79th Cong.)" the words "or the act of August 13, 1946 (ch. 962, 60 Stat. 1057), and except those appointed from graduates of the United States Naval Academy,"; and

(b) Substituting a colon for the period at the end of the paragraph and adding the following: "*Provided further*, That each officer appointed in the grade of ensign in the Navy under the act of August 13, 1946 (ch. 962, 60 Stat. 1057), or upon graduation from the United States Naval Academy who is serving as an officer in a staff corps at the time of his promotion to lieutenant (junior grade) shall, upon promotion, be assigned as his running mate the line lieutenant (junior grade) with date of rank in the same calendar year who would be next senior to him had the officer of the staff corps been originally appointed to the grade of ensign in the line and continued to serve as a line officer to the date of his promotion to lieutenant (junior grade) or if there be no such officer the line officer who would have been next junior."

SEC. 2. Each officer of a staff corps, who is a graduate of the United States Naval Academy or who was appointed as an ensign under the act of August 13, 1946 (ch. 962, 60 Stat. 1057), and who prior to the effective date of this act, was assigned a running mate in the grade of lieutenant (junior grade) under paragraph (3) of section 311 (d) of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947, as amended, shall have assigned as his running mate, in the grade in which he is serving on the effective date of this act, the line officer who would have been his running mate in that grade had paragraph (3) of section 311 (d) been amended as provided in section 1 of this act prior to the date upon which he was assigned a running mate in the grade of lieutenant (junior grade).

SEC. 3. No back pay or allowances shall accrue to any officer of the naval service as the result of the enactment of this act.

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.

AMENDING BANKRUPTCY ACT AS TO UNCLAIMED MONEYS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6247) to amend subdivision a of section 66—unclaimed moneys—of the Bankruptcy Act, as amended, and to repeal subdivision b of section 66 of the Bankruptcy Act, as amended.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That subdivision a of section 66 of the Bankruptcy Act, as amended, is hereby amended by adding at the end thereof the following additional sentence: "Such moneys and dividends shall be deposited and withdrawn as provided in title 28, United States Code, section 2042, and shall not be subject to escheat under the laws of any State."

SEC. 2. Subdivision b of section 66 of the Bankruptcy Act is hereby repealed.

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.

INCREASING COMPENSATION OF TRUSTEES IN BANKRUPTCY

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5047) to increase the compensation of trustees in bankruptcy.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I wonder if a Member can tell me how much it is proposed to increase the fees of trustees in bankruptcy and in what way is it proposed to increase these fees?

Mr. CELLER. There is a graduated increase for trustees in bankruptcy. The fees of trustees have not been changed since 1910. That is 45 years ago. The gentleman realizes that the purchasing value of the dollar has changed in those 45 years. One cannot tell what this will involve in toto. We do not presently know what these amounts are in these bankrupt estates; however, the amount is very small on estates below $10,000. On amounts above $10,000 there are slight percentage increases, the increases being almost inconsequential. There is an attempt made to evaluate in accordance with the change in the value of the dollar. Remember there is no cost to the Government. All trustees fees are paid out of the estates in bankruptcy under court discretion.

This bill has been recommended by the Judicial Conference, which is composed of the Chief Justice of the United States Supreme Court and the chief judges of all the circuit courts throughout the United States, namely the nine circuits. It originated with the Judicial Conference and it has the approval of most of the bar associations.

Mr. GROSS. What are the percentage increases, if the gentleman will tell us?

Mr. CELLER. If the gentleman will look on page 3 of the report he will find that the increases are as follows. These are the ultimate amounts: On the first $500, 10 percent.

Mr. GROSS. On the first $500, did I hear the gentleman correctly, 10 percent?

Mr. CELLER. The total fee on a $500 estate would be 10 percent. It would be 10 percent on the next $1,000. It would be 3 percent on the next $8,500, 2 percent on the next $15,000, and 1 percent on $25,000 or over.

Mr. GROSS. I will say to the gentleman that I am interested in this because of the fact that farm income is steadily decreasing, and if it continues to go down, we may again have a good many bankruptcies in the agricultural areas.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I object, Mr. Speaker.

WAIVER OF STATE RESIDENCE REQUIREMENTS IN CERTAIN ELECTIONS

The Clerk called the resolution (H. Con. Res. 94) favoring the waiver of State residence requirements in certain elections.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, may we have an explanation of the bill?

Mr. CURTIS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MULTER. I yield.

Mr. CURTIS of Massachusetts. It so happens that the national president of the Town Clerks Association resides in the district which I represent. They are very much interested in the problem which arises when a person moves from one State to another shortly before a national election and does not, under the laws of the State, have a chance to qualify in his new State. He is disfranchised, and it is very unfair in many cases. They have been seeking a remedy, and support this resolution, under which the Congress expressing itself

as favoring and recommending to the several States the consideration of appropriate legislation to meet this problem. That is all we are doing by this resolution. It is something that the town clerks have been asking for for several years, and I hope that it will not be objected to at this time.

Mr. MULTER. In other words, this bill does not attempt to change any election laws but merely recommends to the States that they consider making changes?

Mr. CURTIS of Massachusetts. That is correct.

Mr. MULTER. I withdraw my reservation of objection, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the concurrent resolution, as follows:

Whereas many citizens are deprived of the right to vote because they have recently moved from one State to another and have not subsequent to such move complied with the residence requirements of the State to which they have moved; and

Whereas it is desirable that citizens should be entitled to vote for the office of President and Vice President whether or not they had moved from one State to another; and

Whereas such disfranchisement could be avoided by reciprocal arrangements between the several States which would recognize the right of a citizen who had moved from one State to another to continue to vote in the State from which he had moved for such reasonable period of time as would enable him to fulfill the residence requirements in the State to which he had moved: Therefore be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the Congress expresses itself as favoring, and recommends to the several States the immediate enactment of appropriate legislation to enable a person to vote when such person would be eligible to vote but for the fact that he had moved from one State to another and had not yet fulfilled the residence requirements of such State to which he had moved.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 2, line 3, strike out "immediate enactment" and insert "consideration."

Page 2, line 5, after the word "vote", insert "for President and Vice President."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The concurrent resolution was agreed to, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDING THE BANKHEAD-JONES FARM TENANT ACT

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6914) to amend the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, as amended, to modify, clarify, and provide additional authority for insurance of loans.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that a similar Senate bill, S. 1758, be considered in lieu of the House bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

Mr. BOYLE. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to know what the bill provides.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOYLE. I yield.

Mr. POAGE. This bill provides that mortgages made to the Farmers Home Administration may be made direct to the United States Government rather than to a private banking institution, as is now required. We now make mortgages direct to the bank and the Government guarantees the mortgage. If the property is foreclosed, the Government has the right of subrogation to the bank.

Mr. BOYLE. Where is the insurance?

Mr. POAGE. When they are made directly to the United States Government, the Government then sells the mortgage to the banking institution, and in that way the banking institution acquires all the rights of the Government and is, of course, insured, because the Government has endorsed the mortgage when it sold it to them.

Mr. BOYLE. I withdraw my reservation of objection, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, as amended (7 U. S. C. 1000 and the following), is further amended as follows:

Title I of the act is amended by the addition of the following new section 16:

"SEC. 16. (a) The Secretary is authorized to insure and to make commitments for the insurance of loans made for the purposes specified in this title (including those made in accordance with the act of October 19, 1949) and to take as security for the obligations entered into in connection with such loans first mortgages on the farms with respect to which such loans are made and such other security as may be required by the Secretary. Such mortgages shall create a lien running to the United States for the benefit of the fund, notwithstanding the fact that the note may be held by the lender or his assignee.

"(b) Loans insured under this section shall be subject to all the provisions of this title, except as otherwise provided in this section, and with respect to such loans, the terms used in this act shall have the following meanings as the context requires:

"(1) 'Mortgage' shall mean 'loan' on 'the instruments relating to a loan';

"(2) 'Insured mortgage' shall mean 'note endorsed for insurance';

"(3) 'Mortgagor' shall mean 'borrower' or 'obligor on the note';

"(4) 'Mortgagee' shall mean 'lender' or 'holder of insured note.'

"(c) Any mortgage insured or any loan made under this act may be converted to an insured loan under this section at the discretion of the Secretary, and any expenses in connection with such conversion may be paid out of appropriations for administrative expenses.

"(d) In connection with loans insured or converted under this section (1) the holder of the insured note shall be entitled to receive the benefits of the insurance as provided in section 13 (a) only in accordance with an agreement pursuant to section 12 (j) or when the assignment of the note is required by the Secretary, and (2) notice of default to the lender under section 12 (f) shall not be required."

SEC. 2. Section 12 (f) (1) is amended by striking the word "promptly" in both the first and second sentences, by inserting after the word "default" in the second sentence the words "in the payment of principal or interest," and by striking the word "it" in the first sentence and inserting in lieu thereof the word "him."

SEC. 3. Section 12 (f) (2) is amended by striking the word "promptly."

SEC. 4. Section 13 (a) is amended by striking the words "section 12" in the first sentence, inserting in lieu thereof the words "this title", and by inserting the words "in the payment of principal or interest" after the word "default" where it first appears in the first sentence.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

A similar House bill (H. R. 6914) was laid on the table.

LIMITATION ON PERIOD OF LEASES IN DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1210) to amend the Public Buildings Act of 1949 to provide a 5-year limitation on the period of leases of space for Federal agencies in the District of Columbia.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 407 of the Public Buildings Act of 1949 is amended by striking out ", not in excess of 1 year," and by inserting in lieu thereof "not in excess of 5 years."

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RESTRICTIONS ON ADMISSION OF CATTLE AND POULTRY INTO THE VIRGIN ISLANDS

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1166) to amend section 6 of the act of August 30, 1890, as amended, and section 2 of the act of February 2, 1903, as amended.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, what is this all about?

Mr. POAGE. If the gentleman will yield to me, this bill amends the quarantine laws in regard to livestock in the Virgin Islands, and provides for the admission from the British Virgin Islands into the United States Virgin Islands for slaughter only of cattle which have been infested by or exposed to ticks upon being freed therefrom.

At the present time our general laws which are applicable to the Virgin Islands, as well as elsewhere in the United States, prohibits the importation of livestock from any territory where they have been exposed to ticks.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Do tick-infested animals from the British Virgin Islands get over to the American islands and then come up to Texas or to Mexico?

Mr. POAGE. We do not think they could, because it is required under the

terms of this act that the cattle must have been freed from ticks before being imported from the British Islands and they must be imported only for immediate slaughter. Those are the two protections provided which we believe are adequate. The argument made to the committee was that the people on the American Virgin Islands have long been dependent upon livestock, poultry and cattle from the British Virgin Islands as a source of food.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. As I understand it, you are just moving the tick-infested animals one step closer to Texas.

Mr. POAGE. We do not think we are. The animals must have been cleaned.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, as a matter of fact, one of the British Virgin Islands sends to the United States cattle, and have for a long time, either for slaughter or for other purposes. I believe this bill permits them to do what they have been doing for many years. The question I wanted to ask is this: Is it permitted, then, to bring them either into Puerto Rico or into the United States?

Mr. POAGE. If the gentleman is yielding to me, I think unquestionably any animal that was legally in the Virgin Islands has a right to come into Puerto Rico or any other part of the United States. But it could not legally be there from the Virgin Islands, under this bill, because this bill allows the importation only for immediate slaughter and consequently they could not bring an animal in from the British Virgin Islands to the American Virgin Islands or to Puerto Rico or other American territory.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to direct this question to the gentleman. We know that some years ago animals of the Brahma variety were brought into Mexico and eventually we had the foot-and-mouth disease which extended over into United States territory. I want to know if there is any loophole through which these animals might be brought in who would be susceptible to or who might have the foot-and-mouth disease.

Mr. POAGE. Of course, if I thought that were possible, I would not approve this bill and bring it before this body.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I am just asking the gentleman for information.

Mr. POAGE. Obviously, that is a matter of opinion solely and simply. The Committee on Agriculture did not think there was any need for this bill, but the Committee on the Interior did think so. They came before us and suggested the need for it. We do not think there is any need for the bill. But we do not think the result of the bill will be to bring any of these diseases into the United States.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. The gentleman is aware of how many millions of dollars were spent because of the importation of these Brahma cattle which spread the disease to which I have referred. If there were any chance of that, it would be very dangerous.

Mr. POAGE. We cannot see any chance of it. As the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. MILLER] well pointed out, the practice has been for a long time to bring these cattle across from the British islands to the United States islands without any restrictions.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I object.

DISPOSAL OF LAND UNDER BANKHEAD-JONES FARM TENANT ACT

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6815) to provide for the orderly disposition of property acquired under title III of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, and for other purposes.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

AGRICULTURAL EXPERIMENT STATIONS

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1759) to consolidate the Hatch Act of 1887 and laws supplementary thereto relating to the appropriation of Federal funds for the support of agricultural experiment stations in the States, Alaska, Hawaii, and Puerto Rico.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Hatch Act of March 2, 1887, relating to the appropriation of Federal funds for the support of State agricultural experiment stations, is hereby amended to read as follows:

"SECTION 1. It is the policy of Congress to continue the agricultural research at State agricultural experiment stations which has been encouraged and supported by the Hatch Act of 1887, the Adams Act of 1906, the Purnell Act of 1925, the Bankhead-Jones Act of 1935, and title I, section 9, of that act as added by the act of August 14, 1946, and acts amendatory and supplementary thereto, and to promote the efficiency of such research by a codification and simplification of such laws. As used in this act, the terms 'State' or 'States' are defined to include the several States, Alaska, Hawaii, and Puerto Rico. As used in this act, the term 'State agricultural experiment station' means a department which shall have been established, under direction of the college or university or agricultural departments of the college or university in each State in accordance with an act approved July 2, 1862 (12 Stat. 503), entitled 'An act donating public lands to the several States and Territories which may provide colleges for the benefit of agriculture and the mechanic arts'; or such other substantially equivalent arrangements as any State shall determine.

"SEC. 2. It is further the policy of the Congress to promote the efficient production, marketing, distribution, and utilization of products of the farm as essential to the health and welfare of our peoples and to promote a sound and prosperous agriculture and rural life as indispensable to the maintenance of maximum employment and national prosperity and security. It is also the intent of Congress to assure agriculture a position in research equal to that of industry, which will aid in maintaining an equitable balance between agriculture and other segments of our economy. It shall be the object and duty of the State agricultural experiment stations through the expenditure of the appropriations hereinafter authorized to conduct original and other researches, investigations, and experiments bearing directly on and contributing to the establishment and maintenance of a permanent and effective agricultural industry of the United States, including researches basic to the problems of agriculture in its broadest aspects, and such investigations as have for their purpose the development and improvement of the rural home and rural life and the maximum contribution by agriculture to the welfare of the consumer, as may be deemed advisable, having due regard to the varying conditions and needs of the respective States.

"SEC. 3. (a) There are hereby authorized to be appropriated for the purposes of this act such sums as Congress may from time to time determine to be necessary.

"(b) Out of such sums each State shall be entitled to receive annually a sum of money equal to and subject to the same requirement as to use for marketing research projects as the sums received from Federal appropriations for State agricultural experiment stations for the fiscal year 1955, except that amounts heretofore made available from the fund known as the 'Regional research fund, Office of Experiment Stations' shall continue to be available for the support of cooperative regional projects as defined in subsection 3 (c) (3), and the said fund shall be designated 'Regional research fund, State agricultural experiment stations,' and the Secretary of Agriculture shall be entitled to receive annually for the administration of this act, a sum not less than that available for this purpose for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1955: *Provided*, That if the appropriations hereunder available for distribution in any fiscal year are less than those for the fiscal year 1955 the allotment to each State and the amounts for Federal administration and the regional research fund shall be reduced in proportion to the amount of such reduction.

"(c) Any sums made available by the Congress in addition to those provided for in subsection (b) hereof for State agricultural experiment station work shall be distributed as follows:

"1. Twenty percent shall be allotted equally to each State;

"2. Not less than 52 percent of such sums shall be allotted to each State, as follows: One-half in an amount which bears the same ratio to the total amount to be allotted as the rural population of the State bears to the total rural population of all the States as determined by the last preceding decennial census current at the time each such additional sum is first appropriated; and one-half in an amount which bears the same ratio to the total amount to be allotted as the farm population of the State bears to the total farm population of all the States as determined by the last preceding decennial census current at the time such additional sum is first appropriated;

"3. Not more than 25 percent shall be allotted to the States for cooperative research in which two or more State agricultural experiment stations are cooperating to solve problems that concern the agriculture of more than one State. The funds available for such purposes, together with funds available pursuant to subsection (b) hereof for like purpose shall be designated as the 'Regional research fund, State agricultural expriment stations', and shall be used only for such cooperative regional projects as are recommended by a committee of nine persons elected by and representing the directors of the State agricultural experiment stations, and approved by the Secretary of Agriculture.

The necessary travel expenses of the committee of nine persons in performance of their duties may be paid from the fund established by this paragraph.

"4. Three percent shall be available to the Secretary of Agriculture for administration of this act.

"(d) Of any amount in excess of $90,000 available under this act for allotment to any State, exclusive of the regional research fund, State agricultural experiment stations, no allotment and no payments thereof shall be made in excess of the amount which the State makes available out of its own funds for research and for the establishment and maintenance of facilities necessary for the prosecution of such research: *And provided further*, That if any State fails to make available for such research purposes for any fiscal year a sum equal to the amount in excess of $90,000 to which it may be entitled for such year, the remainder of such amount shall be withheld by the Secretary of Agriculture.

"(e) 'Administration' as used in this section shall include participation in planning and coordinating cooperative regional reseach as defined in subsection 3 (c) 3.

"(f) In making payments to States, the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to adjust any such payment to the nearest dollar.

"SEC. 4. Moneys appropriated pursuant to this act shall also be available, in addition to meeting expenses for research and investigations conducted under authority of section 2, for printing and disseminating the results of such reasearch, retirement of employees subject to the provisions of an act approved March 4, 1940 (54 Stat. 39), administrative planning and direction, and for the purchase and rental of land and the construction, acquisition, alteration, or repair of buildings necessary for conducting research. The State agriculture experiment stations are authorized to plan and conduct any research authorized under section 2 of this act in cooperation with each other and such other agencies and individuals as may contribute to the solution of the agricultural problems involved, and moneys appropriated pursuant to this act shall be available for paying the necessary expenses of planning, coordinating, and conducting such cooperative research.

"SEC. 5 Sums available for allotment to the States under the terms of this act, excluding the regional research fund authorized by subsection 3 (c) 3, shall be paid to each State agricultural experiment station in equal quarterly payments beginning on the first day of July of each fiscal year upon vouchers approved by the Secretary of Agriculture. Each such station authorized to receive allotted funds shall have a chief administrative officer known as a director, and a treasurer or other officer appointed by the governing board of the station. Such treasurer or other officer shall receive and account for all funds allotted to the State under the provisions of this act and shall report, with the approval of the director, to the Secretary of Agriculture on or before the first day of September of each year a detailed statement of the amount received under provisions of this act during the preceding fiscal year, and of its disbursement on schedules prescribed by the Secretary of Agriculture. If any portion of the allotted moneys received by the authorized receiving officer of any State agricultural experiment station shall by any action or contingency be diminished, lost, or misapplied, it shall be replaced by the State concerned and until so replaced no subsequent appropriation shall be allotted or paid to such State.

"SEC. 6. Bulletins, reports, periodicals, reprints of articles, and other publications necessary for the dissemination of results of the researches and experiments, including lists of publications available for distribution by the experiment stations, shall be transmitted in the mails of the United States under penalty indicia: *Provided, however*, That each publication shall bear such indicia as are prescribed by the Postmaster General and shall be mailed under such regulations as the Postmaster General may from time to time prescribe. Such publications may be mailed from the principal place of business of the station or from an established subunit of said station.

"SEC. 7. The Secretary of Agriculture is hereby charged with the responsibility for the proper administration of this act, and is authorized and directed to prescribe such rules and regulations as may be necessary to carry out its provisions. It shall be the duty of the Secretary to furnish such advice and assistance as will best promote the purposes of this act, including participation in coordination of research initiated under this act by the State agricultural experiment stations, from time to time to indicate such lines of inquiry as to him seem most important, and to encourage and assist in the establishment and maintenance of cooperation by and between the several State agricultural experiment stations, and between the stations and the United States Department of Agriculture.

"On or before the first day of July in each year after the passage of this act, the Secretary of Agriculture shall ascertain as to each State whether it is entitled to receive its share of the annual appropriations for agritural experiment stations under this act and the amount which thereupon each is entitled, respectively, to receive.

"Whenever it shall appear to the Secretary of Agriculture from the annual statement of receipts and expenditures of funds by any State agricultural experiment station that any portion of the preceding annual appropriation allotted to that station under this act remains unexpended, such amount shall be deducted from the next succeeding annual allotment to the State concerned.

"If the Secretary of Agriculture shall withhold from any State any portion of the appropriations available for allotment, the facts and reasons therefor shall be reported to the President and the amount involved shall be kept separate in the Treasury until the close of the next Congress. If the next Congress shall not direct such sum to be paid, it shall be carried to surplus.

"The Secretary of Agriculture shall make an annual report to the Congress during the first regular session of each year of the receipts and expenditures and work of the agricultural experiment stations in all the States under the provisions of this act and also whether any portion of the appropriation available for allotment to any State has been withheld and if so the reasons therefor.

"SEC. 8. Nothing in this act shall be construed to impair or modify the legal relation existing between any of the colleges or universities under whose direction State agricultural experiment stations have been established and the government of the States in which they are respectively located. States having agricultural experiment stations separate from such colleges or universities and established by law, shall be authorized to apply such benefits to research at stations so established by such States: *Provided*, That in any State in which more than one such college, university, or agricultural experiment station has been established the appropriations made pursuant to this act for such State shall be divided between such institutions as the legislature of such State shall direct.

"SEC. 9. The Congress may at any time, amend, suspend, or repeal any or all of the provisions of this act."

SEC. 2. The following listed sections or parts of sections of the Statutes at Large heretofore covering the provisions consolidated in this act are hereby repealed: *Provided, however*, That any rights or liabilities existing under such repealed sections or parts of sections shall not be affected by their repeal:

Bankhead-Jones Act, title I, sections 2 to 8, June 29, 1935 (49 Stat. 436; 7 U. S. C. 427a-g).

Section 9, and related provisions of section 11 of the Bankhead-Jones Act, title I, as added by title I of the Research and Marketing Act (60 Stat. 1082; 7 U. S. C. 427h, 427j).

Department of Agriculture Organic Act of 1944, title I, section 105, amending the Bankhead-Jones Act, title I, section 5, by adding subsection (c) (58 Stat. 735; 7 U. S. C. 427d).

Act approved June 7, 1888, amending the Hatch Act (25 Stat. 176; 7 U. S. C. 372).

Adams Act approved March 16, 1906 (34 Stat. 63; 7 U. S. C. 369, 371, 373, 366, 374, 375, 361, 376, 380, 382).

Purnell Act approved February 24, 1925 (43 Stat. 970; 7 U. S. C. 370, 371, 373, 374, 375, 376, 366, 361, 380, 382).

The acts extending the benefits of the foregoing acts to the Territory of Hawaii, the Territory of Alaska, and Puerto Rico; Hawaii, act of May 16, 1928 (45 Stat. 571; 7 U. S. C. 386, 386a, 386b); Alaska, act of June 20, 1936 (49 Stat. 1553), as amended by Public Law 739, approved August 29, 1950 (7 U. S. C. 369a); Alaska, act of February 23, 1929 (45 Stat. 1256; 7 U. S. C. 386c); Puerto Rico, act of March 4, 1931 (46 Stat. 1520; 7 U. S. C. 386d, e, f).

Such portion of the Department of Agriculture Appropriation Act of 1890, approved March 2, 1889, as related to examination of soils by experimental stations (25 Stat. 841; 7 U. S. C. 364).

That part of the act of October 1, 1918, relating to the Georgia Agricultural Experiment Station (40 Stat. 998; 7 U. S. C. 383).

With the following committee amendments:

Page 5, after line 22, insert a new paragraph 4, as follows:

"4. Not less than 20 percent of any sums appropriated pursuant to this subsection for distribution to States shall be used by State agricultural experiment stations for conducting marketing research projects approved by the Department of Agriculture."

Page 5, line 23, change paragraph "4" to "5."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TOBACCO ALLOTMENTS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6846) to amend section 313 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, with respect to tobacco allotments.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. HESELTON. Reserving the right to object, I should like to have an explanation of the bill.

Mr. ABBITT. Mr. Speaker, this bill amends the tobacco allotment act. It will further tighten the allotment laws by providing that, beginning in 1955, production of tobacco on a farm will not make the farm eligible for an allotment in any subsequent year as an old farm nor will the growing of such tobacco be considered past experience in tobacco production for the producer. The bill clarifies existing law by making it clear that production of tobacco without a quota will not prevent the farm from being eligible for a new farm allotment. It will permit a farmer to come in and get credit for the allotment that is allowed to new farmers. That was an omission in the law we passed early this year. This will fix it so that new farm-

ers can come in and share in the new allotment.

Mr. HESELTON. May I inquire where the persons who receive these additional allotments will be located?

Mr. ABBITT. Whoever can qualify as a new grower will be entitled to get his proportionate share of the allotment set aside for new growers.

Mr. HESELTON. What if any connection is there between this bill and the following bill on the calendar?

Mr. ABBITT. They are separate matters, though both deal with tobacco allotments.

Mr. HESELTON. I withdraw my reservation of objection, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, why do you have three bills in here?

Mr. ABBITT. They were introduced by the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. WATTS]. They deal with separate matters.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. What is the difference?

Mr. ABBITT. One of them deals with the new grower allotment I have just told you about, another deals with allotments for burley tobacco, and the other deals with allotments so that the farmers in Maryland will not have to go every year but can vote once every third year if that is what they desire.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I withdraw my reservation, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. DEANE. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, does this bill refer both to flue-cured and burley tobacco?

Mr. ABBITT. It refers to all tobacco.

Mr. DEANE. I have a constituent who would like to be heard on this matter. I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

TOBACCO ALLOTMENTS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6847) to amend section 313 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, with respect to tobacco allotments.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. BURNSIDE. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I should like to have an explanation of the bill.

Mr. ABBITT. H. R. 6847 applies only to burley tobacco.

Mr. BURNSIDE. Mr. Speaker, I am vitally interested in burley tobacco and I want to know how it applies to burley tobacco.

Mr. ABBITT. Under the present law, a grower of burley tobacco must plant as much as 75 percent of his allotment during any 1 of 3 consecutive years. As the gentleman knows, there is a tremendous surplus of burley tobacco and this bill merely provides that if he plants as much as 50 percent of his allotment in any 1 of 5 consecutive years, he does not lose his allotment.

Mr. BURNSIDE. Mr. Speaker, I object.

AMENDING TOBACCO REFERENDUM LAWS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6845) to further amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, may we have an explanation of this bill?

Mr. ABBITT. Mr. Speaker, this was the bill which I started to explain by mistake just a moment ago. This bill provides for substantial improvement of administrative practices under section 312 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 dealing with the establishment of national tobacco marketing quotas. Under the present law, they have to have an election as to whether or not the tobacco farmers desire to have quotas for 1 year or for 3 years or whether they want no quotas at all. This bill permits them to have a referendum on the single question of marketing quotas for 3 years or not at all. Under the present law, for instance, in Maryland they have to vote this year and then again next year and this is simply to permit them to vote on market quotas for 3 years.

Mr. HESELTON. I notice that the Department of Agriculture wrote a letter to the chairman of the committee dated July 20. In view of that date, may I inquire whether any action has been taken on this proposal by the other body?

Mr. ABBITT. I am sorry but I did not hear what the gentleman said.

Mr. HESELTON. In view of the fact that the letter of the Department is dated July 20, I would like to inquire whether any action has been taken by the other body on this or a similar bill?

Mr. ABBITT. The other body has passed an identical bill, S. 2297.

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

Mr. ABBITT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of an identical Senate bill (S. 2297) to further amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 312 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended (7 U. S. C. 1312), is hereby amended to read as follows:

SEC. 312. (a) The Secretary shall, not later than December 1 of any marketing year, proclaim a national marketing quota for any kind of tobacco for each of the next three succeeding marketing years whenever he determines with respect to such kind of tobacco—

(1) that a national marketing quota has not previously been proclaimed and the total supply as of the beginning of such marketing year exceeds the reserve supply level therefor;

(2) that such marketing year is the last year of 3 consecutive years for which marketing quotas previously proclaimed will be in effect;

(3) that amendments have been made in provisions for establishing farm acreage allotments which will cause material revision of such allotments before the end of the period for which quotas are in effect; or

(4) that a marketing quota previously proclaimed for such marketing year is not in effect because of disapproval by producers in a referendum held pursuant to subsection (c): *Provided*, That if such producers have disapproved national marketing quotas in referenda held in 3 successive years subsequent to 1952, thereafter a national marketing quota shall not be proclaimed hereunder which would be in effect for any marketing year within the 3-year period for which national marketing quotas previously proclaimed were disapproved by producers in a referendum, unless prior to November 10 of the marketing year one-fourth or more of the farmers engaged in the production of the crop of tobacco harvested in the calendar year in which such marketing year begins petition the Secretary, in accordance with such regulations as he may prescribe, to proclaim a national marketing quota for each of the next 3 succeeding marketing years.

(b) The Secretary shall also determine and announce, prior to the first day of December, the amount of the national marketing quota proclaimed pursuant to subsection (a) which is in effect for the next marketing year in terms of the total quantity of tobacco which may be marketed which will make available during such marketing year a supply of tobacco equal to the reserve supply level. The amount of the national marketing quota so announced may, not later than the following March 1, be increased by not more than 20 percent if the Secretary determines that such increase is necessary in order to meet market demands or to avoid undue restrictions of marketings in adjusting the total supply to the reserve supply level.

(c) Within 30 days after the proclamation of national marketing quotas under subsection (a), the Secretary shall conduct a referendum of farmers engaged in the production of the crop of tobacco harvested immediately prior to the holding of the referendum to determine whether such farmers are in favor of or opposed to such quotas for the next 3 succeeding marketing years. If more than one-third of the farmers voting oppose the national marketing quotas, such results shall be proclaimed by the Secretary and the national marketing quotas so proclaimed shall not be in effect but such results shall in no wise affect or limit the subsequent proclamation and submission to a referendum, as otherwise provided in this section, of a national marketing quota.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

A similar House bill (H. R. 6845) was laid on the table.

AMENDING RICE MARKETING QUOTAS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 7302) to amend the rice marketing quota provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of an identical Senate bill (S. 2573) to amend the rice marketing quota provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 353 (b) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, is amended by inserting in the first sentence thereof the words "in the State" immediately following the words "on the basis of past production of rice" and immediately following the words "taking into consideration the acreage allotments previously established."

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

A similar House bill (H. R. 7302) was laid on the table.

AMENDING ACT OF SEPTEMBER 3, 1954

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6888) to amend the act of September 3, 1954, and to facilitate the entry of skilled specialists chargeable to the quota for Spain.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I read the following statement from page 2 of the report:

On September 3, 1954, the third of a series of bills authorizing the admission of a number of aliens skilled in sheepherding was enacted. A total of 385 nonquota visas were made available under this law. Two bills enacted in the 81st and 82d Congresses, respectively, authorized the issuance of 750 quota visas, with a provision for deduction of the quota numbers in the years following.

In making a study of immigration problems in Spain earlier this year, a special subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary of the House learned that the wives and children of a number of these sheepherders were in distressed condition because of their inability to get visas under the annual Spanish quota of 250, which is heavily oversubscribed. In an effort to relieve this situation in an equitable manner, provision is made in the bill for a nonquota status for the wives and children of the sheepherders whose admission was authorized by the act of September 3, 1954, or under either of the preceding acts aforementioned.

Mr. Speaker, I shall make no objection to this bill. I merely want to say that I am in entire accord with the humanitarian purposes of this bill. As a matter of fact I would like to see the intent and the spirit of this bill extended to the nationals of other countries, immigrants who have come to our country but who find themselves removed from their wives and children because of the quota restrictions which compel them to remain in the nation of origin.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. YATES. I yield.

Mr. WALTER. I call the gentleman's attention to the fact that every preferential quota is open so that the cases the gentleman talks about now are nonexistent. That applies even to the Italian and Greek quotas where the pressure has been greatest.

Mr. YATES. I thank the gentleman for that information. A couple of months ago when I checked I was told that the quotas were oversubscribed. I am glad that the gentleman has informed me now that all quotas are now open and that the families residing in those and other countries can now join their families in this country so that all may be reunited.

Mr. WALTER. Several weeks ago I inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the figures as of the close of business of June 30 of the State Department quota issuing division, and those figures disclosed that there were quota numbers that had not been taken up.

Mr. YATES. I thank the gentleman for that information. I am glad to see that the opportunity is now open for families some of whom have immigrated to this country to be reunited with their loved ones whom they left behind. As I said before, the humanitarian purposes of this bill are good.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. YATES. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. JUDD. May I ask the gentleman from Pennsylvania whether those unused quota numbers for spouses and dependents are available for wives of persons who have been admitted for permanent residence and the wives are already here and are now threatened with deportation?

Mr. WALTER. Yes. This will apply to the spouse of the present immigrant national. No distinction has been made between husband and wife.

Mr. JUDD. I know.

Mr. WALTER. Because of a change in the old law it is possible now for every spouse to be reunited with his spouse in this country.

Mr. JUDD. But if the spouse is already here with the husband or wife who has been admitted for permanent residence, will that spouse now be able to get one of those quota numbers?

Mr. WALTER. Yes.

Mr. JUDD. Without having to go back to the old country?

Mr. WALTER. Yes.

Mr. YATES. If I understood the gentleman from Pennsylvania correctly in his answer to the gentleman from Minnesota, in the case where the wife is here under temporary visa and the husband is here under a permanent status the wife would not have to go back to the country of origin.

Mr. WALTER. Yes, without going back to the country of origin.

Mr. YATES. Would she be compelled to leave this country, such as going to Canada?

Mr. WALTER. Yes, but in that kind of procedure she would leave and then come back to this country under a changed status.

Mr. YATES. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. WIER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. YATES. I yield.

Mr. WIER. I was going to ask the gentleman from Pennsylvania if I could find some sheepherders down in Lebanon, would it be as simple to get them admitted as it is the Spanish sheepherders?

Mr. WALTER. Why does not the gentleman try it?

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 3 (a) of the act of September 3, 1954 (68 Stat. 1145), is hereby amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 3. (a) There shall not be issued more than 385 special nonquota immigrant visas under this act: *Provided*, That special nonquota immigrant visas, without regard to the numerical limitations of this section, shall be issued to the wives and minor, unmarried children of the aliens who are found eligible for special nonquota immigrant visas under the provisions of this act, if they are accompanying or following to join such aliens, and are otherwise eligible to receive immigrant visas under the Immigration and Nationality Act: *Provided further*, That the marriage is found to have occurred prior to July 1, 1955."

SEC. 2. A new section 5 is hereby added to the act of September 3, 1954 (68 Stat. 1145), to read as follows:

"SEC. 5. The quota deductions required under the provisions of the act of June 30, 1950 (64 Stat. 306), and the act of April 9, 1952 (66 Stat. 50), are terminated, effective July 1, 1955: *Provided*, That in allocating the quota numbers hereby restored, priority shall be given to aliens in whose cases the Attorney General (a) has determined eligibility for preferential quota status under the provisions of section 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act or (b) has granted preferential quota status to skilled specialists destined to the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico in accordance with the provisions of section 204 of that act."

With the following committee amendments:

On page 2, after line 5, insert the following:

"SEC. 2. Section 4 of the act of September 3, 1954 (68 Stat. 1145) is hereby amended to read as follows:

" 'SEC. 4. An alien shall not be ineligible to receive a visa and excludable from admission into the United States under the provisions of section 212 (a) (9) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (66 Stat. 182) (a) solely by reason of a single conviction of an offense or offenses each of which, if committed in the United States, would be a misdemeanor punishable by imprisonment not to exceed 1 year, and for which the aggregate penalty actually imposed was imprisonment not to exceed 6 months or a fine not to exceed $500, or both; or (b) solely by reason of the admission of the commission of an offense or offenses or the commission of acts constituting the essential elements of an offense or offenses each of which, if committed in the United States, would be a misdemeanor punishable by imprisonment not to exceed 1 year: *Provided*, That the determination whether an offense or offenses committed outside the United States would, if committed in the United States, be classifiable as a misdemeanor or misdemeanors punishable by im-

prisonment not to exceed 1 year shall be based, not on the applicable foreign law but on the provisions of the United States Code, and whenever such code fails to define an offense or offenses comparable to those committed, on the provisions of the Criminal Code of the District of Columbia.' "

On page 2, line 6, strike out "SEC. 2." and substitute in lieu thereof "SEC. 3."

On page 2, at the end of the bill, add the following:

"SEC. 4. New sections 6 and 7 are hereby added to the act of September 3, 1954, in (68 Stat. 1145) to read as follows:

" 'SEC. 6. The word "Spain" is hereby added to subsection 4 (a) (3) of the Refugee Relief Act of 1953, as amended (67 Stat. 401; 68 Stat. 1044), to follow the word "Sweden" as it appears in the said subsection.

" 'SEC. 7. The provisions of law relating to the deportation of aliens on the ground that they were excludable at the time of entry shall not apply to an otherwise admissible alien, admitted to the United States between December 22, 1945, and November 1, 1954, both dates inclusive, who misrepresented his place of birth, identity, or residence in applying for a visa if such alien shall establish to the satisfaction of the Attorney General that the misrepresentation (a) was predicated upon the fact that the alien had reasonable grounds to fear repatriation to his former residence or homeland where he would be persecuted because of race, religion, or political opinions, and (b) was not committed for the purpose of evading the quota restrictions of the immigration laws or an investigation of the alien at the place of his former residence or elsewhere.' "

The committee amendments were agreed to.

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

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to amend the act of September 3, 1954."

COMMISSION AND ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON INTERNATIONAL RULES OF JUDICIAL PROCEDURE

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 7500) to establish a Commission and Advisory Committee on International Rules of Judicial Procedure.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, may I have a brief explanation of what this bill purports to do?

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, this bill was introduced on the recommendation of the Attorney General of the United States and the several bar associations with the idea that it might be possible to have a commission of 7 appointed, 4 to be appointed from the Government and 3 at large by the President of the United States, for the purpose of determining whether procedures can be recommended in our international legal relations. Of course, if recommendations are made I am sure that treaties would be required to make them effective. This is a step toward devising recommendations where as an example, we have to take depositions abroad.

Mr. GROSS. Does this in any way involve the United States further in the International Court of Justice on which sit three Communist judges?

Mr. WALTER. Oh, no. The idea in back of this is to try to promulgate some uniform rules and regulations in the courts here and abroad.

Mr. GROSS. Does this in any way further involve this country in the infamous status-of-forces treaties and secret agreements by which American servicemen and their dependents can be and are tried in foreign courts?

Mr. WALTER. No, indeed.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I object.

AUTHORIZING SECRETARY OF THE ARMY TO MAKE DONATIONS TO THE CITADEL, CHARLESTON, S. C.

The Clerk called House Joint Resolution 261, authorizing the Secretary of the Army to make such donations as may be available to The Citadel, Charleston, S. C.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the joint resolution as follows:

Whereas The Citadel, the Military College of South Carolina, was established on the 20th day of December 1842 by the Legislature of South Carolina; and

Whereas this institution has educated and trained young American manhood as citizens and soldiers since its establishment; and

Whereas the Military College of South Carolina is modeled and patterned after the United States Military Academy at West Point, N. Y.; and

Whereas a large percentage and number of its graduates have rendered distinguished service in all national conflicts of the United States since its establishment; and

Whereas Gen. Mark W. Clark (retired), now president of this institution, desires some representative surplus ordnance field pieces (tanks or guns) used in World War II or Korea, or captured enemy material to commemorate participation of Citadel men in the military service; and

Whereas existing statutes and laws do not permit the Department of the Army to make a direct transfer to The Citadel: Therefore be it

Resolved, etc., That the Secretary of the Army be, and is hereby, authorized to make such transfers of supplies and equipment as may be available to The Citadel, the Military College of South Carolina, as determined appropriate by the Secretary of the Army.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 2, line 3, following the word "that", insert the following language: "notwithstanding any other provision of law."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The House joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Army to make such transfers of supplies and equipment as may be available to The Citadel, Charleston, S. C."

ELIMINATION OF SEPARATE DIVISIONS WITHIN THE JUDICIAL DISTRICT OF NEBRASKA

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5130) to amend title 28 of the United States Code so as to eliminate the separate divisions within the judicial district of Nebraska.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to substitute the Senate bill, S. 1512, which is identical with the House bill, for H. R. 5130.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the Senate bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 107 of title 28 of the United States Code is amended to read as follows:

"§ 107. Nebraska

"Nebraska constitutes one judicial district.

"Court shall be held at Lincoln, North Platte, and Omaha."

SEC. 2. The amendment made by the first section of this act shall take effect on September 1, 1955.

The Senate bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

A similar House bill (H. R. 5130 was laid on the table.

COAST GUARD MILITARY PERSONNEL

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 7379) to amend title 14, United Sates Code, so as to provide for compensatory absence of Coast Guard military personnel serving at isolated aids to navigation, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I object.

CONVEYANCE OF CERTAIN LANDS OF THE UNITED STATES TO ST. JOHNS COUNTY, FLA.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R.7471) to provide for the conveyance of certain lands of the United States to the Board of Commissioners of St. Johns County, Fla.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, may I inquire of the gentleman from Florida: Is it understood that in the event this property ceases to be used as a public park title will revert back to the United States?

Mr. HERLONG. That is my understanding.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to convey by quitclaim deed to the Board of Commissioners of St. Johns County, Fla., all of the right, title, and interest of the United States in and to the tracts of land more particularly described as follows:

All that certain five and eighty-two one-hundredths acres, more or less, piece or

parcel of land situate, lying and being in Anastasia Island, in the County of St. Johns in the State of Florida, and more particularly described as the following parcels A and B:

PARCEL A

That portion of lot 2, section 21, township 7 south, range 30 east, Tallahassee meridian, Florida, the metes and bounds of which are as follows:

Starting at the General Land Office monument at the center of section 21, township 7 south, range 30 east; thence south 89 degrees 00 minutes west 405.3 feet to a General Land Office monument; thence north 1 degree 00 minutes west 230.3 feet to a point in the center of a paved road; thence north 7 degrees 54 minutes west 1,191.8 feet to a coquina monument which is the point of beginning for parcel A; thence by the following courses:

Course 1: North 82 degrees 06 minutes east, 148 feet to a concrete monument on the westerly side of a hard-surfaced road;

Course 2: Thence north 8 degrees 27 minutes west, 564.7 feet along the westerly side of a hard-surfaced road to a point;

Course 3: Thence north 24 degrees 45 minutes west, 100 feet along the westerly side of a hard-surfaced road to a point;

Course 4: Thence south 82 degrees 06 minutes west, 112.5 feet along the southerly side of a hard-surfaced road to a coquina monument;

Course 5: Thence south 7 degrees 54 minutes east, 660 feet more or less, to a coquina monument being the aforesaid point of beginning.

Containing two and two-tenths acres, more or less, all as marked and shown on drawing numbered D-61 dated 10 October 1935. The two and two-tenths acres, more or less, being part of the land reserved for lighthouse purposes by Executive order dated 1 February 1883 and being the same land retained for lighthouse purposes pursuant to section I of Public Law Numbered 361, approved August 27, 1935 (49 Stat. 896).

PARCEL B

Starting at the coquina monument noted above as the point of beginning for parcel A thence by the following courses:

Course 1: North 7 degrees 54 minutes west, 233 feet to a point;

Course 2: Thence south 82 degrees 06 minutes west, 210 feet to a point;

Course 3: Thence north 7 degrees 54 minutes west, 287 feet to a point;

Course 4: Thence north 82 degrees 06 minutes east, 210 feet to a point;

Course 5: Thence north 7 degrees 54 minutes west 140 feet, more or less, to a common monument;

Course 6: Thence south 82 degrees 06 minutes west 330 degrees to a coquina monument;

Course 7: Thence south 7 degrees 54 minutes east, 660 feet to a coquina monument;

Course 8: Thence north 82 degrees 06 minutes east, 330 feet to a coquina monument, being the aforesaid point of beginning.

Containing three hundred and sixty-two one-hundredths acres, more or less, all as marked and shown on drawing numbered D-61 dated 10 October 1935. The three and sixty-two one-hundredths acres, more or less, being part of the five-acre "Lighthouse Tract" acquired by the United States by deed 25 November 1871 and recorded 11 May 1872 in book T, pages 406 through 411, Saint Johns County land records. Subject, however, to the following right-of-way for road and utilities across parcel B: A strip of land 25 feet wide lying 12.5 feet on each side of a centerline described as follows:

Starting at the coquina monument noted above as the point of beginning for parcel A; thence north 7 degrees 54 minutes west, 660 feet to a coquina monument; thence south 82 degrees 06 minutes west, 119.5 feet to a point, being the point of beginning of the centerline of the 25-foot wide right-of-way; thence south 14 degrees 34 minutes east, 140.96 feet more or less, to a point which is the southerly end of the centerline of the 25-foot right-of-way and said point lying on course number 4 of three and sixty-two one-hundredths acres previously described above. All as shown and marked on drawing numbered D-61 dated 10 October 1935.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 4, strike out "by quitclaim deed".

Page 5, after line 6, insert the following:

"SEC. 2. The deed shall contain a covenant that no structure shall be erected on the land which will in any way adversely affect the operation of the Coast Guard facilities.

"SEC. 3. The deed shall also contain a covenant that the property shall be used as a public park and that in the event of national emergency the property shall be available for use by the Federal Government without compensation."

The committee amendments were 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.

BUFORD DAM

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6961) to designate the lake created by Buford Dam in the State of Georgia as "Lake Sidney Lanier."

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to inquire of the author of the bill or some member of the committee, a question which will apply also to the next bill. Can he tell me why the views of the Board of Geographic Names was not secured? I note in the report there is a letter from the Secretary of the Army stating that the Army has no objection to this bill, but it goes on to say that the Board of Geographic Names may have an interest in the bill and recommends that their views be secured. According to the report, their views were not secured.

Mr. LANDRUM. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, there was no objection. They did not desire to file a report or to make any recommendation about it.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. In other words, they were consulted?

Mr. LANDRUM. That is true.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. I withdraw my reservation of objection, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the lake created by the Buford Dam, now being constructed on the Chattahoochee River about 35 miles northeast of Atlanta, Ga., shall be known and designated as Lake Sidney Lanier in honor of the late Sidney Lanier, author of the poem "Song of the Chattahoochee." Any law, regulation, document, or record of the United States in which such lake is referred to under any other name or designation, shall be held to refer to such lake as Lake Sidney Lanier.

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.

AMENDING SECTION 5221 OF THE REVISED STATUTES

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1187) to amend section 5221 of the Revised Statutes, relating to voluntary liquidation of national banks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 5221 of the Revised Statutes (U. S. C., 1952 edition, title 12, sec. 182) is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 5221. Whenever a vote is taken to go into liquidation it shall be the duty of the board of directors to cause notice of this fact to be certified, under the seal of the association, by its president or cashier, to the Comptroller of the Currency, and publication thereof to be made for a period of 2 months in every issue of a newspaper published in the city or town in which the association is located, or if no newspaper is there published, then in the newspaper published nearest thereto, that the association is closing up its affairs, and notifying its creditors to present their claims against the association for payment."

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HOUSING AUTHORITY OF BEAVER COUNTY, PA.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6198) to provide for the sale of certain war housing projects to the Housing Authority of Beaver County, Pa., for use in providing rental housing for persons of limited income.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, notwithstanding the provisions of any other law (but subject to sections 2 and 4 of this act), the Housing and Home Finance Administrator is authorized and directed to sell and convey to the Housing Authority of the County of Beaver, Borough Township, Pennsylvania, at fair market value as determined by him, for use in providing rental housing for persons of limited income, all right, title, and interest of the United States (including, in addition to dwellings, any offsite easements and any structures, appurtenances, and other property, real or personal, acquired for such dwellings or held in connection therewith) in and to the following war housing projects:

(1) PA-36053, known as Tamaqui Village, containing 125 dwelling units on approximately 9.17 acres of land in Borough Township, Pa.;

(2) PA-30655, known as Pulaski Homes, containing 100 dwelling units on approximately 22.37 acres of land in Pulaski Township, Pa.;

(3) PA-30657, known as Lacock Dwellings, containing 76 dwelling units on approximately 12.26 acres of land in East Rochester, Pa.;

(4) PA-36058, known as Mount Vernon Homes, containing 50 dwelling units on approximately 7 acres of land in Aliquippa, and Hopewell Township, Pa.;

(5) PA-36059, known as Stephen Phillips Homes, containing 100 dwelling units on approximately 13.07 acres of land in Monaca, Pa.;

(6) PA-36301, known as Van Buren Homes, containing 400 dwelling units on approximately 57.85 acres of land in Borough Township, Pa.; and

(7) PA-36449 (PA-36052-60), known as Midland Heights, containing 280 dwellings on approximately 116.28 acres of land in Midland, Pa.

SEC. 2. Notwithstanding the first section of this act, no war housing project shall be sold as provided in such section until it has been offered by the Housing and Home Finance Administrator to a duly organized mutual ownership or cooperative organization, in the manner and under the terms and conditions customarily provided for in the case of offers of war housing projects for sale to such organizations, and such offer has not been accepted within a reasonable period as determined by the Administrator (but not exceeding 120 days).

SEC. 3. Any sale of a war housing project by the Housing and Home Finance Administrator under the first section of this act shall be made on such terms and conditions as the Administrator shall determine; except that full payment to the United States shall be required within a period of not more than 30 years, with interest on the unpaid balance at a rate not exceeding 5 percent per annum.

SEC. 4. The Housing and Home Finance Administrator shall not sell any war housing project under the first section of this act until he has received from the attorney general of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania an opinion to the effect that the Housing Authority of the County of Beaver has legal authority to acquire, pay for, and operate such project as a rental housing project for persons of limited income.

SEC. 5. On the 1st day of the 6th month following the month in which this act is enacted, or on December 1, 1955, whichever is later, this act shall cease to apply to any war housing project listed in the first section of this act which has not theretofore been sold under such section or with respect to which a commitment to sell under such section has not been made.

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.

AUTHORIZE SALE OF CERTAIN PERSONAL PROPERTY

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6199) to amend the act of October 14, 1940, to authorize the sale of personal property held in connection with housing under such act.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 608 of the act entitled "An act to expedite the provision of housing in connection with national defense, and for other purposes," approved October 14, 1940, as amended, is amended by inserting "(a)" immediately after "SEC. 608." and by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(b) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, any personal property held under this act, and not sold with a project or building, may be sold at fair value, as determined by the Administrator, to any agency organized for slum clearance or to provide subsidized housing for persons of low income. Any sale of personal property under this subsection shall be made on a cash basis, payable at the time of settlement."

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.

TRANSFER OF WAR HOUSING PROJECTS TO MOSES LAKE, WASH.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6298) to amend section 601 (g) of the act entitled "An act to expedite the provision of housing in connection with national defense, and for other purposes," approved October 14, 1940, as amended, to permit transfer of war housing projects to the city of Moses Lake, Wash., and to other communities similarly situated.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That subsection 601 (g) of the act entitled "An act to expedite the provision of housing in connection with national defense, and for other purposes," approved October 14, 1940, as amended, is hereby amended by striking the period at the end thereof and adding the following: "if at the time of the relinquishment or transfer there is in existence in such a municipality a local public agency organized specifically and solely for the purpose of slum clearance and community redevelopment."

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.

CONVEY CERTAIN WAR HOUSING PROJECTS TO NORFOLK, VA.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 7073) to authorize the conveyance of certain war-housing projects to the city of Norfolk, Va.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to inquire of the author the purpose for which the housing project is contemplated to be used.

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, the area will eventually be used by the city of Norfolk for industrial development, small business, small industry, as soon as the housing is removed from the site.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. VANIK. I object, Mr. Speaker.

BENEFITS FOR CADETS AND MIDSHIPMEN

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5055) 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.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I wonder if the gentleman would explain the necessity for this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill may be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

AMEND VITALIZATION AND RETIREMENT EQUALIZATION ACT

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5516) 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.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 306 of the Army and Air Force Vitalization and Retirement Equalization Act of 1948 is hereby amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"SEC. 3. Section 306 of the Army and Air Force Vitalization and Retirement Equalization Act of 1948 is hereby further amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"'(g) Service as an Army field clerk or as a field clerk, Quartermaster Corps, shall be deemed to have been active Federal service in the Army of the United States in the grade of warrant officer as provided in the act of April 27, 1926 (44 Stat. 328).'"

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

"That subsection 302 (a), Army and Air Force Vitalization and Retirement Equalization Act of 1948 (62 Stat. 1087), as amended (10 U. S. C. 1036a (a)), is further amended by inserting the words 'Army field clerk, field clerk, Quartermaster Corps,' after the words 'flight officer,' and by inserting the following additional proviso after the words 'December 31, 1946': *'And provided further*, That for the purposes of this section, all periods of classified field service as an Army headquarters clerk or as a clerk of the Army Quartermaster Corps under laws in effect prior to August 29, 1916, shall, in the case of warrant officers, be considered as satisfactory Federal service performed in the status of a warrant officer.'

"SEC. 2. No person shall, by virtue of section 1, be entitled to retired pay for any period prior to the effective date of this act."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

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

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to amend title III 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, and for other purposes."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RELIEF OF CERTAIN RURAL CARRIERS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6622) for the relief of certain rural carriers.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That each rural carrier who served a heavily patronized route during the period between November 1, 1949, and February 16, 1955, and who, as a result of administrative application of section 5 of the act of May 3, 1950 (64 Stat. 101), has received during such period total compensation in excess of the amount authorized under section 17 (d) of the act of July 1, 1945, as amended (sec. 867 (d) of title 39, U. S. C.), is hereby relieved of all liability to refund to the United States the sum representing the difference between the amount of total compensation allowable under section 17 (d) of the act of July 1, 1945, as amended, and the amount of total compensation paid the carrier during such period.

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.

VALIDATE PAYMENTS OF MILEAGE MADE

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 7121) to validate payments of mileage made to United States Army and Air Force personnel pursuant to permanent change of station order authorizing travel by commercial aircraft, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That all payments of mileage made to United States Army and Air Force personnel in accordance with Department of the Army and Department of the Air Force instructions during the period January 1, 1950, through March 31, 1951, inclusive, for travel performed by commercial aircraft pursuant to permanent change of station orders authorizing travel by commercial aircraft, except those for which repayment has been effected, be validated notwithstanding the provisions of section 12 of the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942 (56 Stat. 364), as amended by section 203 of the act of August 2, 1946 (60 Stat. 859), in effect when the travel involved was performed.

SEC. 2. The Comptroller General of the United States, or his designee, shall relieve disbursing officers, including special disbursing agents, of the Army and the Air Force from accountability or responsibility for any payments validated by this act, and shall allow credits in the settlement of the accounts of such officers or agents for such payments which appear to be free from fraud or collusion.

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.

COMMODITY EXCHANGE ACT REGISTRATION FEES

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1051) to amend section 8a (4) of the Commodity Exchange Act, as amended.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 8a (4) of the Commodity Exchange Act, as amended (7 U. S. C. 12a (4)), is amended to read as follows:

"(4) to fix and establish from time to time reasonable fees and charges for registrations and renewals thereof and for copies of registration certificates; and".

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TRADE DEVELOPMENT

The Clerk called the bill (S. 2253) to reemphasize trade development as the primary purpose of title I of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 103 (b) of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954 is amended by striking out "$700,000,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "$1,500,000,000. This limitation shall not be apportioned by year or by country, but shall be considered as an objective as well as a limitation, to be reached as rapidly as possible so long as the purposes of this act can be achieved within the safeguards established."

SEC. 2. Section 106 of such act is amended by adding the following: "The Secretary of Agriculture is also authorized to determine the nations with whom agreements shall be negotiated, and to determine the commodities and quantities thereof which may be included in the negotiations with each country after advising with other agencies of Government affected and within broad policies laid down by the President for implementing this act."

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

INVENTIVE CONTRIBUTIONS AWARDS BOARD

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2383) to authorize the establishment of an Inventive Contributions Awards Board within the Department of Defense, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That this act may be cited as the "Inventive Contributions Awards Act of 1955."

DECLARATION OF POLICY

SEC. 2. It is the purpose of this act to foster invention for national defense through the establishment within the Department of Defense of an Inventive Contributions Awards Board which shall be authorized to recommend to the Secretary the making of such awards, to be known as national defense awards, as it shall consider just for meritorious inventions contributing to the national defense.

DEFINITIONS

SEC. 3. As used in this act—

(a) The term "contribution" means any inventive contribution which is used in the national defense of the United States, and which is not subject to the provisions of the Atomic Energy Act of 1946.

(b) The term "contributor" means any natural person who has made an inventive contribution.

(c) The term "the Department" shall mean the Department of Defense, and the term "Secretary" shall mean the Secretary of Defense.

(d) The term "defense agency" means the Department, or any other department, agency, or independent establishment in the executive branch of the Government (except the Atomic Energy Commission), or any wholly owned Government corporation, designated by the President as a defense agency for the purposes of this act.

(e) The term "Board" means the Inventive Contributions Awards Board established pursuant to section 5 of this act.

(f) The term "award" means a national defense award authorized by section 4 of this act.

(g) The term "communication" shall mean either a disclosure in writing or a submission of a physical embodiment of the contribution.

(h) The term "national defense" shall include the program provided for in the Mutual Security Act of 1951, as amended, and the Mutual Defense Assistance Act of 1949, as amended.

NATIONAL DEFENSE AWARDS

SEC. 4. Any law to the contrary notwithstanding, whenever any contributor has directly or indirectly communicated his contribution to any defense agency, and any such agency in consequence of such communication has used or caused to be used such contribution, the Secretary, upon the recommendation of the Board, may make a national defense award to such contributor or his heirs in such amount, and subject to such terms and conditions, as the Board shall determine in conformity with the provisions of this act to be a proper award for the use thereof.

INVENTIVE CONTRIBUTIONS AWARDS BOARD

SEC. 5. (a) The Secretary is authorized to establish within the Department an Inventive Contributions Awards Board which shall be composed of not more than 15 members appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, for such term or terms as he may specify, from individuals in civil life who are eminent in one or more of the following fields of activity: Invention, science, research, development, and patent law. A quorum of the Board shall meet at such times as the Secretary may specify to consider applications made pursuant to section 6 of this act for awards. Five members shall constitute a quorum of the Board.

(b) From funds available for such purposes, each member shall receive compensation at the rate of $50 for each day of his attendance at meetings of the Board, and shall be reimbursed for all travel expenses actually incurred by him in the performance of his duties as a member of the Board: *Provided*, That the provisions of title 18, United States Code, section 281, shall not apply to the members of this Board and that appointments may be made without regard to the requirements of the Civil Service Retirement Act.

(c) The Board shall perform the duties required of it by section 6 of this act. The Secretary shall provide the Board with such personnel and facilities as he may determine to be required by the Board for the performance of its functions.

(d) The Board, subject to approval by the Secretary, may promulgate such rules and regulations, not inconsistent with this act, as may be required for the performance of its duties hereunder.

APPLICATION FOR AWARDS AND PROCEEDINGS THEREON

SEC. 6. Any contributor may file with the Secretary an application for an award under section 4 of this Act, or be recommended for an award by the head of any defense agency. Such application or recommendation may be

filed upon information and belief, and shall contain a statement concerning—

(1) the nature of such contribution;

(2) the ownership thereof;

(3) the date and manner of its communication to any defense agency;

(4) the nature and extent of the compensation received by such contributor from the United States in connection with the contribution;

(5) the nature and extent of the award for which application or recommendation is made pursuant to this act; and

(6) such other information as the Board shall prescribe by its rules.

(b) Each application or recommendation so filed shall be transmitted to the Board which, subject to the provisions of this act, shall determine the questions presented by such application, and shall make and transmit to the Secretary a report thereon in which the Board shall set forth—

(1) its findings of fact;

(2) its conclusions and recommendations on the question whether the contributor is entitled to an award under this act; and

(3) the terms and conditions upon which any such award should be made.

DETERMINATION OF ELIGIBILITY FOR AWARDS AND QUANTUM THEREOF

SEC. 7. (a) In any proceeding under this act, the contributor shall bear the burden of establishing the communication of the contribution in question, except that the submission of a contribution to the National Inventors Council and by that council to a defense agency shall constitute proof of communication.

(b) In any proceeding under this act if the Board finds that the contributor communicated the contribution and as a result thereof it was used, the Board may recommend an award, and payment thereof in a lump sum or in periodic installments.

(c) In determining the amount of any such award consideration shall be given to—

(1) the novelty, originality, and utility of the contribution;

(2) the extent to which such development was made at the expense of the contributor, and the extent to which such development was made at the expense of the United States;

(3) the extent to which the contributor has benefited, will benefit, or reasonably can be expected to benefit through the commercial exploitation of such contribution;

(4) the extent to which the contributor has been denied the benefits of commercial exploitation of such contribution in consequence of any secrecy restrictions imposed by the United States; and

(5) the extent to which the contributor has been compensated for said contribution by the United States.

(d) If, in any proceeding under this act, it shall appear to the Board that more than one contributor is entitled to compensation with respect to the same contribution, the Board shall ascertain and determine the interests of each such contributor and shall recommend the division of the award, in such proportions as it shall deem equitable, among all persons whom it shall find to be entitled to share therein.

(e) A contributor shall not be barred from eligibility for an award on the ground that he has given the Government a license under his invention either with or without receipt of cash consideration or by virtue of the fact that the Government claims an equitable license under his invention.

PAYMENT OF AWARDS

SEC. 8. (a) Any award made pursuant to this act may be paid in a single payment or by such periodic payments as the Board may recommend.

(b) Awards so made shall be paid from funds appropriated to the defense agency principally interested in the contribution for which such award is made, as determined by the Board, and may be paid from any funds appropriated to such agency which are available for the procurement of equipment or supplies incorporating such contribution or resulting from the practice of such contribution. If the head of the defense agency concerned certificates that funds are not available to such agency for the payment of any such award, the Secretary shall include in his budget estimate for the Department for the next fiscal year an appropriate item for the payment of such award.

(c) No award shall be paid under this act to any contributor or with respect to any contribution in any amount exceeding $75,000 until such award has been transmitted to and approved by the Congress. The approval of the Congress to any such award shall be deemed to have been granted upon the expiration of the first period of 6 months of continuous session of the Congress following the date on which such award is transmitted to it for approval, but only if prior to the expiration of such period there has not been passed a concurrent resolution disapproving such award or approving such award in a reduced amount or subject to different conditions. If within such period any such resolution is passed authorizing payment of such award in a reduced amount or subject to different conditions, payment of such award may be made in conformity with the terms of such resolution.

PROCEEDINGS UNDER OTHER STATUTES

SEC. 9. (a) Nothing contained in this act shall—

(1) prevent any defense agency from making any payment to any contributor pursuant to any other provision of law; or

(2) bar any contributor from prosecuting any suit under any other provision of law; or

(3) prohibit any department or agency of the United States from making any payment to a contributor pursuant to any administrative order of such department or agency.

SEC. 10. Section 10 (r) of the Army Air Corps Act approved June 2, 1926, as amended by act approved March 3, 1927 (10 U. S. C. 310 (r)), is hereby repealed.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and substitute the following:

"That this act may be cited as the 'Inventive Contributions Awards Act of 1955.'

"SEC. 2. It is the purpose of this act to foster invention for national defense by conferring on the National Inventors Council within the Department of Commerce authority to make such awards known as National Defense Awards, as it shall consider just for meritorious inventive contributions made to the national defense.

"DEFINITIONS

"SEC. 3. As used in this act—

"(a) The terms 'contribution' or 'inventive contribution' mean any contribution of a process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter in the fields contemplated by the patent law, or of an improvement in, idea for, or for the use of, such a process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, whether or not patented, unpatented, or unpatentable, and whether or not original with the contributor, new, or amounting to invention, which is used in the national defense of the United States as a result of communication by the contributor, and which is not subject to the provisions of the Atomic Energy Acts of 1946 (42 U. S. C. 1801–1819) and of 1954 (42 U. S. C. 2011–2296).

"(b) The term 'contributor' means a natural person who has made an inventive contribution, other than civilian officers and employees of the Federal Government to whom title III, Public Law 763, 83d Congress, applies, or as otherwise included in section 9 (b) herein.

"(c) The term 'defense agency' means the Department of Defense or any other department, agency, or independent establishment in the executive branch of the Government (except the Atomic Energy Commission), or any wholly owned Government corporation, designated by the President as a defense agency for the purposes of this act.

"(d) The term 'award' means a National Defense Award authorized by section 4 of this act.

"(e) The term 'communication' shall mean either a disclosure in writing or a submission of a physical embodiment of the contribution.

"(f) The term 'Council' means the National Inventors Council within the Department of Commerce.

"NATIONAL DEFENSE AWARDS

"SEC. 4. Any law to the contrary notwithstanding, whenever any contributor has directly or indirectly communicated his contribution to any defense agency, and any such agency in consequence of such communication has used or caused to be used such contribution, the National Inventors Council may make a National Defense Award to such contributor or his heirs in such amount, and subject to such terms and conditions, as the Council shall determine in conformity with the provisions of this act to be a proper award for the use thereof.

"NATIONAL INVENTORS COUNCIL

"SEC. 5. (a) The National Inventors Council shall perform the duties required of it by the provisions of this act.

"(b) The Council, subject to the approval of the Secretary of Commerce, may promulgate such rules and regulations, not inconsistent with this act, as may be required for the performance of its duties hereunder.

"(c) There is hereby authorized to be appropriated such funds as are necessary to meet administrative expenses of the Council in performance of its functions under this act, except no appropriations authorized under this subsection shall be used for the payment of any award under this act.

"APPLICATIONS FOR AWARDS AND PROCEEDINGS THEREON

"SEC. 6. (a) Any contributor may file with the Council an application for an award under section 4 of this act, or be recommended for an award by the head of any defense agency. Such application or recommendation may be filed upon information and belief, and shall contain a statement concerning—

"(1) the nature of such contribution;

"(2) the ownership thereof;

"(3) the date and manner of its communication to any defense agency;

"(4) the nature and extent of the compensation received by such contributor from the United States in connection with the contribution;

"(5) the nature and extent of the award for which application or recommendation is made pursuant to this act; and

"(6) such other information as the Council shall prescribe by its rules.

"(b) Each application or recommendation so filed shall be transmitted to the Council which, subject to the provisions of this act, shall determine the questions presented by such application, and shall make a report thereon in which it shall set forth—

"(1) its findings of fact;

"(2) its conclusions and recommendations on the question whether the contributor is entitled to an award under this act; and

"(3) the terms and conditions upon which any such award should be made.

"DETERMINATION OF ELIGIBILITY FOR AWARDS AND QUANTUM THEREOF

"SEC. 7. (a) In any proceeding under this act, the contributor shall bear the burden of establishing the communication of the contribution in question, except that the submission of a contribution to the National Inventors Council and by that Council to a defense agency shall constitute proof of communication.

"(b) In any proceeding under this act if the Council finds that the contributor communicated the contribution and as a result thereof it was used, it may make an award, and recommend payment thereof in a lump sum or in periodic installments.

"(c) In determining the amount of any such award consideration shall be given to—

"(1) the novelty, originality, and utility of the contribution;

"(2) the extent to which such development was made at the expense of the contributor, and the extent to which such development was made at the expense of the United States;

"(3) the extent to which the contributor has benefited, will benefit, or reasonably can be expected to benefit through the commercial exploitation of such contribution;

"(4) the extent to which the contributor has been denied the benefits of commercial exploitation of such contribution in consequence of any secrecy restrictions imposed by the United States; and

"(5) the extent to which the contributor has been compensated for said contribution by the United States.

"(d) If, in any proceeding under this act, it shall appear to the Council that more than one contributor is entitled to compensation with respect to the same contribution, it shall ascertain and determine the interests of each such contributor and shall recommend the division of the award, in such proportions as it shall deem equitable, among all persons whom it shall find to be entitled to share therein.

"(e) A contributor shall not be barred from eligibility for an award on the ground that he has given the Government a license under his invention either with or without receipt of cash consideration or by virtue of the fact that the Government claims and equitable license under his invention.

"(f) It shall not be necessary that the contributor own the inventive contribution or possess any property interest in it in order to be eligible for an award, but the Council may consider as an additional factor, potential claims by others for the same contributions, or similar contributions, in determining the amount of an award, if any.

"PAYMENTS OF AWARDS

"SEC. 8. (a) Any award made pursuant to this act may be paid in a single payment or by such periodic payments as the Council may recommend.

"(b) Awards so made shall be paid from funds appropriated to the defense agency principally interested in the contribution for which such award is made, as determined by the Council, and may be paid from any funds appropriated to such agency which are available for the procurement of equipment or supplies incorporating such contribution or resulting from the practice of such contribution. If such funds are not available to such agency for the payment of the award, the head of the agency shall so certify and shall include in his budget estimate for the next fiscal year an appropriate item for the payment of such award.

"(c) No award shall be paid under this act to any contributor or with respect to any contribution in any amount exceeding $50,000 until such award has been transmitted to and approved by the Congress. The approval of the Congress to any such award shall be deemed to have been granted upon the expiration of the first period of 6 months of continuous session of the Congress following the date on which such award is transmitted to it for approval, but only if prior to the expiration of such period there has not been passed a concurrent resolution disapproving such award or approving such award in a reduced amount or subject to different conditions. If within such period any such resolution is passed authorizing payment of such award in a reduced amount or subject to different conditions, payment of such award may be made in conformity with the terms of such resolution.

"PROCEEDINGS UNDER OTHER STATUTES

"SEC. 9. (a) Nothing contained in this act shall—

"(1) prevent any defense agency from making any payment to any contributor pursuant to any other provision of law; or

"(2) bar any contributor from prosecuting any suit under any other provision of law; or

"(3) prohibit any department or agency of the United States from making any payment to a contributor pursuant to any administrative order of such department or agency.

"(b) An officer or employee of the Government shall not be eligible for consideration for an award pursuant to this act unless he has received the maximum monetary award that may be granted for an invention under the Government Employees' Incentive Awards Act (68 Stat. 1112).

"SEC. 10. Section 10 (r) of the Army Air Corps Act approved June 2, 1926, as amended by act approved March 3, 1927 (10 U. S. C. 310 (r)), is hereby repealed.

"SEC. 11. The provisions of this act shall be prospective only and shall affect inventive contributions communicated after the effective date of this act."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

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

The title was amended to read: "A bill to authorize the National Inventors Council to make awards for inventive contributions relating to the national defense."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RELEASING RESTRICTIONS ON CERTAIN REAL PROPERTY GRANTED TO CHARLESTON, S. C.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2430) to release certain restrictions on certain real property heretofore granted to the city of Charleston, S. C., by the United States of America.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

AMENDING SECTION 73 (1) OF THE HAWAIIAN ORGANIC ACT

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6808) to amend section 73 (1) of the Hawaiian Organic Act.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the portion of the first proviso of section 73 (1) of the Hawaiian Organic Act which reads "That the commissioner shall, with the approval of said board, sell to any citizen of the United States, or to any person who has legally declared his intention to become a citizen, for residence purposes lots and tracts, not exceeding 3 acres in area;" is hereby amended to read as follows: "That the commissioner shall, with the approval of said board, sell to any citizen of the United States, or to any person who has legally declared his intention to become a citizen, for residence purposes lots and tracts, not exceeding 3 acres in area; but any lot not sold after public auction, or sold and forfeited, or any lot or part thereof surrendered with the consent of the commissioner, which is authorized, may be disposed of upon application at no less than the advertised price without further public notice or auction but after a 6 months' period following the auction, only upon reappraisal and at the price of the reappraised value, if it be greater than the original price at the auction.

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

With the following committee amendments:

Page 2, line 2, strike the words "and tracts."

Page 2, strike all of lines 5 to 10 inclusive and insert in lieu thereof the following: "consent of the commissioner, which consent is authorized, may upon application be sold without further public notice or auction within the period of 2 years immediately subsequent to the day of the public auction, at the advertised price if the sale is within the period of 6 months immediately subsequent to the day of the public auction, and at the advertised price or the price fixed by a reappraisal of the land, whichever is greater, if the sale is within the period subsequent to the said 6 months but prior to the expiration of the said 2 years."

The committee amendments were 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.

AMENDING THE HATCH ACT

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3084) to amend certain provisions of the laws relating to the prevention of political activities to make them inapplicable to State officers and employees.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, may I ask the chairman of the committee to explain this bill.

Mr. BEAMER. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield. This bill would exempt only State employees from the provisions of the Hatch Act.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I yield.

Mr. McCORMACK. This refers to State employees part of whose salary is paid by the Federal Government.

Mr. BEAMER. That is correct.

Mr. McCORMACK. In fact, we ought to go much further than that.

Mr. BEAMER. I think the majority leader is correct.

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, I object.

Mr. BEAMER. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will reserve his reservation for just a moment——

Mr. VANIK. I reserve my right to object, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. BEAMER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to explain this very nonpartisan bill. We have letters from 47 of the 48 attorneys general and most of the governors in the United States endorsing this bill. Teachers and various other groups are exempted, and this merely extends that particular exemption to certain other State employees.

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman name some of the employees who would be exempted by this proposed legislation?

Mr. BEAMER. Any State employee; in forestry, agriculture, highways. The teachers are already exempt under the previous act.

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Speaker, may I ask the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BEAMER] if it is not also true that the Civil Service Commission and the Department of Justice have endorsed this proposed legislation?

Mr. BEAMER. The report of the committee indicates that the Civil Service Commission unanimously has recommended it, as has the Department of Justice. And, as I have already said, we have had a request for this from practically all of the governors and 47 of the 48 attorneys general.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, I object.

AMENDMENTS TO PUBLIC LAWS 815 AND 874, 81ST CONGRESS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 7245) 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.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc.—

EXTENSION OF PUBLIC LAW 874

SECTION 1. The first sentence of section 2 (a) of the act of September 30, 1950 (Public Law 874, 81st Cong.), as amended, is amended, by striking out "5 succeeding fiscal years" and inserting "6 succeeding fiscal years." Sections 3 (a), 3 (c), 4 (a), and 8 (d) of such act are amended by striking out "1956" wherever appearing therein and inserting "1957." Section 3 (c) (2) (D) of such act is amended by inserting after "July 1, 1955," the following: "and the succeeding fiscal year,". Section 10 (a) of such act is amended by striking out "or the succeeding fiscal year" in the first sentence and inserting "or either of the 2 succeeding fiscal years," and by striking out the second sentence and inserting the following: "Notice of such an election shall be filed with the Secretary of the Interior and with the Commissioner of Education before January 1 of the calendar year in which the fiscal year in question begins.".

POSTPONEMENT OF 3 PERCENT "ABSORPTION" REQUIREMENT UNDER PUBLIC LAW 874

SEC. 2. The act of August 31, 1954 (Public Law 732, 83d Cong.), is amended by inserting after "June 30, 1955," the following: "and the succeeding fiscal year."

TRANSFER OF TEMPORARY SCHOOL FACILITIES MADE AVAILABLE UNDER PUBLIC LAW 815

SEC. 3. Sections 203 and 309 of the act of September 23, 1950 (Public Law 815, 81st Cong.), as amended, are each amended by inserting at the end thereof the following new sentence: "The Commissioner may transfer to such agency or its successor all the right, title, and interest of the United States in and to any temporary facilities made available to such agency under this section; any such transfer shall be without charge, but may be made on such other terms and conditions, and at such time, as the Commissioner deems appropriate to carry out the purposes of this title." The amendments made by this section shall apply to any facility made available to a local educational agency either before or after the enactment of this act.

DATE FOR DETERMINING "UNHOUSED" CHILDREN

SEC. 4. (a) Section 304 of such act is amended, effective December 1, 1954, by striking out "the number of children who will otherwise be without such facilities shall be determined by reference to those facilities which (A) are built or under contract as of the date set by the Commissioner under section 303 for filing applications for payments from the funds out of which such Federal share is to be paid" and inserting the following: "the number of children who will otherwise be without such facilities shall be determined by reference to those facilities which (A) are built or under contract as of the earliest date set by the Commissioner under section 303, on or before which the application for such project is filed."

(b) Such section is further amended by inserting "(a)" after "SEC. 304." and by adding at the end of section the following new subsection:

"(b) (1) Where a local educational agency filed an application for payments under this title on or before November 24, 1953, and after that date entered into any construction contract which had the effect of diminishing or eliminating payments to such agency on the basis of the application, the Commissioner shall pay to such agency, out of funds appropriated pursuant to this subsection, an amount equal to the difference between the amount, if any, reserved on the basis of the application and the amount which would have been reserved on the basis of the application out of funds appropriated by the Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1954, if such funds had been sufficient to permit payments without establishing priorities under section 303.

"(2) Payments under this subsection shall be made upon request of the local educational agency involved, filed with the Commissioner within 90 days after the date on which funds are appropriated to make such payments. Except as provided in paragraph (3), such payments shall be made in a lump sum, and shall be made upon condition that the funds paid shall be used solely to finance the construction of school facilities for such agency (including the payment of obligations incurred with respect to school facilities constructed before the enactment of this subsection).

"(3) If, as of the date on which funds are appropriated to make payments under this subsection, any agency to which this subsection applies has not provided minimum school facilities (determined by reference to those facilities which, as of such date, are built or under contract, or are included in a project the application for which has been approved under this title) for the estimated number of children who will be in the membership of its schools at the close of the regular school year 1955–1956, its request shall set forth one or more projects for the construction of minimum school facilities for such children, and with respect to such projects shall meet the requirements of section 205 (b) (1). If, and only if, the projects included in its request and approved for payment will provide minimum school facilities for the number of children for whom such facilities have not been provided, as determined under the preceding sentence, the balance, if any, of the amount payable to such agency under this subsection shall be paid to it in accordance with paragraph (2). Upon approval of the request, payments with respect to each project included in the request shall be made under section 307 as if an application for such project had been approved under section 306."

ASSISTANCE UNDER PUBLIC LAW 815 FOR CHILDREN RESIDING ON INDIAN LAND OUTSIDE SCHOOL DISTRICTS

SEC. 5. (a) Paragraph 1 of section 401 (a) of such Act is amended by inserting before the semicolon the following: "or that the total number of such children who reside on Indian lands located outside the school district of such agency equals or exceeds 100."

(b) Such section 401 (a) is further amended by adding at the end thereof the following: "Assistance may be furnished under this subsection without regard to paragraph (2) (but subject to the other provisions of this subsection and subsection (c)) to any local educational agency which provides free public education for children who reside on Indian lands located outside its school district. For purposes of this subsection 'Indian lands' means Indian reservations or other real property referred to in the third sentence of section 210 (1).".

(c) Section 401 (b) of such act is amended (1) by striking out "the succeeding fiscal year" and inserting in lieu thereof "the 2 succeeding fiscal years", and (2) by striking out "June 30, 1955" and inserting in lieu thereof "June 30, 1956".

PAYMENTS UNDER PUBLIC LAW 815 TO DISTRICTS UNABLE TO FINANCE NONFEDERAL SHARE OF PROJECTS

SEC. 7. Section 308 of such act is amended by inserting "(a)" after "SEC. 308." and by adding at the end of the section the following new subsection:

"(b) Where a local educational agency filed an application for payments under this section before June 30, 1954, and such agency met all the requirements established for approval of such application except the 20 percent requirement as to children countable for payments under this title (45 C. F. R., 1954 Supp., 107.8 (b) (2)), and the number of children countable for the purposes of such requirement was equal to 10 percent or more of the average daily membership of such agency for the school year 1953–54, the Commissioner shall pay to such agency, out of funds appropriated pursuant to this subsection, an amount equal to the amount which would have been reserved on the basis of such application if such requirement had been met. Payments under this subsection shall be made upon application by the local educational agency involved, filed with the Commissioner on or before November 1, 1955, which shall set forth one or more projects for the construction of minimum school facilities for such agency, and shall meet the requirements of section 205 (b) (1) with respect to such projects. Upon approval of an application under this subsection, payments with respect to each project included in the application shall be made under section 307 as if an application for such project had been approved under section 306."

With the following committee amendments:

Page 2, after line 10, insert the following new section:

"PAYMENTS UNDER PUBLIC LAW 874 FOR CURRENT INCREASES IN FEDERALLY CONNECTED CHILDREN

"SEC. 2. Section 4 (a) (1) of such act is amended by striking out 'at least 5 percent of the number of all children in average daily attendance at the schools of such agency during the preceding fiscal year' and inserting 'at least 5 percent of the difference between the number of children in

average daily attendance at the schools of such agency during the preceding fiscal year and the number of such children whose attendance during such year resulted from activities of the United States (including children who resided on Federal property or with a parent employed on Federal property)'." And renumber the succeeding sections accordingly.

Page 3, line 9, strike "children who will otherwise be without such facilities" and insert "such children who will otherwise be without such facilities at such time."

Page 3, line 15, strike "children who will otherwise be without such facilities" and insert "such children who will otherwise be without such facilities at such time."

The committee amendments were 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.

CONVEYANCE OF CERTAIN LAND TO SIOUX FALLS, S. DAK.

The Clerk called the bill (S. 2277) authorizing the Administrator of General Services to convey certain land to the city of Sioux Falls, S. Dak., for park and recreational purposes, for an amount equal to the cost to the United States of acquiring such lands from the city.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Administrator of General Services is authorized and directed to convey by quitclaim deed to the city of Sioux Falls, S. Dak., all right, title, and interest, except mineral rights (including oil and gas), of the United States in and to the following-described land located in Minnehaha County, S. Dak., consisting of approximately 20 acres: The east half of the southeast quarter of the southeast quarter of section 19 in township 101, range 49 west, fifth principal meridian. As consideration for such conveyance the city of Sioux Falls, S. Dak., shall pay an amount, determined by the Administrator of General Services, equal to the cost to the United States of acquiring such land from the city of Sioux Falls, S. Dak.

SEC. 2. The conveyance authorized by this act shall contain the express provisions that the land conveyed shall be used for park and recreational purposes in a manner which, in the judgment of the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs or his designate, will not interfere with the care and treatment of patients in the Veterans' Administration hospital, Sioux Falls, S. Dak., and that, in the event the land conveyed ceases to be so used, all right, title, and interest therein shall immediately revert to and revest in the United States. In the event of a reversion of such land to the United States, the fair market rental value of such land for the period it is held by the city of Sioux Falls, S. Dak., shall be deducted from the purchase price paid by such city and the balance, if any, shall be repaid to such city.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CONVEYANCE OF CERTAIN LAND TO BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS OF LEE COUNTY, FLA.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 7156) to provide for the conveyance of certain land of the United States to the Board of County Commissioners of Lee County, Fla.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Administrator of General Services is authorized and directed to convey to the Board of County Commissioners of Lee County, Fla., all of the right, title, and interest of the United States in and to a tract of land in Government lot No. 2, in section 9, township 46 south, range 23 east, in Lee County, Fla., more particularly described as follows:

Being a strip of land 350 feet in width, lying at the extreme northward part of the aforesaid Government lot No. 2 and extending eastwardly and westwardly between parallel lines entirely across said Government lot No. 2, from the waters of Caloosahatchee River on the westward side of said Government lot No. 2 to an unnamed bay on the eastward side thereof. The northward boundary line of said strip of land is also the northward boundary of the aforesaid Government lot No. 2.

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.

CONVEYANCE OF CERTAIN LAND TO CITY OF MILWAUKEE, WIS.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6857) to authorize the Administrator of the General Services Administration to convey certain land to the city of Milwaukee, Wis.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, it is my understanding that this is conveyed without consideration, but the situation is such that on this property there are some tumble-down building belonging to the Government which have to be removed. The cost to the Government of removing them would be such that it is to the Government's advantage to convey to the city of Milwaukee and have the city bear that expenditure. That is the reason there is no objection made to the fact there is no compensation being paid.

Mr. McCORMACK. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN], I understand, intends to offer an amendment. Will the gentleman advise us what the amendment is?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Yes. Will the Clerk read it?

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the amendment for information.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan: Strike out the period in line 2, page 2, and insert a colon and the following: "*Provided further*, That such conveyance heretofore referred to shall not be executed and delivered until the city of Milwaukee, through its proper legislative authority, declare that it will provide opportunity for water transportation from other ports in the United States and from foreign countries to enter, to discharge cargo, and take on cargo and depart from the harbor at Milwaukee."

The SPEAKER. That is the amendment the gentleman intends to offer if consent is granted to consider the bill.

Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Administrator of the General Services Administration is authorized and directed to convey by quitclaim deed a parcel of land containing approximately forty one-hundredths acre, which has been declared surplus by the United States Coast Guard, to the city of Milwaukee, a municipal subdivision of the State of Wisconsin: *Provided*, That the city of Milwaukee remove and dispose of the buildings located on the said parcel of land without cost to the United States Government.

SEC. 2. The legal description of the land to be conveyed under this act is as follows:

(1) Beginning at United States Government monument number 307 on the north pier of the harbor entrance; running thence easterly along the extension of a line passing through United States Government monuments 305 and 307 on said north pier 12.00 feet to a point; thence north 2 degrees 43 minutes 21 seconds west 115.00 feet to a point; thence south 87 degrees 16 minutes 39 seconds west 110.00 feet to a point; thence south 2 degrees 43 minutes 21 seconds east 115.00 feet to a point on the line passing through the United States Government monuments numbers 305 and 307; thence north 87 degrees 16 minutes 39 seconds east along said line between monuments 98.00 feet, to the point of beginning, being a parcel of land in the north half fractional section 33, township 7 north, range 22 east, in the third ward of the city of Milwaukee, and containing about 0.29 of an acre; and

(2) Beginning at a point on the line passing through the United States Government monuments numbers 305 and 307 and distant 98.00 feet westerly from United States Government monument numbered 307; thence north 2 degrees 43 minutes 21 seconds west 32.70 feet to a point; thence south 87 degrees 16 minutes 39 seconds west 150.02 feet to a point; thence south 00 degrees 45 minutes 1 second east 32.72 feet to a point on the line passing through the United States Government monuments numbers 305 and 307; thence easterly along said line 151.11 feet to the point of beginning, being a parcel of land in the north half fractional section 33, township 7 north, range 22 east, in the third ward of the city of Milwaukee, and containing about 0.11 of an acre.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan: Strike out the period in line 2, page 2, and insert a colon and the following: "*Provided further*, That such conveyance heretofore referred to shall not be executed and delivered until the city of Milwaukee, through its proper legislative authority, declare that it will provide opportunity for water transportation from other ports in the United States and from foreign countries to enter, to discharge cargo, and take on cargo and depart from the harbor at Milwaukee."

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Michigan is recognized for 5 minutes in support of his amendment.

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that the amendment is not germane.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. It certainly is.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that the gentleman from Michigan was recognized before the point of order was raised.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman had not begun his remarks.

Will the gentleman from Wisconsin withhold his point of order so the gentleman from Michigan may explain the amendment?

Mr. REUSS. Yes, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Explain the amendment or the point of order? Am I recognized on the point of order?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Wisconsin has reserved the point of order. The Chair imagines the House would like the gentleman to explain his amendment.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, the amendment is very simple. It is offered in support of our present foreign policy as well as to protect civil rights.

As you may know, I have not been so enthusiastically in support of our foreign policy as advocated by our former Secretary of State, our present Secretary of State, as some others.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. That includes the present administration, I assume?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Insofar as the present administration and the Secretary of State follow Dean Acheson in giving away certain of our liberties, surrendering our national independence, if it should be the policy, my answer would be "Yes."

Now if I may get back to the explanation which the Speaker so kindly thought I should make to the Members. Inasmuch as we have spent billions upon billions of dollars in trying to win the friendship of other nations and other places, it seems to me that recent activities in connection with the port of Milwaukee should have some publicity, and that the port of Milwaukee should be open, not closed to our friends and allies abroad as well as to our own people from other States.

On April 14, 1954, the Kohler Co., near Sheboygan was struck by the UAW-CIO. That is Walter Reuther's outfit—the same Reuther who with tongue in check, not so long ago announced that he was a friend of the farmer. His principal lieutenant, the secretary-treasurer of that organization, Emil Mazey, who has been a professional organizer since 1933, has been over in Sheboygan directing the activities of the strikers under the supervision of Mr. Reuther. There have been some 500 instances of violation of the law. Mazey, as far as I know, although he has been involved in many and many a scene of violence and rioting, was convicted over there for the first time, something new, something amazing, something startling in labor circles—for seldom are the "brains" prosecuted or convicted. Usually it is just the poor misinformed, misguided picket—or innocent bystander who is nabbed and hauled off to jail. Then what happened? The plant continued operations and at a profit—and with local workers—and in spite of the failure of a mayor and a governor to protect the civil rights of the people of the city and State the pickets did not close the plant because they were not able to.

Then, just recently, 2 ships from abroad came over the Atlantic from our friends in Norway loaded with clay, which is absolutely necessary if the factory is to continue operations. They came over and 1 of them attempted to dock in Sheboygan, which is the lake port for the plant. It could not discharge the cargo because of the picket line and because the Socialist mayor would not give the people, who wanted to unload the ship, protection. Nor would the governor protect his own people while unloading. So that ship sailed away and it went to Milwaukee to the harbor where this land, which is owned by the United States, is located, and which is proposed to be given to the city of Milwaukee. What I am trying to do by this amendment is to make sure that the United States Government by making this gift to the city of Milwaukee, and putting this United States property under the control of the city of Milwaukee, must not by implication, lend support to this affront to Norway. Where is the State Department? What has it done to remedy this insult, this affront to Norway?

After the ship could not unload in Milwaukee, it went to Montreal. There it was unloaded. Then the cargo was put on freight cars and the railroad company attempted to send the clay down through the western side of Michigan via the Northwestern Railway. That is where I became interested. The union in Muskegon, still under the direction of Walter Reuther, a great patriot—or is he?—attempted to prevent those cars going through Muskegon on the railroad, the Pennsylvania system, on down thorugh the Fourth Congressional District. Well, they did not succeed. They finally moved the cars over to Sheboygan. I hope the gentleman from Texas, sitting in the front row here [Mr. PATMAN]—I hope you are getting this now—because while this has nothing to do with the Federal Reserve System, it does have something to do with our interstate and foreign commerce and the Federal Reserve will not be any good unless we can continue to carry on this intra and interstate commerce not only in this country between the States but with foreign governments. The cars got over again to Sheboygan and again the mayor failed to protect the railroad company in its effort to make delivery.

But more about Reuther, his lawlessness, and the harm he does the country, next week.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I have a motion to strike out the enacting clause. I thought I had the time to explain my amendment.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman was recognized for 5 minutes in support of his amendment.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I know, but I did not know there was that limitation of time.

The SPEAKER. Under the rules of the House, 5 minutes is the regular time.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Well, Mr. Speaker, I will not trespass on the time of the House.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. REUSS].

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, I renew the point of order on the ground that the amendment is not germane.

The SPEAKER. The amendment does apply to a different subject matter altogether and, therefore, the point of order is sustained.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Then, Mr. Speaker, I object to the bill.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman's objection comes too late.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. How is that, Mr. Speaker?

The SPEAKER. Because unanimous consent has already been obtained for the present consideration of the bill.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Then I will move to strike out the enacting clause.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Michigan may offer such a motion.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I offer a preferential motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan 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. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I assure you that if I had known a point of order would be made, I would have objected to consideration of the bill. The bill provides that the United States convey a small piece of land which is adjacent to the harbor in Milwaukee. The amendment provides that title shall not pass until city authorities open the harbor to domestic and foreign commerce. An amendment is germane when it is akin to or relevant to the subject matter of the bill—Speaker Carlisle, March 17, 1880, Cannon's Procedure, pages 196–201. With as much reason might it be said that an amendment that the city should not take title until it paid the purchase price was not germane. But I will try to get my point across. When the cars to which reference has been made got back in Sheboygan, the pickets went out on the city streets where the rails crossed the street and stopped the cars from going to the plant. Mind you, this was the cargo that came from Norway—think of it, from our friends, our international friends, our allies, if you please. A fine way to create and hold good will, friendship. Milwaukee would not let a ship from our friends discharge cargo of dirt-clay here in an American port. A fine way to promote foreign trade. Perhaps if the clay had been unloaded a cargo of dairy products might have been sold by Wisconsin farmers—or a shipload of Milwaukee beer. Now if they sent those ships over to Grand Rapids where my colleague from the Fifth District [Mr. FORD] lives, or to the port of Holland, or Ottawa, or over in my district, they would get it unloaded because over there we enforce the law, and if they sent it down to St. Joe or Benton Harbor, they would get it unloaded. When someone said to me: "Well, the factory is not there," my reply was, "They can move their factory, and we will give them protection from these

goon squads whether it is Walter Reuther, Mazey, or some Communist who directs the goon activities under the advice to the international officers."

Just recently due to the publicity which was given to this situation by the Chicago Tribune and the Milwaukee Journal, just recently, the Governor, whose name happens to be Kohler, but who has no financial interest in the Kohler firm, just recently he has said that if necessary he will call out the State troops to protect citizens and their property.

Now, it is a strange situation, is it not, when we have to call out State troops to promote international good will? But think, now, think of the situation where we not only with our billions of dollars but the services of our soldiers are trying to show to the other people of the world, trying to demonstrate to them our freedom and convince them we want them to be free; yet in Wisconsin they cannot unload their own cargoes, that our citizens are not free to handle the merchandise they send across the sea. What kind of capital do you suppose the Russians and the Communists will make out of that situation? Cite that situation as the lack of freedom here? Russia seeks foreign trade—we reject it—at the order of a union boss.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I yield.

Mr. LAIRD. The trouble we are having in Wisconsin has been stimulated from your State.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. The gentleman is right about that, Walter Reuther and Emil Mazey and our Governor, Mennen Williams, a Democratic Governor, who has refused the extradition of one of those goons, stands back of the Wisconsin goon squads.

Mr. LAIRD. Our Governor has shown very strong leadership in the past 2 weeks.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Just lately he has seen the handwriting on the wall; but our Democrat Governor, Mennen Williams, will not honor the request for the extradition of one of those goons whom he is harboring in Michigan, the city of refuge, not in the Fourth District, but over on the east side, which is the city of refuge for goon squads and racketeers.

Mr. HINSHAW. The gentleman spoke of the other world a moment ago. Is he speaking of one of these satellites 250 miles out of our orbit?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. That is a new way to spend money. I had not heard of that until yesterday. But if we follow our present trend the goons, the racketeers, the extortionists of labor will control whatever situation may arise.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Michigan to strike out the enacting clause.

The motion was rejected.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

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

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

1956 RICE ACREAGE ALLOTMENTS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 7367) to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

Mr. THOMPSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the amended Senate bill (S. 2511) to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 as amended, be substituted for the House bill.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 352 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, is amended by striking out the period at the end of the first sentence thereof and inserting ": *Provided, however*, That for 1956 no national acreage allotment shall be established which is less than 85 percent of the final allotment established for the immediately preceding year."

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

A motion to reconsider and a similar House bill (H. R. 7367) were laid on the table.

INSPECTION OF AGRICULTURAL COMMODITIES—PENALTY

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1757) to amend the act known as the Agricultural Marketing Act of 1946, approved August 14, 1946.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That subsection (h) of section 203 of the Agricultural Marketing Act of 1946 (7 U. S. C. 1622 (h)) is hereby amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sentence: "Whoever shall violate any provision of any regulation promulgated by the Secretary of Agriculture to govern the possession or use of certificates, memoranda, marks, or other identifications with respect to inspection, class, grade, quality, size, quantity, or condition, or devices for making such marks or identifications, issued, or authorized under this act, or falsely make, issue, alter, forge, or counterfeit any such certificate, memorandum, mark, identification, or device, or knowingly cause or procure, or aid, assist in, or be a party to, such violation, false making, issuing, altering, forging, or counterfeiting, or whoever knowingly shall possess without promptly notifying the Secretary of Agriculture or his representative, utter, publish, or use as true or cause to be uttered, published, or used as true any such false, altered, forged, or counterfeited certificate, memorandum, mark, identification, or device, or in any manner make any false or deceptive representation in connection with any United States standard or inspection, grading, or certification service issued or authorized under this act shall be fined not more than $1,000 or imprisoned not more than 1 year, or both.

SEC. 2. The farm produce inspection clause contained in various appropriation acts (7 U. S. C. 414) and the second, third, and fourth sentences of section 1 of the Produce Agency Act of March 3, 1927 (7 U. S. C. 492) are hereby repealed.

With the following committee amendment:

Beginning on page 1, line 6, after the colon, strike out the remainder of section 1 and insert the following: "Whoever knowingly shall falsely make, issue, alter, forge, or counterfeit any official certificate, memorandum, mark, or other identification, or device for making such mark or identification, with respect to inspection, class, grade, quality, size, quantity, or condition, issued or authorized under this section, or knowingly cause or procure, or aid, assist in, or be a party to, such false making, issuing, altering, forging, or counterfeiting, or whoever knowingly shall possess without promptly notifying the Secretary of Agriculture or his representative, utter, publish, or use as true, or cause to be uttered, published, or used as true, any such falsely made, altered, forged, or counterfeited official certificate, memorandum, mark, identification, or device, or whoever knowingly represents that an agricultural product has been officially inspected or graded (by an authorized inspector or grader) under the authority of this section when such commodity has in in fact not been so graded or inspected shall be fined not more than $1,000 or imprisoned not more than 1 year, or both."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CONVEYANCE TO LAKE COUNTY, CALIF., OF LOWER LAKE RANCHERIA

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 585) to authorize the conveyance to Lake County, Calif., of the Lower Lake Rancheria.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to sell to the county of Lake, Calif., for the purpose of establishing an airport, all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to real property described as south half northeast quarter, and lot 2, section 34, township 13 north, range 7 west, Mount Diablo meridian, containing 140.46 acres, known as the Lower Lake Rancheria, except for a 41-acre tract described in section 2. The deed shall be made from the Secretary of the Interior to the Lake County Board of Supervisors, and the purchase price shall be the fair market value of such property at the time of sale as determined by the Secretary of the Interior. The purchase price shall be placed in a special account in the Treasury known as the California Indians 4 percent judgment fund.

SEC. 2. The Secretary of the Interior is authorized and directed to issue a patent in fee or an unrestricted deed of conveyance to Harry Johnson for the following-described land, to wit: Beginning at a point on the east line of lot 2, of section 34, township 13 north, range 7 west, Mount Diablo base and meridian, that is north 48 degrees 21 minutes 45.5 seconds west, 2,561.46 feet from the southeast corner of section 34, said township and range; and from said point of beginning running thence north 48 degrees 17 minutes 30 seconds west, 1,714.81 feet to a point on

the west line of lot 2, of said section 34, that is north 48 degrees 19 minutes 42.2 seconds west, 5,141.47 feet from the southeast corner of said section 34; thence south, along the west line of lot 2 of said section 34 to the meander line of Clear Lake; thence southeasterly, along said meander line of Clear Lake, to the east line of lot 2, said section 34; and thence north, along the east line of lot 2, said section 34, to the point of beginning, containing 41 acres more or less.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 2, line 4, strike out the sentence: "The purchase price shall be placed in a special account in the Treasury known as the California Indians 4 percent judgment fund" and insert in lieu thereof the sentence: "The proceeds of the sale shall be deposited in the Treasury of the United States to the credit of the Indians of California in their 4 percent judgment fund established under section 6 of the act of May 18, 1928 (ch. 623, 45 Stat. 601, 603)."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

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

The title of the bill was amended to read:

A bill to authorize the conveyance to Lake County, Calif., of the Lower Lake Rancheria, and for other purposes.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CONVEYANCE TO STATE OF NORTH DAKOTA SITE OF ORIGINAL SITTING BULL BURIAL

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 7284) to provide for the conveyance to the State of North Dakota for use as a State historic site of the land where Chief Sitting Bull was originally buried.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill (S. 535) to provide for the conveyance to the State of North Dakota, for use as a State historic site, of the land where Chief Sitting Bull was originally buried, may be sustituted in lieu of the House bill.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior is authorized and directed to convey to the State of North Dakota for use as a State historic site all right, title, and interest, except as provided in section 2, of the United States and the Standing Rock Sioux Tribe of Indians to that parcel of land within the Standing Rock Reservation, N. Dak., which is the site where Chief Sitting Bull was originally buried and is more particularly described as follows: The southeast quarter of the southeast quarter of the southwest quarter of the southeast quarter, and the southwest quarter of the southwest quarter of the southeast quarter of the southeast quarter of section 12, township 130 north, range 80 west, fifth principal meridian, consisting of 5 acres more or less.

SEC. 2. The conveyance authorized by this act shall—

(a) exclude conveyance of any rights to oil, gas, or other mineral deposits in the land conveyed, but the development of any such mineral deposits, which would in any manner interfere with the use of such land as a State historic site, shall not be permitted so long as such land is so used; and

(b) be subject to the condition that in the event the land conveyed should cease to be used as a State historic site title to such land shall revert to the United States to be held in the same manner it was held prior to such conveyance.

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

A motion to reconsider and a similar House bill (H. R. 7284) were laid on the table.

TRANSFER OF TITLE TO CERTAIN LAND TO THE PUEBLO OF SAN LORENZO, NEW MEXICO

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6625) to provide for the transfer of title to certain land and the improvements thereon to the Pueblo of San Lorenzo (Pueblo of Picuris), in New Mexico, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior is authorized and directed to transfer by deed to the Pueblo of San Lorenzo (Pueblo of Picuris), in New Mexico, title to certain tracts of land, together with the improvements thereon, situate, lying, and being within the Pueblo of Picuris Grant heretofore confirmed to the said Pueblo of Picuris by the act of December 22, 1858 (11 Stat. 374), and situate in section 30, township 23 north, range 12 east, New Mexico principal meridian, within the county of Taos and State of New Mexico, and more particularly described as follows:

PARCEL NUMBERED 1

Beginning at the northwest corner of parcel numbered 4, hereinbelow described, which point is located north 23 degrees 30 minutes east, 119.8 feet from a United States Land Office stake marked No. 8, and north 51 degrees 7 minutes east, 1,733.7 feet from the west quarter corner of section 30, township 23 north, range 12 east, New Mexico principal meridian; thence north 22 degrees 00 minutes east 32 feet to a stake; thence south 75 degrees 00 minutes east 186 feet to a stake; thence south 65 degrees 00 minutes east 42 feet; thence south 29 degrees 00 minutes west 44 feet; thence north 67 degrees 00 minutes west 218 feet to the point of beginning, containing 0.19 acre more or less.

PARCEL NUMBERED 2

Beginning at a point in the north line of parcel numbered 1 which also marks the southeast corner of parcel numbered 3 and is located north 55 degrees 15 minutes east, 1,876.5 feet from the west quarter corner of section 30, township 23 north, range 12 east, New Mexico principal meridian; thence north 24 degrees 00 minutes east 62 feet to a stake; thence north 77 degrees 00 minutes east 63 feet to a stake; thence south 29 degrees 00 minutes west 99.5 feet; thence north 65 degrees 00 minutes west 42 feet to the point of beginning, containing 0.08 acre more or less.

PARCEL NUMBERED 3

Beginning at the northwest corner of parcel numbered 1 which point is located north 22 degrees 00 minutes east 32 feet from the northwest corner of parcel numbered 4 and north 50 degrees 38 minutes east 1,762.1 feet from the west quarter corner of section 30, township 23 north, range 12 east, New Mexico principal meridian; thence north 22 degrees 00 minutes east 157.8 feet; thence south 78 degrees 00 minutes east 255.5 feet; thence south 20 degrees 30 minutes west 91.8 feet; thence south 77 degrees 00 minutes west 63 feet to a stake; thence south 24 degrees 00 minutes west 62 feet to a stake; thence north 75 degrees 00 minutes west 186 feet to the point of beginning, containing 0.87 acre more or less.

PARCEL NUMBERED 4

Beginning at the southwest corner whence the northwest corner of section 30, township 23 north, range 12 east, New Mexico principal meridian, bears north 40 degrees 11 minutes west 2,012 feet; thence south 69 degrees 45 minutes east 228 feet to corner No. 2, which is the southeast corner; thence north 23 degrees 32 minutes east 120 feet to corner No. 3, which is the northeast corner; thence south 69 degrees 45 minutes west 228 feet to corner No. 4; thence south 23 degrees 32 minutes west 120 feet to corner No. 1, the place of beginning, containing 0.63 acre.

SEC. 2. Such deed shall vest in the said pueblo a title of the same nature and character as that which the said pueblo had before the United States acquired title to the premises and said land shall thereafter be subject to all the laws of the United States applicable to the lands of the said pueblo.

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.

AUTHORIZING SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR TO EXECUTE A CERTAIN CONTRACT WITH THE TOSTON IRRIGATION DISTRICT (MONTANA)

The Clerk called House Joint Resolution 353 to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to execute a certain contract with the Toston Irrigation District, Montana.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the joint resolution?

There was no objection.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that Senate Joint Resolution 82 be substituted in lieu of House Joint Resolution 353.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate joint resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the Senate joint resolution, as follows:

Whereas there have been constructed certain irrigation distribution and pumping works for the Crow Creek pumping unit, Montana, as a part of the Missouri River Basin project (58 Stat. 837, 891); and

Whereas said works were constructed, pursuant to special provisions contained in the Interior Department Appropriation Acts, 1949 and 1950, to furnish new lands with irrigation water in substitution for irrigated lands in Broadwater County, Mont., inundated by the operation of the Canyon Ferry Reservoir at a maximum normal pool elevation above 3,766 feet; and

Whereas the Toston Irrigation District has been organized under the laws of the State of Montana for the purpose of entering into contractual arrangements with the United States; and

Whereas the said district will probably be unable for some time to pay to the United States more than the cost of operating and maintaining said works, exclusive of charges for electrical pumping energy; and

Whereas the Congress expects said district to make every reasonable effort to expand its boundaries and otherwise to put itself in such financial shape that, upon the expiration of not more than 10 years, it can assume its proper obligations under the Federal reclamation laws (Act of June 17, 1902, 32 Stat. 388, and acts amendatory thereof or supplementary thereto): Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to execute a contract with Toston Irrigation District which provides, among other things, that—

(a) the district will pay to the United States each year the full cost to the Government of operating and maintaining the works of the Crow Creek pumping unit during that year, exclusive of the cost of electrical pumping energy, said payment to be made, as far as the cost can be forecast by the Secretary or his duly authorized delegate, in advance and in not more than two installments;

(b) the United States will deliver to the district, as far as conditions permit, water in sufficient quantity to furnish two acre-feet per irrigated acre, measured at the farm turnouts, for use on the irrigable lands of the district;

(c) the district will, in addition to the amounts specified under (a) above, pay to the United States such sums as may be required to cover the cost, including the cost of electrical pumping energy, of furnishing more than two acre-feet per irrigated acre as hereinbefore provided;

(d) the district acknowledges and will cause each landowner to whom water is delivered to acknowledge that the contract confers upon it and them no right to the continued operation and maintenance of said works beyond the period during which it is in force unless, prior to the expiration thereof, the district shall have entered into a long-term contract conforming to the provisions of the Federal reclamation laws and that no permanent right to the use of water arises, attaches to their lands, or is claimed to arise or attach to their lands by virtue of the delivery of water through said works or the application to their lands of such water;

(e) the district will comply fully with all provisions of the Federal reclamation laws which are not inconsistent with this act and the contract executed pursuant to the authority contained herein; and

(f) the contract shall, subject to the district's compliance with all of its terms and conditions, continue in force until December 31, 1955, and shall be renewed automatically for each of the nine succeeding calendar years unless either of the parties shall, on or before November 1 of any year, serve written notice of its intention that the contract shall not be renewed.

The Senate joint resolution was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

A similar House resolution (H. J. Res. 353) was laid on the table.

ENTRY AND LOCATION, ON DISCOVERY OF A VALUABLE SOURCE MATERIAL, UPON PUBLIC LANDS OF THE UNITED STATES

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6994) to provide for entry and location, on discovery of a valuable source material, upon public lands of the United States classified as or known to be valuable for coal, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, did I hear the term "valuable source material" used?

The SPEAKER. The Chair has not read all of this bill.

Mr. HINSHAW. Has this to do with uranium?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Yes; it does.

Mr. HINSHAW. Should it not be referred to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, it has to do with uranium. The bill was passed last year with an amendment. It has no place with the Atomic Energy Committee.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, subject to the conditions and provisions of this act and to any valid intervening rights acquired under the laws of the United States, public lands of the United States classified as or known to be valuable for coal subject to disposition under the mineral leasing laws and which are open to location and entry subject to the conditions and provisions of the act of August 13, 1954 (68 Stat. 708), unless embraced within a coal prospecting permit or lease, shall also be open to location and entry under the mining laws of the United States upon the discovery of a valuable source material occurring within any seam, bed, or deposit of lignite in such lands: *Provided*, That a copy of the notice of any mining location made for source material occurring in any such bed, seam, or deposit shall be filed for record in the land office of the Bureau of Land Management for the State in which the claim is situated within 90 days after the date of its location: *Provided further*, That the claimant to any such mining location shall report annually to the Mining Supervisor of the Geological Survey the amount of lignite mined or stripped in the recovery of such valuable source material during each calendar year and tender payment to him of 10 cents per ton thereon. Any mineral patents issued hereunder shall be made subject to the recording and payment requirements of this section and shall contain a reservation to the United States of all Leasing Act minerals owned by the United States other than lignite containing valuable source material and lignite necessary to be stripped or mined in the recovery of such material. Mining claims located and mineral patents issued under the provisions of this act shall not include rights to lignite not containing valuable source material except to the extent it may be necessary to mine or strip such lignite in order to mine the source material and, with respect to lode claims, shall not include extralateral rights. For all purposes of this act "source material" and "lignite" shall have the meanings given in section 5 of this act.

SEC. 2. Any mining claim located in a manner prescribed by the mining laws of the United States upon lands of the character described in section 1 of this act, prior to May 25, 1955, if based upon a discovery of valuable source material contained in lignite shall be effective to the same extent as if such lands at the time of location, and at all times thereafter, had not been classified as or known to be valuable for coal subject to disposition under the mineral leasing laws, subject, however, to the provisions of section 1 hereof: *Provided*, That no extralateral rights shall attach to any mining location validated under this section: *And provided further*, That the locator or locators of such a mining claim shall, not later than 180 days from and after the date of this act, post on the claim and file for record in the office where the notice or certificate of location is of record, an amended notice of the mining location stating that such amended notice is filed pursuant to the provisions of this act and for the purpose of obtaining the benefits thereof; and that a copy of said amended notice is, within the said 180-day period, filed in the land office of the Bureau of Land Management for the State in which the mining location is situated, and the mining locator thereafter complies with the requirements of this act.

SEC. 3. Any mining location under the mining laws of the United States, on lands of the character described in section 1 of this act, except locations made for lands within the exterior boundaries of a prior coal prospecting permit or lease, if based upon a discovery of valuable source material in deposits other than deposits of Leasing Act minerals, shall include the right to mine, remove, and dispose of lignite containing source material and lignite necessary to be stripped or mined in the recovery of such material, subject to the reporting and payment requirements of section 1 of this act, and subject to the provisions of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, and upon filing in the land office designated in section 1 hereof, an adequate description of his claim or claims containing such lignite.

SEC. 4. The entryman or owner of any land or the assignee of rights therein, including lands granted to States, with respect to which coal deposits have been reserved to the United States pursuant to the provisions of the act of March 3, 1909 (35 Stat. 844), or the act of June 22, 1910 (36 Stat. 583), excepting lands embraced within a coal prospecting permit or lease, who discovers valuable source material in lignite situated within such entered, granted, or patented lands, and who, except for the reservation of coal to the United States would have the right to mine and remove such source material, shall have the exclusive right to mine, remove, and dispose of the lignite containing such source material and lignite necessary to be stripped or mined in the recovery of such material, subject to the reporting and payment requirements of section 1 of this act, and subject to the provisions of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, upon filing in the land office designated in section 1 hereof, an adequate description sufficient to identify the land containing such lignite.

SEC. 5. The holders of coal leases issued under the provision of the mineral leasing laws, prior to the date of this act, or thereafter if based upon a prospecting permit issued prior to that date, who shall discover during the term of such lease, valuable source material in any coal bed, or deposit situated within the leased lands, shall have the exclusive right to locate such source material under the provisions of this act but the mining of such source material shall be subject to the operating provisions of the lease.

SEC. 6. As used in this act "mineral leasing laws" shall mean the act of October 20, 1914 (38 Stat. 741); the act of February 25, 1920 (41 Stat. 437); the act of April 17, 1926 (44 Stat. 301); the act of February 7, 1927 (44 Stat. 1057); and all acts heretofore or hereafter enacted which are amendatory of or supplementary to any of the foregoing acts; "Leasing Act minerals" shall mean all minerals which, upon the effective date of this act, are provided in the mineral leasing laws to be disposed of thereunder; "lignite" shall mean coal classified at ASTM designation: D 388–38, according to the standards established in the American Society for Testing Materials on Coal and Coke under standard specifications for Classification of Coals by Rank, contained in public land deposits considered as valuable under the coal land classification standards established by the Secre-

tary of the Interior and prescribed in section 30, Code of Federal Regulations, part 201; and "source material" shall mean uranium, thorium, or any other material which is determined by the Atomic Energy Commission pursuant to the provisions of section 61 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 to be source material.

SEC. 7. All moneys received under the provisions of this act shall be paid into the Treasury of the United States and distributed in the same manner as provided in section 35 of the Mineral Leasing Act of 1920, as amended, and section 9 of the Alaska Coal Act of October 20, 1914 (38 Stat. 741).

SEC. 8. The Secretary of the Interior is authorized to issue such rules and regulations as may be necessary or appropriate to effectuate the purposes of this act.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 3, line 3, strike the words "section 5" and insert in lieu thereof the words "section 6."

Page 4, line 4, following the word "location", insert the word "made."

Page 4, line 5, following the words "United States", insert the words ", including the Act of August 13, 1954 (68 Stat. 708)."

Page 4, line 11, following the word "containing", insert the word "valuable."

Page 4, line 12, strike the words "such material" and insert in lieu thereof the words "source material contained in lignite."

Page 4, line 15, following the words "Act of 1954", insert the statutory citation "(68 Stat. 919)."

Page 4, line 17, change the period to a colon and add the following language: "*Provided*, That nothing in this section shall be construed to limit or restrict the rights acquired by virtue of a mining claim, heretofore or hereafter located, under the said mining laws or to impose any additional obligation with respect to the mining and removal of source material which does not occur within any seam, bed, or deposit of lignite."

Page 4, line 24, strike the words "who discovers" and insert in lieu thereof the words "upon the discovery of."

Page 5, line 1, strike the word "and."

Page 5, line 13, following the word "laws" insert the words ", including the Act of August 7, 1947 (61 Stat. 913)."

Page 5, line 15, strike the words "who shall discover" and insert in lieu thereof the words "upon the discovery."

Page 5, line 16, following the word "lease", insert the word "of;" strike the word "coal" and insert in lieu thereof the word "seam."

Page 5, line 17, following the word "deposit", insert the words "of lignite."

Page 5, line 19, following the word "mining" insert the words "and disposal."

Page 5, line 20, strike the period and insert the following language: "and to the provisions of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954: *Provided*, That the provisions of this section shall not apply to coal prospecting permits or leases on lands embraced within entered, granted, or patented lands described in section 4 of this act."

Page 6, following line 25, add a new section as follows:

"SEC. 9. Nothing in this act shall be deemed to amend or repeal any provisions of the act of August 13, 1954 (68 Stat. 708) nor any right granted thereunder."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BERRY: Following section 8 on page 6, line 25, add two new sections, as follows:

"SEC. 9. Nothing in this act shall be deemed to amend or repeal any provisions of the act of August 13, 1954 (68 Stat. 708), or any right granted thereunder.

"SEC. 10. Twenty years after the effective date of this act, all lands subject to the provisions of section 1 shall be withdrawn from all forms of entry under this act. All claims made pursuant to the provisions of this act shall expire at that time, except for (1) claims for which patent has already been issued, and (2) claims on which application for patent has already been made and on which patent is subsequently issued: *Provided*, That, if the President shall so provide by Executive order, the provisions of this section shall not become effective until 30 years after the effective date of this act."

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENDING THE EXTERIOR BOUNDARY OF THE UINTAH AND OURAY INDIAN RESERVATION, UTAH

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 7248) to amend the act extending the exterior boundary of the Uintah and Ouray Indian Reservation in the State of Utah so as to authorize such State to exchange certain mineral lands for other lands mineral in character.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill S. 878, be substituted for the House bill, H. R. 7248.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the Senate bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 3 of the act entitled "An act to define the exterior boundary of the Uintah and Ouray Indian Reservation in the State of Utah, and for other purposes," approved March 11, 1948 (62 Stat. 72), is amended by striking out the first sentence of such section and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "The State of Utah may relinquish to the United States for the benefit of the Indians of the said Ute Reservation such tracts of school or other State-owned lands, surveyed or unsurveyed, within the said reserved area, as it may see fit (reserving to said State, if it so desires, such rights as it may possess to any minerals underlying such State lands as may be relinquished), and said State shall have the right to make selections, including mineral lands and the minerals therein (including oil and gas) if the lands relinquished are mineral in character and rights to the minerals in such lands are relinquished along with the lands, in lieu thereof outside of the area hereby withdrawn, equal in value, as determined by the Secretary of the Interior, to the lands relinquished, from the vacant, unappropriated public lands, within the State of Utah, such lieu selections to be made in the manner provided in the enabling act pertaining to said State, except as to the payment of fees or commissions, which are hereby waived. Valid rights and claims of individuals initiated under Federal law with respect to any lands so selected and prior to such selection shall not be affected by such selection."

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

A similar House bill (H. R. 7248) was laid on the table.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RESTRICTIVE COVENANT ON LAND PATENT NO. 10,410

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6824) to authorize the amendment of the restrictive covenant on land patent numbered 10,410, issued to Keoshi Matsunaga, his heirs or assigns, on July 20, 1936, and covering lot 48 of Ponahawai house lots, situated in the country of Hawaii, Territory of Hawaii.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the commissioner of public lands of the Territory of Hawaii, with the consent of the Governor of said Territory of Hawaii, be authorized to amend the restrictive covenant set forth in land patent numbered 10,410, so that said restrictive covenant will read as follows:

"The land herein described and conveyed is granted and conveyed upon the covenant running with the land, that said land is to be used for religious and/or school purposes only, and in the event of its being used for other than religious and/or school purposes, this patent shall become void, and the whole of said land, together with the fee thereof, and the improvements thereon, shall, without warrant or other legal process, immediately revert to and revest in the Territory of Hawaii."

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

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.

AMENDING SECTION 73 (I) OF THE HAWAIIAN ORGANIC ACT

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6461) to amend section 73 (i) of the Hawaiian Organic Act.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 73 (1) of the Hawaiian Organic Act is hereby amended by adding the following paragraph thereto:

"The Commissioner may include in any patent, agreement, or lease a condition requiring the inclusion of the land in any irrigation project formed or to be formed by the Territorial agency responsible therefor and making the land subject to assessments made or to be made for such irrigation project, which assessment shall be a first charge against the land. For failure to pay the assessments or other breach of the condition the land may be forfeited and sold pursuant to the provisions of this act, and, when sold, so much of the proceeds of sale as are necessary therefor may be used to pay any unpaid assessments."

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

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.

REPEAL CLAUSE (D) OF PROVISO IN ACT OF AUGUST 2, 1937

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5169) to repeal clause (d) of the proviso contained in the act of August 2, 1937, as amended, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to have some explanation of the fiscal effect of this bill.

Mr. DEMPSEY. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, I will say to the gentleman that there is no fiscal effect. A provision was put in the basic law which provided that in order not to have speculation in the land any acreage sold above the appraised value would revert. The project since then has been developed by 160-acre tracts. The tracts are of different value predicated upon what the farmers put in there, and what was of value to the project is now a detriment, and the Department desires to have it removed, as do the farmers, because of the cost.

Mr. FORD. It is my understanding by the terms of this bill the landowners would be released from the current obligations to make regular payments under the conditions set forth in the contract with the Federal Government. It would seem to me that if we approve this provision, it would set back the Government's recovery rate under its original contract with the landowners. If so, what is the justification for it?

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, reading from the bottom of page 3 of the report, it says:

> As reappraisal requests have declined in number, it has become increasingly difficult to hold such requests to accumulate a full day's work for the appraisal board. The resulting increase in the prorated cost of individual appraisals is thus approaching the total cost of a single day's work. This in turn has given rise to justifiable complaints from landowners that the cost of reappraisal is out of proportion or that prospective sales are lost through delays.

In other words, what is happening there, the period for which this provision in the law was placed has expired, and it is costing the Department more money to administer the provision than it is saving the Department in prospective values that they may secure.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I concur in that statement. I raised the same question with the gentleman from New Mexico, and after I discussed it with him and the representatives of the Department, they assured me that this bill will save the Government money. In other words, the expenses of the appraisal are far in excess of the actual cost.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that a similar Senate bill, S. 1965, be considered in lieu of the House bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the proviso in the act entitled "An act to authorize the construction of a Federal reclamation project to furnish a water supply for the lands of the Arch Hurley Conservancy District in New Mexico," approved August 2, 1937, as amended (43 U. S. C., sec. 600a), is amended by striking out the semicolon and the word "and" at the end of clause (c) and by striking out all of clause (d) to the period. No provision with respect to the matters covered in said clause (d) which is contained in any contract entered into prior to the date of enactment of this act shall, except as is otherwise provided by this act, be enforced by the United States. Nothing contained in this section shall affect (1) the retention and application by the United States of any payments which have been made prior to the date of enactment of this act in accordance with any such provision of a contract, (2) the obligation of any party to the United States with respect to any payment which is due to the United States under any such provision but not paid upon the date of enactment of this act, and the application by the United States of any such payment in accordance with the terms of such contract, or (3) the enforcement of any such obligation by refusal to deliver water to lands covered by contractual provisions executed in accordance with said clause (d), except in those cases, if any, in which a sale or transfer consummated between December 27, 1938, and the date of enactment of this act is only discovered after such date of enactment to have been made contrary to such contractual provisions or to said clause (d).

SEC. 2. The Secretary of the Interior is authorized to amend any contract, which has been entered into prior to the date of enactment of this act, to conform with the provisions of the first section of this act. The consent of the United States is hereby given to the recording, at the expense of the party benefited thereby, of any such amended contract and to the simultaneous discharge of record of the original contract. The consent of the United States is likewise given to the discharge of record, at the expense of the party benefited thereby, of any contract which the Secretary of the Interior or his duly authorized agent finds is rendered nugatory by the enactment of this act.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

A similar bill, H. R. 5169, was laid on the table.

INDIAN CLAIMS COMMISSION

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5566) to terminate the existence of the Indian Claims Commission.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 23 of the Indian Claims Commission Act approved August 13, 1946 (60 Stat. 1049), is hereby amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 23. The existence of the Commission shall terminate at the end of 5 years from and after April 10, 1957, or at such earlier time as the Commission shall have made its final report to the Congress on all claims filed with it. Upon its dissolution the records of the Commission shall be delivered to the Archivist of the United States."

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 4, strike out "(60 Stat. 1049)" and insert "(60 Stat. 1049, 1055; 25 U. S. C., sec. 70v)."

Page 2, line 3, insert:

"SEC. 2. Section 13 of the act approved August 13, 1946 (60 Stat. 1049, 1052; 25 U. S. C., sec. 701), is hereby amended by adding the following new subsection:

"'(c) Attorneys appointed pursuant to subsection (b) hereof, may conduct hearings, administer oaths, examine witnesses, receive evidence and report findings of fact and recommendations for conclusions of law in cases assigned to them. Such attorneys shall not, by virtue of such duties, be subject to the Administrative Procedure Act.'"

The committee amendments were agreed to.

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

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to terminate the existence of the Indian Claims Commission, and for other purposes."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REVISED LAWS OF HAWAII

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6463) to ratify and confirm section 4539, Revised Laws of Hawaii 1945, section 1 (b), act 12, Session Laws of Hawaii 1951, and the sales of public lands consummated pursuant to the terms of said statutes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 4539, Revised Laws of Hawaii 1945, is hereby ratified and confirmed.

SEC. 2. Section 1 (b), act 12, Session Laws of Hawaii 1951, is hereby ratified and confirmed.

SEC. 3. All sales of public lands to abutting landowners consummated pursuant to the terms of the foregoing statutes are hereby ratified and confirmed and shall be deemed and held to be perfect and valid as of the date of the sales.

SEC. 4. This act shall take effect on and after the date of its approval.

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.

AMENDMENT OF CERTAIN PATENTS OF GOVERNMENT LANDS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6807) to authorize the amendment of certain patents of Government lands containing restrictions as to use of such lands in the Territory of Hawaii.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Commissioner of Public Lands of the Territory of Hawaii, with the concurrence of the Governor of said Territory, be authorized to amend certain land patents by removing the conditions therein restricting the use of such lands for residence or eleemosynary purposes, so that the lands will be free of any such encum-

brances: *Provided, however,* That no such restriction shall be removed in patents conveying an area in excess of one-half acre: *And provided further,* That in the opinion of the commissioner the surrounding area in which such lands are located has sufficiently changed to warrant such action.

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.

AMEND ACT OF MAY 19, 1947 (CH. 80, 61 STAT. 102)

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6945) to amend the act of May 19, 1947 (ch. 80, 61 Stat. 102), as amended, so as to permit per capita payments to the individual members of the Shoshone Tribe and the Arapahoe Tribe of the Wind River Reservation in Wyoming, to be made quarterly.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that a similar Senate bill, S. 2087, be considered in lieu of the House bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the Senate bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 3 of the act entitled "An act to authorize the segregation and expenditure of trust funds held in joint ownership by the Shoshone and Arapahoe Tribes of the Wind River Reservation," approved May 19, 1947 (ch. 80, 61 Stat. 102), as amended, is hereby amended by striking the words "and the first day of March" wherever it appears therein, and inserting in lieu thereof "the first day of December, the first day of March, and the first day of June". The additional administrative costs of any annual distribution in more than two installments shall be borne by the tribe.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. ASPINALL moves to strike out all after the enacting clause of S. 2087 and insert the provisions of H. R. 6945 as passed.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

A similar House bill, H. R. 6945, was laid on the table.

RENEWAL AND ADJUSTMENT OF DEEPWATER MAIL CONTRACTS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4569) to provide for renewal of and adjustment of compensation under contracts for carrying mail on water routes.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the last two paragraphs of section 3951 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (39 U. S. C. 434), are amended by striking out the word "inland" wherever it appears in such paragraphs.

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.

CONVERSION OF INDEFINITE APPOINTMENT TO CAREER-CONDITIONAL OR CAREER APPOINTMENT

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1849) to provide for the grant of career-conditional and career appointments in the competitive civil service to indefinite employees who previously qualified for competitive appointment.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, may I inquire if the Senate bill would be substantially broadened by any amendment?

Mr. ALEXANDER. That is correct.

Mr. PELLY. 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 Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, I strongly support this legislation to give career status to an estimated 50,000 indefinite Federal employees who have at least 3 years of satisfactory service. I believe I was the first Member of Congress to introduce a bill to correct the unjust situation in which so many loyal and faithful Government employees found themselves through no fault of their own.

I appeared before the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee and urged that the provisions of my bill be substituted for language in another bill which had been passed by the other body. Substantially, this measure represents what I had in mind and recommended.

Therefore, in urging its passage, I likewise commend the committee for recognizing the pressing need of correcting inequities resulting from Executive Order 10577.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, would the author of the bill or someone on the committee explain to the House the purpose of this bill; the necessity for it?

Mr. ALEXANDER. The purpose of the bill is this. Due to Executive Order No. 10577, about 455,000 Federal employees serving under indefinite or temporary appointments were brought under career status and about 80,000 others were left out. According to the testimony of the Civil Service Commission, inequities were caused due to the fact that by written instructions—some of them from the Civil Service Commission—many of these people who were left out had not applied to take a competitive examination. Due to this and certain other causes they were denied eligibility for career status and have continued to serve under temporary or indefinite appointments, although most employees in their category have been granted career status under the Executive order.

In order to correct this and to equalize the effect of the Executive order among all Federal employees, the Commission recommended that, if it were changed, it be broadened in order to take care of all of these employees on a fair basis and eliminate the inequities.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORD. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. The purpose of this is to rectify a situation brought about unintentionally, with discriminatory results to a number of Federal employees. I hope the bill will pass by unanimous consent. It is on the suspension list for today but if we can pass it by unanimous consent it would be advantageous.

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORD. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CEDERBERG. I wholeheartedly concur in the remarks of the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. ALEXANDER]. This legislation will take care of certain people who through no fault of their own find themselves in the situation which the gentleman has so ably described.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, each employee (a) who on the effective date of this act is serving under an indefinite appointment in a position in the competitive civil service other than a position whose salary rate is fixed by the act of July 6, 1945 (59 Stat. 435), as amended, and was so serving on January 23, 1955, and (b) who between June 30, 1950, and January 23, 1955, was certified and within reach for consideration for indefinite appointment from a competitive civil-service register appropriate for filling a position in which he served between such dates shall have his indefinite appointment converted as of the effective date of this act to a career conditional appointment, or a career appointment, as determined appropriate under the civil-service regulations applied in conversions under section 201 of Executive Order 10577 of November 22, 1954.

SEC. 2. Each individual who between January 23, 1955, and the effective date of this act was separated from the service without cause and who otherwise would have been eligible for conversion under section 1 of this act shall be eligible for reinstatement within 2 years of the effective date of this act, under career conditional or career appointment in the competitive civil service in a position for which qualified.

SEC. 3. The United States Civil Service Commission is authorized and directed to promulgate regulations for the administration and enforcement of this act.

SEC. 4. This act shall take effect 90 days from the date of enactment.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike all after the enacting clause and insert the language printed in italics in the reported bill.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the objectors' committee on the Consent Calendar under which S. 1849 comes to the floor of the House, I rise to support this bill and ask the

House to pass it today. This is meritorious legislation. It corrects some gross inequities for many Federal employees which occurred through the promulgation of Executive Order 10577. That order established a career and career-conditional system for Government civil service employees. In my opinion, this recommendation of the Civil Service Commission was needed to strengthen civil service and to protect the faithful employee who could not be given permanent status despite 3 years or more of service.

The employees who have suffered due to the inequities established by Executive Order 10577 are those who either passed a qualifying civil-service examination and were not referred for appointment, or did not take a civil-service examination due to the fact that they were discouraged from doing so either by the Civil Service Commission or by the agency concerned. Others failed to take examinations because such examinations would be of no avail since appointments were restricted to indefinite status and could not be converted to any permanency. The adoption of this legislation would go a long way in correcting these injustices.

Mr. Speaker, I have been particularly concerned with the matter now before us. It was one to which I directed my attention when the Civil Service Commission appeared before the Appropriations Subcommittee on Independent Offices. At that time, I suggested qualifying or noncompetitive examinations for those with 3 years of satisfactory service who were declared ineligible for status because their names were not taken from a civil service roster. This bill meets those suggestions and I congratulate the Post Office and Civil Service Committees of both the House and Senate in recognizing the equity and fairness of this bill.

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

The title was amended to read: "An act to provide for the granting of career-conditional and career appointments to certain qualified employees."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION SERVICE APPROPRIATIONS FOR LOW-INCOME FARMERS' PROGRAM

The Clerk called the bill (S. 2098) to amend Public Law 83, 83d Congress.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Seaker, reserving the right to object, will someone who knows answer a question with regard to this bill? I would like to know the approximate cost of it.

Mr. DIXON. The approximate cost is $925,000 for the year.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. I withdraw my reservation of objection, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Smith-Lever Act, as amended (7 U. S. C. 341 and the following, supp. 1), is further amended as follows:

(a) By adding a new section, following section 7, to read as follows:

"SEC. 8. In order to further the purposes of section 2 in agricultural areas which, because of special circumstances affecting such areas, are at a disadvantage insofar as agricultural development is concerned, and to encourage complementary development essential to the welfare of such areas, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as the Congress from time to time shall determine to be necessary for payments to the States, Alaska, Hawaii, and Puerto Rico on the basis of special needs in such areas as determined by the Secretary of Agriculture. Sums appropriated in pursuance of this section shall be in addition to, and not in substitution for, appropriations, otherwise available under this act."

(b) By renumbering section 8 to read section 9.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

"That the Smith-Lever Act, as amended (7 U. S. C. 341 and the following, supp. 1), is further amended as follows:

"(a) By adding a new section, following section 7, to read as follows:

"'SEC. 8. (a) The Congress finds that there exist special circumstances in certain agricultural areas which cause such areas to be at a disadvantage insofar as agricultural development is concerned, which circumstances include the following: (1) There is concentration of farm families on farms either too small or too unproductive or both; (2) such farm operators because of limited productivity are unable to make adjustments and investments required to establish profitable operations; (3) the productive capacity of the existing farm unit does not permit profitable employment of available labor; (4) because of limited resources, many of these farm families are not able to make full use of current extension programs designed for families operating economic units nor are extension facilities adequate to provide the assistance needed to produce desirable results.

"'(b) In order to further the purposes of section 2 in such areas and to encourage complementary development essential to the welfare of such areas, there are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as the Congress from time to time shall determine to be necessary for payments to the States, Alaska, Hawaii, and Puerto Rico on the basis of special needs in such areas as determined by the Secretary of Agriculture.

"'(c) In determining that the area has such special need, the Secretary shall find that it has a substantial number of disadvantaged farms or farm families for one or more of the reasons heretofore enumerated. The Secretary shall make provisions for the assistance to be extended to include one or more of the following: (1) Intensive on-the-farm educational assistance to the farm family in appraising and resolving its problems; (2) assistance and counseling to local groups in appraising resources for capability of improvement in agriculture or introduction of industry designed to supplement farm income; (3) cooperation with other agencies and groups in furnishing all possible information as to existing employment opportunities, particularly to farm families having underemployed workers; and (4) in cases where the farm family, after analysis of its opportunities and existing resources, finds it advisable to seek a new farming venture, the providing of information, advice, and counsel in connection with making such change.

"'(d) No more than 10 percent of the sums available under this section shall be allotted to any one State. The Secretary shall use project proposals and plans of work submitted by the State extension directors as a basis for determining the allocation of funds appropriated pursuant to this section.

"'(e) Sums appropriated pursuant to this section shall be in addition to, and not in substitution for, appropriations otherwise available under this act. The amounts authorized to be appropriated pursuant to this section shall not exceed a sum in any year equal to 10 percent of sums otherwise appropriated pursuant to this act.'

"(b) By renumbering section 8 to read section 9."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CUSTODIAL EMPLOYEES IN POST OFFICE BUILDINGS

The Clerk called the bill (S. 2403) to authorize the dual employment of custodial employees in post office buildings operated by the General Services Administration, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Postmaster General, with the consent of the Administrator of General Services, may appoint custodial employees working under the jurisdiction of the General Services Administration at Federal buildings occupied in any part by the postal service to positions in the postal service to perform postal duties in addition to their regular duties as such custodial employees, without regard to section 2 of the act of July 31, 1894, as amended (U. S. C., title 5, sec. 62).

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TERMINATING THE PROHIBITION AGAINST MONGOLIAN LABOR ON RECLAMATION PROJECTS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1603) to terminate the prohibition against employment of Mongolian labor in the construction of reclamation projects.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 4 of the Reclamation Act of June 17, 1902 (32 Stat. 389), is hereby amended by inserting a period in lieu of the comma after the word "work" in the proviso of that section and striking out the following language: "and no Mongolian labor shall be employed thereon.".

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.

SERVICEMEN'S READJUSTMENT ACT OF 1944

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1761) to relieve certain veterans who relied on an erroneous interpretation of the law from liability to repay a portion of the subsistence allowances which they received under the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. FORD. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I simply want to state for the RECORD, and I am not asking anyone to draw any inferences from this statement, that the official objectors have not had an opportunity to study any of the remainder of the bills on the Consent Calendar.

The SPEAKER. This is the last bill that is going to be called today on the Consent Calendar.

Mr. FORD. I have no objection to the procedure, but I wanted to make that statement.

The SPEAKER. The trouble about it is that we do not have the bills here on the desk.

Mr. FORD. I withdraw my reservation of objection, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That every individual who, while attending the University of California or Standford University prior to January 1, 1951, was employed by the Veterans' Administraton as a clinical psychologist trainee, and who, in reliance upon interpretations of paragraph 6 of part VIII of Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a) that work performed in excess of 20 hours per week was to be considered as irregular and nonscheduled overtime, did not report to the Veterans' Administration income derived from work performed for the Veterans' Administration in excess of 20 hours per week, is hereby relieved from liability to repay to the United States all sums for which he has been held liable arising out of such work performed for the Veterans' Administration. In the audit and settlement of the accounts of any certifying or disbursing officer of the United States, full credit shall be given for any amount for which liability is relieved by this section.

SEC. 2. The Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to each of the individuals described in the first section of this act an amount equal to the sum of all amounts which he has repaid to the United States (or which have been withheld by the United States from amounts otherwise payable to him, or for his benefit) by reason of the liability of which he is relieved by the first section of this act: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act for the payment of any one claim in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with such claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

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.

ATOMIC ENERGY COMMUNITY ACT OF 1955

Mr. DEMPSEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 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.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Mexico?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That this act may be cited as the "Atomic Energy Community Act of 1955."

CHAPTER 1. DECLARATION, FINDINGS, AND PURPOSE

Sec. 11. Declarations of policy.
Sec. 12. Findings.
Sec. 13. Purpose.

CHAPTER 2. DEFINITIONS

Sec. 21. Definitions.

CHAPTER 3. LOTS, APPRAISALS, AND PRICE

Sec. 31. Lots.
Sec. 32. Appraisals.
Sec. 33. Basis of appraisal.
Sec. 34. Posting.
Sec. 35. Sales prices.
Sec. 36. Improvements.

CHAPTER 4. CLASSIFICATION OF PROPERTY AND PRIORITIES

Sec. 41. Classification of property.
Sec. 42. Priorities.
Sec. 43. Transferability.

CHAPTER 5: SALES OF PROPERTY FOR PRIVATE USE

Sec. 51. Application.
Sec. 52. Disposal of property.
Sec. 53. Sales.
Sec. 54. Cash sales.
Sec. 55. Form and provisions of instruments.
Sec. 56. Occupancy by existing tenants.
Sec. 57. Lots.

CHAPTER 6. FINANCING

Sec. 61. Contract purchase.
Sec. 62. Commission financing.
Sec. 53. Commission indemnity.
Sec. 64. Community employment and population.
Sec. 65. Amount of indemnity.
Sec. 66. Conditions of indemnity.

CHAPTER 7. UTILITIES

Sec. 71. Authorization to transfer utilities.
Sec. 72. Date of transfer.
Sec. 73. Entity receiving transfer.
Sec. 74. Utilities transferable.
Sec. 75. Charges for utilities transferred.

CHAPTER 8. MUNICIPALITIES

Sec. 81. Assistance in organization.
Sec. 82. Authorization to transfer municipal installations.
Sec. 83. Date of transfer.
Sec. 84. Entity receiving transfer.
Sec. 85. Installations transferable.
Sec. 86. Charges for municipal installations transferred.

CHAPTER 9. LOCAL ASSISTANCE

Sec. 91. Basis of assistance to cities and other State and local entities.
Sec. 92. Commission reductions.
Sec. 93. Area of service.
Sec. 94. Commission contracts.

CHAPTER 10. TRANSFER OF FUNCTIONS, AND REVIEW

Sec. 101. Transfer of functions.
Sec. 102. Review.
Sec. 103. Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

CHAPTER 11. GENERAL PROVISIONS

Sec. 111. Powers of the Commission.
Sec. 112. Qualification to purchase.
Sec. 113. Contract forms.
Sec. 114. Evidence.
Sec. 115. Administrative review.
Sec. 116. Repossession.
Sec. 117. Net proceeds.
Sec. 118. Appropriations.
Sec. 119. Separability of provisions.
Sec. 201. Amendment to National Housing Act.
Sec. 202. Amendment to Public Law 874.

CHAPTER 1. DECLARATION, FINDINGS, AND PURPOSE

SEC. 11. Declaration of policy: It is hereby declared to be the policy of the United States of America that Government ownership and management of the communities owned by the Atomic Energy Commission shall be terminated in an expeditious manner which is consistent with and will not impede the accomplishment of the purposes and programs established by the Atomic Energy Act of 1954. To that end, it is desired at each community to—

a. facilitate the establishment of local self-government;

b. provide for the orderly transfer to local entities of municipal functions, municipal installations, and utilities; and

c. provide for the orderly sale to private purchasers of property within those communities with a minimum of dislocation.

SEC. 12. Findings: The Congress of the United States hereby makes the following findings concerning the communities owned by the Atomic Energy Commission;

a. The continued morale of project-connected persons is essential to the common defense and security of the United States.

b. In issuing rules and regulations required or permitted under this act for the disposal of the communities and in disposing of the communities in accordance with the provisions of this act and in accordance with the rules and regulations required or permitted by this act, the Commission is acting under authority delegated to it by the Congress.

c. Funds of the United States may be provided for the disposal of the communities and for assistance in the operation of the communities thereafter under conditions which will provide for the common defense and promote the general welfare.

SEC. 13. Purpose: It is the purpose of this act to effectuate the policies set forth above by providing for:

a. the maintenance of conditions which will not impede the recruitment and retention of personnel essential to the atomic energy program;

b. the obligation of the United States to contribute to the support of municipal functions in a manner commensurate with—

(1) the fiscal problems peculiar to the communities by reason of their construction as national defense installations, and

(2) the municipal and other burdens imposed on the governmental or other entities at the communities by the United States in its operations at or near the communities;

c. the opportunity for the residents of the communities to assume the obligations and privileges of local self-government; and

d. the encouragement of the construction of new homes at the communities.

CHAPTER 2. DEFINITIONS

SEC. 21. Definitions: The intent of Congress in the definitions as given in this section should be construed from the words or phrases used in the definitions. As used in this act—

a. The term "Commission" means the Atomic Energy Commission.

b. The term "community" means that area at—

(1) Oak Ridge, Tenn., designated on a map on file at the principal office of the Commission, entitled "Minimum Geographic Area, Oak Ridge, Tenn.," bearing the legend "Boundary Line, Minimum Geographic Area, Oak Ridge, Tenn.," and market "Approved, 21 April 1955, K. V. Nichols, General Manager"; or

(2) Richland, Wash., designated on a map on file at the principal office of the Commission, entitled "Minimum Geographic Area, Richland, Wash.," bearing the legend "Boundary Line, Minimum Geographic Area,

Richland, Wash.," and marked "Approved, 21 April 1955, K. D. Nichols, General Manager."

c. The term "house" includes the lot on which the house stands.

d. The term "member of a family" means any person who, on the first offering date, resides in the same dwelling unit with one or more of the following relatives (including those having the same relationship through marriage or legal adoption): spouse, father, mother, grandfather, grandmother, brother, sister, son, daughter, uncle, aunt, nephew, niece, or first cousin.

e. The term "mortgage" shall include deeds of trust and such other classes of lien as are given to secure advances on, or the unpaid purchase price of real estate under the laws of the State in which the real estate is located.

f. The term "municipal installation" includes, without limitation, schools, hospitals, police and fire protection systems, sewerage and refuse disposal plants, water supply and distribution installations, streets and roads, libraries, parks, playgrounds and recreational means, municipal government buildings, other properties suitable for municipal or comparable local public service purposes, and any fixtures, equipment, or other property appropriate to the operation, maintenance or repair of the foregoing.

g. The term "occupant" means a person who, on the date on which the property in question is first offered for sale, is entitled to residential occupancy of the Government-owned house in question, or of a family dwelling unit in such house, in accordance with a lease or license agreement with the Commission or its property-management contractor.

h. The term "offering date" means the date the property in question is offered for sale.

i. The term "project area" means that area which on the effective date of this act constitutes the Federal area at Oak Ridge, Tenn., or Hanford, Wash.

j. The term "project-connected person" means any person who, on the first offering date, is regularly employed at the project area in one of the following capacities:

(1) An officer or employee of the Commission or any of its contractors or subcontractors, or of the United States or any agency thereof (including members of the Armed Forces), or of a State or political subdivision or agency thereof;

(2) An officer or employee employed at a school or hospital located in the project area;

(3) A person engaged in or employed in the project area by any professional, commercial, or industrial enterprise occupying premises located in the project area; or

(4) An officer or employee of any church or nonprofit organization occupying premises located in the project area.

k. The term "resident" means any person who, on the date on which the property in question is first offered for sale is either—

(1) an occupant in a residential unit designated for sale at the community, or

(2) a project-connected person who is entitled, in accordance with a lease or similar agreement, to residential occupancy of privately owned rental housing in the community.

l. The term "utility" means any electrical distribution system, any public transportation system, or any public communication system, and any fixtures, equipment, or other property appropriate to the operation, maintenance or repair of the foregoing.

Chapter 3. Lots, Appraisals, and Prices

Sec. 31. Lots: The Commission is authorized to plat each community immediately upon passage of this act, or immediately upon the inclusion of the community within the provisions of this act. The Commission may establish lot boundaries, and realine, divide, or enlarge existing tracts as it deems appropriate.

Sec. 32. Appraisals: The Commission shall proceed to secure appraisals of all property at the community which is to be sold pursuant to this act. The appraisals shall be made by the Federal Housing Commissioner or his designee. The Commission shall reimburse the Federal Housing Commissioner for the cost of such appraisals. Appraisals made under this section shall be the appraisals on which the Federal Housing Commissioner may insure any mortgage or loan under the National Housing Act until such time as he finds that the appraisal values generally in the community no longer represent the fair market values of the properties.

Sec. 33. Basis of appraisal: Except for lots sold pursuant to the provisions of section 57a., the appraised value shall be the current fair market value of the Government's interest in the property.

Sec. 34. Posting: Lists showing the appraised value of each parcel of property to be offered for sale to priority purchasers shall, prior to the offering of such property for sale, be made available for public inspection, at reasonable times, at the offices of the Commission at the community.

Sec. 35. Sales prices:

a. In the sale to priority purchasers of properties on which are located Government-owned single or duplex houses, the sales price shall be the appraised value less a deduction of 15 percent of the appraised value and less the deductions provided by section 36.

b. In all other cases the sales price to priority purchasers shall be the appraised value less the deductions provided by section 36, except that sales made under sections 53 b. and c. shall be made at the price set forth therein.

Sec. 36. Improvements:

a. In addition to any other deduction which may be permitted from the sales price for residential property, there shall, upon application by the prospective purchaser, be deducted the amount by which the current fair market value of the Government's interest in the premises is enhanced as a result of improvements to the premises made by, or at the expense of, the prospective purchaser.

b. A junior occupant of a duplex house, which was purchased by the senior occupant, shall, upon application therefor, be entitled to a credit against the purchase price of any residential property purchased through the exercise of a priority right established under the provisions of section 42, for the amount by which the current fair market value of the Government's interest in the duplex house of which he was an occupant is enhanced as a result of improvements to the premises of such duplex house made by, or at the expense of, the junior occupant.

c. The value of the improvements as specified in subsections 36 a. and b. shall be determined in accordance with the provisions of section 32.

d. Persons purchasing property pursuant to the provisions of section 52, who do not desire to avail themselves of the indemnity provisions contained in sections 63 through 66, shall be entitled to an additional deduction of 10 percent of the appraised value of the property in addition to any other deduction set forth in this section.

Chapter 4. Classification of Property and Priorities

Sec. 41. Classification of property:

a. Immediately upon passage of this act, the Commission shall classify all real property (including such improvements and such fixtures, equipment, and other personal property incident thereto as it may deem appropriate) within each community in accordance with such classifications as shall insure reasonably similar treatment for reasonably similar property. The classification shall be made by such procedures, consistent with this chapter, as it shall determine.

b. The Commission may, but shall not be required to, classify any other real property at or in the vicinity of the community, whether within or outside of that community.

Sec. 42. Priorities: The Commission shall establish, by rule or regulation, a detailed system of reasonable and fair priority rights applicable to the sale of Government-owned property to private purchasers at each community. The priorities shall—

a. be uniform in each class or subclass of property;

b. give such preference to occupants and project-connected persons and to incoming employees of the Commission, of a contractor, or of a licensee as the Commission finds necessary or desirable, giving due consideration to the following factors:

(1) The retention and recruitment of personnel essential to the atomic-energy program;

(2) The minimization of dislocations within the community;

(3) The expeditous accomplishment of the disposal program; and

(4) The desirability of encouraging private firms to locate or remain in the community;

c. give the occupant of a Government-owned single-family house, and the senior occupant of a duplex house, at least 90 days in which to exercise the first right of priority;

d. permit persons who have formerly been occupants, project-connected persons, or inhabitants of the community, upon application therefor, to have such priority as the Commission finds to be fair and equitable;

e. not impair any rights, including purchase rights, conferred by existing leases and covenants; and

Sec. 43. Transferability: No priority shall be transferable, except—

a. a husband and wife may exercise a priority in their joint names;

b. a religious organization may exercise the priority which would otherwise belong to its priest, minister, or rabbi, regardless of whether that position happens to be filled at the time of the exercise of the priority;

c. two or more priority holders having a common interest in a building or location may assign their interests to a single assignee; and

d. the Commission may permit such other transfers as it finds to be fair and equitable.

Chapter 5. Sales of Property for Private Use

Sec. 51. Application: The provisions of this chapter shall be made applicable at each community as soon as the Commission makes a finding in writing that there is a reasonable possibility that the Government-owned real property at such community can be disposed of in accordance with the provisions of this chapter.

Sec. 52. Disposal of property:

a. The Commission shall offer for disposal all real property (including such improvements thereon and such fixtures, equipment, and other personal property incident thereto as it may deem appropriate) within the community which is presently under lease or license agreement with the Commission or its community management contractor for residential, commercial, or industrial, agricultural, church, or other nonprofit use, or which, in the opinion of the Commission, is appropriate for such use, other than—

(1) structures which in the opinion of the Commission should be removed from the community because of their unsatisfactory type of construction, condition, or location; or

(2) property which in the opinion of the Commission should be transferred pursuant to chapter 7 or chapter 8.

b. The Commission may, but shall not be required to, dispose of any other real prop-

erty at the community, whether within or outside of that community.

c. Such property shall be disposed of on such terms and conditions, consistent with this chapter, as the Commission shall prescribe in the national interest, and without regard to any preferences or priorities whatever except those provided for pursuant to this act. Transfers by the Commission of such property shall not impair rights under existing leases and covenants, including any purchase rights therein conferred.

SEC. 53. Sales:

a. Where rights of priority have been granted pursuant to the provisions of this act to Government-owned property, it shall be offered for sale to priority purchaser by giving notice to those eligible for such priority. Such notice shall (1) be in such manner as the Commission shall prescribe, (2) identify the property to be sold, and (3) state the terms and conditions of sale and the date of the offer which, in the case of occupants of single family or duplex houses, shall expire not less than 90 days after the date of the offer.

b. Any property (other than church property) classified for sale under section 41 and offered for sale under section 52, as to which no priority right has been conferred, or as to which all priority rights have expired, shall be advertised for sale to the highest bidder, subject to the right of the Commission to reject any or all bids, and also subject to the right of an occupant of a Government-owned single family or duplex house to buy such house by paying an amount equal to the highest bid. No bid shall be accepted which is below the appraised value or, in the case of Government-owned single and duplex houses is below 85 percent of the appraised value.

c. As to any property which has not been sold under subsection 53 b. within 1 year after the first advertisement for sale under subsection 53 b. the Commission may make such disposition, on such terms and conditions, as it may deem appropriate, but the Commission shall give an occupant of a Government-owned single family or duplex house such further opportunity to purchase such house as shall be fair and equitable.

d. Property for use of churches, in respect of which all priority rights have expired, may be disposed of by advertising and competitive bid, or by negotiated sale or other transfer at such prices, terms, and conditions as the Commission shall determine to be fair and equitable.

SEC. 54. Cash sales: All sales shall be for cash, and the buyer shall arrange for the necessary financing, except as provided in chapter 6 of this act.

SEC. 55. Form and provisions of instruments: Deeds executed in connection with the disposal of property pursuant to the provisions of this act—

a. shall be as simple as the Commission shall find to be appropriate, and may contain such warranties or covenants of title and other provisions (including any indemnity) as the Commission may deem appropriate;

b. with respect to any dormitories or apartment houses and any property used or to be used for construction of housing developments for rental purposes, may retain or acquire such rights to the Commission to designate the future occupants of part or all of such properties as it may deem appropriate to insure the availability of housing for employees of the Commission and its contractors;

c. may require that the transferee, his heirs, successors, and assigns shall compensate the Commission for any municipal services provided by the Commission at rates which will not be in excess of the average tax for such services in the immediate vicinity of the community; and any amounts due and unpaid for such compensation (together with interest and costs thereon) shall, as of the date on which such amounts become delinquent, be a lien in favor of the United States upon the premises sold by the Commission, though not valid as against any mortgagee, pledgee, purchaser, or judgment creditor until notice thereof has been filed in accordance with the laws of the State in which the property is situated or in the office of the clerk of the United States district court for the judicial district in which the property subject to the lien is situated, if such State has not by law provided for the filing of such notice;

d. in transferring any property pursuant to sections 31 and 52, may impose such restrictions and requirements relating to the use of the premises and to public health and safety, as the Commission may deem appropriate, which restrictions and requirements shall not be valid beyond 1 year after the incorporation of the city at the community; and

e. may require that any payments in lieu of property taxes or assessments for local improvements made by the Commission with respect to the property shall be equitably prorated.

SEC. 56. Occupancy by existing tenants: Upon application by any occupant of a single or duplex house made within the period of the first priority when such house is first offered for sale under this act, the Commission shall execute a lease to such occupant for a period not to exceed 1 year from the date on which such property is first offered for sale, or for such period as he remains a project-connected person, whichever is shorter. In selling any house with respect to which a lease executed under this section is in effect, the Commission may provide that the purchaser shall assume any or all obligations of the lessor, but the Commission shall guarantee the lessee's performance under the terms of the lease.

SEC. 57. Lots:

a. Notwithstanding any other provision of this act, the Commission is authorized, immediately upon passage of this act, or immediately upon the inclusion of the community within the provisions of this act, to offer for sale to the lessees single residential lots, which were leased by competitive bid and which do not have a Government-owned building thereon, at a price equal to the initial valuation of the lot as stated in the lease.

b. The Commission is authorized to offer for sale, as soon as possible, other lots, to individual owners, upon which single family or duplex houses may be erected, taking into consideration the zoning restrictions the new city is likely to enact with respect to those lots.

CHAPTER 6. FINANCING

SEC. 61. Contract purchase: The Commission may, in the sale of any single-family or duplex house to a priority purchaser, enter into a contract to purchase which provides that the purchaser shall conclude his purchase within not more than 3 years after the date the contract is entered into. Such contracts to purchase shall provide for such periodic payments, including payments on account of principal, interest, or tax equivalents, as the Commission shall prescribe.

SEC. 62. Commission financing:

a. In the event that the Commission finds that financing on reasonable terms is not available from other sources, the Commission may, in order to facilitate the sale of residential property under chapter 5 of this act, accept, in partial payment of the purchase price of any house, apartment building, or dormitory notes secured by first mortgages on such terms and conditions as the Commission shall deem appropriate. In the case of houses and apartment buildings, the maturity and percentage of appraised value in connection with such notes and mortgages shall not exceed those prescribed under section 223 (a) of the National Housing Act, as amended, and the interest rate shall equal the interest rate plus the premium being charged (and any periodic service charge being authorized by the Federal Housing Commissioner for properties of similar character) under section 223 (a) of the National Housing Act, as amended, at the effective date of such notes and mortgages.

b. The Commission may sell any such notes and mortgages on terms set by the Commission.

SEC. 63. Commission indemnity: For a period of not more than 15 years after the date of enactment of this act, the Commission shall indemnify the purchaser (except a purchaser taking advantage of the provisions of subsection 36 (d)), and any successor in title, of any such single family or duplex house as set forth in this chapter. This indemnity shall be deemed to be incorporated in the deeds given on the sale of Government-owned houses. One person may not invoke the indemnity in respect of more than one house.

SEC. 64. Community employment and population: The indemnity obligation specified in section 63 shall arise only if, for the 6 months just preceding the date on which it is invoked—

(a) the total number of operating, maintenance, and administrative employees in the project area, as determined by the Commission, has been less than 14,337 in the case of Oak Ridge or 7,622 in the case of Richland; and

(b) the population in the community has been less than 29,250 in the case of Oak Ridge or 25,200 in the case of Richland.

For purposes of this section employment shall be determined on the basis of the pay period or periods ending nearest the 15th of each month.

SEC. 65. Amount of indemnity. The indemnity obligation of the Commission specified in section 63 shall be for such amount, less the sales price of the property, as would have remained unpaid under a loan entered into on the date of the execution of the original deed by the Commission—

(1) which was in the amount of the purchase price from the Commission and provided for equal monthly payments of principal and interest over a period of 20 years computed on the basis of the average interest and other charges recorded for property of the same class at the community; and

(2) on which all payments due to the date when notice was received by the Commission had been made.

SEC. 66. Conditions of indemnity. The Commission shall make the indemnity payment specified by section 65 only if the Commission receives a notice from the then owner of the property that he is about to sell the property for a sum less than the unpaid balance of the real or hypothetical loan calculated pursuant to section 65. Such payment shall be made only if—

a. notice is given to the Commission at a time when the conditions of section 64 are satisfied;

b. the sale is made within such time as the Commission may prescribe and in a manner which the Commission determined to afford adequate assurance of a fair price without excessive costs; and

c. the Commission is given such prior notice of the sale and such opportunity to become a purchaser as it shall prescribe.

In such circumstances the Commission is hereby authorized to purchase the property. Sales pursuant to this section and payment by the Commission of such amount, if any, as is owing pursuant to sections 63 through 66 shall end the obligation of the Commission under sections 63 through 66 with respect to that property.

CHAPTER 7. UTILITIES

SEC. 71. Authorization to transfer utilities: The Commission is authorized to transfer to one or more of the entities specified

in this chapter such utilities as in the judgment of the Commission will be appropriate to enable the transferee to meet the needs of the residents of the community for adequate utility services of the kind to be transferred.

SEC. 72. Date of transfer: Transfers of utilities shall be made as soon as possible, but in any event, not later than 5 years after the date of enactment of this act.

SEC. 73. Entity receiving transfer:

a. Transfer may be made to one or more of the following, if the transferee has the legal authority to receive and operate the utility:

(1) the city at the community;

(2) the State in which the community is located;

(3) any political subdivision or agency of that State; or

(4) any person, firm, corporation, or other legal entity.

b. In determining the transferee for any utility, the Commission may consider the following:

(1) the pattern of ownership of the comparable utilities in the State in which the community is located;

(2) the ability of the transferee to operate the utility;

(3) the probable price of the sale of the utility, the ability of the transferee to pay that price, and any probable expense; and

(4) the desires of the eligible voters of the community as directly expressed in any vote in any officially recognized procedure or in any procedure established by the Commission;

(5) the benefit of the United States in reducing possible requirements for local assistance as authorized in chapters 8 and 9 of this act.

SEC. 74. Utilities transferable: All utilities are authorized to be transferred under this chapter, but shall not include property which the Commission determines to be needed for its own use.

SEC. 75. Charges for utilities transferred: The Commission may give the utility to the city incorporated at the community; and must charge in selling the utility to any other transferee. The charges and terms for the transfer of any utility may be established by advertising and competitive bid, or by negotiated sale or other transfer at such prices, terms, and conditions as the Commission shall determine to be fair and equitable.

CHAPTER 8. MUNICIPALITIES

SEC. 81. Assistance in organization: The Commission is authorized, for a period not to extend beyond 5 years after the date of enactment of this act to cooperate with and assist the residents of the community in preparation for and establishment of local self-government and in the transfer of municipal installations and responsibilities to local entities. Such assistance may include payment of any amounts reasonably necessary to meet expenses incident to the establishment and organization of a city government and other local entities at the community, until such time as the municipal installations are transferred in accordance with the provisions of this chapter.

SEC. 82. Authorization to transfer municipal installations: The Commission is authorized to transfer to one or more of the entities specified in this chapter such municipal installations as in the judgment of the Commission, will be appropriate to enable the transferees to meet the needs of the residents of the community for adequate school, hospital, and other municipal services.

SEC. 83. Date of transfer: Transfers of municipal installations may be made at any time, not later than 5 years after the date of enactment of this act.

SEC. 84. Entity receiving transfer:

a. Transfers may be made to one or more of the following, if the entity has the legal authority to receive the installation: (1) the city at the community; (2) the State in which the community is located; (3) any political subdivision or agency of that State; or (4) a private nonprofit organization in the case of the hospital installation or cemetery at the community.

b. In determining the entity to which school, hospital, and other municipal installations, respectively, shall be transferred, the Commission shall be governed, in order, by

(1) the results of a vote in which the eligible voters in the community expressed themselves directly on the transfer in the vote on the incorporation of the city;

(2) the results of a vote in which the eligible voters have directly expressed themselves on the proposed transfer in a referendum or other officially recognized procedure;

(3) there being only one entity which is legally authorized to receive the municipal installation; or

(4) in the absence of the other alternatives, the Commission has conducted a vote of the eligible voters of the community on the proposed transfer under such procedures as it may establish.

SEC. 85. Installations transferable: All municipal installations are authorized to be transferred under this chapter, but shall not include property which the Commission determines to be needed for its own use.

SEC. 86. Charges for municipal installations transferred: The transfer of any municipal installation authorized to be made under the provisions of this chapter may be made without charge to the entity receiving the installation.

CHAPTER 9. LOCAL ASSISTANCE

SEC. 91. Basis of Assistance to Cities and Other State and Local Entities:

a. From the date of transfer of any municipal installations to a governmental or other entity at or for the community, the Commission shall for a period of 10 years make annual assistance payments of just and reasonable sums to the State, county, or local entity having jurisdiction to collect property taxes or to the entity receiving the installation transferred hereunder. In determining the amount and recipient of such payments, the Commission shall consider—

(1) the approximate real property taxes and assessments for local improvements which would be paid to the governmental entity upon property within the community if such property were not exempt from taxation by reason of Federal ownership;

(2) the maintaining of municipal services at a level which will not impede the recruitment or retention of personnel essential to the atomic energy program;

(3) the fiscal problems peculiar to the governmental entity by reason of the construction at the community as a single purpose national defense installation under emergency conditions; and

(4) the municipal services and other burdens imposed on the governmental or other entities at the community by the United States in its operations in the project area.

b. Special interim payments may be made under the provisions of this section to any governmental entity which—

(1) has a special burden due to the requirements under law imposed upon it in assisting in effectuating the purposes of this act for which it will not otherwise receive adequate compensation or revenues; or

(2) will suffer a tax loss or lapse in place of which it will not receive any other adequate revenues until the new governmental entities contemplated by this chapter are receiving their normal taxes and performing their normal functions,

c. Payments made under this section shall be payments made for special burdens imposed on the local governmental entities in accordance with the second sentence of section 168 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954. Payments may be made under this section notwithstanding the provisions of the act of September 30, 1950 (Public Law 874, 81st Cong), as amended.

d. With respect to any entity not less than 6 months prior to the expiration of the 10-year period referred to in subsection a, the Commission shall present to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy its recommendation as to the need for any further contribution payments to such entity. If it recommends further contribution payments, it shall propose a definite schedule of such contribution payments which will provide for an orderly and reasonably prompt withdrawal of the Atomic Energy Commission from participation in and contribution toward local government.

SEC. 92. Commission reductions: Any payment which becomes due under section 91 prior to the transfer of all municipal installations at the community may be reduced by such amount as the Commission determines to be equitable based on the municipal services then being performed by the Commission, and the municipal services then being performed by such governmental entity.

SEC. 93. Area of service: The payments made pursuant to section 91 to transferees of municipal installations are in anticipation that the respective recipients of those payments furnish, or have furnished, for the community, the school, hospital, or other municipal services in respect of which the payments are made. Any such payment may be withheld, in whole or in part, if the Commission finds that the recipient is not furnishing such services for any part of the area so designated.

SEC. 94. Commission contracts: The Commission is authorized, without regard to section 3679 of the Revised Statutes, to enter into a contract with any governmental or other entity to which payments are required to be made pursuant to section 91, obligating the Commission to make to such entity the payments as directed to be made by section 91.

CHAPTER 10. TRANSFER OF FUNCTIONS, AND REVIEW

SEC. 101. Transfer of functions: The President is authorized to delegate the duties and responsibilities placed on the Commission by this act to such other agencies of the United States Government as are reasonably qualified to perform those duties and responsibilities. The President may delegate any or all of the duties and responsibilities of the Commission in the operation of the communities to such other agencies of the United States Government that are reasonably qualified to perform those duties and responsibilities. The Commission shall retain no financing duties and responsibilities.

SEC. 102. Review: The Commission shall present to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy of the Congress a full review of its activities under this act every 3 years in addition to any other presentation which may be required or requested by the joint committee.

SEC. 103. Joint Committee on Atomic Energy: The provisions of chapter 17 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 shall be applicable to all matters under this act.

CHAPTER 11. GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 111. Powers of the Commission: The Commission shall have all powers conferred by the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, including the power to make, promulgate, issue, rescind, and amend such rules, regulations, and delegations as may be appropriate to carry out the provisions of this act and shall be subject to the limitations contained in chapter 14 of that act. Nothing contained

in this act shall impair the powers vested in the Commission by the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, or any other law.

SEC. 112. Qualification to Purchase: No officer or employee of the Commission or of any other Federal agency (including officers and members of the Armed Forces) shall be disqualified from purchasing any property or exercising any right or privilege under this act, but no such officer or employee shall make any determination as to his own eligibility or priority, or as to valuation, price, or terms of sale and financing of property sold to him.

SEC. 113. Contract forms: Contracts entered into pursuant to this act and other instruments executed pursuant to this act shall be in such form and contain such provisions, consistent with this act, as the Commission shall prescribe; and shall be as simple and concise as possible. Any mortgage shall contain terms which will place the United States in the same position, with respect to any mortgages it may hold under the provisions of chapter 6, as that occupied by a private lender under the applicable State laws for the relief of mortgagors with respect to deficiency judgments.

SEC. 114. Evidence: A deed, lease, contract, or other instrument executed by or on behalf of the Commission purporting to transfer title or any other interest in property disposed of pursuant to this act shall be conclusive evidence of compliance with the provisions of this act and rules and regulations promulgated thereunder, insofar as concerns title or other interest of any bona fide grantee or transferee for value without notice of lack of such compliance, and his successors in title.

SEC. 115. Administrative review: Determinations authorized by this act to be made by the Commission as to classification, priorities, prices, and terms and conditions of sale of property disposed under this action shall be subject to review only in accordance with such provisions for administrative review or reconsideration as the Commission may prescribe.

SEC. 116. Repossession: The Commission is authorized to repossess any property sold by it in accordance with the terms of any contract to purchase, mortgage, or other instrument, and to sell or make any other disposition of any property so repossessed and any property purchased by it pursuant to section 66.

SEC. 117. Net proceeds: The net proceeds derived by the Commission from the disposal of property pursuant to this act, after defraying expenses incident to appraisal, sale or other transfer and any financing under section 62, shall be covered into the Treasury. Annually, upon advice of the Commission, there shall be transferred to miscellaneous receipts of the Treasury such portion of such net proceeds as may no longer be needed to meet the contingent obligations provided for in subsection 118 c.

SEC. 118. Appropriations:

a. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary and appropriate to carry out the provisions and purposes of this act.

b. There are authorized to be appropriated the sum of $518,000 at Oak Ridge and the sum of $2,165,000 at Richland for construction, modification, or expansion of municipal installations authorized to be transferred pursuant to chapter 8 of this act.

c. As much as may be necessary of net proceeds from section 117 are hereby appropriated and made available for use by the Commission (without fiscal year limitations) to pay any costs, losses, expenses, or obligations incurred by the Commission in connection with obligations entered into pursuant to section 37 or section 63, with repossession or repurchase, rehabilitation, and further disposition pursuant to sections 63 through 66 and section 116, and with the defense and payment of any claims for breaches of warranties and covenants of title of any property disposed of pursuant to this act.

SEC. 119. Separability of provisions: If any provisions of this act, or the application of such provision to any person or circumstances, is held invalid, the remainder of this act or the application of such provision to persons or circumstances other than those as to which it is held invalid, shall not be affected thereby.

AMENDMENT TO NATIONAL HOUSING ACT

SEC. 201. Section 223 (a) of the National Housing Act, as amended, is further amended as follows:

(a) After paragraph (3) thereof there is added the following new paragraph:

"(4) executed in connection with the sale by the Government, or any agency or official thereof, of any housing (including any property acquired, held, or constructed in connection therewith or to serve the inhabitants thereof) pursuant to the Atomic Energy Community Act of 1955, as amended: *Provided*, That such insurance shall be issued without regard to any preferences or priorities except those prescribed by the Atomic Energy Community Act of 1955, as amended; or".

(b) The paragraph numbered (4) is renumbered (5).

(c) The paragraph numbered (5) is renumbered (6) and is revised to read as follows:

"(6) executed in connection with the first resale, within 2 years from the date of its acquisition from the Government, of any portion of a project or property of the character described in paragraphs (1), (2), (3), and (4) above; or".

(d) The paragraph numbered (6) is renumbered (7) and the last proviso therein is amended by striking "(4) or (5)" and inserting "(4), (5), or (6)" and by striking "(3), or (5)" and inserting "(3), (4), or (6)".

AMENDMENT TO PUBLIC LAW NO. 874, 81ST CONGRESS

SEC. 202. Section 8 (d) of the act of September 30, 1950 (Public Law No. 874, 81st Cong.), as amended, is further amended by adding, after the words "Indian Affairs", the following: ", or the availability of appropriations for the making of payments directed to be made by section 91 of the Atomic Energy Community Act of 1955, as amended."

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MR. T. K. QUINN'S REPLY TO REPRESENTATIVE REECE OF TENNESSEE

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, on June 16, 1955, the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. REECE] extended his remarks in the RECORD in which he made certain unflattering references to Mr. T. K. Quinn. Again on June 29, 1955, the gentleman from Tennessee extended his remarks in the RECORD at which time he made further references to Mr. Quinn and referred back to his earlier remarks of June 16, 1955. It is my personal opinion that the gentleman from Tennessee has been misled and is under some erroneous impressions both concerning what is contained in Mr. Quinn's writings and concerning Mr. Quinn's record of outstanding public service. Mr. Quinn is a distinguished citizen, a man with long and successful experience within the big corporations about which he has written, and his writings and statements, in my opinion, deserve careful and respectful attention. Insofar as I am able to tell, Mr. Quinn has had but one objective in all of his writings—which is to make a good economic system work even better and, particularly, to give small business a chance in this system.

On July 7, 1955, Mr. Quinn wrote to me concerning the references made to him by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. REECE], as follows:

JULY 7, 1955.

DEAR MR. PATMAN: I have, only this week, had my attention called to Representative CARROLL REECE'S rather lengthy remarks about me which appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on June 16, 1955, and to which Representative REECE referred on June 29, saying, "I exposed the philosophy of T. K. Quinn."

Since my philosophy is constantly developing with greater experience, new events, and more study and reflection, it may be premature to say that my philosophy has been fully exposed, even to myself. However, Representative REECE'S remarks have occasioned me to review some of my writings over the years, and I think that my expressions have not been as inconsistent as Representative REECE has been led to think. In any case I find a great deal of similarity of thinking in my first book written some 15 years ago, my more recent book titled "Giant Business Threat to Democracy," and my new book, Reign of the Painted White Elephants, which is to be published this fall.

The subjects of mergers, monopoly, giant corporations, and concentrated economic power overflowing into the political field need much more airing than they are getting from the press, which is dangerously dependent on the advertising dollars of the giants. The country needs more light and clarification. We are in a critical period involving the organization of our society, the preservation of small and independent business and of our revered democratic institutions.

Representative REECE'S unflattering appraisal of me is in the main based upon two charges: First, an old, and I think unfounded, charge concerning my work with the War Production Board; and, second, a charge that my position concerning giant business has been inconsistent over the years.

The charge concerning my WPB record rests upon an old statement made by former Congressman Jerry Voorhis, which Mr. Voorhis was later kind enough to state was made on misinformation. I quote a letter from Mr. Voorhis to me dated July 5, 1955, as follows:

"Mr. T. K. QUINN,
"New York, N. Y.

"DEAR MR. QUINN: It is with profound regret and great alarm that I learned of the attack made upon you and your fine record of service to the American people in the House of Representatives recently. I am certain that the Congressman who made these remarks did so out of misinformation and it is a source of profound regret to me that an old extension of remarks of my own apparently contributed to that misinformation.

"I believed very strongly during the war period, as I do today, that the system of having the Government employ the services of outstanding individuals on a so-called dollar-a-year basis is wrong. I think the Government should pay people in all cases a salary reasonably commensurate with what they are worth. I was frankly concerned about this problem during the war period.

"On one occasion a man in whom I had great confidence came to me with certain information respecting the publication of a new manual on management-labor relations.

This man, mistakenly as I now know, felt that there was something improper about your publishing this book and promoting its sale while you were serving as a War Production Board executive. As you know, I included this material furnished by this man in an extension of my remarks published in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and I have regretted that I ever did so.

"I feel it is inexcusable that I did not telephone you first to ascertain the full facts. Had I done so I would have found that your whole purpose in the publication of this manual was to try to carry over into peacetime some of the harmonious relationships between management and labor which had developed during the war period. I would have found out that you were devoting any receipts over and above the actual costs of publication of this manual to contributions to the Red Cross and it was therefore quite impossible for you to derive any personal profit or advantage from this undertaking.

I am writing this letter in the hope that it may in some measure correct the RECORD and also to express my very sincere regard for you as a person and as a leader of American thought.

"Sincerely yours,

"JERRY VOORHIS,
"Executive Director."

With respect to my work with the War Production Board, I worked wholeheartedly for labor-management peace and the successful outcome of the war, with no political or other ambitions whatever. When the war was over, hoping to preserve something of the constructive relationships we had developed and to avoid the postwar labor troubles which I foresaw, I sought to have printed the results of our work. There was no appropriation, and I therefore printed a manual at my own expense. First, however, I took the manuscript to John Lord O'Brian, the WPB counsel, pointing out to him an opening paragraph in which I explained that if the proceeds of the manual exceeded its cost the balance would be donated to the American Red Cross. If there was a loss I was obliged to absorb it, and I did. Mr. O'Brian's advice was, "Since you are bent upon doing good, go ahead; you will get hell anyway." A wise man.

In marked contrast to Mr. REECE'S impression of my work, Mr. Donald Nelson, the able Chief of the War Production Board, has the following to say in his book, Arsenal of Democracy, page 327:

"In June 1943, T. K. Quinn, president of Maxon, Inc., a national advertising agency, resigned his position to become a dollar-a-year Director General of the War Production Drive. He was at one time vice president of General Electric and chairman of the GE Finance Corp., which he organized. Ted enlarged the division, reorganized procedures, published a weekly paper for war plants, conducted specific industry campaigns, and widely publicized the drive. Under his supervision the number of committees in successful operation was raised from 2,000 to more than 5,000 by the fall of 1944."

Mr. REECE'S charge of inconsistency in my writings over the years rests upon his belief that my earlier writings condoned all aspects of big business and that my later writings have been an attack upon all aspects of big business. And there is a suggestion left that I have done this about-face "because some were successful and his Monitor corporation was not, the system is at fault." Actually I think that the book of mine from which Mr. REECE'S remarks quote extensively, a book titled "Liberty, Employment, and No More Wars," is not inconsistent, but supports to a surprising degree many of my present views. Here, for example, are some quotations from that book which were apparently not called to Mr. REECE'S attention. They express considerable concern over centralized economic power and indicate that at that time I held beliefs which were just the opposite to those suggested by extracts which the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. REECE] has quoted from this same book.

On page 52:

"Centralization is evil. Now the evil in all these instances is centralization itself, whoever practices it. Centralization is evil because it is essentially inhuman. It impersonalizes, disregards the individual and undertakes by remote regulation to control human situations which it never sees, feels, nor understands. Any vaunted 'efficiency' which it claims can be attained only at the cost and sacrifice of human values."

On page 53:

"Centralization of power and authority elsewhere whether political or economic always takes from the individual something of strength and character which is vital to his existence as a self-reliant freeman. It is basically un-American regardless of the form of the transfer. Any kind of remote control amounts to slavery or subordination which must always be repugnant to those for whom liberty is the very breath of life itself. Those who lose their freedom lose what is strongest and noblest in them."

On page 54:

"Let Americans serve notice upon the separate groups, upon unionists, farm blocs, employers, social planners, and all of the ism adherents, that if there actually had to be any all-powerful, all-controlling factor in this country why, of course, we much prefer that it be a strong government, responsible to all of the people. For at least we still have a vote, all of us, in determining its personnel and conduct and we all have a Constitution to protect the rights of minorities and keep our national train on its all-for-one and one-for-all track. All other group rulership is lawless because it represents only its selfish interest and is therefore intolerable to the people as a whole."

On page 57:

"In this book I am primarily interested in pointing the way through a new American decentralization and teamwork toward the objectives which we can and must meet without trying to blueprint the future. We must not expect to have a world or a society that is much better than the people in it, and better people is the first hurdle, as Justice Holmes explained years ago. But the people we have are generally better than we think they are. One of the great difficulties is that the very best of them are not the acquisitive, aggressive, selfish, praise-loving, power-seeking people so often found in many political and economic high places. In the very nature of our limited competition those whom society so noisily rewards for pushing their way into notice and position often stand consciously or unconsciously in the way of progress. Had they been more considerate and generous they might never have attained this eminence. The cause of the greatest number may have to be advanced in spite of some of them."

All of this, representing the heart of what I undertook to say, is entirely consistent with everything I have ever said and still believe. In this same old book I also went on to show that unrestricted competition will not work to the best interests of society.

On page 87:

"In passing, I must point a finger of moral and social disapproval at those corporations which, having established themselves in some one industrial field, take advantage of their financial positions to move into unrelated lines, where they contribute nothing and often cut prices ruinously. The wanton, adroit method is to go after the cream or easy picking in the other field. Thus the position gained in one industrial line enables a large competitor to become a destructive raider in another."

In order to understand my writings on the problems raised by giant business firms, it is important to recognize the difference between a $10 million, $100 million, and billion or multibillion dollar business. I have never opposed necessary big business. A corporation can be a national asset and still be dangerous. Up to a point, size is essential to genuine efficiency and I say so in several of Mr. REECE'S selections. There are indeed techniques of production that require a certain minimum volume. Bigness does make for efficiency—up to a point. But this does not begin to justify United States Steel's combination of 149 other corporations. It does not justify $10 billion General Motors being in the clothes washing machine business or General Electric's ownership of a steel mill among some 90 other corporations. Nor does it justify outright, financial monsterism arranged solely for purposes of capital power and market domination contrary to every tenet of American economic freedom and opportunity.

I do now and always have favored constructive competition of the kind which the giants are now throttling. But not all competition is constructive. Without fair and reasonable governmental restrictions—which he opposes—competition can lead to the elimination of all but a few giants. Do we need anything more than a mere reference to the automobile industry to prove the point? There are only 5 producers left and 2 of them are in mortal danger. Competition is not a god. The Government should act to prevent the bankruptcy of American Motors and Studebaker-Packard when the time comes.

It becomes just a little more difficult to understand that monopoly, on the other hand, is also intolerable. Thus unrestricted competition and monopoly have a polarity. In large areas of our economy price competition has been eliminated, along with free enterprise and open opportunity. Mr. Benjamin Fairless admitted to the Senate Fulbright committee this year that there is no price competition in the steel industry. After the recent wage increases the price of steel was increased by $7.50 a ton and by all of the producers. No one announced a $7 increase or a $7.25 increase but an identical $7.50 increase by all, in unison. Similar price conditions prevail in many other industries which have crowded free enterprise and even constructive competition to the wall. What we actually have in America today is not a system of free enterprise as is so often misrepresented. We have a partially managed and partially free economy.

With respect to certain other allegations, I should explain that efficiency has a narrow and also a broad social meaning. What is good for General Motors may be bad for the country, Mr. Wilson to the contrary notwithstanding. It does not answer my assertion that General Motors used its power to secure more than its share of postwar steel, for example, by presenting figures that in the years from 1946 to 1950—years of steel shortage—General Motors increased its share of the passenger car market from 38 percent to 46 percent. That is precisely my point. The corporation was not only able to increase its proportion of automobile passenger business, but also its other metal production business, in many instances to the disaster of its helpless rivals. It has loaned millions to preempt steel supplies.

Broadly, giant business has not shouldered its social responsibility since the war. Instead, it has fought minimum hours and fair wages—purchasing power—social security, intelligent planning, and in fact, most of the progressive measures. At the same time it opposed all price controls and in many instances exacts enormous profits. I should say now that it must pay in taxes for what it has by default required the Government to undertake. Largely through the expansion of private and public credit, business has kept booming and will, but for how long we do not know. These are new conditions subsequent to my early book. My viewpoint here has changed with new developments.

I still believe that a man of outstanding ability has a greater potential in a big business or a big county then in a small one, thinking only in terms of business, and provided you can find him and help him to develop. But in monster corporations he is lost. Moreover, the constant absorptions and mergers by giant corporations, particularly since the war and in the past 3 years, is decreasing proportionately the number of top jobs so that today even college graduates and white-collar men can look forward only to subordinate positions—see my new October 1955 book, Reign of the Painted White Elephants.

I have always believed that giant corporations should not be broken up "regardless of manufacturing costs and efficiencies." On the other hand, giant corporations are not always organized today wholly on the basis of efficiency; nor do I believe, as the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. REECE] seems to argue, that the antitrust laws have been effective. I would have to say, "Look around you at the giant mergers and combinations and the combinations of combinations which both the Sherman law and the Clayton Act were intended to prevent. How many mergers are being prevented today under the present undeclared open season?" There have been thousands of them in the industrial field, and the banks have so merged that today only 10 of them have 46 percent of the total deposits. Giant corporations are reaching out in all directions for purely market power, excessive profits, and dominating capital positions, and they have entirely too much political as well as economic power.

Sincerely yours,

T. K. QUINN.

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate, by Mr. Carrell, one of its clerks, 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. 7278) entitled "An act making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, and for other purposes."

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendments of the House to Senate amendments Nos. 3, 22, 23, 25, 27, 31, 33, 35, 56, 75, 76, 84, 93, 104, 109, 116, and 123, to the above-entitled bill.

The message also announced that the Senate recedes from its amendment No. 62.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed a bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 2576. An act 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.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendments of the House to a bill of the Senate of the following title:

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.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendment to the bill (H. R. 4048) entitled "An act making recommendations to the States for the enactment of legislation to permit and assist Federal personnel, including members of the Armed Forces, and their families, to exercise their voting franchise, 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. GREEN, Mr. GORE, and Mr. CURTIS to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate disagrees to the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 2391) entitled "An act to amend the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, and for other purposes"; requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. SPARKMAN, Mr. DOUGLAS, Mr. MORSE, Mr. CAPEHART, and Mr. BRICKER 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. 100) entitled "An act 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."

AMENDING THE DEFENSE PRODUCTION ACT OF 1950, AS AMENDED

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 7470) to amend the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended.

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 further consideration of the bill H. R. 7470, with Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. When the committee rose on yesterday, the Clerk had read section 1 of the bill. If there are no amendments to this section the Clerk will read:

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 2. Subsection (c) of section 701 of the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"(c) Whenever the President invokes the powers given him in this act to allocate any material in the civilian market, he shall do so in such a manner as to make available, so far as practicable, for business and various segments thereof in the normal channel of distribution of such material, a fair share of the available civilian supply based, so far as practicable, on the share received by such business under normal conditions during a representative period preceding any future allocation of materials: *Provided*, That the President shall, in the allocation of materials in the civilian market, give due consideration to the needs of new concerns and newly acquired operations, undue hardships of individual businesses, and the needs of smaller concerns in an industry."

SEC. 3. Section 708 of the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, is amended—

(1) by inserting before the period at the end of the first sentence of subsection (b) a colon and the following: *"Provided, however*, That after the enactment of the Defense Production Act Amendments of 1955, the exemption from the prohibitions of the antitrust laws and the Federal Trade Commission Act of the United States shall apply only (1) to acts and omissions to act requested by the President or his duly authorized delegate pursuant to duly approved voluntary agreements or programs relating solely to the exchange between actual or prospective contractors of technical or other information, production techniques, and patents or patent rights, relating to equipment used primarily by or for the military which is being procured by the Department of Defense or any department thereof, and the exchange of materials, equipment, and personnel to be used in the production of such equipment. The Attorney General shall review each of the voluntary agreements and programs covered by this section, and the activities being carried on thereunder, and, if he finds, after such review and after consultation with the Director of the Office of Defense Mobilization and other interested agencies, that the adverse effects of any such agreement or program on the competitive free enterprise system outweigh the benefits of the agreement or program to the national defense, he shall withdraw his approval in accordance with subsection (d) of this section. This review and determination shall be made within ninety days after the enactment of the Defense Production Act Amendments of 1955.";

(2) by inserting in subsection (d) thereof after the word "hereunder" the following: ", or upon withdrawal by the Attorney General of his approval of the voluntary agreement or program on which the request or finding is based,";

(3) by inserting after the first sentence of subsection (e) thereof the following new sentence: "Such surveys, and the reports hereafter required, shall include studies of the voluntary agreements and programs authorized by this section.";

(4) by striking out from the last sentence of subsection (e) thereof the words "at such times thereafter as he deems desirable" and inserting in lieu thereof the words "at least once every three months".

SEC. 4. Section 710 (b) of the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"(b) (1) The President is further authorized, to the extent he deems it necessary and appropriate in order to carry out the provisions of this act, and subject to such regulations as he may issue, to employ persons of outstanding experience and ability without compensation;

"(2) The President shall be guided in the exercise of the authority provided in this subsection by the following policies:

"(i) So far as possible, operations under the act shall be carried on by full-time, salaried employees of the Government, and appointments under this authority shall be to advisory or consultative positions only.

"(ii) Appointments to positions other than advisory or consultative may be made under this authority only when the requirements of the position are such that the incumbent must personally possess outstanding experience and ability not obtainable on a full-time, salaried basis.

"(iii) In the appointment of personnel and in assignment of their duties, the head of the department or agency involved shall take steps to avoid, to as great an extent as possible, any conflict between the governmental duties and the private interests of such personnel.

"(3) Any person appointed under the authority of this subsection shall file, under oath, with the head of the employing agency

at the time of employment a full and complete report of his outside connections, listing all personal and financial relationships which he has or had within 12 months prior to his appointment with any person, firm, corporation, or other entity, or any trade organization, labor union or similar organization, and he shall file monthly thereafter, under oath, so long as his appointment shall be in effect, any changes in such outside connections.

"(4) Appointees under this subsection (b) shall, when policy matters are involved, be limited to advising appropriate full-time salaried Government officials who are responsible for making policy decisions.

"(5) Any person employed under this subsection (b) is hereby exempted, with respect to such employment, from the operation of sections 281, 283, 284, 434, and 1914 of title 18, United States Code, and section 190 of the Revised Statutes (5 U. S. C. 99), except that—

"(i) exemption hereunder shall not extend to the negotiation or execution, by such appointee, of Government contracts with the private employer of such appointee or with any corporation, joint stock company, association, firm, partnership, or other entity in the pecuniary profits or contracts of which the appointee has any direct or indirect interest;

"(ii) exemption hereunder shall not extend to making any recommendation or taking any action with respect to individual applications to the Government for relief or assistance, on appeal or otherwise, under the provisions of the act made by the private employer of the appointee or by any corporation, joint stock company, association, firm, partnership, or other entity in the pecuniary profits or contracts of which the appointee has any direct or indirect interest;

"(iii) exemption hereunder shall not extend to the prosecution by the appointee, or participation by the appointee in any fashion in the prosecution, of any claims against the Government involving any matter concerning which the appointee had any responsibility during his employment under this subsection, during the period of such employment and the further period of 2 years after the termination of such employment; and

"(iv) exemption hereunder shall not extend to the receipt or payment of salary in connection with the appointee's Government service hereunder from any source other than the private employer of the appointee at the time of his appointment hereunder.

"(6) Appointments under this subsection (b) shall be supported by written certification by the head of the employing department or agency—

"(i) that the appointment is necessary and appropriate in order to carry out the provisions of the act;

"(ii) that the duties of the position to which the appointment is being made require outstanding experience and ability;

"(iii) that the appointee has the outstanding experience and ability required by the position; and

"(iv) that the department or agency head has been unable to obtain a person with the qualifications necessary for the position on a full-time, salaried basis.

"(7) The heads of the departments or agencies making appointments under this subsection (b) shall file with the Division of the Federal Register a statement including the name of the appointee, the employing department or agency, the title of his position, and the name of his private employer.

"(8) At least once every 3 months the Chairman of the United States Civil Service Commission shall survey appointments made under this subsection and shall report his findings to the President and the Joint Committee on Defense Production and make such recommendations as he may deem proper."

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. PATMAN: On page 4, line 7, strike out line 7 and all that follows down to line 4 on page 8 and insert: "SEC. 4. Section 710 (b) of the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, is hereby repealed.

TO PREVENT W. O. C. EMPLOYEES

Mr. PATMAN. This amendment really means that we shall not have any W. O. C.'s, that is, employees of the Government serving without compensation. It strikes out the section which makes that possible. The discussion yesterday is in the RECORD this morning, and I do not think it is necessary to take up too much time because the issue is well known and, I believe, the Members have their minds pretty well made up. This is an attempt to perpetuate in a time of peace something that we have never heretofore allowed except in time of war. I am in accord with the policy of the Government that during a war or great national emergency, when patriotism is the first consideration, it is all right for us to call in people who are representing great corporations with a particular know-how to advise with them. In time of war that is all right. But in time of peace, it could amount to permitting the Government to be used as a vehicle for private business and private concerns when it permits people with a conflict of interest to serve in a governmental capacity and at the same time receive pay from their employers.

SERVE TWO MASTERS

The question is which one would the employee serve more faithfully and loyally, the Government of the United States, from whom he is receiving nothing, or his private employer, to whom he is greatly obligated? This private employer over the years has been good to his employee; the employee's future is wrapped up in his employer. Now, which is he going to serve? You know it is awfully hard for a person to serve 2 masters, yet this permits a person to serve 2 masters—the Government and his private employer—when the Government pays him nothing and the private employer pays him a good salary.

I do not think it should be permitted in time of peace. If we were to permit this bill to become law like it is, it would be the first time in the history of this Republic, commencing in 1789, when we have ever permitted people to serve without pay during time of peace and serve their private employer at the same time.

So this is attempting to perpetuate a new policy; it is in violation of all our traditions of the past. I do not think we should undertake it. If we need people with certain qualifications and experience in the Government in time of peace, we should be able to obtain and pay career employees who could do this type of work and should not rely upon private business in time of peace.

But you know it will be contended that this is a national emergency, that this bill carries a national emergency. I contend it does not, because if it involved a national emergency it would carry more powers. In a national emergency it would carry standby authority to the President to invoke price controls, wage controls, allocations, allotments, and everything like that which normally goes along with a great national emergency or war.

This bill does not carry any such provision as that; therefore, it cannot be said that it is meeting a great national emergency, because it is not; it does not carry normal standby powers for a national emergency, and I ask you to consider this. I know each Member has his own views, and I am not capable of changing anyone's mind; I am not attempting to, but I do hope you seriously consider this one fact. If you pass this bill like it is even by attempting to place limitations and restrictions upon it, that still will not get the job done. If you pass it like it is you are commencing for the first time in the history of this Republic a new policy, that of letting people serve in the Government and have a conflict of interests by serving private employers at the same time.

I hope you strike this out.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] states that he would be for some of the dollar-a-year men if it were in time of war or great national emergency. He admits the need under those circumstances. Are we not in great national emergency now? We are spending $40 billion a year in preparation for peace or for war. This is certainly convincing evidence that we are in a national emergency.

The Director, Dr. Flemming, said there is a national emergency. If there is no national emergency, why do we want this bill at all?

We will never be caught as we were before World War I and World War II. We are going to be ready to fight and we are going to stay ready to fight always.

The man who administers the act says: Give me the tools for me to do the job. We have certain specialists in private enterprise that we do not have in Government, and we need them. We cannot find substitutes for them. Are we going to fail to give him those men? I thought we were satisfied in the committee after we adopted this amendment that I offered which gives all the safeguards necessary to protect the Government. I thought we had satisfied the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN]. We put all the safeguards that we possibly could put around this so that there will be no further abuse along these lines.

When ex-President Truman was Senator, he was chairman of an investigating committee of the other body. At that time he wanted to do away with the dollar-a-year men. After he became President of the United States he changed his mind because he could not find certain specialists in Government and had to go to private enterprise for them.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. PATMAN. Is it not a fact that he changed his mind during the war, right after the Korean war started?

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. That may be true, but he changed his mind on account of a national emergency like this is and it is a national emergency as long as you are spending $40 billion a year for preparation for national defense.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I have observed the gentleman a good many years and I believe that what he says is his firm conviction. Is it the gentleman's conviction that the patriotic impulse of these men to serve the Government in time of need would overcome the temptation to take money or influence on the side?

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. The gentleman is correct. You cannot get men with certain specialized training and experience who are receiving large salaries, $40,000 or $50,000 a year, to come into the Government for just a few months at small salaries.

We put all the safeguards in this bill we could in order to get good men and I do not see how anyone can oppose it.

Let me read what the safeguards are. President Truman issued an order after he became President of the United States placing safeguards around dollar-a-year appointments. That was an Executive order that was issued. Now for the first time we are putting it in this bill. That is not the only curb we have. Let me read some of the others.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. PATMAN. Is it not a fact that the curb he imposed was during wartimes? If those curbs were necessary in time of war should we not have additional curbs away beyond what we have, if at all?

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. We are doing more today getting ready for peace or for war than we ever did during the time the fighting was going on.

This Executive Order 10182 issued by the President and other pertinent restrictions are included in the bill. This is the first time that the Truman order has been made law.

Section 4 (1) limits the role of w. o. c. personnel when policy matters are involved to advising appropriate full-time salaried officials who are responsible for making policy decisions.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Georgia has expired.

(By unanimous consent (at the request of Mr. BROWN of Georgia) Mr. BROWN of Georgia was permitted to proceed for 5 addtional minutes.)

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, these dollar-a-year men cannot make policy. They can only advise.

Section 4 (2) requires every appointee to file under oath with the head of his employing agency at the time of his employment a full and complete report of his outside connections, listing all personal and financial relationships which he has at that time, or has had within 12 months prior to his appointment, with any person, firm, corporation, or other entity, or any trade organization, labor union, or similar organization. The appointee would also be required to file monthly thereafter, under oath, during the period of his appointment any changes in his outside connections and (3) requires the Chairman of the Civil Service Commission to file with the Joint Committee on Defense Production the findings of his quarterly surveys of w. o. c. appointments together with his recommendations with respect thereto. I believe these provisions will provide adequate safeguards against any future abuse.

At present there is a relatively small number of w. o. c.'s on the Government's rolls, but they are rendering important service to the mobilization program. The use of section 710 to provide the Government with the services of high-caliber men during the present emergency has been highly successful and should be continued. The termination of this authority would be a grave blow to national defense. I strongly urge that the House will follow the recommendations of its Committee on Banking and Currency in regard to w. o. c.'s.

In some instances men with good qualification are found in the Government career service, but in others they are available only in private life—in industrial concerns, labor unions, universities, and the various professions. Many of them are financially able to accept Government employment on civil-service salaries, but others are economically committed to an extent that would not permit so great a reduction in their income. As you know the salaries of Government executives are not generally on a par with those of private enterprise. Under such circumstances the experience of that type of person can be obtained only if he can be appointed without compensation and can continue to receive his salary from private sources. Men from private life appointed on a w. o. c. basis, or its equivalent World War II basis of $1 a year, have rendered outstanding services during periods of mobilization—essential services which could not be obtained in a comparable degree by any other means.

Now, Mr. Chairman, we think we have placed all the safeguards that are necessary to protect the Government from any abuses by the w. o. c.'s. We know that Mr. Flemming cannot do a good job in carrying out the intention of Congress without some of these specialists from private enterprise, since he cannot get them from Government. And he will not secure any from private enterprise if he can find qualified men in Government.

I certainly hope you will vote down this amendment by my esteemed friend from Texas.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I think this particular amendment does raise a very important question and one that deserves the most serious consideration of the Members of this House. I have considerable sympathy with what the gentleman from Texas said in his remarks. He has pointed out some points which we should and must consider. It is not easy; it is difficult. I have not thought too highly of every dollar-a-year man in the past working for the Government, whether in time of peace or in war, and I think we should exercise great caution and restraint and sound judgment before smearing or condemning some of the men who have been unjustly accused and smeared even by some of the Government agencies in days gone by and particularly at the present time.

In yesterday's Washington Daily News there was an article by Peter Edson entitled "How Much Patriotism? How Much Profit?" It poses this question of how we can get top-grade executives, men of long and successful business experience, to serve their Government in times of great emergency, of war. I think we all have to agree, too, that it would be much easier for a man to serve unselfishly out of pure patriotism and without any hope of reward or profit in time of war than in time of peace. Today we are neither in war nor peace, which makes our decision all the more difficult.

In this article of yesterday by Peter Edson he says, after citing several cases that have been brought to the public's attention:

> Still another mixup has now come to light in a case going back to the Truman administration. It is revealed by Senator JOHN J. WILLIAMS, Republican, Delaware, and Comptroller General Joseph Campbell.
>
> They charge that the Government lost $325,000 on a zinc-supply contract for the defense stockpile. The contract was with Mid-Continent Supply Co., of St. Paul. It was made by former General Services Administrator Jess Larson on recommendation of Howard I. Young, his dollar-a-year metals adviser, who was also president of American Zinc, Lead & Smelting Co., St. Louis.
>
> The Mid-Continent zinc was to be refined by American Zinc Co., of Illinois, a subsidiary of the St. Louis company in which Mr. Young's son, R. A. Young, was vice president.
>
> Comptroller General Campbell has suggested a possible conflict of interest in this case, though both Larson and the Youngs deny there was anything wrong, and say it was all in the national interest.

I agree completely with the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] that no man can serve two masters. We cannot serve God and Mammon. I want to assure the Members of this House that the only God served in this particular instance is the Father of us all, and not Mr. Young's company or any other company in which he has a selfish interest. His mind, heart, and hands are clean and there are no fears as to the outcome. It is not only indiscreet but positively wicked to charge a great patriot who has given so unselfishly of his time, money, and effort to serve our country in a time of crisis.

Mr. Speaker, let us not drive away the biggest brains, the best hearts, and greatest patriots from the service of our country in time of need.

I want to say to the Members of this House that I have known Howard I. Young for 30 years. He is one of the finest Christian gentlemen, of unimpeachable integrity, absolute honesty, and pure patriotism that I have ever

known. He enjoys the highest confidence, the greatest trust and respect, not only of his associates in the mining industry, but of all the people, regardless of religion or politics, down in the 7th Congressional District which I have the honor to represent and in which Mr. Young was lucky enough to be born. He comes from Stotts City and Joplin, Mo., and at the present time lives in the city of St. Louis.

After these wild and reckless charges were made by the agency of this Congress, not by the Executive Department, but by the Comptroller General's Office, after hearings were held and the story was told—and the report should never have been made until the facts were known in advance—I was happy to read in yesterday afternoon's edition of the Washington Star this article on the front page: "United States Retracts Accusation Against $1-a-Year Man."

This is by the Associated Press and, as I said, on the front page of the Star of yesterday afternoon. I think this is very important:

The Office of Comptroller General Joseph Campbell says it was wrong in two accusations of wrongdoing against Howard I. Young, a Government dollar-a-year man in 1951–2, and was dropping them.

Mr. Young is president of American Zinc, Lead & Smelting Co., of St. Louis. He retained his position with the company when he was an official in the Defense Materials Procurement Agency during the Truman administration.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHORT] has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. SHORT was allowed to proceed for 5 additional minutes.)

Mr. SHORT—

Allegations of "conflict of interest" in Mr. Young's handling of some zinc contracts during his time with the DMPA were made by Mr. Campbell July 7. The Senate-House Defense Production Committee conducted an inquiry. Yesterday, the committee made public testimony taken the day before behind closed doors in which Mr. Campbell's office said two of its charges against Mr. Young were based on wrong information.

The charges were that Mr. Young's firm sold $60,000 worth of machinery to the Mid-Continent Mining Co. after Mr. Young helped to promote a DMPA loan to Mid-Continent—

Which is untrue—

and that Mr. Young's firm sold 1,167 tons of zinc to the stockpile at a price 1½ cents a pound above the market price.

That is also untrue. We do not have all the evidence. Even so times and conditions change.

The transcript of the committee meeting quoted Frank H. Weitzel, Assistant Comptroller General—

Who is taking the rap for his superiors for the serious mistake made—

as testifying that "we admit we were wrong" and that the Comptroller General was dropping the accusations.

The transcript also quoted Mr. Young's lawyer, John F. Lane, as accusing the General Accounting Office, which Mr. Campbell heads, of bias and prejudice against his client.

Mr. Young has said in sworn testimony before the committee that he never made any money for himself or his firm from Government contracts which he had handled.

The committee did not say what steps it might take next.

But I hope they will follow the recommendation made by Mr. Young's attorney:

1. That we be relieved of any further obligation to this committee to discuss the GAO report with the GAO.

2. That the committee direct the Comptroller General to withdraw all copies of his report on the grounds that its erroneous, misleading inferences, inaccuracies and lack of completeness fully warrant the conclusion that it should not have been issued in the first place.

3. That this committee suggest to the Comptroller General that an apology to Mr. Young now appears to be entirely in order.

Mr. Chairman, a grievous wrong has been done to a great and good man, a loyal and patriotic American. Oh, yes, they drove the nail in the wall and now they are pulling the nail out, but the hole is still in the wall. That has caused this man unjust criticism and caused his lovely wife and two fine sons much mental anguish and physical suffering by false accusation without any foundation in fact whatever. Retraction can never catch up with accusation. Where is our great ethical press? So I think we should exercise great caution and restraint and judgment before we file or hurl unfounded charges.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHORT. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. I am not as well acquainted with Mr. Young as is the gentleman, but I do have faith in the gentleman from Missouri, and I do know Jess Larson who was the boss of this man. There is no more able and conscientious public servant than Jess Larson. He was a No. 1 public servant during that time. I want to compliment the gentleman.

Mr. SHORT. I thank the gentleman from Oklahoma and I join him in his high regard for Jess Larson. He was a fine, faithful, and loyal public servant. Howard Young has told me that there is no finer nor abler man than Jess Larson. And Jess Larson had the courage, fairness, and the honesty to go before this committee and say that if any mistakes were made it was his fault and not that of Howard Young. To point the finger of suspicion at this good man is a dastardly thing to do unless men are well informed before they hurl these reckless and irresponsible charges.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHORT. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. JUDD. I do not know Mr. Young personally, but not only was he libeled and his good name blackened in this GAO report, but other people were also involved. One firm against which charges were made was the Mid-Continent Mining Co., whose headquarters happens to be in St. Paul. That is not in my district, but I know some of its officers and have some familiarity with this whole case. The GAO report suggested that in return for the recommendation of Mr. Young that a loan be granted that company, it would have its zinc ore processed in Mr. Young's smelter in St. Louis. Now, where else would zinc ore mined in the gentleman's part of the country, Missouri, go to be refined except to St. Louis? Whoever prepared the GAO report took certain facts which were not cause and effect and insinuated they were. Some of the statements made as facts were easily demonstrable not to be facts. GAO recklessly destroyed the good name of American citizens. When that can happen, there ought to be an investigation of the General Accounting Office. And I trust, Mr. Chairman, that the Member of the other body who spread this libelous report on the official pages of the Congress will ask to have it expunged from the permanent RECORD.

Mr. SHORT. The investigators should be investigated. I am not mad at anybody. I want to live peaceably with all men. I am easy to get along with. But I can fight; and I never run away from one. Howard Young is my friend. More important he is a good American who unselfishly serves his country. Even the Democrats know it and that seals the book. Do not smear him nor cause his wife and sons to suffer this unjustified mental anguish and physical torture. It is a blemish upon us and not them.

Mr. Speaker, the following editorial appeared in the Joplin Globe of Sunday, July 24, 1955:

THE CASE OF HOWARD I. YOUNG

People in this district naturally have been interested in recent publicity concerning Howard I. Young, president of the American Zinc, Lead & Smelting Co. He is a product of this district, sharing with Alton Jones, head of Cities Service, the honor of being our finest examples of smalltown boys who made good in the city.

Starting as a clerk with the important company he has now headed for so long, Howard Young has received almost every honor the American mining industry could offer, including the presidency of the American Mining Congress, a position he still holds.

It is understandable that a man who has received such convincing evidence of the trust of the leaders of his profession as to his ability, honesty and integrity should have been astounded to pick up the newspapers recently and discover that a United States Senator, WILLIAMS, of Delaware, had made a speech in the Senate in which he reported that the head of the General Accounting Office of the United States suspected Young of misconduct while acting as the nonsalaried Deputy Administrator of the Defense Materials Procurement Agency from 1951 to 1953.

The amazing thing is that such a charge should have been made and publicized without giving Young a chance to present his side of the matter. There is no room here to print the multitudinous details of the case as it progressed, including sizzling castigation of Senator WILLIAMS on the Senate floor by Senator CAPEHART, of Indiana, for what he termed "character assassination" before hearing from the person accused. Suffice it to say that Young immediately asked for and did present his side of the case and that after he had done so it was obvious the charges were completely unreasonable and unfair.

In 1951, shortly after Young's appointment to the position with the Government as a dollar-a-year assistant, he visited this district and addressed mine operators in Joplin.

Here is a brief excerpt from an editorial in this column following this visit:

"If district mining men had hoped a plan for generous subsidy of local mining operations would be announced for the DMPA by Deputy Administrator Howard I. Young, in his address here Friday night, they were disappointed. He made no such announcement. The best he had to say was that the matter of encouraging increased production is being studied and that he will do what he can, consistent with the best interest of the Nation at large, to promote the interest of the mining industry here and elsewhere in the country.

"Howard Young is one of the most capable and highly honored men of the Nation in the mining industry. In addition, he is a 100 percent American, earnestly devoted to the task in which he now has an important part—that of allocating critical mineral resources for America and the free world. It is encouraging to feel and believe that there are many men of similar high repute and sterling character engaged in cooperating for the Nation's safety and protection."

We reiterate this sentiment today. But it is self-evident that Uncle Sam will find it harder and harder to get capable business leaders to cooperate in Government operation if they are to be maligned without cause and without a chance to tell their story before absurd charges are given general publicity. It is a procedure idiotic on its face and unqualifiedly condemnable.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT].

Mr. HIESTAND. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to yield the time allotted to me to Mr. WOLCOTT.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, as has been so ably and well said by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BROWN], although we are not in a war the whole concept of the Defense Production Act is predicated on preparation for possible conflict. Were it not for the threat to the free democracies of the world today by potential enemies there would be no justification for continuing the Defense Production Act in any particular. So long as there is a clashing of political ideologies between the East and West, then we must keep ourselves in a position of preparedness, which we are doing. That, of course, involves and calls for some advice on the part of those who know what it is all about. We are still producing for a stockpile of strategic and critical materials, and it is absolutely essential that under this act we bring into the Government the people who are familiar with the production and distribution of these critical materials. Mention was made by the gentleman from Georgia of an Executive order promulgated by President Truman in 1950, Executive Order 10182, which is still in force and effect. It is a workable order and ties in with this problem of those who are employed without compensation. The purpose of that Executive order was to throw certain safeguards around this employment. It is a workable order. Now the substance of this Executive order for the first time has been written into the law so that unless the law is changed some time in the future, we always will have these standards under which these dollar-a-year men have had to work since 1950. The major change from that is an addition, which at the suggestion of the Department of the Interior, your Committee on Banking and Currency wrote into the act. It is found on page 5 wherein it provides that—

(4) Appointees under this subsection (b) shall, when policy matters are involved, be limited to advising appropriate full-time salaried Government officials who are responsible for making policy decisions.

That is an addition to the Executive order which has been in full force and effect since 1950. In other words, when these dollar-a-year men come in to aid with this problem of producing and allocating the materials for the stockpile, they come in as advisors. I think all the safeguards we should write into the act have been written in. I am certain, or anyway I am hopeful, that the gentleman's amendment will be defeated.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I yield.

Mr. McDONOUGH. The gentleman from Texas stated to the committee a moment ago that we should not have these w. o. c. men unless we are in a national emergency. As I recall, the other day the Speaker of the House asked the Attorney General for a ruling as to whether we were in a national emergency to determine whether the House should adjourn on the 31st of July, and the Attorney General said that we are in a national emergency and, therefore, any action after the 31st of July is legal action on the part of this Congress. So I point out we are in a national emergency.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Chairman, I also have the highest regard for Jess Larson. I do not know the gentleman, Mr. Young, who has been mentioned here, but I have no reason to disbelieve anything that has been said by our colleagues about him and his high repute.

However, let us get the record straight. Our Banking and Currency Committee of the House considered this matter in executive session, and our committee has released nothing with reference to these charges. As to what has been done in the other body, I must quote to you now, and this comes directly from the ticker tape:

WASHINGTON.—The General Accounting Office said today it had only reworded—not withdrawn—its charge that the Government bought zinc above market prices from a firm headed by Howard I. Young while he was a Government official.

Young, of St. Louis, president of the American Zinc, Lead & Smelting Co., was a dollar-a-year official in the Defense Materials Procurement Agency from 1951 to 1953 while still drawing his regular pay from the company.

The GAO said its charge that American Zinc sold 1,167 tons of zinc to the Government stockpiling program in 1952 at a price of 1½ cents above the market price still stands. It denied that testimony made public Thursday constituted a withdrawal of its earlier statement.

This charge must be aired in the proper place. The floor of the House is not the proper tribunal in which to try anyone. I make no charges, but I do say that this matter does indicate the need for strengthening this bill with reference to employing w. o. c.'s.

Mr. HIESTAND. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MULTER. I yield.

Mr. HIESTAND. Was not the gentleman from New York instrumental in committee in putting these safeguards in the bill?

Mr. MULTER. The committee did not accept all of my suggestions on the subject. I intend to offer other amendments today. You will recall that two of my amendments were rejected by a very close division.

When it comes to extending the employment of these w. o. c.'s outside of defense procurement we are extending this bill too far. The bill is a bad bill unless it is going to limit these w. o. c.'s as to their activities. I do not think the bill goes far enough on that score.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SPENCE] is recognized.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I regret and deplore all this talk about breach of trust. How else and where else can we find good men of experience in time of emergency?

I am for the bill; I am against the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN].

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, may we have the amendment read?

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

The Clerk again read the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. VANIK: Page 5, line 15, insert the following new sentence:

"Such affidavit will also list the name of the appointee's private employer and will further state that such appointee shall not knowingly commit any act of omission or commission which will to the detriment of the Government inure to the appointee's personal benefit or to the benefit of his present or prospective employer."

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is a very simple amendment to the bill. It merely provides that the affidavit carry supplemental information in which the appointee says that he will not knowingly commit any act of omission or commission which will to the detriment of the Government inure to his own personal benefit or to the benefit of his present or prospective employer. This is a very simple amendment which in effect is a loyalty-to-Government affidavit.

I think the time has come when we should boldly endeavor to do those things

that should be done to strengthen and improve civil service methods and Government salary-levels to develop and attract high quality personnel into Government. It is surprising how much competence and ability can be found throughout the public service in view of the lack of incentives by reason of low salaries and official confusion.

In this period of relief from "shooting" wars, we must take time out to develop selective methods and incentives to in some way compete with private industry in "luring" topflight officials to Government. If this effort cannot be undertaken at this time, the opportunity is not likely to become better.

If the Government career man cannot hope for promotion to high administrative or policy-participating positions, one of the greatest incentives to careers in Government is destroyed. If the Government employee cannot look forward to promotion and advancement to high administrative responsibility, his prospects are dull indeed.

The dollar-a-year man, while he can contribute special training and experience, can never contribute a prime essential in Government service—loyalty. His compensation comes from his private industry. His future by way of promotion and advancement and his retirement security rest with his employer. He could rarely be expected to render a decision in Government which would be contrary to the interests of his employer. While he may never render decisions or make policy contrary to public interest while in Government service, the accumulation in his know-how in confidential Government methods and procedures may far exceed his contribution of know-how to Government. This contact with governmental methods, processes, and officials could well develop as a private business channel into Government for the advantages of private business.

What other great impelling force would justify the willingness of private business to "loan" executives to Government. The cost of this type of business expense could not be justified unless the stockholders could be convinced of a profitable return.

Ever since President Grover Cleveland's day, the effort has been continuous to improve the standards and the nature of civil service. Government can be as readily contaminated against the public interest by private business as by political interference. The public service must be kept pure of influence. The public trust undertaken in public service must be undertaken by dedicated men and women who have or who can be made to acquire adequate know-how in the public service. The public service must be developed to provide in-service training facilities. The critical times which may have necessitated the "loan" of private executives to Government have substantially passed. Government must again develop and train its own administrative leaders.

Until such time as government can provide proper and adequate incentives and as long as the national emergency continues, w. o. c.'s are necessary. Their activities, however, are of great concern and safeguards must be taken to insure their loyalty to the Government service.

All I propose by this amendment is to suggest that the affidavit include these substantial points: First, that the official must state in his affidavit that he will not knowingly commit any act or fail to do any act which will be to the detriment of Government, or one that will be either to his own personal advantage or to the advantage of a prospective employer.

Before closing, may I say that Dr. Fleming stated in committee that he saw no reason why any official contemplated to be appointed under this act should refuse to sign such an affidavit. If we can ask public employees to sign an affidavit stating that they will remain loyal to the country, if we can ask them to sign an affidavit in which they promise not to strike, and we passed that kind of a requirement a few weeks ago, it seems to me entirely reasonable to require w. o. c.'s to sign an affidavit in which they promise to be loyal to their Government. I urge your support of this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VANIK].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MULTER: On page 5, line 19, strike out the period in line 19 and inserting the following: "and appointments under this subsection (b) shall not be made to the position of the director or assistant director, head or assistant head of a bureau division, section, or other comparable policymaking or administrative position, and a person appointed under this subsection shall not perform the functions of such a director, assistant director, head or assistant head."

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Chairman, the committee by its action has decided that we do need an extension of this act as it applies to w. o. c.'s and in line with that I offer this amendment and the subsequent amendments in order to strengthen the bill. These amendments will probably prevent another Young incident or any of the other incidents which have been developed during the testimony before our committee and further developed and elaborated upon in the hearings being conducted by the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER] chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary.

I put into the RECORD yesterday a list of names furnished to us by the Secretary of Commerce, Mr. Weeks. Let me just indicate 1 or 2 instances, taking the names and the facts from that list, to indicate the necessity for this amendment. Working as a w. o. c. in that department, we had one gentleman by the name of Rowlands. His job was deputy director of the Container and Packaging Division. Now, who was this gentleman? After you decide first, of course, that that division was necessary to defense production, then let us see what was he doing. Well, he was writing specifications for containers and packages for the United States Government. Where did he come from and who was paying his salary and for what? One of the largest packaging and container companies in the country, Continental Can Co., was employing that gentleman as its special representative in Washington. Now, a special representative in Washington is just a nice name for what we used to call 5 percenters and more recently we called 10 percenters, and now we find they are on the payrolls of the big companies at salaries that run into 5 and 6 figures per annum. So this gentleman, for whom apparently there was no substitute, as the special representative of this large company, was put in charge of the very department that was writing specifications for commodities on which his company would bid.

Second, I put the entire list in the RECORD yesterday. All you need to do is to read the names, what they are doing in Government, what they are doing outside, and you will see the tremendous conflict in interest that my amendment seeks to avoid.

The next gentleman is William H. Thomas. What is his job? Government director of the General Industrial Equipment Division of Government, writing specifications and buying equipment for the Government. What is his job on the outside where he is drawing his livelihood at a very high compensation? He is manager of the Government Sales Division of Air Products, Inc. My amendment would prevent that kind of employment of w. o. c.'s.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MULTER. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. I must admit I am a little confused and slightly dismayed by some of the statements made here. I would like to ask the gentleman, does he proceed on the assumption that if a man is in the business or industrial world or even possibly been something of a success at it, necessarily he is not loyal to his country and is a crook who would like to gouge his Government?

Mr. MULTER. I would like to make it clear, as I did today and yesterday on this floor and as I did in committee, that I am making no charges against any of these men. But, the fact of the matter is we are in an emergency; we are still drafting boys and we are still drafting physicians and dentists who must give up their outside interests and serve only our Government. If these business men want to do a loyal job for our Government, which they ought to do, and not serve their masters on the outside in private enterprise at the same time, if they want to serve their Government loyally, let them do it in a fashion where their employers on the outside will not participate; let them stay away from specifications on which their employers will bid.

Let them not consult with anybody in Government who is going to give their private employers any advantage under such contracts.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. MULTER. I yield further.

Mr. HALLECK. I am glad to hear the gentleman say that we are still in an

emergency; and that, of course, is the reason for the extension of this act.

Mr. MULTER. Yes.

Mr. HALLECK. If the gentleman will permit me, I would like to make this further observation. I have had occasion firsthand to see something of the work of these "without compensation" employees. The head of the telephone division until today, comes from my district in Indiana. He is the president of a telephone company with 3,000 subscribers. I happen to know he is one of the best men in our part of the country. He came down here and has done a good job. I resent the implications that I continue to hear all the time that somehow or other all of these people must be crooks. As a matter of fact, when you get into war, you start sending for the people who know how to get things done. Thank God, we have got that kind of people in this country.

Mr. MULTER. Unfortunately, the friend of the gentleman from Indiana is not the rule but the exception. My amendment seeks to make them not the exception but the rule.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, nobody charges that w. o. c.'s and businessmen who are drawn into the Government are crooks. We need those skilled and talented businessmen. We covet them. It is essential to have them in this mobilization period. What is sought is to get after the abuses in the use of these men. And there have been grave abuses.

The bill before us goes a great way toward alleviating and preventing those abuses. For example, on page 4, lines 21 to 25, we have this significant and cogent language:

> Appointments to positions other than advisory or consultative may be made under this authority.

That is fine, but what has happened? That language is already part of an Executive order. This bill nails the Executive order into statute. But in the interpretation of that order to the effect that w. o. c.'s may be used only in an advisory capacity, we find that w. o. c.'s are made heads of divisions where they are in control of from 20 to 80 employees, career men of the Government and actually determine policy. And when you are head of a division or a deputy head, you make important and momentous decisions which, indeed, are not merely advisory, but are administrative and involve policy. But those decisions are in the main policymaking decisions. I cannot repeat this too often.

For example, in the case of the Aluminum and Magnesium Division in the BDSA of the Department of Commerce, the head of the Division was a man by the name of Perkins, who was an official of the Reynolds Metals Co. He was succeeded by a man named Erskine, who was an official of the Aluminum Company of America. Mind you, they were heads of divisions; and, for example, they had to pass upon the question whether or not there should be an expansion of the production of aluminum with Government aid. And what did they do? They advised against expansion of aluminum in the face of grave shortages of aluminum in this country.

I do not impugn their motives. I do not know what their motives were. I am sure they are honorable men. I do know that in the face of the grave shortages that decision that was made would greatly enhance the prestige and power and profits of their own companies. Failure of expansion would necessarily increase demand for an ever shortening supply of aluminum.

We have something like 25 divisions in the Department, the successor to the NPA in the BDSA Department of Commerce, known as the Business Defense and Services Administration.

Fifteen of the twenty-five divisions are headed by w. o. c. men. Those are policymaking heads of divisions. The amendment that has been offered by the gentleman from New York would be a command by the Congress to the Department of Commerce that the head of the division could not be a w. o. c.—must be a career man.

Let me read to you what Mr. Honeywell stated. He is the head of the Business Defense Services Administration. He said this on February 4, 1954, before the Chicago Conference on Industry:

> Other key executives from industry, serving without compensation from the Government, are directors of most of the industry divisions. In time we hope to have all of these divisions headed by w. o. c.'s, as we call them for serving "without compensation."

Thus the Department of Commerce desires only w. o. c.'s and not career Government officials in these position.

Now, see how industry dictates the policy promulgated and evaluated by the Business Defense Services Administration. In numerous industry advisory committees strongest recommendations are made that only officers of these industry members shall occupy policymaking positions; namely, heads of departments and divisions.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

Mr. HALLECK. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Chairman, we have a lot of work to do today. We have some amendments here that everyone knows are not going to get anywhere. It seems to me it would be a good thing to go on and vote on this amendment.

Mr. CELLER. I ask for 2 minutes.

Mr. HALLECK. All right; bargain rates. I withdraw my objection, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. CELLER. In the minutes of the steel products industry advisory meeting on September 9, 1953, appeared the following:

> In a discussion of the proposed organization of the Iron and Steel Division Mr. Wallace explained that plans are to fill the positions of Director and Assistant Director with w. o. c. employees, each to serve for 6 months.

That recommendation of the steel products industry was followed to the letter by the head of the Business Defense Services Administration. I can show you many minutes of industry meetings of a similar nature where it was said, "We want w. o. c.'s to head divisions, we want the w. o. c.'s in policymaking positions." And slavishly the head of the Business Defense Services Administration responds to the request, or rather I should say the commands of the industry. The result is that practically most of the BDSA are run by w. o. c.'s—members of the industry. In such positions decisions are made affecting tax amortizations, affecting quotas and the like. Industry and not the Government really makes the decisions. They do not merely advise, they make the decisions. That is the abuse I speak of, and I say that to the gentleman from Indiana. Of course, Mr. Honeywell or Commerce officials will answer that they merely suggest action to the Secretary of Commerce. They do suggest but the suggestion is usually so powerful as always to be accepted. The Secretary of Commerce cannot possibly know all the details and ramifications of all actions taken, he must of necessity rely upon and accept the so-called suggestions. These suggestions are really orders—orders never, if ever, rejected.

Therefore, if we adopt this amendment, we would say to those in authority, "You cannot appoint w. o. c.'s in these policymaking positions as heads of divisions or heads of departments, you must appoint career paid Government men."

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment of the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER].

We must keep in mind that persons from industry who come to work for the Government as w. o. c.'s are in a very real sense serving two masters. Although these w. o. c.'s work for the Government, their salaries are paid not by the Government but by their company. Human nature being what it is, can anyone be so naive as to suppose that the decisions of a w. o. c. would run counter to the best interests of his company? It would be an extraordinary individual who would not have a subconscious gravitation to his company's best interests; who would make a decision adverse to his company upon which he depends for a livelihood.

This amendment has but one purpose, to prevent w. o. c.'s from being placed in a position where they can make decisions which affect not only their own company but competing companies as well. This amendment would set up safeguards so that vital policy decisions, such as the granting of tax-amortization certificates to particular companies and the channeling of defense materials will be made by officials in Government who do not have a private ax to grind.

Mr. Chairman, all this week our antitrust subcommittee has been hearing testimony about the activities of w. o. c.'s in the Business and Defense Services

Administration of Secretary Weeks' Department of Commerce, which employs more w. o. c.'s than any other agency of Government.

What did our Antitrust Subcommittee find? We found that in the Business and Defense Services Administration everyone of the three Assistant Administrators as a w. o. c.; the directors of 15 of the 25 industry divisions are likewise w. o. c.'s. We found that these w. o. c.'s by virtue of occupying these strategic positions have made vital policy decisions affecting their own companies; they have decided as to what companies in their own industry should or should not be the beneficiary of Government tax-amortization certificates; the extent to which, if any, defense production of critical materials should be expanded or not; what companies should be the recipients of Government financial assistance. This is fundamentally wrong. I say it is too much to expect any man under these circumstances to make decisions which will not parallel the best interests of his company. In saying this, I am not impugning the motive of any individual. I want to make it clear that many w. o. c.'s have rendered excellent service to the Government, particularly in technical and advisory capacities. I am all in favor of having men trained in industry serve a tour of duty with the Government, particularly in time of emergency. Certainly there is much in the way of skill and technical background that industry persons can contribute to the complex machinery of Government. That is one thing. It is quite another to turn over to men whose pecuniary ties with industry continue responsibility for making vital Government decisions in which their companies have a direct and immediate stake.

Mr. Chairman, we cannot legislate morality. But we can by adopting this amendment insure that people will not be placed in a position where they can use their public office to private advantage.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. CELLER) there were—ayes 27, noes 89.

So the amendment was rejected.

DEFLATIONARY MOVE ON HOME CONSTRUCTION

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I strongly disapprove of action of the FHA and VA in reducing from 30 years to 25 years and increasing the maximum maturity by 2 percent the minimum downpayments for homes.

It cannot be said that we are overbuilding, in view of new family formation, high mobility, rising housing standards, increasing incomes, and the unfilled housing needs of the country. While the rate of new family formation has been declining, there are many other determinants of future housing requirements. The latter are based not only on population growth and family formation but migration, losses of housing units, obsolescence and deterioration, undoubling of families, and vacancy and occupancy rates.

In 1950, according to the Census, there were 10.6 million occupied nonfarm dwellings which were dilapidated or were deficient in plumbing facilities. It may be conservatively estimated that at least 8 million nonfarm dwellings are substandard and are either so far gone that they must be destroyed or that economically they can be brought up to standard through rehabilitation. Another 2 or 3 million farm homes are below accepted farm standards. To date we have made little progress in reducing the number of substandard dwellings. At the rate of only 1.3 or 1.4 million homes a year, little further can be done to replace substandard homes and meet the Nation's minimum housing requirements.

Many experts in the field believe that 2 million homes a year are needed. Professor Wheaton in his study of American Housing Needs: 1955–70 found 2 to 2.4 million units a year were needed and that it was economically feasible to achieve this goal. The National Association of Home Builders has estimated that 1.4 million homes are needed annually between 1954 and 1960, and that in the sixties need would rise sharply with increasing family formation. The recently published authoritative 20th Century Fund Survey of America's needs and resources estimates that 1,550,000 dwelling units a year are needed for new construction in the 1950–60 decade, with an additional 350,000 a year to be rehabilitated.

Production of more houses to bring down their price is the cure for any inflationary possibility that may exist. The imposition of credit controls will have the effect of reducing production.

The press release is as follows:

Housing Administrator Albert M. Cole and Federal Housing Commissioner Normal P. Mason in a joint statement today announced that the FHA, effective immediately, is reducing the maximum maturity of FHA-insured home mortgages from 30 years to 25 and is increasing by 2 percent the minimum down payments for homes.

Administrator Cole described the action taken by FHA Commissioner Mason as "a mild and temporary precautionary measure which seeks to assure that the housing market will not contribute inflationary measures to the economy."

Following is the text of the Cole-Mason statement:

"We have been watching with great interest recent trends in housing costs. FHA's Division of Research and Statistics has seen indications of a slight but rising trend in the cost of housing.

"This has not yet been reflected in the prices purchasers must pay for homes but it is a pressure which will affect the general economic well-being of the United States.

"There are also indications of possible shortages in building materials, such as certain steel items, Portland cement and wallboard.

"These signs are not alarming but they are warning signs of inflationary possibilities.

"To counteract any unnecessary rise in the price of homes, FHA is temporarily suspending its regulations which permit the writing of 30-year mortgage loans, substituting instead a 25-year maximum. Prior to August 2, 1954, the maximum generally was 25 years.

"FHA is also increasing by 2 percent the minimum down payments for all 1-to-4 family dwelling units purchased with FHA-insured loans."

Minimum down payment for FHA-financed homes formerly was 5 percent of the first $9,000 of the FHA's appraised value of the home and 25 percent of the amount above $9,000. The minimum down payment does not include closing costs, which also must be paid in cash.

The new directive requires a minimum down payment, exclusive of closing costs, of 7 percent of the first $9,000 of value plus 27 percent of the value in excess of $9,000.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order that the gentleman is not speaking in order. He is out of order because he is not speaking in order.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, I am glad to answer that point of order. This relates to the emergency. You know the President asked for this power a year ago, and it was denied. The Congress turned him down on that request, but now a year after it was denied, on the theory evidently of an emergency, they are going ahead and reducing these maturities from 30 years to 25 years, and also increasing the payments effective tomorrow. I just wanted to enter this disapproval.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MULTER: On page 8, after line 4, insert the following:

"(9) Appointees under this subsection (b) shall only be assigned duties with regard to functions specifically authorized by titles I, III, and VII of this act."

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Chairman, this amendment seeks to limit the activities of these w. o. c.'s to the three titles of the defense production act that we are extending in this bill. Those titles are the only matters which we are extending in this Defense Production Act, and they are matters as to which these w. o. c.'s should be limited in their activities. That is all the amendment seeks to do—to limit their activities to the three titles that we are now extending.

Mr. Chairman, I urge the adoption of the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MULTER. On page 8, after line 4, insert the following:

"(10) Before any appointment is made under this subsection (b) the appointing official shall first certify to the Civil Service Commission the duties to be performed by such appointee and the efforts he had made to obtain a person competent to perform them and that he has been unable to employ any competent full-time salaried Government employee to perform such duties and the Civil Service Commission shall certify that there is no existing list of persons qualified to perform such duties and the President shall certify that the appointment is necessary to carry out the purposes of this act as amended and extended. The duties of the appointee shall be limited to those set forth in the certification of the appointing official."

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Chairman, the amendment is self-explanatory. It will make effective the very limitations and

restrictions that we have put into this bill thus far.

I urge the adoption of the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER].

The amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 5. Section 712 of the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, is amended—

(1) by striking out "25" from the second sentence of subsection (c) thereof and inserting in lieu thereof "40"; and

(2) by striking out "$50,000" in the first sentence of subsection (e) thereof and inserting in lieu thereof "$65,000".

SEC. 6. Section 717 of the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, is amended by striking out "July 31, 1955" from the first sentence of subsection (a) thereof and inserting in lieu thereof "June 30, 1956".

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee, 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. 7470, to amend the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, pursuant to House Resolution 320, he reported the same back to the House.

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.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (S. 2391) to amend the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, and for other purposes, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert the provisions of the House bill just passed.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the Senate bill?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That this act may be cited as the "Defense Production Act Amendments of 1955."

SEC. 2. Section 2 of the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"DECLARATION OF POLICY

"SEC. 2. In view of the present international situation and in order to provide for the national defense and national security, our mobilization effort continues to require some diversion of certain materials and facilities from civilian use to military and related purposes. It also requires the development of preparedness programs and the expansion of productive capacity and supply beyond the levels needed to meet the civilian demand, in order to reduce the time required for full mobilization in the event of an attack on the United States."

SEC. 3. Section 303 of the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, is amended—

(1) by striking out "1963" in subsection (b) and inserting in lieu thereof "1965"; and

(2) by adding at the end thereof a new subsection as follows:

"(g) When in his judgment it will aid the national defense, and upon a certification by the Secretary of Agriculture or the Secretary of the Interior that a particular strategic and critical material is likely to be in short supply in time of war or other national emergency, the President may make provision for the development of substitutes for such strategic and critical materials."

SEC. 4. Subsection (c) of section 701 of the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"(c) Whenever the President invokes the powers given him in this act to allocate any material in the civilian market, he shall do so in such a manner as to make available, so far as practicable, for business and various segments thereof in the normal channel of distribution of such material, a fair share of the available civilian supply based, so far as practicable, on the share received by such business under normal conditions during a representative period preceding any future allocation of materials: *Provided*, That the President shall, in the allocation of materials in the civilian market, give due consideration to the needs of new concerns and newly acquired operations, undue hardships of individual businesses, and the needs of smaller concerns in an industry."

SEC. 5. Section 701 of the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, is amended by adding after subsection (c) a new subsection as follows:

"(d) In order to further the objectives and purposes of this section, the Office of Defense Mobilization is directed to investigate the distribution of defense contracts with particular reference to the share of such contracts which has gone and is now going to small business, either directly or by subcontract; to review the policies, procedures, and administrative arrangements now being followed in order to increase participation by small business in the mobilization program; to explore all practical ways, whether by amendments to laws, policies, regulations, or administrative arrangements, or otherwise, to increase the share of defense procurement going to small business; to get from the departments and agencies engaged in procurement, and from other appropriation agencies including the Small Business Administration, their views and recommendations on ways to increase the share of procurement going to small business; and to make a report to the President and the Congress, not later than 6 months after the enactment of the Defense Production Act Amendments of 1955, which report shall contain the following: (i) a full statement of the steps taken by the Office of Defense Mobilization in making investigations required by this subsection; (ii) the findings of the Office of Defense Mobilization with respect to the share of procurement which has gone and is now going to small business; (iii) a full and complete statement of the actions taken by the Office of Defense Mobilization and other agencies to increase such small business share; (iv) a full and complete statement of the recommendations made by the procurement agencies and other agencies consulted by the Office of Defense Mobilization; and (v) specific recommendations by the Office of Defense Mobilization for further action to increase the share of procurement going to small business."

SEC. 6. Section 708 of the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, is amended—

(1) by inserting before the period at the end of the first sentence of subsection (b) a colon and the following: *"Provided, however*, That after the enactment of the Defense Production Act Amendments of 1955, the exemption from the prohibitions of the antitrust laws and the Federal Trade Commission Act of the United States shall apply only (1) to acts and omissions to act requested by the President or his duly authorized delegate pursuant to duly approved voluntary agreements or programs relating solely to the exchange between actual or prospective contractors of technical or other information, production techniques, and patents or patent rights, relating to equipment used exclusively by or for the military which is being procured by the Department of Defense or any department thereof, and the exchange of materials, equipment, and personnel to be used in the production of such equipment; and (2) to acts and omissions to act requested by the President or his duly authorized delegate pursuant to voluntary agreements or programs which were duly approved under this section before the enactment of the Defense Production Act Amendments of 1955. The Attorney General shall review each of the voluntary agreements and programs covered by clause (2) of the proviso in the preceding sentence, and the activities being carried on thereunder, and, if he finds, after such review and after consultation with the Director of the Office of Defense Mobilization and other interested agencies, that the adverse effects of any such agreement or program on the competitive free enterprise system outweigh the benefits of the agreement or program to the national defense, he shall withdraw his approval in accordance with subsection (d) of this section. This review and determination shall be made within 90 days after the enactment of the Defense Production Act Amendments of 1955.";

(2) by inserting in subsection (d) thereof after the word "hereunder" the following: ", or upon withdrawal by the Attorney General of his approval of the voluntary agreement or program on which the request or finding is based,";

(3) by inserting after the first sentence of subsection (e) thereof the following new sentence: "Such surveys, and the reports hereafter required, shall include studies of the voluntary agreements and programs authorized by this section.";

(4) by striking out from the last sentence of subsection (e) thereof the words "at such times thereafter as he deems desirable" and inserting in lieu thereof the words "at least once every 3 months".

SEC. 7. Section 710 of the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, is amended—

(1) by amending subsection (b) thereof to read as follows:

"(b) (1) The President is further authorized, to the extent he deems it necessary and appropriate in order to carry out the provisions of this act, and subject to such regulations as he may issue, to employ persons of outstanding experience and ability without compensation. This authority may be delegated to heads of departments or agencies delegated or assigned functions under this act but may not be redelegated by them. In order to carry out the policy of the Congress that, so far as possible, operations under this act shall be carried on by full-time, salaried employees of the Government, heads of departments and agencies in making appointments under this subsection shall certify to the following with respect to each such appointment:

"(A) That the appointment is necessary and appropriate in order to carry out the provisions of this act;

"(B) That the duties of the position to which the appointment is being made require outstanding experience and ability;

"(C) That the appointee has the outstanding experience and ability required by the position; and

"(D) That the department or agency head has been unable to obtain a person with

qualifications necessary for the position on a full-time salaried basis.

"(2) Appointees under this subsection (b) shall, when policy matters are involved, be limited to advising appropriate full-time salaried Government officials who are responsible for making policy decisions.

"(3) The President is authorized to provide by regulation for the exemption of persons appointed under this subsection from the operation of sections 281, 283, 284, 434, and 1914 of title 18 of the United States Code and section 190 of the Revised Statutes (5 U. S. C. 99); except that such exemption shall not extend to the following:

"(A) To the negotiation or execution by an appointee under this subsection of Government contracts with the private employer of such appointee or with any corporation, joint stock company, association, firm, partnership, or other entity in the pecuniary profits or contracts of which the appointee or his private employer has any direct or indirect interest;

"(B) To the making of any recommendation or the taking of any action with respect to individual applications to the Government for relief or assistance, on appeal or otherwise, made by the private employer of the appointee or by any corporation, joint stock company, association, firm, partnership or other entity in the pecuniary profits or contracts of which the appointee or his private employer has any direct or indirect interest;

"(C) To the prosecution by the appointee, or participation by the appointee in any fashion, in the prosecution of any claims against the Government involving any matter concerning which the appointee had any responsibility during his employment under this subsection, during the period of such employment and the further period of 2 years after the termination of such employment; and

"(D) To the receipt or payment of salary in connection with the appointee's service under this subsection from any source other than the private employer of the appointee at the time of his appointment under this subsection.

"(4) Persons appointed under the authority of this subsection may be allowed transporation and not to exceed $15 per diem in lieu of subsistence while away from their homes or regular places of business pursuant to such appointment."; and

(2) by redesignating subsections "(e)" and "(f)" as subsections "(f)" and "(g)", respectively, and by inserting after subsection "(d)" a new subsection as follows:

"(e) The President is further authorized to provide for the establishment and training of a nucleus executive reserve for employment in executive positions in Government during periods of emergency. Members of this executive reserve who are not full-time Government employees may be allowed transportation and not to exceed $15 per diem in lieu of subsistence while away from their homes or regular places of business for the purpose of participating in the executive reserve training program. The President is authorized to provide by regulation for the exemption of such persons who are not full-time Government employees from the operation of sections 281, 283, 284, 434, and 1914 of title 18 of the United States Code and section 190 of the Revised Statutes (5 U. S. C. 99)."

SEC. 8. Section 712 of the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, is amended—

(1) by striking out "25" from the second sentence of subsection (c) thereof and inserting in lieu thereof "40"; and

(2) by striking out "$50,000" in the first sentence of subsection (e) thereof and inserting in lieu thereof "$65,000."

SEC. 9. Section 717 of the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, is amended by striking out "July 31, 1955" from the first sentence of subsection (a) thereof and inserting in lieu thereof "June 30, 1957."

SEC. 10. The Rubber Producing Facilities Disposal Act of 1953, as heretofore amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"SEC. 26. (a) Notwithstanding the second sentence of section 7 (a), the period for receipt of proposals for the purchase of the Government-owned rubber-producing facility at Institute, W. Va., known as Plancor No. 980, shall not expire until the end of the 60-day period which begins on the date of the enactment of this section.

"(b) If one or more proposals are received for the purchase of Plancor No. 980 within the time period specified in subsection (a), the Commission, notwithstanding the expiration of the period for negotiation specified in section 7 (f), shall negotiate with those submitting the proposals for a period not to exceed 75 days for the purpose of entering into a definite contract of sale.

"(c) Within 10 days after the termination of the actual negotiation period referred to in subsection (b) or, if Congress is not then in session, within 10 days after Congress next convenes, the Commission shall prepare and submit to the Congress a report containing, with respect to the disposal under this section of Plancor No. 980, the information described in paragraphs (1) to (5), inclusive, and paragraph (8) of section 9 (a). Unless the contract is disapproved by either House of the Congress by a resolution prior to the expiration of 30 days of continuous session (as defined in section 3 (c)) of the Congress following the date upon which the report is submitted to it, upon the expiration of such 30-day period the contract shall become fully effective and the Commission shall proceed to carry it out, and transfer of possession of the facility sold shall be made as soon as practicable but in any event within 30 days after the expiration of such 30-day period. The failure to complete transfer of possession within 30 days after the expiration of the period for congressional review shall not give rise to or be the basis of rescission of the contract for sale.

"(d) If, upon termination of the transfer period provided for in subsection (c), no contract for the sale of Plancor No. 980 has become effective, the operating agency last designated by the President shall continue to maintain said plancor in adequate standby condition under the provisions of section 8 of the Rubber Producing Facilities Disposal Act of 1953."

SEC. 11. Notwithstanding the provisions of section 3 (d) of the Rubber Producing Facilities Disposal Act of 1953, the Rubber Producing Facilities Disposal Commission (hereinafter referred to as the "Commission") before submission to the Congress of its report relative to Plancor No. 980, shall submit it to the Attorney General, who shall, within 7 days after receiving the report, advise the Commission whether, in his opinion, the proposed disposition, if carried out, will violate the antitrust laws.

SEC. 12. Notwithstanding the provisions of sections 14 and 22 of the Rubber Producing Facilities Disposal Act of 1953, the Rubber Act of 1948, as amended, is hereby extended with respect to the rubber-producing facilities covered by this act, to the close of the day of transfer of possession of Plancor No. 980 to a purchaser in accordance with the provisions of section 26 of the Rubber Producing Facilities Disposal Act.

SEC. 13. Notwithstanding the provisions of section 4 of Public Law 19, approved March 31, 1955, and notwithstanding the provisions of section 20 of the Rubber Producing Facilities Disposal Act of 1953, the Commission established by the latter act shall cease to exist at the close of the 30th day following the termination of the transfer period provided for in section 26 (c) of that act, unless no sale of Plancor No. 980 is recommended by the Commission pursuant to section 26 (c) of that act, in which event the Commission shall cease to exist at the close of the 130th day following the date of enactment of this act.

SEC. 14. Except as otherwise provided in this act, disposal of Plancor No. 980 shall be fully subject to all the provisions of the Rubber Producing Facilities Disposal Act of 1953 and such criteria as have been established by the Commission in handling disposal of other Government-owned rubber-producing facilities under that act: *Provided*, That the provisions of section 7 (j), 7 (k), 9 (d), 9 (f), 10, 11, 15, and 24 of that act shall not apply, to the disposal of Plancor No. 980. As promptly as practicable following the date of transfer of possession of Plancor No. 980 to a purchaser under this act, the operating agency last designated by the President shall offer for sale to such purchaser the end products at such plant and held in inventory for Government account on the day of such transfer of possession, together with the feedstocks then located at such plant or purchased by the operating agency for use at such plant. Sale of such end products shall be made at the Government sales price prevailing on the business day next preceding the date of transfer of possession of such plant. Sale of such feedstocks shall be made at not less than their cost to the Government. In the event the purchaser declines to purchase such end products or feedstocks when first offered to it by the operating agency, they may be thereafter disposed of in such manner as the operating agency deems advisable. In the event Plancor No. 980 is not sold under the provisions of this act, any end products at such plant and held in inventory for Government account and any feedstocks located at such plant or purchased by the operating agency for use at such plant shall be disposed of in such manner as the operating agency deems advisable, at the prevailing market price for such end products and feedstocks.

SEC. 15. The provisions of this act shall not be applicable to the disposal of any Government-owned rubber-producing facilities other than Plancor No. 980; and all action taken pursuant to the provisions of the Rubber Producing Facilities Disposal Act of 1953, or the amendment thereto known as Public Law 19, enacted March 31, 1955, prior to the enactment of this act shall be governed by the provisions of that act as it existed prior to the enactment of this act and shall have the same force and effect as if this act had not been enacted.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SPENCE: Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert the provisions of H. R. 7470 as passed, as follows:

"That this act may be cited as the 'Defense Production Act Amendments of 1955.'

"SEC. 2. Subsection (c) of section 701 of the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"'(c) Whenever the President invokes the powers given him in this act to allocate any material in the civilian market, he shall do so in such a manner as to make available, so far as practicable, for business and various segments thereof in the normal channel of distribution of such material, a fair share of the available civilian supply based, so far as practicable, on the share received by such business under normal conditions during a representative period preceding any future allocation of materials: *Provided*, That the President shall, in the allocation of materials in the civilian market, give due consideration to the needs of new concerns and newly acquired operations, undue hardships of individual businesses, and the needs of smaller concerns in an industry.'

"SEC. 3. Section 708 of the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, is amended—

"(1) by inserting before the period at the end of the first sentence of subsection (b) a colon and the following: *'Provided, however,* That after the enactment of the Defense Production Act Amendments of 1955, the exemption from the prohibitions of the antitrust laws and the Federal Trade Commission Act of the United States shall apply only (1) to acts and omissions to act requested by the President or his duly authorized delegate pursuant to duly approved voluntary agreements or programs relating solely to the exchange between actual or prospective contractors of technical or other information, production techniques, and patents or patent rights, relating to equipment used primarily by or for the military which is being procured by the Department of Defense or any department thereof, and the exchange of materials, equipment, and personnel to be used in the production of such equipment. The Attorney General shall review each of the voluntary agreements and programs covered by this section, and the activities being carried on thereunder, and, if he finds, after such review and after consultation with the Director of the Office of Defense Mobilization and other interested agencies, that the adverse effects of any such agreement or program on the competitive free enterprise system outweigh the benefits of the agreement or program to the national defense, he shall withdraw his approval in accordance with subsection (d) of this section. This review and determination shall be made within 90 days after the enactment of the Defense Production Act Amendments of 1955.'

"(2) by inserting in subsection (d) thereof after the word 'hereunder' the following: ', or upon withdrawal by the Attorney General of his approval of the voluntary agreement or program on which the request or finding is based,';

"(3) by inserting after the first sentence of subsection (e) thereof the following new sentence: 'Such surveys, and the reports hereafter required, shall include studies of the voluntary agreements and programs authorized by this section.';

"(4) by striking out from the last sentence of subsection (e) thereof the words 'at such times thereafter as he deems desirable' and inserting in lieu thereof the words 'at least once every 3 months.'

"SEC. 4. Section 710 (b) of the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"'(b) (1) The President is further authorized, to the extent he deems it necessary and appropriate in order to carry out the provisions of this act, and subject to such regulations as he may issue, to employ persons of outstanding experience and ability without compensation;

"'(2) The President shall be guided in the exercise of the authority provided in this subsection by the following policies:

"'(i) So far as possible, operations under the act shall be carried on by full-time, salaried employees of the Government, and appointments under this authority shall be to advisory or consultative positions only.

"'(ii) Appointments to positions other than advisory or consultative may be made under this authority only when the requirements of the position are such that the incumbent must personally possess outstanding experience and ability not obtainable on a full-time, salaried basis.

"'(iii) In the appointment of personnel and in assignment of their duties, the head of the department or agency involved shall take steps to avoid, to as great an extent as possible, any conflict between the governmental duties and the private interests of such personnel.

"'(3) Any person appointed under the authority of this subsection shall file, under oath, with the head of the employing agency at the time of employment a full and complete report of his outside connections, listing all personal and financial relationships which he has or had within 12 months prior to his appointment with any person, firm, corporation, or other entity, or any trade organization, labor union or similar organization, and he shall file monthly thereafter, under oath, so long as his appointment shall be in effect, any changes in such outside connections.

"'(4) Appointees under this subsection (b) shall, when policy matters are involved, be limited to advising appropriate full-time salaried Government officials who are responsible for making policy decisions.

"'(5) Any person employed under this subsection (b) is hereby exempted, with respect to such employment, from the operation of sections 281, 283, 284, 434, and 1914 of title 18, United States Code, and section 190 of the Revised Statutes (5 U. S. C. 99), except that—

"'(i) exemption hereunder shall not extend to the negotiation or execution, by such appointee, of Government contracts with the private employer of such appointee or with any corporation, joint stock company, association, firm, partnership, or other entity in the pecuniary profits or contracts of which the appointee has any direct or indirect interest;

"'(ii) exemption hereunder shall not extend to making any recommendation or taking any action with respect to individual applications to the Government for relief or assistance, on appeal or otherwise, under the provisions of the act made by the private employer of the appointee or by any corporation, joint stock company, association, firm, partnership, or other entity in the pecuniary profits or contracts of which the appointee has any direct or indirect interest;

"'(iii) exemption hereunder shall not extend to the prosecution by the appointee, or participation by the appointee in any fashion in the prosecution, of any claims against the Government involving any matter concerning which the appointee had any responsibility during his employment under this subsection, during the period of such employment and the further period of 2 years after the termination of such employment; and

"'(iv) exemption hereunder shall not extend to the receipt or payment of salary in connection with the appointee's Government service hereunder from any source other than the private employer of the appointee at the time of his appointment hereunder.

"'(6) Appointments under this subsection (b) shall be supported by written certification by the head of the employing department or agency—

"'(i) that the appointment is necessary and appropriate in order to carry out the provisions of the act;

"'(ii) that the duties of the position to which the appointment is being made require outstanding experience and ability;

"'(iii) that the appointee has the outstanding experience and ability required by the position; and

"'(iv) that the department or agency head has been unable to obtain a person with the qualifications necessary for the position on a full-time, salaried basis.

"'(7) The heads of the departments or agencies making appointments under this subsection (b) shall file with the Division of the Federal Register a statement including the name of the appointee, the employing department or agency, the title of his position, and the name of his private employer.

"'(8) At least once every 3 months the Chairman of the United States Civil Service Commission shall survey appointments made under this subsection and shall report his findings to the President and the Joint Committee on Defense Production and make such recommendations as he may deem proper.'

"SEC. 5. Section 712 of the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, is amended—

"(1) by seeking out '25' from the second sentence of subsection (c) thereof and inserting in lieu thereof '40'; and

"(2) by striking out '$50,000' in the first sentence of subsection (e) thereof and inserting in lieu thereof '$65,000'

"SEC. 6. Section 717 of the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, is amended by striking out 'July 31, 1955' from the first sentence of subsection (a) thereof and inserting in lieu thereof 'June 30, 1956.'"

The amendment was agreed to.

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

A motion to reconsider and the bill H. R. 7470 were laid on the table.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill S. 2391 with an amendment of the House, insist on the amendment of the House, and ask for a conference with the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. SPENCE, BROWN of Georgia, PATMAN, RAINS, WOLCOTT, GAMBLE, and TALLE.

INVESTIGATION BY COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I offer the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 331, Rept. No. 1601) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Ways and Means, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, is authorized and directed to conduct thorough studies and investigations of all matters coming within the jurisdiction of such committee.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this resolution, the committee, or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized to hold such hearings, to sit and act during the present Congress at such times and places, within the continental United States, its Territories and possessions, as the committee may determine, whether or not the House is in session, has recessed, or has adjourned, to require the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents by subpena or otherwise, to administer such oaths, and to take such testimony, as it deems necessary. Subpenas may be issued under the signature of the chairman of the committee or of any subcommittee, or by any member designated by any such chairman, and may be served by any person designated by any such chairman or member.

SEC. 3. The committee may report to the House at any time during the present Congress the results of any studies or investigations made under authority of this resolution, together with such recommendations as it deems appropriate. Any such report which is made when the House is not in session shall be filed with the Clerk of the House.

The resolution was agreed to.

REVISION AND EXTENSION OF SUGAR ACT OF 1948

Mr. COOLEY. 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. 7030) to amend and extend the Sugar Act of 1948, as amended, and for other purposes.

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. 7030 with Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY] will be recognized for 30 minutes and the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE] will be recognized for 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY].

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 29 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, our committee is about to present to this House one of the most complicated pieces of legislation that the House has ever been called upon to consider. It is of far-reaching importance. The time for presenting this complicated bill to the House is very limited. I have at my disposal only 30 minutes, which is a rather short time to present a bill of this importance to the House, when our committee has worked diligently on the bill for more than a month, with meetings in the morning and in the afternoon. I know I have never worked harder on any bill that has been reported from our committee during my service on the committee than I have on this bill. It affects people in far-distant places and it vitally affects every one of your constituents.

In presenting the matter to the Rules Committee, knowing that the Rules Committee was pressed for time just as we are pressed for time, I stated to that committee that I would not undertake to discuss the details of this complicated program, and unless there is some real demand for a detailed discussion of the program we are now presenting, I should like very much to avoid a discussion of those details, if possible.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. When does the present law expire?

Mr. COOLEY. The present law was rewritten in 1951 and it expires in December 1956.

Mr. GROSS. Then why is the bill here at all today?

Mr. COOLEY. I am glad the gentleman asked me that question. I will be very glad to answer it.

Mr. MORANO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. MORANO. No hearings have been printed on this bill; is that so?

Mr. COOLEY. Unfortunately, that is true.

Mr. MORANO. How do we know what transpired in the hearings?

Mr. COOLEY. I will tell the gentleman if he will give me a chance.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DONDERO. Does this further restrict the quotas allowed to the growers of sugar in this country?

Mr. COOLEY. No.

Mr. CHUDOFF. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. CHUDOFF. The gentleman said he did not want to go into details. In Philadelphia we have two big sugar refineries that refine practically all of the Cuban sugar that comes into this country. I am told by men who work in that factory that this is going to cut off Cuban sugar completely. They will have to close up their refinery if that is so. I would like to know whether that is true or not.

Mr. COOLEY. If the gentleman will let me proceed with my statement, I think I can save time, and I will try as best I can to explain the bill. I have no desire to avoid a discussion of the details of the bill, but I do want to say, in the first place, the information that the gentleman has received is entirely inaccurate.

We have before us the proposition of dividing 8,400,000 tons of sugar.

That sugar is divided among our domestic producers, the beet area, the sugarcane area, Puerto Rico, Hawaii, and then we provide an allotment for the Philippines, for Cuba, for Mexico, for the Dominican Republic, for Peru, Haiti, Panama, and so on. Representatives of every country and area participating in this program have been very active in behalf of the particular area in which they are interested.

This town has been literally throbbing with lobbyists and lawyers. I was urged to start these hearings, and I was reluctant to do so because I knew just how controversial this matter is.

When the bill was presented to this House in 1951 by our committee, it was only briefly discussed, because when all these various groups came to me for hearings I insisted that they themselves try to reach an agreement, and, they did just that. So, when the bill was presented here, I doubt if a single Member of the House even remembers the occasion. It was adopted, and we proceed to live with it and under it until our own domestic growers, because of no fault of their own, found themselves with a burdensome surplus, and when this Congress convened a bill was introduced in the other body which was supported by 49 Senators. More than 30 bills were introduced in this House and referred to our committee. I mention that only to show you the interest in this legislation.

Then a meeting was called at the White House and some 40 to 45 Senators and Congressmen attended the meeting with the President. At that meeting the President was advised of the fact that this law would not expire until December 1956 but that notwithstanding that expiration date this Sugar Act should be opened up to the end that the domestic producers might be given some relief. At that meeting I think the President said something like this:

> I realize that it is better to write this sort of legislation in advance of the year in which it goes into operation. I appreciate the fact that we should have conferences.

I am not trying to quote the President, but this is the substance of what he said:

> And I will call it to the attention of the Secretary of Agriculture. But—

He said—

> the State Department should be in the conferences and we should not run out on any agreements.

That is the first time I had ever seen that many Members of Congress together, none of whom wanted to talk. Not another word was said, and we left the White House. No one asked the President what he meant when he said we should not run out on agreements. We all knew what he meant when he said the State Department should be in on the conferences. I interpreted what he said to mean that he regarded the sugar law somewhat in the nature of an international agreement with Cuba. Of course, it is not an international agreement. We know we have a perfect right legally and morally to change any law we enact. This law we are asking you to accept today can be changed tomorrow if Congress decides to exercise its will. So, the pressure was terrific not to open up the act, not to schedule hearings, and, on the other hand, the pressure was terrific to open up the act and to schedule hearings.

All these bills were pending in our committee. Finally, in April I asked the Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. Benson, the Department of State, and the Department of the Interior for a report on these bills. The Department of the Interior, of course, is interested because of the Territories. Although I asked for the reports in April, we did not receive a report. Weeks came and went. Finally, on the 22d day of June, we started these hearings. I was so certain that we would find ourselves deadlocked in a great controversy, that we would only consume 2 or 3 days and then perhaps call off the hearings. But after the hearings were started, the officials of the departments, in testifying before our committee, when they were reminded of the fact that they had not reported on any of these bills, they finally brought in a report. When we received the report and the bill which was proposed by the administration, it was in language difficult to understand.

So I asked that the formula be broken down into tonnages so that our committee could deal with figures and facts concerning the different areas. That was done. We were presented with a chart. When we received the chart showing the tonnages, it was easy to understand what had been done.

The Department of Agriculture took the position that in dealing with foreign countries the State Department should exercise its judgment as to the quotas for those foreign countries. Agriculture made its recommendations with regard to the domestic areas, and the two departments concurred in the result.

When that chart was presented and understood, apparently everybody was dissatisfied. I know that members of our committee approached the performance of their duty impartially and with open minds and in an effort to accomplish something that would be as acceptable to the administrative branch as possible and something that would be equitable among all of the areas.

So we started with the proposal from the Department, and all of us were determined to stick as closely as we possibly could to the recommendations of the administration, but not do violence to ourselves and our own judgment and to other areas.

While we gave careful consideration to the bill recommended by the executive branch we claimed for ourselves the right to prepare and present a bill which we considered to be fair, just, and equitable.

The bill presented to us called for a 55–45 division of the consumption in the American market. We started out with 8,400,000 tons. The departments recommended that we give our own producers 55 percent of that and the other 45 percent of our consumption to Cuba and to other foreign countries. They went further than that and took it upon themselves in the Department of State to say that in the distribution of the 45 percent of our total consumption among Cuba and foreign countries, it should be divided 60 percent to Cuba and 40 percent to the full-duty countries.

Our committee again exercised its own will and we changed the figures of 60–40 to 50–50—and we changed the 55–45 to 50–50. And then we claimed for ourselves the right to make other arbitrary decisions.

This matter was presented to us as if there were something sacred about the formula that had been worked out in the bill. I pointed out to the officials that they had made at least 20 arbitrary decisions and determinations before they arrived at their formula.

We certainly have a right to make some arbitrary decisions ourselves. We tried to satisfy as many people as we could and to do as little harm as possible to any particular area, because in dividing this up we could only give away that which we could take away from somebody else. So we started out with this: The Department had taken away from Cuba 100,000 tons of sugar and had given it to our domestic producers. The Department had recommended 977,000 tons of sugar for the Philippines, and that was an arbitrary decision. The Department had suggested that the Philippine quota be frozen through the life of the bill. That was an arbitrary decision, and we accepted all of these arbitrary decisions.

Naturally, every group affected was asking for an increased quota. The refiners from Houston to Boston were interested in this legislation. The refiners of sugar in Puerto Rico wanted to increase their refined sugar quota. So the committee—with all these problems before us, and I say that I do not want to discuss the details of the act because if I do I will never be able to tell you what I want to tell you about the bill—started out to do the best job we could.

First, after giving 100,000 tons to our domestic producers and fixing the Philippine quota at a fair level of 977,000 tons, the Hawaiian Islands are perfectly satisfied because they have a quota large enough, they think, to take care of their needs. Puerto Rico has been willing to accept what we have provided in this bill for Puerto Rico, although it is far short of its wants. Puerto Rico would like to have an increased quota. Puerto Rico would like to have an increased raw sugar quota and an increased refined sugar quota.

Mr. SIMPSON of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. I yield.

Mr. SIMPSON of Illinois. Now that the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture has explained the bill, I wonder if he would admit that the sugar legislation is just as confused as the road legislation was last week.

Mr. COOLEY. I will admit this House will really be confused if they try to know all that is in this bill. It is something you almost are forced to accept upon faith. I think you are justified in accepting it upon faith because this sugar program has been in operation for 20 years, and I am certain that some of you ladies and gentleman who are listening to me now did not know that. I have made speeches in city districts and throughout this country and I have said to many audiences, "People denounce the farm program, but here is one part of our program that no one denounces." The program has operated so well, so successfully, and so smoothly, that the average housewife is not even aware of the fact that we have a sugar program. Even the average Congressman is unaware of the fact that we have a sugar program. But we have it. It has operated well, and under the program, prices have been stabilized through the years. We have avoided great fluctuations in prices even in war, World War II, the Korean war, and otherwise. On this program at the end of this year this sugar program will result in a net profit to the taxpayers of America of more than $300 million.

Mr. BELCHER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. BELCHER. In addition, at this time the Government does not own one single dollar's worth of sugar.

Mr. COOLEY. The gentleman is right. If a program has operated so well so long, that is justification for your accepting this program today on faith.

Mr. HALE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Maine.

Mr. HALE. Am I correct in understanding that the general effect of this legislation is to cut down the importations from Cuba in favor of importations from other Western Hemisphere countries?

Mr. COOLEY. No. If I can hurry on, I think I can tell you what we did.

I would just like to say this, and I think I am right. There are men here who can correct me if I am wrong. There are people on this floor from the beet-sugar-growing areas. We have some distinguished Members from the Congress on the committee from the beet-producing districts. They are here to speak for themselves. But I think I am safe in saying to you that they are satisfied with this bill, and that those from the cane-sugar-producing areas are also satisfied with the bill. The people in Hawaii are satisfied with the bill. Puerto Rico is satisfied with it. All of the full-duty countries are satisfied with it. I think I am safe in saying that the refiners of America are satisfied with it, and if they are not, they can speak for themselves. When I say they are satisfied, I mean there is general satisfaction with the bill. I do not mean as we have presented it and as it is here now, because there are some controversies involved. There is a section here that deals almost directly with the Philippines because the Philippines have discriminated against us in their own Congress. They have enacted a law and have named the American Virginia type of tobacco by name, and they by their congressional action have driven us out of their markets and have unfairly discriminated against us. That act is still on their books. So we put this provision in this bill, and I will say here and now that it is directed at the Philippines because of that unfair law which they enacted against us, which is nothing more or less than a gratuitous insult to the American flag, because even if the law were repealed tomorrow, we could not force them to buy tobacco. They have provided by law that their manufacturers cannot buy our tobacco. I have discussed this matter with many people and I have agreed that when the amendment is offered to strike out that section, I will accept the amendment and let the section be stricken out.

I understand the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMICK] will offer the amendment, but I am saying here now, and I want to make it clear, that the Congress of the Philippines can repeal their law just as quickly as we can withdraw this amendment, and if they do not do it, I am saying now that I will bring a bill out of my committee in January to prevent any further discriminations against any agricultural commodities produced in our country.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. I yield.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman has already answered one question that I had, but I do have another question. I should like to ask the gentleman whether this bill was well supported in committee.

Mr. COOLEY. Oh, yes; I will say that but for one section in the bill I have reason to believe that the vote in the committee would have been unanimous or almost unanimous. The section I refer to is the section providing for nonrecourse loans. We do provide here for relief—not only should we provide immediate relief for our domestic producers, but we should give domestic producers the benefit of nonrecourse loans at a level of 90 percent of parity. I am

certain that an amendment will be offered to strike this provision out. I still believe it should be retained. But if the producers do not want it, and if the Congressmen representing those districts in which sugar is produced do not want it, I certainly shall not attempt to force a loan program upon them. I understand my good friend, the gentleman from Utah [Mr. DIXON], will offer an amendment to strike out this provision for nonrecourse loans.

Mr. GROSS. I was in hopes that somebody from that area of the country would offer an amendment to strike it out, because certainly most of them from the Rocky Mountain area voted against 90 percent of parity for midwestern agriculture.

Mr. COOLEY. That is exactly the reason why the gentleman from North Carolina is not willing to take it out. I want them to take it out, if it is to be taken out.

Mr. BELCHER. I think you have cleared up the question I wanted to ask, that is that the two controversial sections of the bill of the 90 percent and the Philippines, and my understanding is that the gentleman is not opposed to taking them out.

Mr. COOLEY. No, but I want these 82½-percenters to take it out; I do not want to take it out myself.

One other thing about the State Department. The State Department is objecting to the bill as it affects Peru because Peru would be greatly handicapped in negotiations in connection with the International Sugar Agreement if that provision is retained in the bill. The Peruvian representative, a very distinguished Washington lawyer, came to me and pointed out that Peru would be handicapped by this provision and would go to the next international sugar conference handcuffed and would be unable to negotiate at arms length and on a fair basis with other countries. I shall, therefore, offer an amendment to strike out this provision.

Mr. SIMPSON of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. I yield.

Mr. SIMPSON of Illinois. I wonder if the gentleman from North Carolina would tell the House what the average acre subsidy is.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina has again expired.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, if nobody objects I will take 3 additional minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I would just like to say to my good friend from Illinois that it would take too much of the time of the House to answer the gentleman's question, because the subsidy per acre varies in different areas.

Mr. SIMPSON of Illinois. Would the gentleman admit that it averages better than $40 an acre in the United States?

Mr. COOLEY. I have the figures and assure the gentleman I will put them in, but I think the gentleman is very modest in the figure he uses.

Mr. SIMPSON of Illinois. It will average more than $42 an acre in the United States.

Mr. COOLEY. Probably so. But when you think about voting against this bill, just think what the situation would be if you did not have this bill.

Mr. SIMPSON of Illinois. I did vote against the bill.

Mr. COOLEY. I am surprised at the gentleman.

Mr. SHEEHAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. I yield.

Mr. SHEEHAN. One of the objections that has been made has been to the use of 1947 as a factor in the computation of price.

Mr. COOLEY. That has been taken out. That is something that will probably afford some relief to the industrial users and I assume that is what the gentleman has in mind.

Mr. SHEEHAN. That is right.

Mr. COOLEY. Not only that, but also the formula is modified in the way the gentleman has indicated. Furthermore, any time that the Secretary thinks sugar prices are too high he can authorize the bringing in of more offshore sugar and that itself would tend to put prices down.

Mr. SHEEHAN. Was it not proposed that instead of using 1947 as a base, 1947–49 be used as a base?

Mr. COOLEY. Certainly. That is correct, and that is the provision we approved.

Mr. SHEEHAN. What advantage or disadvantage does it give?

Mr. COOLEY. My recollection is a reduction of about 80 cents a hundredweight.

Mr. SHEEHAN. You mean it reduces the total.

Mr. COOLEY. The price ceiling would go down that much.

Mr. SHEEHAN. However, if the Secretary of Agriculture should use this as a factor in getting at the prices does not the gentleman think it would get close to 105 or 110 percent of parity, using 1947–49 as a factor?

Mr. COOLEY. Actually, if the Secretary should carry out the full effect of the formula written in the Sugar Act the price of sugar would be substantially higher, I think probably a cent or a cent and a half a pound.

Mr. SHEEHAN. It would simply mean that, regardless even if the 90 percent factor is taken out, if the Secretary of Agriculture goes to 1947–49 base, the price of sugar will be 105 or 110 percent of parity, and this would mean that sugar was in the most favored position of any agricultural product.

Mr. COOLEY. It is now and always has been.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. I have but 2 minutes remaining, but I will yield to the gentleman.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Referring to the gentleman's statement of what the situation would be if we did not have a law, in 1920 when I was married we paid 32 cents a pound for sugar. Ever since then, in my experience, it has not gone over 8½ cents a pound. That is what the sugar law did.

Mr. COOLEY. You cannot live without the act, because you would actually crucify all the domestic producers.

Mr. MORANO. But the law expires in December of 1956.

Mr. COOLEY. I wish that I had the time, for I would be glad to go over the facts and show exactly what we have done for Cuba.

Mr. MORANO. I am thinking about the United States right now.

Mr. COOLEY. Take the State Department bill and our bill, and at the end of the 4-year period Cuba has only given up about 11,000 tons of sugar more than she would have to give up under the State Department bill.

Mr. MORANO. That may be true, but I am thinking about the things that Cuba buys from the United States.

Mr. COOLEY. Well, what about Mexico? Mexico buys more from us than Cuba and all the full duty countries put together.

Every sugar-producing area and all the problems of all of those areas were carefully considered by members of our committee in our efforts to deal fairly and justly with the people from all of the sugar-producing areas participating in this program. Hearings started June 22 and ended July 21. Twenty meetings of our committee were held. More than 1,300 pages of testimony was taken and numerous lengthy statements were presented to the committtee and inserted in the record. More than 100 witnesses testified, and hundreds of letters and telegrams were received and considered. Numerous charts and documents were analyzed, and many formulas were considered. The one purpose of our committee was to act impartially and to do justice among all friendly areas participating in this program.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the hard work of the Committee on Agriculture in response to the appeal of representatives of sugar-producing areas, but it is to be regretted that the involved relationship between the economic problems dealt with in the pending bill and those of other countries, particularly of Cuba, have not received greater emphasis. Our own welfare requires it, and I trust that in the periodic reviews which this legislation will receive we may be able to devise an acceptable policy with reference to the importation of Cuban sugar. Undue restrictions in the Cuban quota create new problems for us since Cuba's interests are so closely tied to our own. I think of this illustration, Mr. Chairman. Cuba, having a high per capita rice consumption, is one of our best customers for American rice, but because her sugar markets here are not permitted to expand the Cuban people are not purchasing our rice in quantities they would normally use. As a result they are forced to turn land to rice cultivation for their own use which is uneconomic from every standpoint. Sugar and rice are vital elements in the island's economy. Granting that much depends upon the wisdom and foresight of Cuba's own policymakers, it is evident that economic difficulties in Cuba and the Caribbean react upon our own domestic situations. Ultimately we must weigh this interrelationship.

As chairman of the subcommittee on foreign economic policy of the House Foreign Affairs Committee, I urge the

Agriculture Committee members to take into account the economic factors which I have briefly described.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, it is true, as the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Agriculture has stated, that it is impossible in the time allotted to discuss all the details of this legislation. However, this is legislation which has been before the Congress ever since 1934. We passed legislation that year; in 1937 we amended it somewhat; the 1937 legislation was extended several times. We passed legislation in 1948 and in 1951, all of which embodied essentially the same principles that are contained in this legislation and which did not differ a great deal from this legislation except in the distribution of sugar consumption to the various producing areas. The basic theory of the legislation has been the same since 1934.

The problem that committee faced and which the House faces in considering this legislation is making as fair a distribution of sugar production to the various producing areas as it is possible to do. I believe that the committee has done a good job, not just as I would have it if I were writing it, not just as you would do it, perhaps; but when you consider that we have every producing area asking for more production than it is now receiving and more than we can possibly give, you can understand, of course, that no one is going to be entirely satisfied with a bill of this kind. It is impossible to satisfy everyone.

For a number of years going back to the beginning of the war, and up until last year, we had no particular problem as far as taking care of domestic sugar producers was concerned, because, owing to the competition of other crops, domestic quotas on the mainland were not filled. In fact, in 1948 following the war years, the sugar producers of this country voluntarily gave up their share of any increase in domestic production in favor of Cuba and other foreign countries. But in the period which has elapsed since that time, during which we have had a constantly increasing demand for sugar acreage in this country, due to the fact that we have a surplus of almost every agricultural commodity, it has come about that the sugar-producing areas on the United States mainland and in Puerto Rico need more sugar acreage and production. This situation is particularly acute in the mainland cane areas in Louisiana, and Florida, and it exists to a considerable degree also in the beet sugar producing areas of the country.

This situation has become so difficult that in the mainland cane areas a surplus of sugar has accumulated to the extent that unless some relief is afforded this year there will be no market for a large percentage of the cane sugar production in 1955.

Now, the same position does not prevail as to beets, but there are more than normal carryovers of beet sugar, also. The way this bill attempts to solve that problem is to provide that for 1955 authority will be given to purchase 100,000 tons of sugar for foreign relief distribution. This 100,000 tons will be purchased from the supplies already on hand and will, to that extent, relieve the congested situation.

Then for the year 1956 we amend the present law, which will still be in effect in 1956, by providing for a division between the domestic producers and the foreign producers of the increase in production above 8,350,000 tons of sugar, and we provide for a division of that sugar on the basis 50 percent to domestic producers and 50 percent to foreign producers. Of the domestic 50 percent—45.2 percent will go to domestic beet producers, 42.6 to domestic cane producers, and 10.6 percent to Puerto Rico and a small percentage to the Virgin Islands. The 50 percent going to foreign countries will be divided 96 percent to Cuba and 4 percent to the full duty countries. This is for the year 1956. Beginning in 1957 domestic producers will be given 50 percent of the increase in domestic consumption, which is estimated to be about 135,000 tons per year. Foreign producers, excluding the Philippines, will be given the other 50 percent, and that will be divided during the life of this legislation approximately on the basis of one-third to Cuba and two-thirds to the full duty countries.

Now, there are other changes in the legislation. Those are the important ones, however, as far as the division of sugar production is concerned, and they are the most controversial parts of the legislation. There is a change in the pricing formula, which was mentioned by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY], in that the base is changed from 1947 to the period 1947–1949, and there are changes in the definitions and other technical changes in the act which it will not be possible for me to go into at this time.

Mr. HOLMES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOPE. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. HOLMES. I have been listening with a great deal of interest to the gentleman's presentation of this matter. We have a great many people out in the State of Washington in the irrigation districts that are classified as nonhistory growers. These people are very vitally interested in receiving some recognition in relation to their needs for sugar beet acreage in these new lands coming under irrigation. I know the matter was seriously discussed in committee, and could the gentleman advise me as to what is provided in the bill in relation to any flexibility concerning these nonhistory growers?

Mr. HOPE. I will say to the gentleman that the bill itself does not provide any formula for the distribution of additional acreage of sugar beets. However, the committee feels that very careful consideration should be given to the needs of the new growers and so states in the report.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOPE. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DONDERO. The point I am interested in is this. I have followed the gentleman closely and understand that the acreage for domestic producers will be increased?

Mr. HOPE. That is correct.

Mr. DONDERO. What I am particularly interested in is this, because I have had complaints about it. Will the quota for domestic producers be increased in order to take care of the increased production of sugar? And I want to add right there that one domestic producer in this country I am informed has on hand some 55,000 tons of sugar in a warehouse, and cannot sell a pound of it because of the quota. Is there any relief granted in this bill to that kind of a situation?

Mr. HOPE. This bill, of course, provides, as I stated in the beginning of my remarks, for the purchase of 100,000 tons of sugar for foreign relief purposes. The producer the gentleman has in mind might get some relief from that source, as that is the purpose of this purchase, to relieve the situation on sugar which has accumulated and cannot be disposed of under the quota allocations.

Mr. DONDERO. It is one of the large cane producing companies of this country.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOPE. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. COOLEY. We had no such evidence as that before the committee. We did have evidence of the fact that there were about 15,000 tons in Louisiana and about 35,000 tons in Florida actually in storage.

Mr. DONDERO. I may have misunderstood what was the amount, but that was the figure given me, 55,000 tons. Maybe it was 35,000 tons. This was cane sugar.

Mr. MORANO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOPE. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. MORANO. The distinguished gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE] in answer to a question of the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HOLMES] said that there was additional acreage for domestic beet sugar provided in this bill. If so, what is that additional acreage, if the gentleman has that figure?

Mr. HOPE. That could only be an estimate, but from a rough computation that I made a little while ago, it would indicate that based on the estimate of 135,000 tons increase in consumption per year and on the division that we are talking about, 50 percent to domestic producers and 50 percent to foreign producers, beginning in 1957 domestic sugar beet producers would get about 12,000 acres per year and mainland cane producers would get somewhat less than that.

Mr. MORANO. If there is now a surplus of beet sugar, why do we need additional acreage? I do not understand that.

Mr. HOPE. This would be the absorption of the increased consumption. They will not get the increased acreage until the consumption increases. Under this bill domestic producers will share in the increase in consumption. Since

1948 all increased consumption has gone to Cuba and other foreign countries.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE] has again expired.

Mr. HOPE. I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. HILL].

Mr. HILL. Mr. Chairman, the bill H. R. 7030, to amend and extend the Sugar Act of 1948, is one of the most important pieces of legislation to come before this session of Congress.

Let me state in the beginning of my remarks that the Committee on Agriculture, its chairman and both the majority and minority members have cooperated and labored diligently on this legislation and brought to this House a bill on the extension of the Sugar Act of 1948 which in my considered opinion meets the changing condition of world production and marketing of sugar.

In order to understand why we need this legislation in this session of Congress we should be reminded that the basic quotas for the mainland sugar producers and the Hawaiian Islands have remained rigidly fixed since 1948. When we speak of the mainland sugar producing areas we, of course, mean the cane and sugar beet areas in the United States proper.

In the act of 1948 Puerto Rico's basic quota was increased 170,000 tons, the Virgin Islands was increased 6,000 tons, but the mainland sugar producing areas within the borders of the United States remained the same, which was 1,800,000 tons beet area and 500,000 tons for the cane area.

During this same period of time the United States consumption increased about 1 million tons. And remember now that not 1 ton of increase was granted to the domestic sugarcane and beet sugar producers. This is the main reason the Sugar Act should be amended and changed at this time.

The Sugar Acts of 1934 and 1937 divided the United States market percentagewise. The 1937 act reserved 55.59 percent of the United States market for domestic producers and the balance to foreign countries. And as the demand for sugar increased in the United States these producing areas shared proportionately in the expanding market.

Under the law as it now exists Cuba supplies 96 percent of each year's increased demand for sugar in the United States. All other foreign suppliers supply, not proportionately but in the manner indicated in the legislation, the balance of the 4 percent. None of the increase in consumption under the present law can be supplied by the domestic producers.

Under the present law the Secretary of Agriculture has estimated that we will use 8,400,000 tons of sugar in 1955 and according to the formula in the law the maximum the domestic areas can produce would be in short tons as follows:

Domestic beet	1,800,000
Mainland cane	500,000
Hawaii	1,052,000
Puerto Rico	1,080,000
Virgin Islands	12,000
Total	3,956,000

Under the present law the Republic of the Philippines supplies us 977,000 tons; Cuba, 2,859,840 tons; and the full-duty countries, which are the countries permitted to supply us with 4 percent of our annual consumption, would supply the balance.

These full-duty countries, according to our report, would supply as follows:

Peru	55,658
Dominican Republic	29,592
Mexico	12,269
Nicaragua	8,386
Haiti	2,863

And a small amount from various countries mentioned in the report.

I might add that when we are speaking of domestic industry in this Sugar Act we refer to United States mainland, Hawaii, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands.

I think I should mention the fact that Cuba's supply of our entire domestic consumption in the United States is 2,859,840 tons. Cuba has been well taken care of and certainly receives the cream of the sugar imports under the present act and will continue to do so under H. R. 7030.

Under the proposed changes in the law the domestic industry would be granted quota increases to relieve an intolerable situation which has developed because of increased per-acre yields and the inflexibility of marketing quotas fixed by the present law. And the domestic industry would share in future growth of the United States sugar markets on a 50–50 basis.

The principal reasons for considering the changes of the Sugar Act at this time are based on the fact that the present Sugar Act expires at the end of 1956. Growers contract with processors before the planting of crops, and the sugar crops are marketed a year after the crops are harvested.

Our domestic sugar industry is important to our national well-being both agriculturally and economically. In the vast reaches of the semi-arid West, the sugar beet has become synonymous with stability. New growers could get little consideration under present legislation, but would share in the increased consumption under H. R. 7030. It is the ace-in-the-hole upon which many of our western farmers depend. It is a prime cash crop, it is important to proper rotation practices, it is the basis for livestock feeding operations.

In the South—Louisiana and Florida—sugarcane means just as much to the farmers who grow it. We have been told that in the 150-year history of the sugarcane industry in Louisiana, no other cash crop has been found to replace sugarcane.

In our offshore island possessions—Hawaii, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands—sugarcane is a mainstay of the entire economies.

Last year alone, the domestic sugar industry poured more than a billion dollars into our national economy.

We are all well aware that the United States sugar industry is regulated by Federal law. For more than 20 years, our national sugar program has proven to be an excellent one. In 1934 we initiated the present system. In 1937 Congress made changes in the details of the first Sugar Act. Again in 1948 and in 1951 it was deemed necessary to amend and extend the existing act. Now, once again, changing conditions make necessary changes in the law to keep it modernized and attuned to circumstances as they now exist.

If we examine what has taken place in our domestic sugar industry and our Nation as a whole since the Sugar Act was amended, it becomes quite obvious why this Congress must once again revise the law to fit new conditions. Our population is expanding rapidly, at the rate of some 2½ million persons each year. As we grow in numbers, so do we grow in our appetite for food. Sugar is no exception. Our annual consumption of this commodity is going upward, year by year.

But, as a result of the fixed marketing quota provisions applied to all domestic sugar producers in amendments to the Sugar Act in 1948, these people have been forced to remain static. Worse than that, as our Nation grows and expands, our sugar farmers are being told they must cut back their acreages. These cuts have become necessary because of the fixed quotas, plus the industry's own tremendous advances in efficiency.

Our domestic sugar industry lays just and indisputable claim to being the most efficient in the entire sugar world—and sugar is almost a universal product, produced in varying quantities in all but a very few countries on earth.

In the past 7 years, our western sugar-beet farmers have increased their production of sugar per acre by some 15 percent. In the past 30 years, their production improvement has been estimated at 68 percent.

In Louisiana, sugar production per acre has been increased 21 percent in the past 7 years.

In Hawaii, the man-hours required to produce 1 ton of sugar are the lowest in the world.

These are gains which have been achieved through hard work and hard thinking. Our farmers and processors, our scientists and experts in the Department of Agriculture, our State colleges and others have united their manpower and their brainpower in bringing into reality these truly American accomplishments, only to be penalized for increasing efficiency.

In the past 2 years our sugarcane farmers in Louisiana and Florida have had this said to them twice for an aggregate acreage cut of 18 percent. And our sugar-beet farmers throughout the West have had the same word and a cut of 10 percent in their acreage.

This simply does not make sense when one considers that we produce in this Nation only a portion of the sugar we consume. We are not producing sugar enough to meet our needs. We are importing almost half of every pound of sugar we use.

We are penalizing our farmers for no good reason, forcing them out of sugar production into the growing of other crops already in surplus supply.

It is essential that we reverse this trend by passing H. R. 7030.

During the 12 years I have been privileged to serve on the Committee on Agriculture, there seldom has been greater effort made to solve a more complex problem than confronted our committee when we addressed ourselves to the matter of proposed sugar legislation. Hearings on the proposal to amend and extend the Sugar Act extended over a period of a month. We heard from virtually everyone with a direct or indirect interest in the matter. Thousands of words of testimony have gone into the record.

As we weighed the many problems involved, we have been not only keenly sensitive to the problems and best interests of our own domestic sugar industry, but we have attempted to give full attention to our trade relationships with our good neighbors and friends in foreign lands who help supply our sugar. The bill before us represents give and take on all sides. We have all had to compromise in order that some solution, if not ideal, could be found and action taken this year.

Throughout our committee deliberations, and now that the matter is before us as a Committee of the Whole, it has been and continues to be necessary that we test the proposed amendments and extension in relation to the basic stated purposes of the Sugar Act, which is our national policy. These purposes are stated thus:

An act to regulate commerce among the several States, with the Territories and possessions of the United States, and with foreign countries; to protect the welfare of the consumers of sugars and those engaged in the sugar-producing industry; to promote the export trade of the United States; and for other purposes.

Mr. Chairman, time is of the essence. Our sugar farmers must, and deserve to know now what they are going to be permitted to grow next year. They cannot wait until next spring to be told how they may crop their lands. California plants in November and contracts will not be let for sugar that cannot be marketed. They have sought our counsel and assistance. We cannot deny them.

I earnestly hope my colleagues that you will feel disposed to support this legislation.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 additional minute to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. HILL. Mr. Chairman, I have not time to finish my remarks, so I will place them in the RECORD and I hope you will read them carefully, because we tried very earnestly in this bill to carry out the theory that we need a national Sugar act.

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. CEDERBERG. I want to associate myself with the remarks of the gentleman from Colorado and also express to the Committee on Agriculture the appreciation of thousands of sugar beet growers in the State of Michigan for your farsightedness in bringing up this legislation. We think it will be of real benefit to us.

Mr. BEAMER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. BEAMER. I want to associate myself with the remarks of the gentleman from Colorado and to ask a question. I also have received inquiries, among them a telegram asking why we do not have 55 percent instead of 50 percent.

Mr. HILL. I will answer that under the 5-minute rule.

Mr. BENTLEY. 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 Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. BENTLEY. Mr. Chairman, in connection with this debate on H. R. 7030, I wish to call the attention of the Members to the present serious situation whereby fixed quota restrictions are discriminating against United States sugar and permitting foreign sugar to fill entirely the increase in the United States sugar market.

In 20 years, the cost of sugar has risen 30 percent less than the average cost of other foods and today retails at practically the same price as it did in 1948. It is a vital commodity, being crystallized energy, the lowest in cost per energy unit of all foods, vital to diet, vital to industry in peace and war. It is not a surplus crop since the United States, including its Territories, produces little more than half of the sugar we consume.

Since 1948, United States population has increased from 146 to 162 million people, an increase of 16 million. During this same period, the Nation's annual sugar consumption has risen by a million tons, from 7.2 to 8.2 million tons and is still increasing.

Mr. Chairman, this increase has been supplied entirely by foreigners. All the annual market growth goes to foreign countries, 96 percent to Cuba, 4 percent to other foreigners, nothing to Americans. Domestic sugar producers have fixed quotas set by existing law and cannot supply 1 ounce of present or future market increases unless that law is changed. Thus the American producers' share of the American sugar market shrinks as the Nation's total sugar needs rise.

During the last 7 years, American sugar farmers have modernized and mechanized their operations at great expense, increased their efficiency tremendously and raised their production per acre by as much as 20 percent. However, Mr. Chairman, their progress has been stalled by rigid marketing quotas which have forced drastic cuts in sugar crop acreage up to 18 percent in the last 2 years, with more cuts to come unless immediate action is taken.

This immediate action to restore to American producers their rightful share in the United States sugar market increases is urgent because American citizens should no longer be denied the right to share in the growth of their own country. If there are further acreage cuts it will work a severe hardship on American sugar farmers in 24 States and in American Island Territories. Further, if more acres are diverted from sugarcane or sugar beets, it will add to the supplies of crops which are already in surplus. Finally, the American sugar industry, which each year pours a billion dollars into the economic lifestream of our country and helps other industries pay the wages of millions of Americans, must be kept healthy.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I understand that bills have been introduced by 49 Senators and 28 Congressmen to remedy the situation that has arisen under the present sugar act. These 77 sponsors are divided almost equally between the two political parties and there is widespread bipartisan support for these measures by many persons who understand the need for and the effect of this proposed legislation. However, many Americans have been confused by a propaganda campaign conducted by certain Cuban sugar interests.

Mr. Chairman, this proposed legislation will not reduce the volume of sugar shipments from Cuba or any other foreign nation below their present quotas. It does not deny to Cuba or to any other foreign producer the privilege of continuing to participate in the future growth of the United States market. It merely restores the historic right of our own citizens to receive a share of future increases in our own market and it should be passed this year to avoid further damaging consequences to the American sugar industry.

Now what about the situation in Michigan. This year Michigan sugar beet growers were allocated 9.58 percent of the total acreage of 850,000 acres. Now in 1950 there were 5,300 sugar beet producers in Michigan while in 1935 there were 12,500. That drop is explained by the restrictions and by the acreage cuts on sugar beet farmers to which I have referred above. This unprofitable situation has driven many sugar beet producers in my district to divert their acreage to corn, a basic commodity, and now one sees corn bins all throughout central Michigan, holding surpluses under Government loans, whereas a few years ago those counties were corn-importing areas. Relief is needed and needed quickly for Michigan's sugar beet producers.

Mr. Chairman, I do not regard H. R. 7030 as the best possible relief that our sugar producers can obtain but I intend to support it because it certainly is a step in the right direction. That direction is to give American sugar producers their fair share of the American sugar market.

Mr. CHENWORTH. 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 Colorado?

There was no objection.

Mr. CHENOWETH. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H. R. 7030, a bill amending and extending the Sugar Act of 1948. I want to commend the committee on bringing this bill to the floor of the House.

I was one of several Members of the House who introduced similar bills. My bill was H. R. 5470. I am very much

interested in this sugar legislation and I feel that the bill before us today is vitally needed at this time.

Mr. Chairman, I represent the Third Congressional District of Colorado, which is a large sugar beet producing area. I have three sugar beet factories located in my district. All of these factories have been in operation for many years, and are a vital part of the economy of our area. I consider it highly essential to our national economy to promote and maintain the domestic sugar industry of our country, both cane and beet. We do not appreciate the importance of our domestic sugar industry until outside supplies are cut off as in time of war, when we must rely on our domestic production for our needs. Certainly it would be a shortsighted policy to neglect this important industry.

I submit that every effort should be made to keep our domestic sugar industry in a healthy and prosperous condition. This is what we are seeking to do by this legislation before us today. We want to do everything possible to assure an adequate supply of domestic sugar in the event of another emergency.

I strongly feel that our domestic sugar producers should be permitted to participate in the expanding domestic market. Under sugar legislation in effect from 1934 to 1948 both domestic and foreign sugar producers shared the United States sugar market on a percentage basis. However, the Sugar Act of 1948 established fixed inflexible quotas for all domestic producing areas. It gave to foreign producing countries all of the benefit of increased consumption in this country. Practically 100 percent of this increase went to Cuba.

The domestic industry concurred in the 1948 act because of appreciation for the contribution which Cuba had made, along with our domestic areas, in meeting wartime sugar demands. It was felt in 1948 that Cuba should have some temporary period within which to adjust production to post-war market demands. It was understood at that time that this arrangement was not to be final or irrevocable, and the right was reserved to ask for a revision of the act whenever circumstances required.

Mr. Chairman, that time has now arrived, and the proposed amendment is absolutely necessary. The domestic producing areas as asking that their traditional share of the expanding United States market be restored to them. Under the Sugar Act of 1937 the domestic areas received 55.59 percent of total domestic requirements. This bill will restore the quota system under which our domestic producers will again be permitted to obtain their fair share of the increased consumption of sugar in this country.

Mr. Chairman, sugar companies in this country are now carrying large inventories, and are not able to dispose of the sugar stocks on hand. Under this bill 100,000 tons of domestic sugar will be purchased by the Government for foreign distribution. This will be of great help in relieving the present situation.

Mr. Chairman, it is important to have this legislation enacted at this session, and I want to again commend the Committee on Agriculture for its prompt action on this bill. This is a good bill and should receive the support of the House.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CARRIGG].

Mr. CARIGG. 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 Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. CARRIGG. Mr. Speaker, at the hearings on the bill to amend the Sugar Act of 1948, Mr. Henry F. Holland, Assistant Secretary of State for Inter-American Affairs, explained before the committee the position of his Department, and as regards the Philippines, he said the following: "The Department does not recommend an increase in the Philippine qouta at this time. The Department believes, however, that consideration should be given to allowing the Philippines a share in increased consumption when sugar legislation is next amended and after sugar from the Philippines begins to pay a tariff." The Filipinos were at first gratified with the statement. They were not surprised at the first part of this statement that said that "the Department does not recommend an increase in the Philippine quota at this time" in view of the observation of the Department that the act should not be amended so as to take effect during next year. Sugar from the Philippines begins to pay a tariff next year, and the phrase "when sugar legislation is next amended," was interpreted to mean the legislation under consideration.

It now turns out that what Mr. Holland meant is when the legislation is amended after the present amendments, which are intended to be in effect for 6 years. In other words, the Department would permit the domestic producers and the so-called full-duty countries—Santo Domingo, Haiti, Mexico, Peru—all countries supplying the United States, to share in increased quotas due to increased sugar consumption, with the solitary exception of the Philippines.

Is it possible that of all the countries supplying the American sugar market, the only one to be excluded from the benefits of increased quotas is the Philippines who, among these foreign suppliers, is the country that needs it most because it has the gravest problem of trade deficits, unemployment, and inflation as a consequence of her loyalty to America in the last war?

Is it possible that the only country to be excluded is this country who, among these foreign suppliers, paid most dearly in lives and property for their loyalty to the cause of freedom, who continued to shed blood for this cause in Korea, and whose representative acted so effectively to prevent the Asian-African conference in Bandung from becoming a Communist and anti-American organization which would have lined up the peoples of these two great continents against America and the free world?

Is it possible that this country which, among the foreign suppliers, has the most serious problem of communism, aggravated by unemployment and inflation, should precisely be the country singled out for exclusion from the benefits of increased American quotas?

Is it possible that this country that is the showcase of democracy and the only Christian country in the Orient, and which is being watched by one-half of humanity that lives in that area to see if the democratic and the Christian way of life is superior to that of communism, should be so unfairly discriminated against?

Is it possible that this country that notwithstanding its still shattered economy buys only 25 percent less in the American market than another supplier that has 200 percent more sugar quota—is it possible that the United States should want this country with its great potential market of 20 million progressive people to delay its economic recovery?

Is it possible that this country that was prevented, because of the war and the resulting destruction of her industries, from selling 8 million tons of sugar worth a billion dollars on which the United States collected duties from the substitute suppliers of $100 million, should be further punished by excluding her from the benefits of increased quotas in the United States sugar market?

Is it possible that this country where we have valuable military, naval, and aerial bases and is only a few hundred miles from the coast of Communist China, this country that gives our investments the same rights and protection as those of her own nationals, should be singled out for exclusion from the benefits of increased American sugar quotas?

When the Department sent the Assistant Secretary of State for Inter-American Affairs as its spokesman on the proposed legislation, the Philippine case may be said to have two strikes on it. We have the highest respect for Assistant Secretary Holland, but he is daily exposed to the pleadings and pressures of the representatives of the countries with which his division has to deal, and has little contact with the representatives of the Philippines. The importance of the legislation now before Congress transcends the mere value of so many tons of sugar. We pray the American Government and the American Congress to pause and reconsider the implications of the proposed exclusion of the Philippines from the benefits of the amendments to the Sugar Act. The Filipinos and particularly Asia and the world at large are watching how America deals with her tried allies and friends.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. THOMSON].

Mr. THOMSON of Wyoming. 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 Wyoming?

There was no objection.

Mr. THOMSON of Wyoming. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of fair treatment of our domestic sugar industry. I reluctantly state that the bill before the

Committee, in my opinion, falls far short of giving fair treatment to the domestic industry.

Of course, the State which it is my privilege to represent has vested interest in this legislation. We are not one of the largest producing States in the Nation, but the sugar beet industry is very important to our economy. Sugar beets represented 20 percent of the cash farm income crop in Wyoming in 1954, according to Department of Agriculture figures. It is not only important to us as farming commodity, but affects almost every other segment of our economy, including labor and business, which is practically all small business in Wyoming. Just to give you some idea of this, the farmer received approximately $6½ million for his crop. Payrolls of the sugar factories in 1954 represented $2 million. Freight payments by truck and railroad amounted to $1½ million. Two and one-half million were accounted for by sugar refinery purchases of coal and various other industrial supplies. This totals $12½ million, but is really only a fraction of what could be developed, and if we were to arrive at the true realistic total, we would have to take into account the equipment purchased by the farmer and the food and other items purchased by farmers and factory workers, and those indirectly concerned. This will give you some idea of the importance of this to our economy.

I am not here, however, to make an appeal for special consideration for my State, or any other State. I think this is good, sound legislation, for the best interest of the country as a whole, and when I say the country as a whole, I mean of the farmers, businessmen, laborers, and the consumers.

Although the statement has apparently been criticized, I still think the question before this committee and the Congress can be simply boiled down to the proposition of, Is the American farmer to be allowed to share in the growth and progress of America? No matter how one attempts to sidestep the issue, that is what must be decided.

I attended a good portion of the hearings and had a representative present at almost all others. We secured copies of those statements made available to us. Most of the pertinent facts were put in the record, and were presented very fairly and ably by representatives of the growers and the domestic industry. I am confident that if they were weighed on the basis of fairness and historical evidence, and what is best for the over-all American citizen, then fair legislation would certainly be passed by this Congress in the form which my colleagues and myself introduced identical bills.

The main opposition seems to be centered around the so-called obligation we have to Cuba. I think that it is established beyond contradiction that we have no legal obligation, which we seek to controvert. Cuba would be left with her full quota before World War II, plus virtually all the increased consumption up to the present date, plus whatever share of the historic 45 percent foreign production that is eventually allotted to her by this committee and this Congress. The argument that we are cutting down on her is simply without basis in fact. We cannot be charged with disrupting her economy, for we do not propose to buy less from her, but continually more. Cuba had a right to expect that the domestic producer would reenter the market for their historic share as soon as they had recovered from the various effects of wartime dislocations. Cuba entered the market during World War II and supplied us over and beyond her historic quotas. Naturally we were gratified at this. On the other hand, they have been repaid well, and to say that they are entitled to more consideration is to completely overlook the primary fact that we fought and financed a war that benefited Cuba just as well as the rest of the world. I remember a Puerto Rican regiment in North Africa, and a Brazilian division in Italy, but to the best of my knowledge, no Cuban blood was spilled on foreign soil. I think we cannot disregard the interest of the American farmer, and particularly the debt that we owe to the veteran who located on one of our reclamation farms in Wyoming and other Western States, and is now denied any sugar-beet production under the present law.

Yes, Cuba was well repaid for contributing to our war effort by producing sugar—at a profit—while we fought a war—at a loss. Cuba has had all our increase in domestic consumption since the beginning of World War II, added to their basic quota at that time. The Cuban import quota increased from roughly 1,900,000 tons in 1940 to 2,668,000 tons in 1955. Under our bills we would take 188,000 tons out of the 200,000 estimated increase in consumption this year, and share the balance. Therefore, Cuba's quota for 1955 might well be as high as 2,673,000 tons. The argument that we would be taking something away from Cuba this year does not stand up in this light.

As far as I am concerned, the argument fails that we even have a moral obligation to Cuba in connection with this. If this Government, and this Congress, has a moral obligation to anyone, it is to these veterans, who are suddenly denied a right to produce. They have obligated themselves to pay for the expensive machinery now used on a sugar beet farm. Unless we do something about this law and do it now, we are saying to them, "We made available to you a small 160-acre farm. We encouraged you to sign the repayment contract to pay back the cost of irrigation. We stood by while you invested in this machinery and gave a boost to the American factory worker. Now we are no longer interested in you. You cannot grow a cash crop. For all we care you can lose your machinery. You can lose your farm, and your family can go begging."

If there is any moral obligation involved in this legislation, in my humble opinion it is to these veterans.

Let us look at the moral obligation statements from yet another angle. Throughout the hearings it was pointed up that the reason for the 1948 Sugar Act amendments was to give the American farmer a chance to build back his production curtailed by the war, and to allow Cuba to scale down her production gradually to gear it to a postwar economy over a period of 5 years rather than to take an abrupt drop in quota. There lies a moral obligation on the part of Cuba. Cuba has not lived up to the spirit of the agreement, nor made any recognizable attempt to live up to it. She has each year increased her acreage, and each year increased her production. Cuba, then, is in the peculiar position of charging the wronged party with a moral obligation that cannot exist in the light of her refusal to comply with the spirit of the agreement made possible by the generosity and understanding of the domestic producers and the Philippine producers.

I have always tried, throughout my legislative experience, to decide issues on the basis of principle. The principle involved here is that the American citizen, whether he be a farmer, laborer, a shipowner, or a lawyer, is certainly entitled to benefit from his own enterprise and his own initiative—he is certainly entitled to a share in the growth of America. This is the principle involved in the 50–50 provision of S. 2090, adopted on the floor of the House last week, to give the American shipowner a chance to take a half share of the shipping of American products abroad. When my Wyoming Farm Bureau Federation wired me to oppose this proposal, I immediately contacted them by telephone to tell them that I considered the principle involved—exactly the same principle we are fighting for in attempting to get the sugar bill passed—the right of the American to participate in the growth of America. I supported the 50–50 provision for American shipowners and sailors. It was adopted by an overwhelming division vote. I think the House will follow the same principle as applied to our sugar industry.

What is the present law, how did it come about and how does it operate? At the end of World War II the domestic producer, in what appears now to be too generous a gesture, said in effect, "It will take us a few years to build back to what we were producing before the war, which was 1,800,000 tons a year. Cuba is way up on production. Heretofore, we have shared the market at 55 percent for domestic and 45 percent for foreign production. We will consent to take a fixed quota of 1,800,000 tons for our beet sugar growers and similar fixed quotas for others, based on the production before the war. We will let Cuba have most of the increased consumption, 96 percent of it; the rest will go to other foreign producers. Furthermore, we will let Cuba make up the deficit as to quotas on the Philippine production, while that country is being redeveloped, plus the domestic deficit as well. This will permit Cuba to go down from her wartime peak gradually, without serious economic dislocations, and we will give them 5 years to do it."

In simple language, this was the effect of the 1948 act. In 1951, it was extended for another 5-year period, because of the intervention of the Korean war, but with the express reservation that if the domestic production moved up before that time, we would ask for a share of the increase in the future market.

What do we mean by increase in the future market? Simply that by reason of increased population and increased per capita consumption, there is an average of about 150,000 or 200,000 tons more sugar marketed in the United States each year. With the sudden end of the Korean war, and for that we thank God, the American production did build up more rapidly than expected. In 1953, we raised 1,872,000 tons of beet sugar, 72,000 tons over quota. In 1954, this jumped to 1,978,000 tons. Acreage restrictions had to be applied.

You can imagine my concern with this, as the Congressman representing Wyoming. I therefore introduced H. R. 5443, calling for an amendment to the Sugar Act to increase the domestic quota for the sugar-beet producer by a total of 85,000 tons and similar increases for other domestic producers, and calling for a return to the historic formula of allowing the United States domestic producer a 55-percent share of the increasing market, starting with 1955 quotas.

In connection with reciprocal-trade legislation, H. R. 1, some of you probably wondered why I voted to place a curb on the power of the State Department to control our foreign-trade policy. I think this is a very good indication of why I feel this way. I believe we must trade with the rest of the world. I believe that trade is one of our best weapons for peace, but I do not believe we should give away our American standard of living or disregard the interest of our American producers.

The bill which I introduced, and the identical bills introduced by other Congressman, were introduced after many, many meetings within the industry and other interested persons. They represented the very minimum necessary to take care of our accumulated inventories of refined sugar which were not held in Government storage at Government expense, but in private storage as a private inventory, and still give some relief to our hard-pressed American sugar-beet farmer and cane-sugar grower. Why is it that the committee bill is not satisfactory?

In the first place, it will not give us any relief on the 1955 quota, which determines the crop to be grown in 1956. The banker will not wait for his money. The farm-machinery man will insist on his payments. The sugar farmer, and particularly the young veteran, will go broke, will be faced with foreclosure, and with loss of the expensive machinery which he bought in good faith. Yes, he may even lose his farm itself. The first money that will come to him under this committee bill cannot be reasonably expected until 1958, when payment is made for the crop he grows in 1957.

In the second place, the bill refuses to recognize the historic basis for sharing in increased sugar consumption. It cuts the American producer from 55 percent of the increase in the American market to 50 percent. Unless this is changed, Congress will be placed in the position of again giving away just a little bit more of our American standard of living to the detriment of our farmer, our laborer, our businessman, and our general economy.

In the third place, the bill attempts to tie sugar into a rigid price-support program at the taxpayers expense when it is not a surplus product at all. We produce only about 50 percent of our domestic consumption. Are we to increase our consumption at the taxpayers' expense and drive down the price to our American farmer?

In the fourth place, the bill puts the American farmer in the position of accepting largesse through a purchase of domestic sugar for free overseas distribution, when all the American farmer wants is a chance to earn an honest living and share in the growth of America on a fair basis as an American citizen, just life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness—by hard work.

The bills which were introduced were fair to foreign producers as previously pointed out—took nothing away from them and represented the very minimum that would be helpful to the American sugar beet farmer, or cane sugar grower.

If it were not for the fact that I sincerely believe and hope that the amendment to be offered by Congressman DIXON, of Utah, taking the 90-percent provision out will be adopted, and if it were not for my sincere belief that the other body will make further changes in this bill which time does not permit us to consider, I would be constrained to speak in opposition to the bill and vote against it. If time permitted, I am confident that this House could take care of putting the bill in proper form right here on the floor because I have complete confidence in the combined judgment of the Members of this House when all the facts are known to them. There are many other deserving bills, however, on the schedule and I do not believe that the best interests of the country would be served by bringing about a prolonged floor discussion on the amendments that are necessary to make this bill a fair and just bill to all.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Utah [Mr. DAWSON].

Mr. DAWSON of Utah. 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 Utah?

There was no objection.

Mr. DAWSON of Utah. Mr. Chairman, here is some legislation which everyone in this House should vote for with enthusiasm.

It takes nothing away from our friends in other sugar-producing countries, but it at the same time gives something to our domestic producers: to wit, a share of the increase in domestic consumption.

The fact that this legislation has been subjected to any opposition and controversy is an indication of how far we have traveled down the road of considering the welfare of other nations before considering the needs of our own people at home.

The simple truth is that since the Sugar Act was passed by Congress in 1948, annual sugar consumption has increased about 1 million tons in the United States. Yet, this increased consumption in our own country has not benefited our domestic cane- and beet-sugar producer at all. Due to rigid quotas imposed by the act, the increased market has been given to Cuba while our own farmers have had their beet-sugar acreage cut as productivity increases.

This legislation would not cut back Cuba sugar production. It would just give the United States producer the right to share in the increased market our own Nation's expanding population creates.

The Cuban argument that it must sell us ever-increasing amounts of sugar if it is to buy products of our American industries falls of its own weight. The domestic beet and cane producer is also a customer of domestic industry—provided he can make a living—and he pays property, income, and excise taxes for the support of his Government in addition.

There should be no question about the fairness, timeliness, or need for this legislation in anyone's mind.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Montana [Mr. FJARE].

Mr. FJARE. 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 Montana?

There was no objection.

Mr. FJARE. Mr. Chairman, we are considering H. R. 7030, a bill amending and extending the Sugar Act of 1948, as amended. This legislation is important to the diversified farmer of the West, and especially to the citizens of my home State of Montana. Agriculture in general is the leading industry of my State, as is the case with many of our States, and consequently legislation enabling our sugar industry to grow as our Nation grows is of vital importance to a continuing sound agricultural economy.

I believe that the Sugar Act of 1948 was designed to meet problems of the temporary postwar transition period and was not to be regarded as the establishment of long-time national sugar policy. With our steadily increasing population in the United States, the demand for sugar continues to rise. Yet the domestic sugar producer fails to share in this expanding market under the present Sugar Act. This means that the Montana sugar-beet grower, for example, is being treated more like a colonist than the foreign producer. Certainly we must realize the need for foreign trade, but not at the complete expense of our own people.

Sugar-beet growers in the West have a heavy investment in equipment, and their expenditures constitute an important part of our national economy, especially in the rural areas of our Nation. In addition the sugar industry through its sugar factories in the fall of the year provides employment for many people in these areas during that period, and this is important because of seasonal lags in employment during that time. Transportation and other businesses directly and indirectly receive a stimulus

from the operations of these sugar-beet growers and processors, and all in all they are an important part of our economy.

This legislation is not an attempt to cut down on our imports, but merely an effort to allow our own farmers to share in the growth of our Nation. In a time of agricultural surpluses, it does not make sense to unduly restrict production on a crop that is not in long supply in our own Nation. To do so is to divert production to crops grown for storage rather than consumption. I, therefore, urge favorable consideration of H. R. 7030.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. COON].

Mr. COON. 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 Oregon?

There was no objection.

Mr. COON. Mr. Chairman, I am supporting this legislation, to increase the quotas of the United States sugar producers. This is especially important to me, because most of the beet sugar produced in this country, comes from the Rocky Mountain and Pacific coast areas.

The production of sugar is one of the most important of the western agricultural industries. This industry includes the growing and processing of sugar beets, for the production of sugar, and the valuable byproducts used in the feeding of livestock.

Many of our industries accepted restrictions during the international economic adjustment following World War II. Heavy curbs were put on our sugar growers, in order to aid Cuba, during that emergency.

Circumstances have now changed. It is necessary for our producers of sugar to have immediate adjustments of these restrictive quotas, which are still in force. Consumption of sugar in this Nation is increasing at a rate of over 125,000 tons a year. All of this increased market is reserved to Cuba and other foreign suppliers. Our sugar people here at home are not allowed to supply one ounce of it. They are not permitted to profit one cent from the increased market, which they, themselves, have helped to create.

I feel very strongly that our domestic producers should share in this Nation's growth. Yet the reasonable and proper request of the American sugar growers for relief has been met by a storm of protest by Cuban interests. These foreign markets now feel that they have a vested right, and special privileges greater than those of our own citizens.

Therefore, Mr. Chairman, and colleagues, I strongly urge that this legislation be enacted.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. BURNSIDE].

Mr. BURNSIDE. 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 West Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. BURNSIDE. Mr. Chairman, I am in favor of H. R. 7030.

I note that H. R. 7030, which is now before the House, makes provision for a modest increase in the sugar quota of Mexico. I am glad to see that, although I don't believe that the measure of relief granted is enough to take care of the problems of our good friends south of the border. I am in receipt of a petition filed on behalf of the sugar producers of Mexico by my good friend, the former Secretary of the Interior Oscar Chapman, which makes out what is to my mind a very persuasive argument for allotting a quota of 2 percent of United States consumption of sugar to Mexico. I have also received a letter from Mr. Chapman stating that he and the Mexican sugar producers, whom he represents, are urging the passage of H. R. 7030, even though it gives them only a small fraction of what they originally requested, because it does afford some urgently needed relief to the Mexican sugar industry.

Mr. Chairman, this fairminded and practical attitude of compromise has characterized the approach of the Mexican sugar producers throughout this controversy on sugar legislation. I am glad to say that they have recognized the equities of other claimants and, so far as I know, they have been the only foreign country which has consistently emphasized that the first duty of Congress is to take care of the best interests of the United States sugar industry. I believe that such a fairminded approach deserves commendation and recognition by the Congress.

I certainly believe, Mr. Chairman, that the Congress should attempt, insofar as possible, to give the benefits of legislation where it is needed most and to help those who do the most to help us.

Mexico is the best customer of the United States in all Latin America and the fourth largest in the entire world, purchasing more from the United States than all the principal sugar-quota countries combined. Last year, for example, Mexico purchased $628 million worth of products from the United States, $200 million more than the giant sugar-quota country, Cuba.

Mexico's balance of trade with the United States was unfavorable to Mexico by $300 million last year. This figure is astounding: almost $1 million a day. From this it will be seen how desperately Mexico needs United States dollars, some of which will be made available by this increased sugar quota.

Mexico has tried very hard to diversify its industry. For this reason, each industry in Mexico must do its part in bringing in some dollars. I am advised that the Mexican sugar industry is the fourth largest in the country and the relief provided by some additional dollars through increased sugar quotas is of vital importance to the Mexican economy.

It is my information, Mr. Chairman, that the original request of Mexico for which such a strong and persuasive case was presented would amount to a quota of approximately 164,000 tons per year. The present bill, H. R. 7030, I am advised, affords only an average of 44,000 tons per year. Surely this is a modest request. This sugar quota will not even provide enough dollars to pay for the sugar machinery that the Mexican sugar industry is buying in the United States every year. Nevertheless, Mexico is supporting the proposed legislation as a just and reasonable compromise of all of the equities of all of the various claimants. I urge the House to adopt H. R. 7030 which was favorably reported by its Committee on Agriculture and represents a careful balancing of all of the equities.

Mrs. PFOST. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOPE. I yield to the gentlewoman from Idaho.

Mrs. PFOST. Mr. Chairman, in behalf of all the sugar-beet producers of Idaho, and particularly those producers in my own district, I urge immediate passage of H. R. 7030.

I believe we all are familiar with the basic reasons for this legislation. Since 1948 American sugar producers have been denied the right all other Americans have had—the right to share in the growth of our great country. H. R. 7030 will restore that right, beginning in 1956.

To be sure, this bill does not fill the entire needs of American sugar producers. It doesn't give them immediate benefits of the scale to which I, in my heart, believe they are entitled. The bill represents a compromise between the needs of the American sugar farmer and the interests of foreign nations which share in supplying our Nation's sugar requirements.

In recognition of the rights and interests of others, this bill is representative of the genuine spirit of my State, and the spirit of the entire West. The West was settled by people who sought a better life not only for themselves, but also for their neighbors. Many are the examples of self-sacrifice in the history of Idaho—sacrifices made by the individual for the general welfare of the community.

And it was in this spirit that the terms of this bill were developed during many long hours and weeks of arduous work.

As a temporary measure, to help our friends in the Caribbean, American sugar producers gave up the right to share in the growth of America under the Sugar Act of 1948, which this bill amends. With the passage of this bill, the right will be restored.

And so for all American sugar farmers, and for a fundamental American principle, I ask you to cast your vote in favor of H. R. 7030.

Now, for just a few moments I should like to tell you why the sugar-beet crop is of such tremendous importance to the West. The beet is more than a sugar crop. It is the key to success in the irrigated sections of Idaho and in the other Western States. It is the most important and most dependable cash crop, and more than any other has built strong and stable communities.

Because of its versatility and the value of its byproducts, the sugar beet is the foundation of a sound livestock industry, which contributes immeasurably to the

economic soundness of the operations of many of our Idaho farmers.

For the sugar beet is many crops in one.

From the beet itself comes pure sugar—the product of sunshine and carbon dioxide taken from the air and the sparkling water which comes from the melting snows and the rains that flow into our streams and irrigation canals.

When the beet is pulled from the ground at harvest, countless small roots remain in the soil, later decaying and giving our land new fertility.

The leafy green beet tops, removed from the beet before processing, are a succulent livestock feed. The pulp which remains after the sugar has been removed from the beet is another byproduct, which also is a valuable livestock feed. A single acre of sugar beets will produce enough feed—in addition to the sugar—to produce 300 pounds of meat to feed our people and provide income for our farmers.

In the great cycle of nature, the residue from the feed lots is returned again to the soil, and the land on which beets are grown is fertilized.

Thus the sugar beet takes nothing from the land, under the wise plan of farm management which our Idaho farmers use. The sugar is manufactured by this miraculous plant from sunshine, air and water. All the rest is returned again to the soil.

And that is why the sugar beet is so vital as a rotation crop in the West—as well as a source of American sugar for the American people.

But our farmers cannot obtain the full benefits from this crop if, year after year, their acreage is drastically cut—more and more.

Yet that is what is happening under the fixed quota system which has denied our citizens the right to supply any of our growing sugar market. The kind of progress that has made America great has resulted in more and more efficient production of sugar beets. We now need fewer acres to produce a specific amount of sugar than we did in 1948, when the present fixed quotas were established. And so our acreage must be cut to keep production in line with antiquated quotas. And each time our farmers increase their efficiency of production, they are penalized further.

Does this make sense in America? Surely it does not.

H. R. 7030 will restore once again to Idaho sugar beet farmers—and to all American sugar producers—the right to progress with our Nation, and to plant a reasonable acreage of a crop so essential to their operations.

And so again I ask your support of this urgently needed legislation.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMPSON].

Mr. THOMPSON of Texas. 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 Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. THOMPSON of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I have no desire to prolong the discussion of the proposed sugar legislation. As has been so well said, this is one of the most complicated matters which comes before the Congress.

The Committee on Agriculture has worked long hours for many weeks, and the bill which is before you is the best compromise which could be had under all circumstances. I started deliberations with three major responsibilities in mind.

In my district there are sugar-refining interests, and I did not want to see any disturbance of the traditional balance between domestic and offshore refiners. The present bill gives my people the protection which I desired.

Further, I was very much concerned over the problems of the domestic raw sugar producers, and I was entirely in sympathy with their desire to have some help in their extremely critical surplus problem. The bill before us makes provision for the domestic producers.

My third responsibility was to my rice producers. Texas and adjoining southwestern States sell more rice in Cuba than in any other part of the world. I am very reluctant to have anything done which would disturb this good neighbor and good customer.

I hope that before this bill is finally enacted into law, the proportion of offshore raw sugar allocated to Cuba will be more generous than it is in the present bill.

In addition to my regard for a good customer, I cannot forget the loyalty of our neighbor nation in times of stress when we were in desperate need of sugar and when other producing nations were undertaking to hold us up. Perhaps between now and the time the bill is passed by the other body and finally enacted into law, the situation which is causing Cubans so much distress will be more reasonably adjusted.

I make these comments without any criticism whatever of the work of the committee. Certainly no one who watched the long and patient work of the committee leadership could say a word other than of praise for any one of them.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. ROGERS].

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. I thank the gentleman and I just want to bring to the attention of the House that in my district alone we have 40,000 tons of sugar that we cannot sell because our domestic producers have not been allowed any part of the increase in the American market since 1948; we have not been able to sell even 1 single ounce of sugar. It is time for us to get some action.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I yield the remainder of my time to the gentleman from Maine [Mr. MCINTIRE].

Mr. MCINTIRE. Mr. Chairman, I first want to state that the chairman of our Committee on Agriculture, the distinguished gentleman from North Carolina, and the gentleman from Maine, could not deal with the sugar problem any more objectively because neither of us has sugar involved in his district, nor in his State.

I have enjoyed the opportunity to become acquainted with sugar as we have worked on this legislation. We have worked diligently on the legislation.

I voted against this bill as it was reported out of committee. Some of the amendments which will be proposed will improve the bill substantially. However, there are one or two points that I did want to bring to the committee's attention. I want to preface these remarks with this statement, that my difference of opinion with the majority of the committee rests largely in the distribution of tonnage among our friendly neighbors, together with the provisions in the bill that will no doubt be subject to amendment later. I fully appreciate the hours spent by members of the committee and appreciate that the chairman, the ranking member, Mr. HOPE, and others have extended experience in this legislation and I deeply respected their idea.

From the very start it would seem to me that there has been no basic question as to whether it would be 55–45 or 50–50 as far as the domestic industry is concerned; that has not been the major area of controversy. It has come pretty largely in the division as between the foreign countries that participate in our market.

The gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE] has pointed out to you that this bill does not change quotas for 1955. It changes quotas only slightly for 1956. The legislation goes into full effect in relation to the full duty countries and Cuba when we come into 1957, although it does affect some, particularly Cuba in 1956.

I have tried to look at this legislation objectively. I am not in accord entirely with the formula as set up because I think, as our chairman has indicated, there have been many things that have had to be set up arbitrarily. I feel that the formula does not deal equitably as between Cuba and the full duty countries.

Mr. BUDGE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MCINTIRE. I yield to the gentleman from Idaho.

Mr. BUDGE. I want to express my appreciation to the gentleman and to the other members of the committee for bringing this bill on the floor at this time. It is desperately needed and I heartily commend it to the membership.

Mr. MCINTIRE. I am fully in accord with the fact that this is important legislation, but I regret that, in the haste which has seemed to be essential that it has been necessary to meet some domestic problems, we seem to have overlooked rather substantially what in my personal opinion is an inequity in distribution of that which goes to our neighbors to the south.

Time does not permit details but I believe this legislation would be far more equitable to all parties concerned if one of the following suggestions were followed in distributing tonnage developed by our increase in our domestic needs, namely: First, 55 percent to domestic producers and 45 percent to Cuba and full duty countries; (2) provide fixed quotas for the fullduty countries by adding 40,000 tons to a base attained in 1956 and provide no increase for sub-

sequent years of the act dividing balance of annual growth two-thirds to domestic producers and one-third to Cuba; (3) distribute total annual increase on basis of 55 percent to domestic producers, 35 percent to Cuba and 10 percent to full duty countries. Formula would be effective from 1957 to end of act.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield to my distinguished and beloved friend, Mrs. KNUTSON, of Minnesota, such time as she may desire to use.

Mr. Chairman, I have been a member of the House Committee on Agriculture for 21 years. No other woman has ever served on that committee, so far as I know, before Mrs. KNUTSON was elected to membership on that very important Committee on Agriculture. When I was advised that a lady would be elected to our committee, very frankly I objected. I looked with grave apprehensions and actually did not want a woman on the committee. I am ashamed of myself. No human being could have been more worthy of membership on that committee than COYA KNUTSON. Frankly, I would not swap her for one-half dozen men. Mrs. KNUTSON has been intensely and constantly interested in the work of the committee, in the welfare of the farmers, and has performed all the duties assigned to her in magnificent fashion. She is a brilliant woman, a tireless worker, a diplomat, and a statesman in the true sense of the word. She has made a great contribution to the work of our committee, to her constituents and to her country. She understands the problems of farmers and has a community of interests with them in the great cause of agriculture. It has been a real pleasure to me to serve with her on the committee and I want to thank her now for her splendid efforts, for the great contributions she has made, and for the help she has given to me and to the other members of our committee.

Mrs. KNUTSON. Mr. Chairman, I would like to associate myself with the statements made by the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture [Mr. COOLEY] who has done a tremendous job on this bill. There is a great deal of interest in my district for this legislation and I sincerely hope it will pass. If you could have followed us around on this legislation you would appreciate how much work has been done. I have great respect for the ability and courage that the chairman showed in helping us with this legislation. It has been a sweet subject for some time, I assure you.

I represent the Ninth District in Minnesota, one of the largest sugar beet growers in the United States; farmers and growers of my district need a substantial increase in sugar beet acreage.

The bill that I have introduced and support does not provide anywhere near the additional acreage for sugar beets needed in the Red River valley of Minnesota and North Dakota. It will only prevent additional acreage cutbacks and perhaps in a few years restore to present growers the acreage they lost this year because of limitation of acreage in the United States to that required to produce 1,800,000 tons of beet sugar.

Last year, about 95,000 acres of sugar beets were grown and harvested in the valley. With our new plant, completed in 1954 at a cost of about $10 million, we can easily process beets grown on 115,000 acres. However, our growers have been restricted to less than 90,000 acres for 1955.

We have hundreds of thousands of acres of land suitable for growing sugar beets in the Red River valley, and our farmers and growers desire to substantially increase beet acreage. This crop is the only rotation crop that can successfully be used as far north as the Red River valley. To a certain degree, more acreage in sugar beets takes the pressure off other crops that would normally be grown.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from California [Mr. SISK].

Mr. SISK. Mr. Chairman, I want to take this opportunity to commend the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture [Mr. COOLEY] on this legislation. I rise in support of it and I hope it will pass.

Mr. Chairman, I feel that this is a good bill, that it provides a fair and honest break to our friendly neighbors who produce sugar as well as to the farmers in our own country who are struggling to make both ends meet in the face of acreage reductions and limitations on their sugar output.

As I understand it, under the present law, quotas of imported sugar are increased to supply the increased sugar consumption in the United States, while our own growers are restricted to supplying their portion of our historical requirements. The proposal now before us would give a share of increased consumption to domestic producers and, above certain increases, would authorize increased imports.

It has been charged that passage of this bill would injure Cuba by decreasing that country's exports to the United States. I do not believe this to be true. Cuba would remain entitled to send us as much sugar as she has in the past and could increase her quota if our consumption warrants, but our own beet and cane growers would have a fair share of increases, to which they are obviously entitled.

I personally know of the difficulties and problems facing beet growers in my own district and I am going to vote here to help them with those problems. Certainly, we cannot deny our own farmers the right to participate in our country's growth and I have confidence in the sense of fair play and justice of my colleagues in voting for this bill to help in relieving our own farm problems.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, on July 13, I made a short speech entitled "Excellent Food With Low Caloric Content Now Available to Everyone." This statement illustrated the ingenuity of American industry. It was not intended, directly or indirectly, to cast any reflection on the beneficial uses of sugar and especially its importance as an energy-producing food necessary to the health and vigor of all normal persons.

Sugar is a tremendously important part of the normal diet. Its production is an important American industry. As the Representative of the people of one of California's foremost beet sugar-producing districts, I am, and long have been, well aware of these facts.

During my seven terms in the House of Representatives, I have been fully aware of the importance of the beet sugar industry. For 10 years, I had 4 sugar refineries in my congressional district—third. Following the redistricting after the census of 1950, my district has been the 11th and it contains two sugar refineries; the Spreckels Sugar Co. at Manteca, and the Holly Sugar Corp. at Tracy, both successful and prosperous plants.

When consideration is given to the fact that 85 to 90 percent of all food taken into the body is used for energy expenditure, the importance of carbohydrates—particularly sugar—is evident. These are the quick energy foods which play an important role as intermediates in protein manufacture as well as in the growth process.

The production of sugar in the United States is a major industry. In California, the income to sugar beet farmers from their 1954 crop alone amounted to more than $65 million. Payrolls in our 11 California beet sugar processing factories amounted to an additional $13 million. Our beet sugar industry, one of the most important consumers of natural gas in California, paid gas companies in excess of $3 million last year, and more than $8½ million was received by the railroads from our California beet sugar industry. Exclusive of Federal taxes, expenditures of the industry reached the very significant total of $100 million in California in 1954.

This year, more than 170,000 acres of sugar beets are being grown in 34 counties of California.

This year we are writing a sugar bill. I believe I can modestly say that I had a part in getting the Rules Committee to reverse its stand, and consent to put out a rule to make the sugar bill in order.

I have a vivid recollection of how in 1920, when I was married, my bride paid 32 cents a pound for sugar. Later, a Sugar Act was enacted and at no time since we have had a Sugar Act, has the price risen above 8.5 cents a pound.

All during my congressional career I have given complete support to the beet sugar industry and to the legislation pertaining to the industry, and expect to continue to do so.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, as I explained in the outset, because of the pressure of time, it is not possible for me to discuss, with any degree of satisfaction, the details of this complicated bill. I am glad to provide for the record detailed information which I hope will be beneficial and helpful.

PRESENT SUGAR ACT

Objective: The major objectives of the Sugar Act are to maintain a healthy domestic sugar industry, to assure adequate sugar supplies to consumers at reasonable prices, and to promote our general export trade.

Outline of major provisions: The total supply of sugar that may be marketed in the United States is determined annually by the Secretary of Agriculture at a level which, in conjunction with existing demand conditions, is expected to produce a price fair to both producers and consumers. Shares in the total supply are assigned to domestic and foreign sugar-producing areas. When necessary, domestic quotas are subdivided into marketing allotments for each qualified marketer. Also, when necessary, the quota for each domestic area is subdivided into proportionate shares assigned to individual producers of sugarcane and sugar beets. Government payments are made to domestic growers who comply with the condition prescribed in the act.

Determining sugar requirements: Each December, the Secretary of Agriculture is required to determine how much sugar will be needed to meet United States requirements for the subsequent calendar year. A public hearing is held at which all interested persons, including consumers, industrial users, wholesalers, refiners, sugarcane and sugar-beet processors, and producers may present views and recommendations on the matter.

Establishing quotas: After requirements are determined, each domestic and foreign producing area supplying the United States with sugar is assigned a quota representing its share of the United States market. The law establishes fixed marketing quotas for the five domestic areas and the Philippines and residual quotas to Cuba and other foreign countries. Cuba receives 96 percent and other foreign countries 4 percent of the residual quota. Fixed quotas for the domestic areas are as follows:

Area:	*Short tons sugar (raw value)*
Domestic beet sugar	1,800,000
Domestic cane sugar	500,000
Hawaii	1,052,000
Puerto Rico	1,080,000
Virgin Islands	12,000

On the basis of an annual sugar requirement of 8,400,000 tons, domestic areas supply about 53 percent and foreign countries supply about 47 percent.

Establishing marketing allotments: One important function of the sugar program is to promote orderly marketing. This can sometimes be accomplished through quotas alone. However, quotas may not suffice, especially when supplies in the producing areas materially exceed the quotas. If the Secretary believes that the pressure of supplies in an area is likely to result in disorderly marketing, he must allot the quota fairly among persons who market sugar. This allotment assures each marketer of an equitable share of the market, and permits the conduct of business on a more stable day-to-day basis.

Establishing proportionate share-acreage allotments: When the indicated sugar supply for a domestic area is greater than the quantity needed to fill the quota and provide a normal carryover inventory, the act requires the Secretary to divide the market among individual producing farms. The total amount of sugarcane or sugar beets that may be harvested for sugar on a farm is known as a farm's "proportionate share." The establishment of proportionate shares assures that each eligible farm in the producing area will receive its fair share of the market and, at the same time, bear its fair share of any required adjustment in production. Among other conditions, producers are required to market within their proportionate shares if they wish to qualify for conditional payments.

Making conditional payments: In addition to the price protection afforded growers under the quota system, the act provides for direct payment to growers ranging from 80 cents per 100 pounds of sugar for production of less than 350 tons of sugar per farm, down to 30 cents per 100 pounds for production in excess of 30,000 tons per farm. The average payment for all domestic producers is about 67 cents per 100 pounds. In addition to these payments, the act affords a degree of protection to producers with respect to bona fide abandonment of planted acreage and crop deficiencies of harvested acreage resulting directly from drought, flood, storm, freeze, disease or insects. In the case of payment for acreage abandonment and crop deficiency, the payment is computed on the basis of specified percentages of the farm's normal yield.

Conditions of payments: To qualify for conditional payments, producers must fulfill .a number of conditions. These are: (a) they must not employ child labor; (b) they must not market sugarcane or sugar beets in excess of farm proportionate shares; (c) they must pay fair wages as determined by the Secretary; and (d) if they are also processors, they must pay fair prices as determined by the Secretary for sugar beets or sugarcane purchased from other producers.

Processing tax: A tax on sugar provides funds to the Government which more than offset the total of all conditional payments plus the costs incurred in administering the Sugar Act. This tax is one-half cent a pound, raw value, on all sugar processed or imported for direct consumption.

MAJOR PROVISIONS OF H. R. 7030

Term of the amendment: The bill reenacts and extends for 4 years, to December 31, 1960, the Sugar Act of 1948, as amended, with further amendments dealing primarily with adjustments of quotas. The present act, in the absence of any action by the Congress, would expire December 31, 1956. The bill also extends for 4 years, to June 30, 1961, the applicability of the excise tax on sugar in the Internal Revenue Code. This tax finances the sugar-stabilizing program.

Major effects: This legislation's major effect is to open the way for United States domestic-area producers to participate with foreign areas in supplying the growth of the United States sugar market. The bill maintains unchanged participation of domestic and foreign areas in the present level of consumption in the United States market. Cuba, for a number of years, has enjoyed an increasing market for her sugar here—equal virtually to the complete growth of sugar consumption in the United States. This legislation would open the way for United States producers to participate in the larger market constantly being created by the growth of our consumption of sugar. In addition, and to a lesser extent, other foreign suppliers would enjoy a part of the expanding market along with Cuba.

Method of assigning increases in the domestic market in 1956: An annual growth in the United States sugar consumption of approximately 135,000 tons is expected on the basis of past experience. For the calendar year 1956, the amount of the increase in our market above 8,350,000 short tons, raw value, would be apportioned 50 percent to domestic producing areas and 50 percent to the foreign suppliers—except the Philippines, which has a fixed quota—with Cuba getting 96 percent and all other countries receiving 4 percent of the 50 percent going to the foreign suppliers. The first 188,000 tons, or any part thereof, by which quotas for the domestic areas are so increased in 1956, would be apportioned 45.2 percent to the domestic beet area, 42.6 percent to the mainland cane area, 10.6 percent to Puerto Rico, and 1.6 percent to the Virgin Islands. If rising consumption should increase the quotas of domestic areas by more than 188,000 tons in 1956, the excess would be allotted on the basis of the present law's assignment of quotas.

Specific quota provisions for 1957, 1958, 1959, and 1960: This bill—

First. Assigns between the domestic producing areas and the foreign suppliers additional quotas year by year, each equal to 50 percent of the growth of the United States market above the current 8,350,000 tons of consumption a year.

Second. Provides that for 1957, 1958, 1959, and 1960 the additional quotas for domestic areas producers—representing 50 percent of the growth in the United States market—will be distributed in accordance with the final quotas established for the calendar year 1956.

Third. Provide that in 1957 the total of established and growth quotas for foreign suppliers—other than the Philippines—would be distributed as follows: The first 175,000 tons to the foreign suppliers other than Cuba and the Philippines and Cuba to receive a quota computed by subtracting 175,000 tons from the sum of the quotas for foreign countries other than the Philippines.

Fourth. Provides that for 1958, 1959, and 1960 the additional quotas representing 50 percent of the growth assigned to foreign suppliers—other than the Philippines—would be distributed as follows: The first 45,000 tons to the foreign suppliers other than Cuba and the Philippines and Cuba to receive an additional quota computed by subtracting 45,000 tons from the 50 percent of the growth in the United States market which would be assigned to foreign countries.

Fifth. Provide that proration of their quota among the foreign countries other than Cuba and the Philippines be changed beginning in 1957—

(a) By assigning to those countries which exported to the United States less

than 1,000 tons during the years 1953 and 1954 a fixed quantity equal to their average proration in those years.

(b) By assigning to the countries that brought in between 1,000 and 3,000 in those years a fixed quantity of 2,000 tons in addition to their further proration below.

(c) Countries whose average imports here were between 1,000 and 2,000 short tons in 1953 and 1954 receive prorations for 1957 equal to such average entries plus 30 percent thereof and for each subsequent year prorations for such countries are increased by an additional 30 percent above the prorations for the immediately preceding year.

(d) The balance of the quota for countries other than Cuba and the Philippines is prorated 37 percent to the Dominican Republic, 36 percent to Peru, 20 percent to Mexico, 5 percent to Nicaragua, and 2 percent to Haiti.

Special 100,000-ton program: To alleviate a surplus condition in the continental United States sugar-producing areas, this bill provides that the Government purchase or otherwise remove from the market 100,000 tons from the 1955 or previous crops in such areas for disposition outside the continental United States in such manner as not to interfere unduly with normal marketing of sugar. It is assumed this sugar will be distributed in the relief operations of the International Cooperation Administration.

New growers: Although the committee has not included in the bill any specific directive for distribution of additional domestic quotas to new producers, it is the belief of the committee that the act should be administered so as to benefit new producers and new producing regions as increased domestic acreage becomes available as the result of quota increases.

Restrictions on quota of foreign countries: Foreign countries which fail by a substantial margin to supply sugar to this market in years when the world price is higher than our domestic price are subject to quota curtailment in future years, unless the Secretary of Agriculture finds that such curtailment is unwarranted. Foreign countries which discriminate against the importation of agricultural commodities from this country are subject to quota suspension during each year when such restrictive measures are in effect. Foreign countries which did not become participants to the International Sugar Agreement on or before January 1, 1957, are not eligible for increases in quotas or prorations above the 1956 level.

Direct-consumption sugar limitations: Provisions of the Sugar Act which limit the entry of direct-consumption sugar within quotas of both foreign and offshore domestic areas would be varied slightly to permit an increase in such allocations for the offshore domestic areas and to permit those foreign countries which have relatively small quotas—less than 7,000 tons—the convenience of shipping either raw or refined sugar to this market.

Proration of deficits in area quotas: The method of prorating deficits would be changed slightly to insure that increases which domestic areas receive through market participation but which they are not able to fill shall first be prorated to other domestic areas rather than to Cuba and the other domestic areas as is the case under the present act. In the event a domestic area is unable to fill a proration of a deficit assigned to it which results from increased quota due to market participation, the unfilled portion also would be apportioned to other domestic areas unless no such area is able to supply the required quantity in which case it would be added to the quota of Cuba.

Definitions and administrative provisions: The bill also contains a number of minor amendments which affect the administrative procedures under the act and other amendments which affect definitions. Sections 1 through 4 of the bill revise some of the definitions contained in title I of the act. Sections 15, 16, and 17 of the bill revise administrative provisions of the bill.

Liberalization of allotments and proportionate shares: Section 10 authorizes the Secretary to consider and make allowance for the effect of drought, storm, flood, freezes, disease, insects, and other uncontrollable conditions when he allots any area quota or proration. Section 14 provides similar authorization with respect to the establishment of proportionate shares. Section 13 would permit the marketing of or processing of sugar beets or sugarcane for livestock feed in excess of the proportionate share for a farm.

Refunding of import tax: Section 23 provides for the refunding of the import compensating tax on manufactured sugar imported for use as livestock feed or in the distillation of alcohol.

Price consideration: Section 5 changes the base period for the consideration that the Secretary is directed to give to the relationship between the wholesale price of refined sugar and the general cost of living in the United States from that part of 1947 when ceiling prices were effective to the generally accepted statistical base period of 1947–49.

BENEFITS TO VARIOUS AREAS UNDER SUGAR PROGRAM

DOMESTIC AREAS

Quantity: Under the 1948 act domestic areas receive fixed quotas totaling 4,444,000 tons.

Under H. R. 7030 they will receive, in addition to their fixed quotas, one-half of future increases in domestic requirements which will increase their estimated total quotas to 4,536,000 tons in 1956 and to 4,806,000 tons in 1960.

Benefits: Domestic areas receive the following benefits:

(a) Quota premium, $1.90 per hundred pounds.

(b) Tariff, 50 cents per hundred pounds.

(c) Sugar Act payment average, 70 cents per hundred pounds.

Each producer, to receive a Sugar Act payment, must fulfill the following conditions:

(a) Market within his proportionate share.

(b) Pay fair prices for any cane or beets purchased.

(c) Pay fair wages as determined by the Secretary.

(d) Employ no child labor.

PHILIPPINES

Quantity: Under the proposed bill the Philippines will continue to receive a fixed quota of 977,000 tons.

Benefits: The Philippine producers now receive the same quota premium and tariff benefit as domestic producers, but receive no Sugar Act payments. Under the trade agreement, the Philippines will begin to pay 5 percent of the tariff next January but will not pay the full tariff until 1974.

CUBA

Quantity: Under the Sugar Act of 1948, Cuba received 96 percent of all increases in domestic requirements.

Under H. R. 7030 Cuba will receive small increases which will bring its estimated quota from 2,900,000 tons in 1956 to 2,982,000 tons in 1960.

Benefits: Cuba receives the benefit of the quota premium of $1.90 per hundred pounds. It receives no Sugar Act payments.

Under the agreement of 1902 the duty on Cuban products imported into the United States is 80 percent of full duty which results in the present tariff on Cuban sugar of 50 cents per hundred pounds compared with 62.5 cents per 100 pounds of sugar from full-duty countries. Since the bulk of our imports come from Cuba, the Cuban rate is considered the effective one.

FULL-DUTY COUNTRIES

Quantity: Under the original Sugar Act of 1948, full-duty countries supplied only 1.36 percent of the increase in domestic requirements and under the amended act now in effect they supply 4 percent of such increases.

Under H. R. 7030 they will have fixed increases. The bill will increase the quotas of these countries from an estimated 120,000 tons in 1956 to 175,000 tons in 1957 from which point they will be increased from 45,000 tons per year to 310,000 tons in 1960.

Benefits: The full-duty countries receive the quota premium of $1.90 per hundred pounds. They pay the full tariff rate of 62.5 cents per 100 pounds.

SUGAR PRICES

Sugar prices are supported under the Sugar Act at levels which will maintain and protect the prosperity of the domestic industry without unduly burdening consumers.

Domestic prices are supported primarily through adjustments in the total supplies made available under quotas.

The total quotas or requirements are determined in light of:

(a) Past sugar distribution.

(b) Size of inventories.

(c) Population increase.

(d) Demand conditions.

(e) Trend and level of consumer-purchasing power.

(f) Comparative trends in sugar prices and the consumer-price index since the period of price controls in 1947.

Actual prices recently have been approximately as follows:

Raw sugar, 6 cents per pound compared with 6.32 under price control in 1947.

Refined cane sugar, New York, 8.55 cents per pound compared with 8.40 in 1947.

Beet sugar, Chicago, 8.10 cents per pound compared with 8.30 in 1947.

Amendment: The Consumers' Price Index has risen since 1947 while sugar prices have held about stationary. If sugar prices had risen with other commodities, refined sugar would now sell at 10 cents per pound.

To allay fears of consumers, H. R. 7030 provides that the base period 1947–49 shall be used rather than the first 10 months of 1947 while prices were under price control for comparisons with the Consumers' Price Index. The amendment will have the effect of reducing the formula price to just over 9 cents per pound.

COMPUTATION OF SUGAR ACT PAYMENTS

Basic payments: Sugar Act payments are computed on the amount of sugar commercially recoverable—(actual or average amount recovered)—from sugar beets or sugarcane marketed from farms in the domestic sugar-producing areas for the extraction of sugar. The basic rate of 80 cents per 100 pounds of sugar, raw value, is paid on the first 350 short tons of sugar produced on a farm. This rate is reduced progressively to a minimum of 30 cents on all sugar produced in excess of 30,000 tons per farm. The average rate of payment for all domestic areas on recent crops has averaged approximately 69 cents per 100 pounds of sugar.

Crop insurance type payments: In addition to the payments on sugar beets or sugarcane marketed, the act affords protection to producers with respect to bona fide abandonment of planted acreage and crop deficiencies of harvested acreage resulting directly from drought, flood, storm, freeze, disease, or insects. In case of acreage abandoned and approved for payment, the payment is computed on the number of acres within the farm's proportionate share at one-third of the normal yield of sugar per acre established for the farm. With respect to crop deficiency on harvested acreage which is approved for payment, the payment is computed upon the deficiency of actual production below 80 percent of normal production.

Payments in recent years: Sugar act payments per ton of sugar beets or sugarcane during the most recent crop for which information is available have averaged:

Sugar beets	$2.33
Mainland sugarcane	1.19
Hawaii	1.05
Puerto Rico	1.54
Virgin Islands	1.25

Total payments for recent years are shown below:

Area	Years				
	1949	1950	1951	1952	1953
Domestic beet sugar	$26,587,114	$33,750,327	$25,894,874	$24,735,389	$28,978,787
Mainland cane sugar	7,100,263	7,826,148	6,467,540	7,976,607	8,608,393
Hawaii	8,437,594	8,471,073	9,143,041	9,398,138	10,155,590
Puerto Rico	17,509,831	17,148,123	18,922,493	16,965,951	16,710,000
Virgin Islands	65,586	138,509	97,776	145,089	170,844
Total	59,700,388	67,324,180	60,525,724	59,221,174	65,623,614
Portion of above total representing payment for abandonment or deficiency	898,500	1,192,900	1,764,800	639,700	1,025,800

Tax collections in recent years

1950	$75,087,101
1951	83,660,289
1952	82,077,127
1953	82,996,776
1954	80,197,761

ACREAGE RESERVES FOR NEW GROWERS

The proportionate share determinations issued for the producing areas wherein restrictions are in effect provide the following reserves for new growers:

Sugar beet area: A minimum of 1 percent of each State acreage allocation is set aside for new growers.

Mainland cane sugar area: Any new grower may market sugarcane from 5 acres.

Puerto Rico: Any new grower may market sugarcane to produce 5 tons of sugar.

WAGE RATES UNDER THE SUGAR ACTS

General: Fair and reasonable wage determinations by the Secretary of rates which producers of sugar beets and sugarcane must pay field workers, as one of the requirements for payments under the Sugar Acts, have been issued annually in most of the domestic sugar-producing areas since 1937. One sugar beet wage determination was issued in 1935, and determinations in the Virgin Islands were not instituted until 1942. From 1934, the average earnings of workers for all the areas as a group have increased slightly more than 4½ times, or from about 17 cents per hour in 1934 to approximately 80 cents in 1954.

By areas: The amount of increase has varied somewhat in accordance with conditions among and affecting the various areas. Foremost among these conditions is the extent to which productivity gains have occurred during the 20-year period in each area. Estimated average hourly cash earnings of all workers not including payments in kind or perquisites for 1954 and the percentage relationship to 1934 are shown below:

Area	Estimated average earnings per hour		1954 average earnings as a percent of 1934
	1934	1954	
Sugar beet	$0.30	$0.85	283
Louisiana	.12	.53	442
Florida	.15	.82	547
Hawaii	.12	1.42	1,183
Puerto Rico	.10	.41	410
Virgin Islands	.06	.55	917

The controversial sections: First, the provision for nonrecourse loans; second, the section directed at the Philippines; third, the provision directed at Peru, may all be deleted without doing real violence to the bill we are submitting. I repeat, however, that I am still in favor of a nonrecourse loan provision, but I am convinced that the other two sections I have referred to should be removed from the bill. If, however, the Philippines continue to discriminate against American tobacco, when Congress convenes in January, the Sugar Act which we are now considering may be again amended. I am not willing to tolerate longer this rank discrimination against a product upon the production of which my people depend for a livelihood. The Philippines have been treated fairly in the bill we are presenting, and in recognition of this fair treatment, the discriminatory provisions of the Philippine law should be forthrightly and immediately repealed.

Mr. Chairman, I have made some interesting calculations which indicate just how fairly Cuba has been treated. Certainly I am interested in Cuba and in the welfare of the people of Cuba, and I value the friendship existing between the people of Cuba and the people of our own country, but I maintain that Cuba should be delighted with the treatment which has been accorded her in this bill. Here are arguments, facts, and figures which I do not believe can be successfully controverted or denied:

First. The theory of the administration proposal was to provide a substantial participation in the growth factor to the domestic producers and to supply some increased participation in the growth factor to the full duty countries. At the same time the administration proposal took into account the importance of maintaining for the Cubans a reasonable and fair participation in the growth factor.

Second. The committee, in amending the proposed administration proposal, followed the philosophy of the administration proposal. However, the committee determined that it would be better to give to the Cubans a larger quota in the early years under the new bill so as to permit the Cubans better to adjust their planning to the future quotas. In other words, the committee has strengthened the position of the Cubans by giving to them a larger quota in the years 1956, 1957, and 1958 than is provided under the administration's proposal and reducing their quota slightly from the administration proposal for the years 1959 and 1960. In this way the committee believed that the Cubans would have a better opportunity to adjust to the new situation, the equity of which the Cubans themselves recognize, wherein the domestic producers and other foreign producers would have a greater participation in the growth factor.

Third. The end result, insofar as total tonnage of sugar to be supplied to the United States by Cuba during the years 1956 through 1960, is almost identical under the administration proposal and the bill as reported out by the House Committee on Agriculture. Thus, during this period under the administration

proposal, Cuba would have exported to the United States 17,563,260 tons of sugar. During the same period, under the bill as reported out by the committee, the Cubans will export 17,551,480 tons of sugar, or a reduction of 11,780 tons in the entire period from that provided under the administration proposal. This reduction amounts to three-fourths of one-tenth of 1 percent.

Fourth. The following table reveals how the bill as reported out by the committee is a better bill for the Cubans than the bill as proposed by the administration:

Cuba's exports of sugar to the United States

Year	Administration proposal	Committee bill	Tonnage by which committee bill exceeds administration proposal
1956	2,891,760	2,900,640	+8,880
1957	2,898,240	2,914,000	+15,760
1958	2,934,690	2,936,500	+1,810
1959	2,971,140	2,959,000	−12,140
1960	3,007,590	2,981,500	−26,090
Total			[1] −11,780

[1] Net loss over life of bill.

In working out the participation in the growth factor, the committee has recognized:

(a) The importance of the domestic producers obtaining a substantial participation in the growth factor which never before had been provided to them.

(b) Giving a small increase in participation in the growth factor to the full-duty countries whose participation up to now under the existing law had been limited to 4 percent.

(c) Adjusting the smaller participation that Cuba would have in the growth factor so that the cut would be a more gradual one than that provided by the administration bill and would permit Cuba to plan better its future sugar economy.

The ability of the committee to achieve this result for Cuba and at the same time maintain the philosophy that Cuba should receive a substantial part of the growth factor is revealed by the following table:

Percent of Cuba in growth factor

Year	Administration proposal	Committee bill
1955–56	23.6	30.2
1956–57	4.8	9.9
1957–58	27.0	16.67
1958–59	27.0	16.67
1959–60	27.0	16.67
Average	21.9	18.02

Under the sugar legislation as it now exists, Cuba supplies 34.04 percent of the entire sugar consumption of the United States.

The administration, the committee, and the Cubans have all recognized that this participation must be reduced to some extent in order to permit greater participation to the domestic producers and some small increased participation to the full-duty countries.

The administration recognized this factor since its bill, as of 1960, would have given to the Cubans the privilege of supplying 33.14 percent of the entire sugar consumption of the United States.

The committee bill has followed the principle recognized by the Cubans and as advocated by the proposed administration bill by granting to the Cubans in 1960 the privilege of supplying 32.85 percent of the entire sugar consumption of the United States. In other words, the committee bill reduces Cuba's share in the total United States market in 1960 by less than 1 percent, by 0.29 of 1 percent from the administration proposal.

Under the proposed administration bill, in 1960 the Cubans would have accounted for 71.06 percent of all the sugar exported to the United States.

The committee has followed this principle of recognizing that the Cubans should receive the larger share of the United States market insofar as all foreign countries are concerned. Under the committee bill, the Cubans in 1960 will supply 69.85 percent of all the sugar exported to the United States from abroad. The difference, therefore, between the proposed administration bill and the committee bill involves only a reduction of 1.13 percent insofar as Cuba's relative position among all foreign suppliers is concerned.

The annual average of Cuban deliveries to the United States under existing legislation for the period 1948–52 is 3,061,000 tons as compared to the average of the full-duty countries of 56,000.

Under existing legislation, for the period 1953–56, the annual average of the Cuban deliveries to the United States would be 2,812,000 as compared to the annual average of the full-duty countries of 117,000.

Under the committee bill, the annual average of Cuban deliveries to the United States for the period 1957–60 is 2,939,000 as compared to the annual average of the full-duty countries of 242,500.

Thus the Cuban position is bettered from what has been the case under the existing legislation.

Moreover, it is to be noted that the annual average of Cuban deliveries to the United States for the period 1948–60 under existing legislation and the committee bill is 2,947,000, as compared to the average of the full-duty countries of 132,000.

In his testimony in 1951 Mr. Myers stated:

> The Sugar Act of 1948 was designed particularly to assist Cuba. It was feared in 1947 when the Sugar Act of 1948 was being drafted that a period of declining demand and retrenchment might lie ahead. Therefore, it was felt that the United States had a moral obligation to give the Cuban sugar industry every reasonable assistance during the period of anticipated retrenchment.

Thus Cuba was given substantial benefits under the 1948 act, which Cuba accepted, on the theory that these benefits would permit it to prepare for the necessary retrenchment.

The fact is that Cuba failed to retrench. Thus, in 1947, her annual production was 6,448,000 tons. The annual average production of Cuba for the years 1948–51 was 6,228,000 tons. Its annual production in 1952 was 7,964,000 tons. This production was equal to 99.98 percent of the total United States consumption.

The fact is, therefore, that while Cuba accepted the benefits of the 1948 act, it failed to undertake the obligation imposed by the theory of the act, which was for Cuba to restrict its production and prepare for the inevitable retrenchment.

It is important to note how much more the United States Treasury will obtain under the provisions of the committee bill as against the existing legislation as a result of additional tonnage being granted to the full-duty countries.

The additional tonnage granted to the full-duty countries is 474,740 tons.

This additional amount means that the United States Treasury gets $2.50 per ton more than would be obtained if Cuba were to ship this extra amount.

The total additional amount obtained, therefore, by the United States Treasury is $1,186,850.

It is important to study the history of Cuban sugar entries to the United States, both in terms of tonnages and dollars.

In 1948 Cuban sugar entries totaled 2,927,000 tons.

In 1954, Cuban sugar entries totaled 2,729,000 tons, or a reduction of 200,000 tons from her 1948 sugar entries.

The value of the Cuban sugar sales to the United States in 1948 totaled $271.6 million, as compared to $283.3 million in 1954.

Thus, although in 1954 Cuban sugar entries were 200,000 less tons than in 1948, she earned on her 1954 sugar entries $11.7 million more than in 1948.

In respect of total Cuban exports to the United States, Cuba exported, in 1954, $26 million more, including sugar, than she did in 1948, although her imports from the United States had decreased in 1954 by $12.8 million from her imports from the United States in 1948.

In changing the recommendation of the executive branch from 55 to 45, that is, 55 percent of our total consumption to domestic producers and 45 percent to foreign producers, to a division of 50 percent to domestic producers and 50 percent to foreign producers, we took away from our own domestic producers and gave to foreign producers far more than we have taken away from Cuba during the life of the bill we have presented. Fortunately, Cuba does not complain about the 100,000 tons which were given to our domestic producers, but some of the people interested in Cuba seem to be very unhappy and somewhat dissatisfied with the provisions of the bill we are presenting. Actually, Mr. Chairman, Cuba should be delighted. It should be realized that in 1955 and 1956 and all through the life of the program Cuba has been well cared for, and in 1962, if the present arrangement continues, Cuba will have a quota in excess of 3 million tons, while all of the full-duty countries put together will only have 400,000 tons.

I frankly believe, Mr. Chairman, that all countries and areas participating in this program should be pleased with the provisions of this bill.

It is not possible for me to tell you how much work has been done in connection

with the bill and the problems involved. I have made just about every possible calculation that could be made, based upon different percentages and under different formulas and with different tonnages. Most of these calculations have of necessity been made without the aid or assistance of the statisticians and mathematicians and calculating machines of the Department of Agriculture. The Department of Agriculture closes at about 5:30 in the afternoon, and only by laborious effort and by working into late hours of the night and the early hours of the morning was I able to present the various charts and calculations to the members of our committee for their consideration. I know, Mr. Chairman, better than anyone else how hard and how faithfully the members of our committee have worked on these problems. In making these calculations and in preparing these charts, if one figure is changed, then all the rest of the figures must be changed. I hope, therefore, that no effort will be made to change these figures and calculations and tonnages here on the floor of the House.

Many of the areas and countries participating in this program, and I might say most of the countries and areas participating in this program, have been well and ably represented by distinguished lawyers, economists, and lobbyists, but unfortunately some of the participating full-duty countries have had no lawyers, economists, or lobbyists representing them except the members of our committee who were determined to accord fair treatment to all areas. Some people seem to be dissatisfied because our committee decided to increase the quotas for our good neighbors south of the border. Mexico has not even been able to sell enough sugar in our market to earn enough dollars to buy enough machinery to operate the sugar industry of Mexico. The Dominican Republic has filled the quotas she has been given and has kept faith with our country. Panama was entitled to better treatment than had been accorded, and so our committee increased the quota to Panama. We did not forget Haiti, Costa Rica, Formosa, and the other countries who have participated, even in a small way, in this very important sugar program—even Hong Kong was given 3 tons and British Guiana 85 tons.

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, I want to say again that our committee has done a good job. This bill is important. It should be passed as presented. It should be accepted by all countries and areas involved, and certainly it should be accepted by the Senate and signed by the President.

If this bill is forced into a conference we will adjourn without a sugar bill and relief will be denied to our domestic producers who are now temporarily in distress. Our labor will be lost and the sugar program may expire next year and we may face the chaotic condition that existed before the House Committee on Agriculture prepared and presented the first sugar bill more than 20 years ago.

This bill contains everything that the present Secretary of Agriculture has denounced, ridiculed, and repudiated. It is saturated with subsidies, it is permeated with controls and regimentations. Every phase of the industry is strictly controlled. Even the wages of the laborers in the fields are fixed. In this program we have acreage allotments and marketing quotas, and marketing quotas are fixed in tonnages. The refining of sugar is regulated. The price of sugar is fixed. Price supports are provided and prices are now being supported in the beet producing areas at 93.5 percent of parity. Import quotas are fixed. Refining quotas are fixed. Every possible thing affecting the production, harvesting, marketing, and distribution of sugar is firmly fixed by this law, and yet the Secretary of Agriculture and even the President of the United States in a special message to Congress officially approve of the sugar program.

Yes, both the Secretary and the President recommended and approved the wool program, under which the production of wool is now supported at 105 percent of parity. But those of us who are primarily interested in the producers of basic commodities are told that 90 percent of parity for our farmers involves something that is evil, unholy, and un-American.

Consistency—oh, what a jewel. It probably depends upon whose ox is gored. Seventy-six percent of parity for wheat farmers, 93½ percent for sugar farmers, 105 percent for sheep farmers, and flexible supports for everyone else seems to be the price support program of the present administration. Why cannot we be fair with all farmers? Why cannot we be fair with each other? This thing we call 90-percent price support for basic commodities is obviously obnoxious to the present administration. The present administration talks eloquently about 100 percent of parity—in the market place—but the present administration has not been able to find the market place. The present administration is frightened by the abundance which the farmers of our Nation have produced, and the present administration does not seem to know how to deal with the problem of abundance. The fact remains that when this administration came into office, the overall price support program on basic agricultural commodities showed a net profit of more than $13 million, but under this present administration that net profit has disappeared, and now the program shows substantial losses. Mr. Chairman, I could go on and on talking about the weaknesses of the present administration, but let us come back to the matter before us. This bill must be enacted before this Congress adjourns.

Mr. Chairman, I cannot conclude in good conscience until I have paid at least a brief tribute to the one man who has been responsible for the proper administration of the sugar program, Lawrence Meyers, the director and administrator of the sugar program. Larry Meyers knows more about this bill and all other sugar bills and programs than any man in America. He has done and is doing a magnificent job. He has not and he will not yield to pressure from any quarter. He has well and faithfully discharged all of the great and grave responsibilities of the office he holds. He is held in high esteem by all men everywhere who have known him well. He is an upright, a forthright, trustworthy, and courageous "bureaucrat." He has devoted his life to public service, and he deserves a commendation of Congress. Because of Larry Meyers this sugar program has been an outstanding success and has operated so well and so successfully that it has not been criticized by men of either party. Larry Meyers is a public servant, and he has rendered service far beyond the call of duty. If he had rendered such valuable service in England instead of here at home, I am sure that we would now today be addressing him as Sir Lawrence.

Mr. Chairman, I want to publicly congratulate and commend Lawrence Meyers and publicly thank him for his constant interest in the problems here involved and for the great assistance that he has been to me and to the members of our committee in the preparation of the bill now under consideration. I do not know whether he approves of everything we have done or not, but I do know that he knows that we have a right to do everything we have done. If this bill is enacted, I am certain that he will, to the very best of his ability, carry out the true intent and meaning of every provision of this bill. Larry Meyers knows that legislation is the result of compromise, and while this bill might not reflect his views entirely, he appreciates the importance of the program, which must, of necessity, be continued. During our deliberations and the consideration of the problems involved, I have felt perfectly free to call upon him during all of the hours of the day and even at his home late into the night. I know that he has worked many long hours after he has finished his labors in the Department of Agriculture. Not only does he know the problems which here perplex us, but he understands the problems of the producers of sugar throughout the world. He is our representative at all international conferences, at which such problems are considered, and is recognized as a world authority. May the Lord bless and keep him as he continues his labors.

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired. The Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered as read and open to amendment at any point.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

The bill follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 101 (d) of the Sugar Act of 1948, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"(d) The term 'raw sugar' means any sugars (exclusive of liquid sugar from foreign countries having liquid sugar quotas), whether or not principally of crystalline structure, which are to be further refined or improved in quality to produce any sugars principally of crystalline structure or liquid sugar."

SEC. 2. Section 101 (e) of such act is amended to read as follows:

"(e) The term 'direct-consumption sugar' means any sugars principally of crystalline structure and any liquid sugar (exclusive of liquid sugar from foreign countries having liquid sugar quotas), which are not to be further refined or improved in quality."

SEC. 3. Section 101 (l) of such act is amended by deleting the parenthetical word "(Clerget)."

SEC. 4. Section 101 of such act is amended by adding at the end thereof a new paragraph to read as follows:

"(n) The term 'to be further refined or improved in quality' means to be subjected substantially to the processes of (1) affination or defecation, (2) clarification, and (3) further purification by adsorption or crystallization. The Secretary is authorized, in accordance with findings based on public hearings to determine whether specific processes to which sugars are subjected are sufficient to meet the requirements of this paragraph (n) and whether sugars of specific qualities are raw sugar within the meaning of paragraph (d) of this section, or direct-consumption sugar within the meaning of paragraph (e) of this section."

SEC. 5. Section 201 of such act is amended by striking in the second sentence thereof the words "1947 prior to the termination of price control of sugar" and inserting in lieu thereof "1947–49."

SEC. 6. Section 202 (a) of such act is amended by inserting a colon and "(1) For the calendar year 1956" in lieu of the first comma and by adding the following new paragraphs:

"(2) For the calendar year 1956, by apportioning among such areas 50 percent of the amount by which the determination made pursuant to section 201 exceeds 8,350,000 short tons, raw value, as follows:

"(A) The first 188,000 short tons, raw value, or any part thereof, by which quotas for the domestic areas are so increased shall be apportioned 45.2 percent to the domestic beet area; 42.6 percent to the mainland cane area; 10.6 percent to Puerto Rico; and 1.6 percent to the Virgin Islands; and

"(B) Any additional amount shall be apportioned on the basis established in paragraph (a) (1) as adjusted by subparagraph (A) of this paragraph (a) (2).

"(3) For the calendar year 1957 and each subsequent calendar year, by apportioning among such areas 4,444,000 short tons, raw value, in accordance with paragraph (a) (1) of this section, and by adding thereto 50 percent of the amount by which the determination made pursuant to section 201 exceeds 8,350,000 short tons, raw value, apportioned as follows: First, by apportioning in accordance with the provisions of paragraph (a) (2) of this section an amount not in excess of the amount so apportioned in 1956, and second, by apportioning the remainder, if any, in accordance with the final quotas established for the calendar year 1956, pursuant to paragraphs (a) (1) and (a) (2) of this section."

SEC. 7. Section 202 (c) of such act is amended by striking out "For" after "(c)" and inserting in lieu thereof "(1) For the calendar year 1956, for" and by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraphs:

"(2) For the calendar year 1957 and for each subsequent calendar year for foreign countries other than the Republic of the Philippines, by prorating to Cuba 96 percent and to such other foreign countries 4 percent of the amount of sugar, raw value, by which 8,350,000 short tons or such lesser amount as determined pursuant to section 201 exceeds the sum of 4,444,000 short tons, raw value, and the quota established pursuant to subsection (b) of this section; and by prorating to Cuba 50 percent and to foreign countries other than Cuba and the Republic of the Philippines 50 percent of the amount of sugar, raw value, by which the amount determined pursuant to section 201 exceeds the sum of 8,350,000 short tons plus the increase in quotas provided for in subsection (a) (3) of this section: *Provided*, (i) That for 1957 the quota for foreign countries other than Cuba and the Republic of the Philippines shall be 175,000 short tons, raw value, and the quota for Cuba shall equal the sum of the quotas for foreign countries other than the Republic of the Philippines less 175,000 short tons, raw value; and (ii) that for the calendar year 1958 and each subsequent calendar year through 1960 the quota for foreign countries other than Cuba and the Republic of the Philippines shall be increased 45,000 short tons, raw value, annually and the quota for Cuba shall equal the sum of the quotas for foreign countries other than the Republic of the Philippines for such year less the quota for foreign countries other than Cuba and the Republic of the Philippines for such year. The quota for foreign countries other than Cuba and the Republic of the Philippines shall be prorated for the calendar year 1957 and for each subsequent calendar year, as follows:

"(A) Each country whose average annual importations into the United States within the quota were less than 1,000 short tons, raw value, during the years 1953 and 1954 shall receive a proration equal to such average importations.

"(B) Each country whose average annual importations into the United States within the quota were more than 1,000 short tons but less than 3,000 short tons, raw value, during the years 1953 and 1954 shall receive each year 2,000 tons in addition to the basic tonnages prorated under subparagraphs (C) or (D) hereof.

"(C) Each country whose average annual importations into the United States within the quota were 1,000 short tons but less than 2,000 short tons, raw value, during the years 1953 and 1954 shall receive a proration for 1957 equal to its average importations for the calendar years 1953 and 1954 plus 30 percent thereof and for each calendar year subsequent to 1957 through 1960 the proration for each such country shall be increased by an additional 30 percent of its proration under this subparagraph (C) for the immediately preceding calendar year.

"(D) That part of the quota not otherwise prorated in subparagraphs (A), (B), and (C) above shall be prorated as follows:

"Country:	*Percent*
Dominican Republic	37
Peru	36
Mexico	20
Nicaragua	5
Haiti	2"

SEC. 8. Section 202 of such act is amended by adding the following new paragraphs:

"(e) Whenever in any year any foreign country with a quota or proration thereof of more than 10,000 short tons fails to fill such quota or proration by more than 10 percent and at any time during such year the world price of sugar exceeds the domestic price, the quota or proration thereof for such country for subsequent years shall be reduced by an amount equal to the amount by which such country failed to fill its quota or proration thereof, unless the Secretary finds that such failure was due to crop disaster or force majeure or finds that such reduction would be contrary to the objectives of this act. Any reduction hereunder shall be prorated in the same manner as deficits are prorated under section 204.

"(f) No country shall have its quota or proration thereof increased above its quota or proration thereof for the calendar year 1956 unless, on or before January 1, 1957, such country becomes a party to and bound by the International Sugar Agreement for the Regulation of the Production and Marketing of Sugar (ratified by and with the advice and consent of the U. S. Senate on April 29, 1954).

"(g) Notwithstanding any other provision of law except paragraph (d) hereof, if the Secretary determines that any country for which a sugar quota or proration thereof is established herein causes a substantial reduction in the importation of any agricultural commodity from the United States below the quantity imported during a representative period of years, in raw or manufactured form, through import quotas, import taxes, exchange restrictions, or other trade restrictive measures, the sugar quota or proration thereof for such country shall be suspended during each year when such restrictive measures are at any time in effect and the portion of such quota or proration thereof so suspended shall be prorated in the same manner as deficits are prorated under section 204."

SEC. 9. (a) The second sentence of section 204 (a) of such act is amended by inserting before the period at the end thereof a colon and the following: "*Provided*, That any deficit in any domestic sugar-producing area occurring by reason of inability to market that part of the quota for such area allotted under the provisions of section 202 (a) (2) or the increases allotted under section 202 (a) (3) shall first be prorated to other domestic areas on the basis of the quotas then in effect."

(b) The last paragraph of section 204 (a) of such act is amended by inserting before the period at the end thereof a semicolon and the following: "except that in the case of proration of any such deficit in any domestic sugar-producing area occuring by reason of inability to market that part of the quota for such area allotted under and by reason of section 202 (a) (2) or the increases allotted under section 202 (a) (3), the Secretary shall apportion the unfilled amount on such basis and to such other domestic areas as he determines is required to fill such deficit, and if he finds that no domestic area will be able to supply such unfilled amount, he shall add it to the quota for Cuba."

SEC. 10. Section 205 (a) of such act is amended by inserting immediately before the final sentence thereof the following: "In making such allotments, the Secretary may also take into consideration and make due allowance for the adverse effect of drought, storm, flood, freeze, disease, insects, or other similar abnormal and uncontrollable conditions seriously and broadly affecting any general area served by the factory or factories of such person.".

SEC. 11. (a) Section 207 (a) of such act is amended by adding after the word "year" the following: ", plus an amount equal to the same percentage of 29,616 short tons, raw value, that the increase in the quota for Hawaii under section 202 is of 1,052,000 short tons, raw value."

(b) Section 207 (b) of such act is amended by striking the period at the end thereof and by adding the following: "which shall be principally of crystalline structure, plus an amount equal to the same percentage of 126,033 short tons, raw value, that the increase in the quota for Puerto Rico under section 202 is of 1,080,000 short tons, raw value, which latter amount may be filled by direct-consumption sugar whether or not principally of crystalline structure.".

SEC. 12. Section 207 (h) of such act is amended by striking out "The" after "(h)" and inserting in lieu thereof "(1) for the calendar year 1956, the" and by adding the following new paragraph:

"(2) For the calendar year 1957 and each subsequent calendar year, the quota for foreign countries other than Cuba and the Republic of the Philippines may be filled by direct-consumption sugar to the extent of 1.36 percent of the amount of sugar determined pursuant to section 201 less the sum of the quotas established in subsections (a) and (b) of section 202: *Provided*, That such limitation shall not apply to countries receiving prorations under section 202 (c) of 7,000

short tons or less. The direct-consumption portion of such quota which is subject to the 1.36 percent limitation referred to above shall be prorated to countries which receive prorations under section 202 (c) of more than 7,000 short tons on the basis of average imports of direct-consumption sugar within the quota for the years 1951, 1952, 1953, and 1954."

SEC. 13. Section 301 (b) of such act is amended by inserting after the words "(or processed)" the following: ", except for livestock feed, or for the production of livestock feed, as determined by the Secretary,".

SEC. 14. Section 302 (b) of such act is amended by inserting after "(or processed)" the words "within the proportionate share" and by striking the period at the end thereof and inserting the following: "and of the producers in any local producing area whose past production has been adversely, seriously, and generally affected by drought, storm, flood, freeze, disease, insects or other similar abnormal and uncontrollable conditions. For the purposes of establishing proportionate shares hereunder and in order to encourage wise use of land resources, foster greater diversification of agricultural production, and promote the conservation of soil and water resources in Puerto Rico, the Secretary, on application of any owner of a farm in Puerto Rico, is hereby authorized, whenever he determines it to be in the public interest and to facilitate the sale or rental of land for other productive purposes, to transfer the sugarcane production record for any parcel or parcels of land in Puerto Rico owned by the applicant to any other parcel or parcels of land owned by such applicant in Puerto Rico.".

SEC. 15. Section 405 of such act is amended by inserting "(a)" at the beginning thereof and by adding the following new paragraph:

"(b) Any person whose sugar-processing operations otherwise meet the requirements of section 101 (n) and who subjects to such processes sugar imported or brought into the continental United States under a declaration that it is raw sugar but which sugar subsequently is determined to be of direct-consumption quality and to be in excess of the direct-consumption portion of the applicable quota or proration or allotment thereof, shall forfeit to the United States a sum equal to 1 cent per pound for each pound, raw value, of such sugar in excess of the direct-consumption portion of the applicable quota or proration or allotment thereof, which forfeiture shall be recoverable in a civil suit brought in the name of the United States."

SEC. 16. Section 407 of such act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following sentence: "The provisions of this section shall not apply to persons whose services are obtained pursuant to section 305."

SEC. 17. Section 411 of such act is renumbered as section 412, section 412 of such act is renumbered as section 413, and a new section 411 inserted as follows:

"SEC. 411. The Secretary is authorized to issue such regulations as may be necessary to carry out article 7 of the International Sugar Agreement for the Regulation of the Production and Marketing of Sugar (ratified by and with the advice and consent of the United States Senate on April 29, 1954), restricting importations of sugar into the United States from foreign countries not participating in such agreement, or to carry out the corresponding provisions of any such future agreements ratified by and with the advice and consent of the United States Senate."

SEC. 18. Renumbered section 412 of such act (relating to termination of the powers of the Secretary under the act) is amended by striking out "1956" in each place it appears therein and inserting in lieu thereof "1960".

SEC. 19. A new section 414 is added to such act as follows:

"SEC. 414. (a) To alleviate the conditions which exist in the continental United States sugar-producing areas by reason of the quantities of surplus overquota sugar produced in such areas, the Commodity Credit Corporation shall carry out loans, purchases, or other operations with respect to 100,000 short tons of sugar produced from the 1955 or previous crops in such areas.

"(b) Sugar acquired hereunder shall be disposed of outside the continental United States in such manner as the Corporation determines will not unduly interfere with normal marketings of sugar, including dispositions under the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, as amended.

"(c) No borrower shall be personally liable for any deficiency arising from the sale of the sugar securing any loan made under authority of this section, unless such loan was obtained through fraudulent representations by the borrower. This provision shall not, however, be construed to prevent Commodity Credit Coporation from requiring the borrower to assume liability for deficiencies in the quality or quantity of sugar delivered under the loan, for failure to properly care for and preserve such sugar, or for failure or refusal to deliver the sugar in accordance with the requirements of the program.

"(d) Sugar acquired hereunder shall not be subject to the provisions of title II of this act."

SEC. 20. Section 201 of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended (63 Stat. 1052; 68 Stat. 899, 912), is further amended as follows:

1. After the comma following the word "butterfat" in the clause preceding the colon, insert the following: "sugar beets and sugarcane,".

(2) After subsection (c) thereof insert a new subsection (d) as follows:

"(d) The price of sugar beets and sugarcane, respectively, shall be supported at a level of 90 percent of the parity price therefor through loans, purchases, or other operations with respect to sugar derived from the processing of proportionate shares of sugar beets or sugarcane of the 1956 and subsequent crops produced in the domestic sugar-producing areas of the United States. Loans, purchases, or other operations with respect to such sugar shall be at such rates or prices as the Secretary determines, after taking into account receipts of producers from by-products and conditional payments will reflect the equivalent of 90 percent of the parity price either for sugar beets or sugarcane. Sugar acquired hereunder shall not be subject to the provisions of title II of the Sugar Act of 1948, as amended."

SEC. 21. Section 4501 (c) and 6412 (d) (relating to the termination of taxes on sugar) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 are amended by striking out "1957" in each place it appears therein and inserting in lieu thereof "1961."

SEC. 22. Section 4502 (4), chapter 4, subchapter A, "Sugar," of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 is amended as follows: Strike out the parenthetical word "(Clerget)" where it occurs in the first sentence and delete the second sentence thereof.

SEC. 23. (a) Section 4504, chapter 37, subchapter A, "Sugar," of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 is amended by adding before the period at the end thereof the following: "and except that such tax may be subject to refunds as a tax under the provisions of section 6418 (a)."

(b) Section 6418 (a) of chapter 65 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 is amended by striking out the "(a)" immediately following "section 4501."

SEC. 24. The amendments made hereby shall become effective January 1, 1956, except as otherwise designated and except that required determinations and regulations may be issued in 1955 for the calendar year 1956.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. LAIRD: On page 15, beginning on line 18, strike out the remainder of section 8 through and including line 18 on page 16.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Chairman, I support this legislation, but may I say that at the time this legislation was before the committee there were certain sections that were written into the bill which I took exception to. On page 15 of the bill, section 8, beginning with line 18, there are two restrictive sections written into this bill that will affect two particular countries.

I read from page 15, line 18:

No country shall have its quota or proration thereof increased above its quota or production thereof for the calendar year 1956 unless, on or before January 1, 1957, such country becomes a party to and bound by the international sugar agreement for the regulation of the production and marketing of sugar.

That particular section applies only to Peru.

The next subparagraph of section 8 applies only to the Philippines. The Legisature of the Philippines is now in session and considering suspending some of the practices which brought this section about, and I feel that this sugar bill is not the place to deal with this particular problem. The Philippines were great friends of ours during World War II. I served and was in the Philippines during World War II, and I do not feel that we should discriminate against the Philippine Islands in establishing these sugar allotments. It is my hope that the Government of the Philippines will take immediate action to suspend these discriminatory practices.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LAIRD. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. COOLEY. I also say that we should not discriminate against the Philippine Islands: I agree with that. But does not the gentleman agree with me that the Philippine Islands should not discriminate against us?

Mr. LAIRD. I certainly do agree with the chairman, but I do not think we should write this language into the sugar bill at this time.

Mr. COOLEY. I am perfectly willing for it to be deleted from the bill, and I so stated to the House a minute ago, and, so far as I am concerned, I accept the amendment.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I think the RECORD should show in justice to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY] that prior to this bill being programed, in consultation with Speaker RAYBURN and myself, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY] and other members of his committee stated to the Speaker and myself that the provisions of the bill relating to the Philippine Islands would be deleted. And it was my intention to offer such an amendment. However, that is included in the amendment which is pending at the desk and which is be-

fore the Committee at the present time. Of course, I support the amendment, because authorship of the amendment is immaterial. It is the result which I am concerned with.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I will be very happy to.

Mr. COOLEY. I might also add that I assured the gentleman that I would offer an amendment striking out the section directed at Peru, because Peru is not a member of the International Sugar Agreement.

Mr. McCORMACK. Exactly.

Without getting into the field referred to by the gentleman from North Carolina, the international situation is such that the carrying of these provisions, in my opinion, would be highly inadvisable at this time. I am confident and I sincerely hope that any actions on the part of any other country that are discriminatory in results to our own country or any of the products of our own country will be removed as quickly as possible. However, we must lift ourselves above such situations at times, and it seems to me that this is one of the times, and the striking out of this provision, I think, would be most healthly, most beneficial, because in relation to the Philippines we must remember that we have there real friends, friends that we can rely upon.

During the trying days of World War II, and for many years prior thereto, they were, for all practical purposes, a part of the United States and they showed their love of America by the great sacrifices that they made.

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I am happy to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BONNER. This situation in the Philippines is not something new. This has been going on for some time.

Mr. McCORMACK. Let us not get into that now.

Mr. BONNER. I thought maybe I could get my piece in here now instead of delaying the House with another 5-minute speech.

When some time ago I objected to the renewal of the Philippine trade agreement, there were discriminations going on in the issuance of import licenses. We got that straightened out. Then there was a discriminatory act passed. This is a two-way street. I think it is wholesome that this discussion has taken place in the House so those in the Philippines might know that we were not giving way all the time but were willing to accept some and give some. I will withdraw my objection in this case for the reason that this week I had a very satisfactory understanding with a very prominent member of the Philippine Congress, who was here in Washington on a short visit and greatly interested in this bill. Hereafter my action will be different.

Mr. McCORMACK. I am sure the remarks made by the two gentlemen from North Carolina will be noticed. On the other hand, we are a great Nation and we can afford to show our greatness by lifting ourselves above ordinary human reactions at times. This is one of those occasions. Certainly as a message of friendship to those who are our friends and as a contribution to our good relations on an international level, it is important not only to the United States, but to the people of the Philippines for us to accept the amendment of the gentleman. It will be greatly appreciated.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I am glad to yield to the distinguished ranking member of the committee with whom, I might say, I had a conversation, and he told me, when he learned I was going to propose the amendment, that he would accept it and I assume he is accepting the amendment.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I am in entire accord with the gentleman and the amendment which he has sponsored. Also I want to express the thought that those of us on this side of the aisle who are interested in this legislation appreciate the splendid cooperation we have had from the majority leader in programing this bill under very difficult circumstances.

Mr. McCORMACK. I appreciate the comments of the gentleman.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. 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 Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Chairman, as a member of the Foreign Affairs Committee, and chairman of the Subcommittee on the Far East and the Pacific, I have been closely concerned with the economic, political, and collective security conditions prevailing in that important region.

As we all know, more than one-half of humanity lives in that area. Further, far-reaching economic, political, and social developments are presently taking place in that region—developments which may seriously affect the future course of events insofar as our Nation, and the other free nations of the world, are concerned.

For these, and other equally important reasons, I believe that it is in our own interest to pay close attention to what is happening in the Pacific and in the Far East.

I rise to address myself to H. R. 7030, a bill to amend and extend the Sugar Act of 1948 and more particularly to section 8, subsection g thereof, which provides:

(g) Notwithstanding any other provision of law except paragraph (d) hereof, if the Secretary determines that any country for which a sugar quota or proration thereof is established herein causes a substantial reduction in the importation of any agricultural commodity from the United States below the quantity imported during a representative period of years, in raw or manufactured form, through import quotas, import taxes, exchange restrictions, or other trade restrictive measures, the sugar quota or proration thereof for such country shall be suspended during each year when such restrictive measures are at any time in effect and the portion of such quota or proration thereof so suspended shall be prorated in the same manner as deficits are prorated under section 204.

Everyone who knows anything about the hearings on the proposed legislation is well aware of the fact that this provision is directed at our good friend and ally the Philippines. In 1952, the Philippine Republic enacted a law, Republic Act No. 698, establishing import quotas on all foreign grown leaf tobacco and thereby curtailed the amount of tobacco permitted to be imported into the Philippines. Let me say, first of all, that in spite of the import restrictions imposed in the Philippines, for reasons I will subsequently enumerate, they are still one of the biggest buyers of American tobacco. Why were these import quotas imposed? These import quotas were imposed upon the advice and strong recommendations made by the so-called Bell Mission and representatives of the Foreign Operations Administration in the Philippines. These agencies of our own Government sought to protect the dollar reserves of the Philippines in view of her tremendous trade deficits recognizing that the Philippines had to curtail its purchases abroad of such items as were considered nonessential. Mr. Chairman, tobacco happened to be considered one of the less essential products that the Philippines had to buy as it was quite evident that she had to give preference to capital goods and raw materials so necessary for the rehabilitation of her industries totally destroyed in the last war. I am glad to be able to say that my distinguished colleague, Congressman HERBERT BONNER of North Carolina, Chairman of the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee and well-known to have the interest of the American tobacco industry at heart, in a statement made on the floor of the House on June 21 in connection with certain Philippine legislation then under consideration, stated that he was recommending that the bill be passed because certain inequities that had been practised in the Philippines against American commerce, would be corrected. His recommendation on the legislation then being considered was based on assurances incorporated in a letter dated June 18, 1955, addressed to him from Gen. Carlos P. Romulo, special representative of the President of the Republic of the Philippines, together with a cablegram from President Magsaysay on this matter.

The executive branch of the present administration has spoken with respect to these import quotas, specifically on May 16, 1955, when the Philippine Trade Agreement was before the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives. On page 50, of the hearings the Honorable William J. Sebald, Acting Assistant Secretary of State for Far Eastern Affairs, in testifying on the imposition of import quotas stated:

Mr. SEBALD. One of the principal reasons for the import bans was to save foreign currency. There were a great many unnecessary, or items which the Philippine Government considered unnecessary, importations which were being made. They therefore put a ban on such imports because it was exhausting their foreign exchange.

Mr. JENKINS. We have had fine relationship with the Philippines. These matters that you have referred to were not anything

that would cause any rift between the two countries?

Mr. SEBALD. That is correct. It was a matter of necessity for the Philippine Government in order for it to keep its head above water.

Mr. JENKINS. In some of these cases of bans imposed by the Philippine Government, it looks as if they were going pretty far.

Mr. SEBALD. They were nondiscriminatory in the sense that it was the article which was banned, the importation of the article that was banned rather than because it happened to be an American article.

Mr. JENKINS. Anyhow, the agency that you represent was satisfied with what was going on?

Mr. SEBALD. Yes, sir; I think it was necessary.

It is significant at this point to direct your attention to the fact that the Philippines has been unable to fill her quota for the last 13 years resulting in the loss to her of some 8 million tons which went to another large American supplier and on which taxes were collected by the United States Government of approximately 100 million dollars. You are all aware of the fact that this body passed within the last 2 weeks amendments to the Philippine Trade Act, which amendments are now with the President of the United States. This penalty provision, retaliatory in character, in my opinion, would undo all the good that the recent approval of the amendments to the Philippine Trade Act has done to our happy relations with the Philippines and it is doubtful if the President can sign the trade agreement as authorized in this session if the penalty provision in this act is approved. It is urged that section 8 (g) be deleted from this bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LAIRD].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. DIXON. Mr. Chairman, offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DIXON to the committee amendment: On page 22, line 20, strike out all of section 20 of the bill and renumber succeeding sections to conform.

Mr. DIXON. Mr. Chairman, I am fully in accord with the bill and shall support it, although I have this amendment to offer.

You have seen the apprehensive look and expression on the faces of all of us who come from the sugar States, and even on the face of our dear colleague, the lady from Minnesota [Mrs. KNUTSON], because she is worried because she sees the acute need for the passage of this bill. I shall not say more about the urgency of this measure.

I want also to thank our chairman and the committee for the fine work they have done on this bill.

Getting to the amendment, the purpose is to strike section 20 of the bill. I shall read the first few lines that contain the gist of this section:

The price of sugar beets and sugarcane, respectively, shall be supported at a level of 90 percent of the parity price.

I shall not read any more. That gives you the idea. This section 20 is foreign to the original purpose of the bill. The purpose of the bill as stated in the report is to give relief to the domestic sugar growers by allowing them to participate in the increasing consumption of sugar in the United States. Section 20 is foreign to that purpose.

At this juncture I should like to yield sufficient time to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BOGGS], who represents the cane producers and who has faithfully attended our committee hearings, to answer two questions. The first question is, "Is section 20 essential to the achievement of the purposes of the bill from the standpoint of the cane growers?"

Mr. BOGGS. My answer is that this section was not in the bill introduced by my colleague the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. WILLIS] and myself.

Mr. DIXON. Second, would the gentleman have any objection if this section were deleted?

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Chairman, for myself, I have no objection whatsoever.

Mr. DIXON. Mr. WILLIS, I would like to yield to you.

Mr. WILLIS. I cannot improve on the replies of my colleague the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BOGGS].

Mr. DIXON. I should like to yield sufficient time to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. HILL] to answer those two questions for the beet growers.

Mr. HILL. I would like to say two things I forgot to say a while ago.

Mr. DIXON. That is not what I yielded for.

Mr. HILL. In working on this legislation, the growers in my area never had finer supporters than the gentlemen from Louisiana [Mr. WILLIS and Mr. BOGGS]. In other words, the cane people have worked absolutely shoulder to shoulder with the beet growers in the long time we have worked on this bill.

Mr. DIXON. Now may I ask the gentleman to answer these two questions: Do the beet growers consider that this section is essential to achieving the purpose of this Sugar Act?

Mr. HILL. The gentleman knows I am not in a prayer meeting. I am testifying for this bill. As far as I am concerned, there are several other parts of this bill that could be left out and I would still be happy. But as things are today, I do not see any reason why this section should not come out of the bill just as we took the sections out a while ago. In other words, this bill has too much of an international flavor to come out of an agricultural committee. I have argued all the time, and I think with good reason, that when we come to dividing up sugar, and you will find it in our report——

Mr. DIXON. I refuse to yield further.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. DIXON was permitted to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

Mr. BOGGS. May I say to the gentleman that I have always supported the 90-percent-of-parity concept. However, since the very inception of sugar legislation that concept has never been included for the obvious reason, as I see it, that sugar legislation, as the chairman of the committee and as the ranking minority member of the committee and other members of the committee have pointed out, is a very complex piece of legislation, covering domestic production, foreign production, mainland production, production in the possessions, and so forth. Therefore, my response to the gentleman really is that I do not believe we should debate that issue at this time in this bill. That does not mean I do not think it possibly is a very good thing to have for the sugar producers.

Mr. DIXON. I thank the gentleman.

I should like at this time to yield sufficient time for our honored chairman, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY], who has worked so hard on this bill, to answer two questions.

In your opinion, is this section necessary to accomplish the purposes of this bill?

Mr. COOLEY. Frankly, I could say "Yes" or "No," but I would prefer to say this: In putting the provision in the bill, we did so only after conference with the people from the cane area. I actually believed at the time we put it in that you might need it in 2 or 3 years from now in the event you get into trouble again. In other words, if you have a surplus 2 years from now, you will not have to be running back here to the Congress to amend this law. But if you have the nonrecourse loan program, you could place the sugar under loan, if you had to freeze the crop, and then put it back into the market and continue without having to come back to the Congress to amend the law.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Utah [Mr. DIXON] has again expired.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may proceed for 2 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. COOLEY. If I may finish my statement, I appreciate the fact, of course, that we are here dealing with what is ordinarily a deficit crop. It is a deficit crop under all circumstances because we do not produce all the sugar we need and consume in this country. But there is no objection that I can possibly see to having it in the law. But, if it is politically obnoxious to you, you have the right to have the House decide that. In fairness to the gentleman's amendment, I think I should point out that when the amendment was offered in committee to strike out this section, it failed by a tie vote of, I believe, 15 to 15. That, of course, shows that it is a controversial issue. I know that the gentleman, even with this provision in the bill, voted to report the bill favorably to the floor.

Mr. DIXON. Now, to go to the second question: Would you have any objection to the removal of section 20 from the bill?

Mr. COOLEY. Personally, I have no objection, but I do not think I can improve on the answer made by the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BOGGS] to the gentleman: I believe in 90 percent of parity, and I do not like flexible price supports.

Mr. MORANO. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

Mr. MORANO. Mr. Chairman, products exported to Cuba are produced in every section of the United States. The Cuban market is vital to the continued prosperity of ricegrowers and processors in Louisiana, Texas, Arkansas, Mississippi, and California, which produce almost the entire United States rice crop. Farmers in such States as Iowa, Illinois, Indiana, Ohio, Missouri, and Minnesota, which rely on lard exports for a large part of their income, send their lard to Cuba and other countries. In 1951, Cuba took nearly 15 percent of all the cotton manufactures exported from the United States, thus contributing to the prosperity of such textile-manufacturing States as North and South Carolina, Georgia, Alabama, Virginia, Tennessee, Texas, Massachusetts, and Connecticut. The United States sells to Cuba large quantities of iron, steel, and other metal products, the export of which is important to the economy of Michigan, Ohio, Illinois, Pennsylvania, New York, and New Jersey.

During July 1954, the Consolidated Railroads of Cuba placed a $7 million order for 51 diesel electric locomotives with the General Motors Electro-Motive division's plant near La Grange, Ill. The order, which is stated to be the largest of its kind received by the division for export, is cited as an example of foreign trade helping to create mutual prosperity for both the United States and Cuba. It required the export of roughly 70,000 tons of raw cane sugar from Cuba to the United States to make possible the $7 million purchase of locomotives from the United States. Thousands of employees in the United States were provided with work because of the interchange of locomotives and sugar.

The important point which United States foreign policy must take into account is that since Cuba pays for most of its purchases of United States exports with the proceeds of its sales of sugar to the United States, any reduction in the United States quota for Cuban sugar will, by the very law of economics, compel Cubans to reduce their purchases of United States products, such as those enumerated above. Such a reduction on imports by Cuba would affect almost every State of the Union.

It should continue to be our policy to encourage and assist Cuba in finding ways and means of reducing her dependence on sugar. This does not mean producing less sugar, but rather developing additional enterprises, by expanding existing and creating new industries producing sugar byproducts. This is of prime importance, because Cuba is beset by a high degree of instability due to the nature of the sugar industry. Every year there is a long dead season when most of the sugar workers are unemployed and the capital equipment of the centrales remains idle.

During its extended trip through Cuba the study mission was impressed with the fact that most of the farms are dedicated to one crop—sugar or tobacco or cattle or coffee. The seasonal unemployment inherent in the sugar industry, together with the fact that the growth of the Cuban economy has not kept pace with the needs of a growing population, point up the necessity for greater diversification of the Cuban economy wherever feasible. While the study mission did not have an opportunity to make an extensive study of this question, the problem was discussed with many Cubans from all levels. The consensus was that what is needed is a comprehensive plan for economic development. But this cannot emerge unless the Cubans themselves press forward on this problem at all fronts and can count on United States encouragement and support, both at the governmental and private-capital level.

Mr. Chairman, the United States in recent years has bought approximately 60 percent of Cuba's exports, and Cuba has bought approximately 75 percent of its imports from the United States.

Mr. Chairman, another factor which must be considered in formulating a sound foreign policy toward Cuba is United States private investment in Cuba. American direct investments in Cuba totaled $642.4 million at the end of 1950 making Cuba the fourth most important country in the world for such United States investment, preceded only by Canada, the United Kingdom, and Venezuela.

It is estimated that United States indirect or portfolio investments in Cuba totaled about $65 million at the end of 1950.

As already pointed out, 41 of Cuba's 161 active sugar mills are owned and operated by American interests. These currently account for approximately 43 percent of Cuba's sugar crop. United States interest is also substantial in electric power, radio and television, telephone and telegraph systems, railroads, and banks.

Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to this bill and I hope it is defeated. This bill changes the rules in the middle of the game.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I offer a preferential motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. HAYS of Ohio moves that the committee do now rise and report the bill with the recommendation that the enacting clause be stricken out.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, the Ohio district I have the honor to represent in this Congress is predominantly a dairy district. As a matter of fact, dairying accounts for approximately 80 percent of the farm income of my district. While asking your attention to speak on the sugar bill, I feel it only fair that I should associate milk and sugar since I do not represent any sugar growers directly.

You are all aware that in the past 3 years there has been a great deal of unjustified criticism expressed by the public, and by Members of this body, that the American dairy farmer is a recipient of undue Government subsidy in support of his operation.

As you know, I have denied such charges, and with justification, considering the fact that the American dairy farmer is the largest single segment of the Nation's agriculture; that annually he produces approximately 20 percent of the total gross farm income of the Nation; that 1 out of every 15 people gainfully employed in the United States, whether in industry or agriculture, works for the American dairy cow; that when we support the milk price of the American dairy farmer, we are supporting the basic economic structure of this Nation; and that presently under the 75-percent support level declared by the present Secretary of Agriculture, the American dairy farmer is today the worst off of any segment of our agriculture.

Today we are considering House bill 7030 introduced by my distinguished colleague from North Carolina, the chairman of the House Agriculture Committee, which concerns itself primarily with increasing the subsidy to the sugar growers of the United States. I would point out, to begin with, that the sugar growers of this Nation, both beet and cane producers, are a very minor segment of the American agricultural economy. I would also point out that as of this moment, despite the fact that they are producers of a deficit agricultural commodity, they are one of the most highly subsidized segments of our economy.

You will find in the report on this bill that the sugar growers are directly supported by a $65 million subsidy. This amounts to a $40-an-acre subsidy for beet growers, a $29-an-acre subsidy for the cane growers of Florida and Louisiana, and the astounding amount of $100 an acre for the cane growers of Hawaii.

I do not need to point out to you that comparatively these figures alone show a far higher subsidy than that accorded the American dairy farmer.

However, this is only a partial report of the subsidy received by our domestic sugar growers. In addition, they receive an approximate 2.63-cents-a-pound subsidy in the form of taxes and tariffs that raise the price every American consumer pays for each single pound of sugar he uses. When this total of direct and indirect subsidy to a selected group of American agriculture is tabulated, you will find that the American consumer is paying an approximate $400 million annually to subsidize a domestic sugar production that is now and always will be completely inadequate to meet domestic needs.

Yet this bill 7030, which bears the name of my distinguished colleague from North Carolina, would further increase this hidden tax upon the American taxpayer by approximately $16 million annually in the course of the life of this bill.

Gentlemen, I must oppose this financial rape of the American consumer, and I would like to say in closing that while, in opposing this measure, I want to pay great tribute to my distinguished colleague from North Carolina in the fact that he was the author of, and directed through this Congress, a bill which would raise the dairy-support level from 75 to 80 percent of parity, I feel that, in supporting that increase, and I feel now, that such action was taken in behalf of the general economic prosperity of the United States, while this bill would only

add to consumer costs without aiding the general economy.

I feel, in voicing my opposition to this sugar bill, that if we enact this measure we are simply subsidizing a selected group of farmers, not only at the expense of the rest of the Nation's agriculture, but also at direct cost to the American consumer and the American taxpayer.

Mr. POAGE. Mr Chairman, I rise in opposition to the preferential motion.

Mr. BASS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for me to ask a question of the gentleman from Idaho?

Mr. POAGE. I would be glad to have the gentleman ask the same question I have in mind.

Mr. BASS of Tennessee. I would like to ask him. He did not have time to yield to me a moment ago.

Mr. POAGE. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BASS of Tennessee. We had a little discussion here a minute ago, the gentleman from Utah [Mr. DIXON], my close friend—and we sat together on the committee all through this sugar bill. Let me ask him this question: Would the 90 percent parity provision in this bill increase or decrease the support price on sugar?

Mr. DIXON. I do not believe it would change it.

Mr. BASS of Tennessee. Does the gentleman mean he is not aware of the fact that beet sugar is now supported at 93½ percent of parity?

Mr. DIXON. Ninety-three percent?

Mr. BASS of Tennessee. That is true; and if this provision carries it will be carried at 90 cents, would it not?

Mr. DIXON. No; I do not think it would change.

Mr. BASS of Tennessee. That is what the language says, 90 percent of parity.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, I do not yield further.

I think it is absolutely clear to the House that the gentleman from Utah has come before us opposing a program to support beet sugar at 90 percent of parity when he is getting 93½ percent of parity support on all the beet sugar that he has heretofore produced. I wonder if his opposition to this bill is based on such deep principles as have been suggested by some of the speakers, or if the fact that beet producers have heretofore done pretty well made him unmindful of what may happen in future years.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POAGE. I yield.

Mr. COOLEY. I am glad to have sugar get 93½ percent of parity.

Mr. POAGE. Beet sugar is getting 93½ percent of parity and has been for a good many years. Cane sugar does not get so much.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POAGE. I yield.

Mr. GROSS. Could that possibly be the reason why most of the Republicans voted originally against 90 percent of parity for the midwestern farmers and other farmers?

Mr. POAGE. I cannot tell the gentleman from Iowa why the western Republicans voted as they did. I am not going to pass judgment on why anybody voted. It is a fact that certain Members did vote against 90 percent of parity for cotton, peanuts, and for other commodities. I know those same Members have been getting 93½ percent of parity for the products they told us are so important to their area. I know when we propose to give them 90 percent of parity in this bill. Now they say it is all wrong.

Mr. GROSS. They also invoked the law of supply and demand?

Mr. POAGE. Yes; but they have been living under a completely controlled economy. They want the law of supply and demand for everybody else.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POAGE. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. MARTIN. I would like to get this situation out in the open. I understood the gentleman from Utah was making this motion because those of you on the Democratic side who wanted a sugar bill, realizing it had to come out, asked him to do it.

Mr. POAGE. Let us be fair about that, Mr. Minority Leader. The gentleman now occupying the well has never asked anybody to take this out. He is for it, he has been for it always and he is now for it, and I do not want any insinuation made that I am not for the proposal in this bill. There has not been any agreement to take this out.

Mr. MARTIN. Well, is that not a fact?

Mr. POAGE. No; it is not a fact. Anybody who insinuates that this present speaker has ever favored taking this out makes a misstatement.

Mr. MARTIN. I am not making any insinuation about the present speaker, but I say this gentleman is doing it because those of you on the other side who wanted a sugar bill asked him to do it.

Mr. POAGE. No. I was present when the gentleman from Utah sat in the committee and voted to report this bill out with this provision in it. No; he is not offering this amendment because somebody on the other side asked him to offer it. He offered it in committee and it was voted down, as the chairman said, by a close vote. He then voted for the bill with the amendment in it.

Mr. MARTIN. What was the conversation up in the Rules Committee?

Mr. POAGE. I was not present in the Rules Committee. I do not know a thing in the world about any conversation in the Rules Committee. If the gentleman knows something about a conversation in the Rules Committee, let him get time and tell the House about it. If the gentleman wants to tell this House something, let him get time and tell this House what he understands about it. I was not present at any Rules Committee meeting. I was not a party to any agreement. I am for 90 percent for any crop that is willing to submit to the necessary controls.

The CHAIRMAN. All time on the preferential motion has expired. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HAYS].

The motion was rejected.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the bill and all amendments thereto close in 20 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

Messrs. HAYS of Ohio, MATTHEWS, and JENNINGS objected.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on the bill and all amendments thereto close in 20 minutes.

The motion was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MCCARTHY].

Mr. MCCARTHY. Mr. Chairman, it is impossible to make in 1 minute an adequate statement on this bill. I was a member of this committee when we extended the Sugar Act in 1951. I supported the extension. I have examined the report on this bill, and I find it to be completely inadequate. I hope to support the bill on final passage. The House should be permitted to hear the case against certain provisions of this bill and amendments should be offered with some order. The chairman of the committee argues that we should accept this bill on faith as there is not sufficient time for explanation. We have a right to have an explanation of the bill. Since this is obviously not going to be granted I will support a motion to recommit. The present act does not expire until December 1956. We can act early next year.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has expired.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the time allotted me be yielded to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MCCARTHY].

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MCCARTHY. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. COOLEY. I only point out to the House that the Committee on Rules gave us 1 hour. I had 30 minutes, and I explained that it was impossible within 30 minutes for me to explain this bill and that the membership, of necessity, would have to take it on faith.

Mr. MCCARTHY. And I am arguing that they should not take it on faith.

Mr. COOLEY. Did the gentleman come before this committee that he used to serve on and that he has such a high regard for and express his views on this legislation?

Mr. MCCARTHY. I hoped to read the hearings to see what was going on.

Mr. COOLEY. We had 1,300 pages of hearings, and the gentleman's name does not appear in the record.

Mr. MCCARTHY. I could scarcely get a chance to ask a question when I was a member of the committee. I scarcely expected better treatment as an outsider.

Mr. MORANO. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, is it not true that there were no hearings so that you could read them?

Mr. MCCARTHY. That is correct.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has expired.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KING].

Mr. KING of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, if the Dixon amendment is not accepted, we are here involved not only in a fight over the sugar bill, but a fight over the extension of the price-support program to include another crop, and give the Government authority to pile up surplus sugar in storage.

Before proceeding further I would like to ask the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY], whether he accepts the Dixon amendment.

Mr. COOLEY. Do I accept it?

Mr. KING of Pennsylvania. Does the gentleman accept it, yes or no?

Mr. COOLEY. No.

Mr. KING of Pennsylvania. We proceed then with the assumption that when you vote for this bill you are voting for an extension of the price-support program to include a commodity not previously included and that the Government is going to start piling up sugar in storage and adding to that $1 million-a-day rental that we are paying. The sugar program in itself is a finely managed program for the sugar interests.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY].

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I take this time to clear up 2 or 3 points. First as to what was said in the Committee on Rules. I am prompted to take the floor at this time because of the question propounded by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN] to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE]. I stated frankly to the Committee on Rules that the vote in the committee was 15 to 15 on this proposition, that I had no authority whatever from the committee to accept the amendment which would be offered by the gentleman from Utah [Mr. DIXON]. I told the Committee on Rules that I understood the amendment would be introduced and would be voted upon in the House. The gentleman from Colorado [Mr. HILL] thereupon said, "Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I am quite certain that we will take this provision out on the floor of the House."

I am not now in a position to speak for the committee. I still say that I believe that the provision now in the bill is good. But if Mr. DIXON does not want it and others do not want it, that is up to the House to decide. But I am not in a position to accept it.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. HILL].

Mr. HILL. Mr. Chairman, I am happy to join our chairman concerning what went on in the Committee on Rules. I would like to say this concerning this argument about 90 percent of parity that has been injected into the discussion on the floor today, that that has nothing to do with it except for that little bit of overproduction that we would get above the line; because the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY] in the preparation of this amendment said that all the sugar that was grown under the provisions of this section, whatever the number is, would not be considered anyway.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida [Mr. MATTHEWS].

Mr. MATTHEWS. Mr. Chairman, we shall be called upon soon to vote on the Dixon amendment, and I intend to vote for that amendment because I believe it will help us get this sugar legislation that is desperately needed by our sugar growers. I think it is fair and reasonable legislation.

I want to say a word in appreciation of the magnificent efforts of our distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE], and the fight that he has made over the years for the great farm programs of this country and for our country. I want him to know that I have not retreated at all from my convictions concerning 90-percent price support on basic crops, but frankly, I feel that we ought to support the Dixon amendment in order to get this legislation passed, and I shall so support it.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SIMPSON].

Mr. SIMPSON of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I merely wish to say that at the proper time I am going to offer a motion to recommit.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BOGGS].

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Chairman, I regret the fact that this 90-percent fight has occurred on this bill. Everybody has had to compromise on this legislation. This is not the bill any of us really wanted. Those of us who represent the areas in distress feel that it is not quite adequate. Nevertheless, it represents a tremendous amount of work on the part of the committee.

The sugar producers have never had a 90-percent-of-parity concept in this legislation since its very beginning. It might be a very good thing to have, but I doubt that we can settle the matter at this time.

Further, this legislation over a period of years has been bipartisan in nature. It has been passed by Republican-controlled Congresses and Democratic-controlled Congresses. I hope we can continue the legislation on a bipartisan basis, because it affects so many States in the Union.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. THOMSON].

Mr. THOMSON of Wyoming. Mr. Chairman, I want to associate myself with the remarks of the gentleman from Louisiana. I know we are all interested in working effectively to accomplish our work and adjourn. It is unfortunate that this controversy on which we have already spent so much time in this session should be injected into this bill. To bring up irrelevant side issues causes us to appear to take positions that I know we would not take in more considered moments. I know the gentleman from Texas would never be serious in complaining about our small sugar beet farmers getting 93.5 percent of parity after listening to the conflicting opinions that I have heard from him on the floor of the House. We certainly get confused when we try to apply the same reasoning to totally incompatible problems. I think it is obvious on the surface that the situation pertaining to the principal basic commodities and the situation that pertains to sugar in the United States are not comparable for the simple reason that in the case of most of the basics, we have a surplus raised in the United States over what is consumed in the United States; whereas in the case of sugar, we are dealing with a commodity where our domestic production is approximately one-half of our consumption. I voted in favor of flexible price supports. Before doing so, I tried to give honest consideration to the other proposals. My vote was based on what I believe to be in the best interest of the American farmer and the American economy in general. I am confident that others, who voted otherwise, to a large measure, voted because of similar convictions. I certainly respect the opinions of those who disagree with me, and only time will tell which of us is correct. Certainly this committee should and will consider this legislation on its merits, and on the basis of what is best for the American farmer, the American economy and the American public without permitting the legislation to be prejudiced by side issues.

Let me state that my constituents and myself are extremely interested in a selfish way in the basic crop which is of greatest concern. Of course, I refer to wheat. Reference has been made to the livingroom approach in connection with the restrictions on imports by quotas. If the approach with regard to sugar is a livingroom approach, then certainly our policy as to wheat, in which my constituents are also directly interested, and most of the other basic commodities, is that of a closed-door policy. With certain limited exceptions, we permit no importations, and this is as it should be, for we are raising presently in the United States more of these commodities than we can consume.

Considerable comment has been made about the awful subsidy attached to this program. This, in my humble opinion, is not a subsidy in the sense that the word is commonly used in America today, but is a production payment made to the American producer in lieu of tariff. I think all of us must agree that the American producer cannot pay high wages or other high costs of production, nor can we in America continue to advance our standard of living, and still compete with foreign producers, whether we produce sugar, automobiles, bicycles, textiles, cotton, wool, livestock, toys, oil, coal, or almost any other commodity that you can think of. The Sugar Act took us from the high tariffs to the quota procedure, with payments to growers, primarily to benefit Cuba. The whole sugar problem is a tariff problem, and not a price-support problem. Just as a further example, some members of this committee and myself have common interest in the livestock industry. We take great pride that our livestock producers have

refused to seek price supports. On the other hand, if we were to suddenly throw open the Mexican border and drop all barriers to importation of Argentine beef, it would be but a short time before domestic industry was completely demoralized. I can continue to draw similar parallels with other commodities. The facts show that the sugar program has not operated to the detriment of the consumer, but rather to his benefit.

In connection with the problem as to basic commodities, may I also point out that this revision of the Sugar Act will help to solve some of the problems pertaining to acreage cuts on the basic commodities. I know of instances in my own State where the reason that some of our veterans, who have been on projects far long enough to have acquired a sugar history since World War II, but have not, is caused mainly because they could grow certain basic commodities, at a guaranteed price, with less investment and less work. By permitting them to grow sugar beets now, we will ease the pain as far as the acreage restrictions are concerned on wheat; not only on them, but on other wheatgrowers in other districts.

It has been inferred that we cannot ease off on acreage controls every time we feel a pinch, or we will have a chaotic farm program. This might be true generally, but we certainly can increase the acreage allotments on sugar when we have a crop which we do not domestically produce in surplus, and when we can do so without taking it away from anyone else, as I will subsequently point out. I should also like to mention that during my short service in Congress, I have had occasion to vote for acreage increases for the small tobacco producer, rice producer, cotton farmer, and, I believe, peanut farmer, even though these are crops in which there is a domestic surplus. Certainly it is not fair to infer that there is no compassion in our souls for others while we ask special privileges, when all we are asking is for a share in the growth of America for our sugar producers and are willing to give and pay higher domestic prices in order to maintain our American standard of living, and so forth, with regard to the entire domestic consumption of other commodities.

I was somewhat amazed by the sweeping statements made before the House Agriculture Committee by representatives of some domestic industries, who apparently felt that they were best serving their own interests by suggesting that everything should be given to the foreign interests. In connection with this, I should like to compliment and thank the representatives of foreign interests other than Cuba for the very fair and fine statements which they made. I certainly hope that they shall be given favorable consideration for a greater share in the foreign quota. As concerns domestic interests, who made statements to the opposite effect, I would again like to point out that they cannot, over the long haul, compete with lower labor and other production costs in foreign countries any better than can the American sugar producers. Within the last few days, I have received a letter from one of my constituents wanting to know why he could not buy truck tractors from Canada without paying a 10 percent duty. I could very well use a new car. I might very well be driving an Italian Fiat, or a German Volkswagen, or a British Austin, if we were to remove the 10 percent duty. I am not suggesting that this be done, because I believe in preserving the American standard of living and protecting the American worker and businessman, but I might suggest that the same consideration be given our sugar farmers, laborers, and businessmen. I have some figures available, if anyone is interested, on what the small population in Wyoming alone buys in some of these commodities. Certainly if our economy is strong, the ability of the domestic market to purchase must be preserved. It is rather interesting to note that one of the companies whose representative appeared before this committee minimizing the importance of the domestic producer only very recently contacted me in an entirely different vein. The State which I represent was thinking of going into a machine accounting system. The local representative of this company approached me with the request that I speak to the governor about giving his company an opportunity to be considered. At that time, I was led to believe that this was a very important piece of business to the company generally. May I remind this company that a good portion of the taxes that must be raised to pay for these machines, when and if they are bought, must come from Wyoming sugar beet producers and others directly and indirectly connected with the industry.

Mr. Chairman, I urge that we defeat the preferential motion. I urge that we pass the Dixon amendment. The debate as to high rigid or flexible price supports for basic commodities that has already become repetitious has nothing to do with this bill. This is not a question of price supports paid from the Treasury for crops produced in this country in excess of the total needs of the country. This is a tariff problem. The payment made is a production payment in lieu of tariff under a system established for the benefit or the foreign producer. Not so long ago I received a wire from my Farm Bureau organization for which I have the highest regard suggesting that I should oppose guaranteeing 50 percent of the shipping to American ships. I notified them that I could not do that because of the principles in which I believe. I believe that we must preserve the American standard of living, whether it be for our sailors, who must support their families here in America, or it be for our sugar-beet farmers and those who labor in our sugar industry. I suggest to you that the identical principle involved in the shipping amendment is involved in this bill. As I recall, the vote in favor of protecting American shipping was almost unanimous. I suggest to you that this bill should receive the same treatment after adoption of the Dixon amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE].

(By unanimous consent, Mr. JENNINGS and Mr. JONES of Missouri yielded the time allotted them to Mr. POAGE.)

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, I am sorry some of our Members seem to be so disturbed and so afraid of what may happen to them. I am not afraid of the threats that have been made here about killing the sugar bill. I do not think many Members would kill the sugar bill, least of all the very people who are making the threats about killing it. They have no intention of killing the sugar bill, yet they tell us that because this sugar bill has the 90-percent-of-parity provision in it, that that endangers the passage of the bill and we ought to run and hide somewhere because perchance they will kill the bill if we do not take out the 90-percent-of-parity provision. If they are really afraid that the bill is going to be defeated why did they not accept it as reported by the committee? I submit these people who claim to be so deeply concerned are the ones who were willing to jeopardize the bill with an amendment.

Let us see what this 90-percent-of-parity does. It is put in the bill simply because many of us thought that we ought to give to sugar as fair treatment as we give to any other commodity. We do not want to discriminate against sugar. We hate to see discrimination in favor of sugar. We think it ought to be treated as fairly as cotton, peanuts, wheat, or tobacco. Ninety percent, yes, that is a fair basis. We ask it for our commodities. We offer it to others.

This 90-percent-of-parity provision does a whole lot more than simply establish the principle. Some people seem to think it simply establishes the principle, but that is far from all it does. We are taking care of the State of Florida with this 90 percent provision. We are taking care of the State of Louisiana. Those States have now a surplus of sugar. The Representatives from Florida stood on this floor and told you that. They cannot sell. It is grown on allotted acres. You pass this bill without this 90-percent provision and you still are going to have a surplus and your farmers are not going to be able to dispose of their sugar this coming year.

You pass this legislation with this provision in it and every pound of sugar you grow on allotted acres by your farmers will get 90 percent of parity, not only this year but in the future. Turn to California. You have at least one mill shut down in California right this moment because they cannot sell their supply of sugar. Pass this bill with the 90-percent provision in it and every bit of that sugar will be taken up and the farmers of California will be able to get contracts and sell their sugar this coming year and in future years.

It is simple enough. Do you want a bill that is going to take care of all the farmers of America? There is not one sugar farmer in my district and not one of them in my State. But, I do want to be fair with them. If you want to run out on your own farmers, that is your privilege. Remember, they are your

farmers and not mine. But I would suggest that if they were my farmers, I would be trying to see that they get the kind of coverage that the cotton farmer gets. I would be trying to see that they get the same fair treatment that the tobacco farmers get. I would be trying to see that they had an opportunity to dispose of their surplus sugar, and this bill, as it is now written, gives them that. This bill as it stands offers that protection. If this amendment is carried there will be no sale for their surplus sugar.

(By unanimous consent, at the request of Mr. DAWSON of Utah, the time allotted to him was granted to Mr. DIXON.)

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Utah [Mr. DIXON].

Mr. DIXON. The gentleman from Texas argued this 90-percent idea on the basis of analogy. This form of argument is only fair where the situations are similar but where they are entirely different, it is the weakest form of argument. Sugar is nothing like wheat, cotton, and rice. Wheat, cotton, and rice are produced in surplus. We produce more than we can consume. Sugar, on the other hand, is not produced in surplus. We must buy and import 3,800,000 tons each year or 47 percent of what we consume. Our domestic producers need an additional quota of 100,000 to 188,000 tons. Instead of placing this under loan, having it pass into Government hands at great cost and having it depress our market, as section 20 would have us do, all we need to do is to import that much less sugar from foreign countries and our troubles are over.

Now, Mr. Chairman, leaders of both the beet and cane producers just testified that section 20 is not necessary and that they have no objection to taking it out. Even our esteemed chairman of the Committee on Agriculture testified to the same effect. Why then should we not support my amendment and delete section 20?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HAYS].

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the gentleman from Utah [Mr. DIXON] four questions which he can answer by saying yes or no.

First. Is wool an important commodity in Utah?

The answer is "Yes"—I will answer for the gentleman from Utah.

Second. Sugar is an important commodity in Utah. Since you do not seem to want to answer the question, I will answer that that is true.

Third. Wool is supported by 105 percent of parity. Sugar by 93 percent of parity.

Now I come to the $64 question: Has the Secretary of Agriculture from Utah ever said anything about cutting them below 90 percent of parity?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. HARRISON].

Mr. HARRISON of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, I want to support this legislation since the amendments have been offered, and evidently will be passed. I want to make it as simple as I can. It seems to me we have been talking about a complicated situation. We are talking about 135,000 tons of sugar each year, and that is the increased consumption in this country created by the increase in population. At the present time, Cuba is getting that increased consumption in this particular bill. Now we are going to take it away from Cuba. I think if we wanted to be fair we would give it to our domestic producers. The reason the bill is before us at the present time is because our domestic producers are in trouble. Since we are trying to take care of them, I do not think we have gone near far enough to take care of our domestic producers. I was in Washington last winter. They have 1,200,000 acres of land coming into production out there and they want to raise some sugar beets. I say that we should go further in taking care of our domestic producers.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Florida [Mr. CRAMER] is recognized.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, I have received many letters in the last few weeks from many areas in the State of Florida. There has been considerable concern shown over the surplus cane-sugar condition that exists in my State, in which I am very much interested.

I am pleased that on page 7 of the report that the matter of surplus has been at least partially worked out and that it has been agreed that 100,000 tons will be purchased this year by the Government through ICA to help alleviate that situation.

I want to compliment the committee on the manner in which it has attempted to work out and compromise this problem.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California [Mr. JOHNSON] is recognized.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Chairman, I have been familiar with this program for 13 years, and the program itself has been in effect for 21 years. The proof of the pudding is that it has stabilized the price of sugar.

I may be pardoned, I hope, by telling you my own experience with the cost of sugar. I was married in 1920. My wife and I started housekeeping in May 1920. My bride was shocked when she went to the grocery store to buy some sugar and to be confronted with the statement of the clerk that the cost was 32 cents a pound. I merely mention this personal experience because it illustrates what could happen to sugar when the price is not controlled.

In 1934 the first Sugar Act was passed. Since that time the price has not varied very much. For the past 10 years it has varied from 8 to 10 cents a pound. Every home will be benefited by this legislation.

In my district are now two sugar refineries. In the district I first represented—Third of California—I had four sugar refineries. The sugar made in those refineries was beet sugar. The sugar industry in my district is a large industry. I am proud of the beet growers and those who operate the refineries and have supported their program during my entire service in Congress, and expect to continue to do so as long as I am a Member of Congress.

This bill is a most constructive bill, and I have no doubt that it will pass.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE] is recognized.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, this is a program which has been in effect for 21 years. I do not think we have had any farm program that has been as successful as the sugar program. It has operated under a price formula which was entirely different from the 90-percent support provision which relates to the basic commodities.

To adopt the 90-percent amendment would not have any effect that I can see upon this legislation because we still leave in the bill section 201, which is the pricing formula of this legislation. It would be just as necessary and just as cumbersome I think to leave this 90-percent formula in the bill as it would be to put a fifth wheel on an automobile; it is not needed; there is no justification for it, and I think we ought to vote it down.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California [Mr. HAGEN] is recognized.

Mr. HAGEN. Mr. Chairman, I wish to commend the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY], and the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE], who in my opinion are two of the most outstanding members of this body.

I want to say first that the concept of 90 percent of parity involves a whole structure of supporting laws which have not heretofore been provided for sugar and are not supplied by this bill. No outside expert testimony was taken with respect to such laws necessary to the application of the 90-percent concept to sugar. The inclusion of this concept in the sugar bill was very hastily considered and for that reason the Dixon amendment should be adopted.

Furthermore I wish to say that the basic impact of this bill is the question of which producers will secure the largest participation in an admitted program of subsidization. Are you going to permit the domestic producer to secure a larger share of the subsidy, or are you going to let that subsidy go increasingly abroad? That is the basic question posed by this bill. I am certain that the membership will overwhelmingly agree that our United States producers are entitled to a fair share of that subsidy by a fair degree of participation in the growth of our sugar consumption.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired, all time on this amendment has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Utah [Mr. DIXON] to the committee amendment.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. MORANO) there were—ayes 123, noes 37.

So the amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the committee amendment as amended.

The committee amendment as amended was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the Chair, Mr. SIKES, 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. 7030) to amend and extend the Sugar Act of 1948, as amended, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 328, he reported this bill back to the House with an amendment adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the amendment.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, I ask for a separate vote on the Dixon amendment.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman want a division?

Mr. MARTIN. I suggest to the Chair that we have gone beyond the point where he may ask for a separate vote.

The SPEAKER. Well, the Chair will be liberal with Members. Does the gentleman ask for a division?

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, I ask for a separate vote on the Dixon amendment.

The SPEAKER. That is exactly what the Chair put.

Mr. POAGE. There were three amendments adopted.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, was not the Dixon amendment, and the other amendments, amendments to the committee amendment? In that situation can we have a separate vote on either one of the amendments without having a vote on the committee amendment?

The SPEAKER. Under the rule anyone may demand a separate vote on the whole amendment or on an amendment to the committee amendment.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, I do not like to differ with the Speaker, but the gentleman from North Carolina, in my opinion, is correct in the statement that the amendment of the gentleman from Utah is an amendment to the committee amendment, and, therefore, all we have before us is the committee amendment, as amended.

The SPEAKER. The Chair would like to read part of the rule to the gentleman. It states:

> The Committee shall rise and report the bill back to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and any Member may demand a separate vote in the House on any of the amendments adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the bill or committee substitute.

The amendment of the gentleman from Utah is an amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the committee substitute.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, that amendment disappeared when we adopted the committee amendment.

The SPEAKER. Well, that is what the special rule provides.

Mr. MARTIN. The special rules are getting awfully tough around here.

The SPEAKER. They are not any tougher than the job of the present occupant of the Chair.

The question is on the so-called Dixon amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Amendment offered by Mr. DIXON of Utah to the committee amendment: On page 22, line 20, strike out all of section 20 of the bill and renumber the succeeding sections.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were refused.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the committee substitute as amended.

The committee substitute, as amended, was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

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

Mr. SIMPSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. SIMPSON of Illinois. I am, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Mr. SIMPSON of Illinois moves that the bill, H. R. 7030, be recommitted to the Committee on Agriculture.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recommit.

Mr. MORANO. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were refused.

The motion to recommit was rejected.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. MORANO. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were refused.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. JONES of Missouri) there were—ayes 194, nays 44.

So the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members desiring to do so may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

JANE EDITH THOMAS

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 7588) for the relief of Jane Edith Thomas.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

> *Be it enacted, etc.*, That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Jane Edith Thomas shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee.

With the following committee amendment:

> Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert: "That section 301 (a) (7) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, commonly referred to as the McCarran-Walter Act, shall be held and considered to be applicable to Jane Edith Thomas, the daughter of Leslie F. Thomas, a United States citizen."

Mr. SCHENCK. 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 Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. SCHENCK. Mr. Speaker, a week ago last Thursday, on July 21, the Dayton Daily News, of Dayton, Ohio, brought a matter to my attention that has since received almost nationwide publicity through the wire services, newspapers, radio stations, and television stations. This has happened because of the natural interest and concern by people everywhere in matters which affect small children, and also because of the circumstances surrounding this situation. As a result, I have received many letters, telegrams, and personal messages urging me to take every necessary corrective and proper step to resolve this problem.

Here, Mr. Speaker, is a résumé of what has happened to cause such warmhearted concern.

Leslie Francis Thomas was born in Russell, Ky., in 1931. He became a soldier and was sent overseas. In 1950, while stationed in the then free city of Trieste, he married an Italian girl. A year later, their daughter, Janie, was born in a United States Army hospital in Trieste. Mr. and Mr. Thomas were told that their daughter would be an American citizen because her father had been born and raised in the United States and also because his daughter was born in a United States Army hospital over which the flag of the United States was flown. This, it seems, was further confirmed because when Thomas was returned to the United States, in March 1952, he brought his wife and daughter, Janie, carrying an American passport issued by the American consul in Venice, Italy.

Mr. Thomas was mustered out, but reenlisted and was assigned to Fort Dix, N. J. In June 1952 he received a letter from the United States consul in Venice which stated in part:

> At the time of the birth of Jane Edith Thomas, you had not resided in the United States for a period sufficient to bring your case under the provisions of section 201 (G) of the Nationality Act of 1940.

The letter went on to say that "the already issued passport is disapproved" and explained that:

> Section 201 (G) provides that children born overseas to an American citizen and a foreign national are automatically United States citizens if the American parent has had 10 years of residence in the United States, at least 5 of which were after attaining the age of 16 years.

Private Thomas had not lived in the United States 5 years after becoming 16 years of age because he was just 20 years old when Janie was born.

All of this didn't make sense to Private Thomas and he ignored the letter. After

all, he was a bona fide American citizen, he had served in the United States Army and he had reenlisted, all because of his devotion to his country. He just could not make himself believe that a responsible official of our Government would raise such a technical point against the citizenship of his daughter and against the properness of her remaining in the United States. He thought American Immigration and State Department officials had more important duties and that they would not become overly concerned about his baby daughter. But he did not reckon with the great lengths to which some will go to observe every little technicality.

Private Thomas was sent overseas again in September 1952—this time to Germany. His wife and baby daughter, Janie, went to New York to live with relatives to await his return from overseas duty. Thirteen months later his wife sent him the frantic word:

Janie had been served with a warrant for arrest as an alien and ordered to appear at a deportation hearing on November 5, 1953, at Ellis Island.

At the hearing their little two-year-old daughter was charged with illegal entry and was paroled to her mother who became a naturalized citizen soon thereafter. The friendly American Red Cross had assisted Mrs. Thomas by securing the assignment of an attorney to help her in this very trying time.

The entire matter was then held in abeyance until Private Thomas returned to the United States in June 1954. After his discharge from the Army, he and his family moved to Dayton, Ohio, which is located in the Third Congressional District of Ohio. Mr. Thomas was told that he could take Janie to Canada and could bring her back on an "immigrant visa" and, of course, he has had to make monthly parole reports on Janie. He was also advised that he had until September 30, 1955, to complete arrangements to have Janie readmitted to the United States on an immigrant visa. Naturally, Mr. Thomas resented all this deeply because he felt all this reflected upon his baby daughter, Janie, and Mrs. Thomas, a recently naturalized citizen of her chosen country, and could not understand how the laws of our Nation would make such a seemingly unnecessary demand upon them.

When I learned this story, Mr. Speaker, I was deeply concerned and determined to do all I could properly do to assist this little girl and her family in this problem.

I found the Immigration and State Department officials both friendly and cooperative. They were willing to do anything they properly could within the scope of their authority to assist the Thomas family. They suggested that arrangements could be completed in advance with the friendly cooperation of Canadian officials so that Janie could be taken into Canada and immediately admitted back into the United States on an "immigrant visa." This, it was stated, however, still left the citizenship of Janie undetermined while she completed the necessary arrangements to become a citizen of the United States.

Mr. Thomas, however, had several objections to that procedure. He felt that it was entirely unnecessary and he still had faith and confidence in his native United States that some other and better way would be found. He also, as an industrial worker, felt, Mr. Speaker, that he could not afford to lose the time from his work or spend the money necessary for the trip especially in view of his anticipated expenses in connection with the expected arrival of another child.

Upon studying the matter with earnest care, Mr. Speaker, and talking it over fully with my good friend and colleague, the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania, Congressman FRANCIS WALTER, I found there is another and proper way.

I need not remind the Members of Congress, Mr. Speaker, that our colleague, Congressman WALTER, is well recognized among us as the outstanding authority and expert on all matters of immigration and that as chairman of the Subcommittee on Immigration of the House Committee on the Judiciary, he is always ready and willing to be of every proper assistance. Neither do I need to remind our colleagues, Mr. Speaker, that Congressman WALTER takes a warmhearted interest in the problems of his colleagues and is always very helpful.

As the result of our discussion, Mr. Speaker, I introduced H. R. 7588, a bill for the relief of Jane Edith Thomas, on Monday, July 25, 1955. Because of his deep interest and desire to be helpful, Mr. Speaker, Congressman WALTER obtained the approval of not only his subcommittee but also the approval of the full Committee on the Judiciary, after the bill was properly amended on Thursday, July 28. Then through the helpful consideration of my good friend, the majority leader, Congressman JOHN MCCORMACK, and with your gracious permission, Mr. Speaker, H. R. 7588 appears today on the final Private Calendar of this session of the House. It is my sincere hope, Mr. Speaker, that this legislation to assist Janie Thomas will be unanimously approved at this time so that it can be presented to the Senate immediately in the sincere hope that it will also be approved in that body without delay. This will make a veteran of our United States Army, Leslie Thomas, his wife, their daughter, their Congressman, and many interested people throughout the Nation happy and convinced all over again that the United States is the greatest Nation in the world and that it does have a heart that is warm toward the needs of its people. It will renew the faith of people, if that is at all necessary, because it will show to the world that even in the rush of the final hours of a session of Congress, we can and will take the time to be of human service.

I cannot close these comments, Mr. Speaker, without pointing out to my colleagues here and the Nation as a whole, that this trying situation came about as the result of a provision in the Nationality Act of 1940. It was my privilege, Mr. Speaker, as a Member of the 82d Congress in 1952, to vote for the McCarran-Walter Act and to also vote to override a Presidential veto so that this legislation could be enacted into law. It is under the provisions of this McCarran-Walter Immigration Act, Mr. Speaker, that this corrective action is possible here today. It is also most heart-warming, Mr. Speaker, to know that not only will Jane Edith Thomas be properly admitted to these United States when H. R. 7588 becomes a law with the signature of President Eisenhower, but that also, Mr. Speaker, she will be immediately endowed at the same time with all the rights and privileges of full citizenship in these great United States.

I am deeply indebted to all who have had a part in making the consideration of H. R. 7588 possible today, and I urge its adoption.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the committee amendment.

The committee 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.

DISTRIBUTION OF CERTAIN MONEYS TO MEMBERS OF KAW TRIBE OF INDIANS

Mr. BELCHER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 2197) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to distribute equally to members of the Kaw Tribe of Indians certain moneys to the credit of the tribe in the United States Treasury.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior is authorized and directed to distribute equally among the members of the Kaw Tribe of Indians whose names appear on the roll prepared pursuant to the act of July 1, 1902 (32 Stat. 636), and the persons who were allotted under the Act of April 29, 1922 (42 Stat. 1589), all funds on deposit in the Treasury of the United States to the credit of the Kansas or Kaw Tribe of Indians, including funds appropriated by the Act of April 22, 1955 (69 Stat. 28), for the payment of a judgment against the United States. The share of any deceased member shall be distributed among his heirs or devisees.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time was read the third time and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

KOREAN WAR ORPHANS

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 2312) for the relief of certain Korean war orphans.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of sections 101 (a) (27) (A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Joseph

Han Holt, Mary Chae Holt, Helen Chan Holt, Paul Kim Holt, Betty Rhee Holt, and Nathanial Chae Holt shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien children of Harry and Bertha Holt, citizens of the United States.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CONVEYANCE OF REAL PROPERTY TO ANNISTON, ALA.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 46) to authorize the conveyance to the city of Anniston, Ala., of certain real property within Fort McClellan, Ala., 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:

Resolved, That the bill from the House of Representatives (H. R. 46) entitled "An act to authorize the conveyance to the city of Anniston, Ala., of certain real property within Fort McClellan, Ala.," do pass with the following amendments:

(1) Page 1, line 3, strike out "after" and insert "if."

(2) Page 1, line 10, strike out "cemetery" and insert: "municipal."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

STEAMSHIP "LA GUARDIA"

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 91) to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to sell the steamship *La Guardia*.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the joint resolution, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate, etc., That (a) the Secretary of Commerce is hereby authorized during a period of 6 months after the enactment of this act, to sell the steamship *La Guardia* and the materials and equipment heretofore removed from the vessel and held in storage by the Maritime Administration, on an "as is, where is" basis to the Hawaiian Steamship Co., Ltd., subject to the provisions of this act and such terms and conditions not contrary hereto as the Secretary may prescribe. The sales price of the vessel (including all its furnishings, furniture, equipment, and spare parts whether held aboard or on shore), shall be $3,950,000. The sales price shall be subject to depreciation computed at the rate of 5 percent per annum for the period commencing with the date of enactment of this act and ending with the date of execution of the contract of sale of the steamship *La Guardia* hereunder. Such sale shall be made upon a condition and agreement that the purchaser recondition the vessel satisfactory to the Secretary of Commerce in a domestic shipyard for passenger service.

(b) The Secretary of Commerce, upon application by the Hawaiian Steamship Co., Ltd., purchaser of the steamship *La Guardia* hereunder, upon determination that such action may be taken without prejudice to the Department of Commerce, Maritime Administration operations, is authorized to release to such purchaser such additional furnishings, furniture, and equipment now held by the Maritime Administration, as he may determine are necessary to equip the steamship *La Guardia* for the passenger trade, with payment by the purchaser of an amount equal to 25 percent of the estimated original acquisition cost of such furnishings, furniture, and equipment as determined by the Secretary of Commerce.

(c) The purchaser hereunder may be permitted, entirely at his own expense and risk, to inspect the steamship *La Guardia* and to move such vessel, upon conditions approved by the Secretary of Commerce, to drydock and inspect the underwater surfaces.

(d) Such sale shall be on the basis of the payment of not less than 25 percent of the sales price of the vessel at the date of the execution of such sales contract, with balance payable in approximately equal annual installments, the first of which shall be due and payable 1 year from the date of execution of the contract, over the remainder of the 20-year economic life of the vessel, with interest on the unpaid balance at the rate of 3½ percent per annum; with right of prepayment from time to time of any or all of the sales price remaining unpaid. The obligation of the purchaser with respect to payment of such unpaid balance, with interest, shall be secured by a first preferred mortgage on the vessel sold, which mortgage may provide that the sole recourse against the purchaser of the vessel under such mortgage, and any of the notes secured thereby shall be limited to repossession of the vessel by the United States, and the assignment of insurance claims, if the purchaser shall have complied with all provisions of the mortgage other than those relating to the payment of principal and interest when due, and the obligation of the purchaser shall be satisfied and discharged by the surrender of the vessel, and all right, title, and interest therein to the United States. Such vessel upon surrender shall be (1) free and clear of all liens and encumbrances whatsoever, except the lien of the above-mentioned preferred mortgage and any other mortgage held by the Secretary of Commerce pursuant to an assignment under title XI of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, (2) in class, and (3) equipped and in as good order and condition, ordinary wear and tear excepted, as when reconditioned as a passenger vessel by the purchaser except that any deficiencies with respect to freedom from encumbrances, condition, and class, may, to the extent covered by valid policies of insurance, be satisfied by the assignment to the United States of claims of the purchaser under such policies of insurance.

(e) Any contract of sale executed under authority of this act shall provide that in the event the United States shall, through purchase or requisition, acquire ownership of such vessel, the owner shall be paid therefor the value thereof, but in no event shall such payment exceed the actual depreciated sales price under such contract (together with the actual depreciated cost of capital improvements thereon), or the fair and reasonable scrap value of such vessel, as determined by the Maritime Administrator, whichever is the greater; that such determination shall be final; that in computing the depreciated acquisition cost of such vessel, the depreciation shall be computed on the vessel on the schedule adopted or accepted by the Internal Revenue Service for income-tax purposes as applicable to such vessel; that such vessel shall remain documented under the laws of the United States for a period of 10 years after completion as a passenger vessel or as long as there remains due the United States any principal or interest on account of the sales price, whichever is the longer period; and that the foregoing provisions respecting the requisition or the acquisition of ownership by the United States and documentation shall run with the title to such vessel and be binding on all owners thereof.

The joint resolution was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

STEAMSHIP "MONTEREY"

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 92) to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to sell the steamship *Monterey*.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the joint resolution, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate, etc., That (a) the Secretary of Commerce is hereby authorized, during a period of 6 months after the enactment of this joint resolution, to sell the steamship *Monterey* and the uninstalled materials heretofore acquired by the United States with said vessel, which are held in storage by the Maritime Administration, Department of Commerce, to a citizen of the United States at competitive bidding, subject to the provisions of this joint resolution, and such terms and conditions not contrary hereto as the Secretary may prescribe. The vessel with such materials shall be sold on an "as is, where is" basis, at an aggregate minimum sales price of $3,081,665.72, depreciated on the basis of a 20-year life from August 6, 1952, to the date of the award of the contract of sale. Such sale shall be made upon a condition and agreement that the purchaser expend at least $10 million to recondition the vessel satisfactory to the Secretary of Commerce in a domestic shipyard for passenger service, with documentation under the laws of the United States. Such sale shall be on the basis of the payment of not less than 25 percent of the sale price of the vessel and materials at the time of the execution of such sales contract, with balance payable in approximately equal annual installments over the life expectancy of the vessel after reconditioning by the purchaser which life expectancy shall be determined jointly by the Secretary of the Treasury and the Secretary of Commerce, with interest on the portion of the sales price remaining unpaid at the rate of 3½ percent per annum; with right of prepayment from time to time of any or all of the sales price remaining unpaid. The obligation of the purchaser with respect to payment of such unpaid balance, with interest, shall be secured by a first preferred mortgage on the vessel sold, which mortgage may provide that the sole recourse against the purchaser under such mortgage, and any of the notes secured thereby, shall be limited to repossession of the vessel by the United States and the assignment of insurance claims, if the purchaser shall have complied with all provisions of the mortgage other than those relating to the payment of principal and interest when due, and the obligation of the purchaser shall be satisfied and discharged by the surrender of the

vessel, and all right, title, and interest therein to the United States. Such vessel upon surrender shall be (1) free and clear of all liens and encumbrances whatsoever, except the lien of the above-mentioned preferred mortgage and any other mortgage held by the Secretary of Commerce pursuant to an assignment under title XI of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, (2) in class, and (3) equipped and in as good order and condition, ordinary wear and tear excepted, as when reconditioned as a passenger vessel by the purchaser except that any deficiencies with respect to freedom from encumbrances, condition, and class, may, to the extent covered by valid policies of insurance, be satisfied by the assignment to the United States of claims of the purchaser under such policies of insurance.

(b) Any contract of sale executed under authority of this joint resolution shall provide that in the event the United States shall, through purchase or requisition, acquire ownership of such vessel, the owner shall be paid therefor the value thereof, but in no event shall such payment exceed the actual depreciated sales price under such contract (together with the actual depreciated cost of capital improvements thereon), or the fair and reasonable scrap value of such vessel, as determined by the Maritime Administrator, whichever is the greater; that such determination shall be final; that in computing the depreciated acquisition cost of such vessel, the depreciation shall be computed on the vessel on the schedule adopted or accepted by the Secretary of the Treasury for Federal income tax purposes as applicable to such vessel; that such vessel shall remain documented under the laws of the United States for a period of at least 10 years after completion as a passenger vessel or as long as there remains due the United States any principal or interest on account of the sales price, whichever is the longer period; and that the foregoing provisions respecting the requisition or the acquisition of ownership by the United States and documentation shall run with the title to such vessel and be binding on all owners thereof.

The joint resolution was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

APPROPRIATION OF ACCUMULATED RECEIPTS UNDER PITTMAN-ROBERTSON ACT

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 756) to authorize the appropriation of accumulated receipts in the Federal aid to wildlife-restoration fund established by the Pittman-Robertson Act and to authorize the expenditure of funds apportioned to a State under such act for the management of wildlife areas and resources.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

Mr. MARTIN. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I do not know much about this bill. Will the gentleman explain it?

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, this bill provides for the distribution of the tax money under the Pittman-Robertson Act that accumulated during the world-war period and has not been distributed. Under the formula of that act these funds are distributed to the States. It requires a matching by the States. They are distributed annually but this money accumulated during the war when the States could not use the money.

Mr. MARTIN. I think I should like to have that withdrawn until I have an opportunity to know something more about it. It looks as if this is going back a number of years to get an extra bite from the Treasury.

Mr. BONNER. It is the understanding of the Speaker and myself that this was cleared with the gentleman.

Mr. MARTIN. How much money is involved?

Mr. BONNER. $13 million.

Mr. MARTIN. Then you will have to come back and get another appropriation?

Mr. BONNER. No; this money has already been collected. The tax has accumulated. No one is taxed any additional money. This is a tax that was imposed in years gone by, and the money is available at the present time for distribution.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARTIN. Yes. I am trying to get information.

Mr. BOW. Is this an appropriation?

Mr. BONNER. No; this is not an appropriation. The money is now in the Treasury available for distribution.

Mr. MARTIN. This money has not been spent in the past?

Mr. BONNER. No; the money is in the Treasury now.

Mr. MARTIN. Is it a unanimous report from the committee?

Mr. BONNER. Yes; it is unanimous.

Mr. MARTIN. I withdraw my reservation of objection, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. TABER. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I wonder how this can be anything but an appropriation of funds.

Mr. BONNER. This money does not have to be appropriated. The sportsmen of the Nation have already paid this money in on a tax on firearms and other utensils used in hunting. The money is in the Treasury now. It is a special fund. There is no appropriation.

Mr. TABER. We have always had those items submitted to us for action. Frankly, I feel that I must object at this time, and I do object.

COAST GUARD MILITARY PERSONNEL

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 2566) 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.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 432 (f) of title 14, United States Code, is amended by inserting the words "as amended" following the words "Federal Employees Pay Act of 1945."

SEC. 2. Section 432 (g) of title 14, United States Code, is amended by amending the first sentence thereof to read as follows: "The head of the department in which the Coast Guard is operating, under regulations prescribed by him, may regulate the hours of duty and the pay of civilian keepers of lighthouses and civilians employed on lightships and other vessels of the Coast Guard, but such personnel may be called upon for duty in emergency circumstances or otherwise at any time or all times."

SEC. 3. The analysis of chapter 13 of title 14, United States Code, is amended by inserting in such analysis, the following item:

"511. Compensatory absence of military personnel at isolated aids to navigation."

SEC. 4. Chapter 13 of title 14, United States Code, is amended by inserting a new section as follows:

"§ 511. Compensatory absence of military personnel at isolated aids to navigation

"The head of the department in which the Coast Guard is operating, under regulations prescribed by him, may grant compensatory absence from duty to military personnel of the Coast Guard serving in lightships and at lighthouses and other isolated aids to navigation of the Coast Guard when conditions of duty result in confinement because of isolation or in long periods of continuous duty."

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

A similar House bill (H. R. 7379) was laid on the table.

AMENDEMENT OF RAILROAD RETIREMENT ACT AND RAILROAD UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE ACT

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 4744) to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937, as amended, and the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act, 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 3, lines 4 and 5, after "appointed", insert ", except one administrative assistant to each member of the Board."

Page 3, line 11, after "appointed", insert ", except one administrative assistant to each member of the Board."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ADJUSTMENT OF OBLIGATIONS OF SETTLERS ON CERTAIN PROJECTS

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 1621) to authorize adjustment by the Secretary of Agriculture of certain obligations of settlers on projects developed or subject to the act of August 11, 1939, as amended, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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 the provisions of sections 41 (g), 43, and 51 of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, as amended (7 U. S. C. 1015 (g), 1017, and 1025), are hereby extended to apply on the obligations of settlers on projects developed under the Act of August 11, 1939, as amended (16 U. S. C. 590y–z), or similar projects under the water conservation and use item of the Department of the Interior Appropriation Act, 1940, as amended (53 Stat. 719), of the type incurred in accordance with section 5 of said act (16 U. S. C. 590z–3), or other obligations to or administered by the Secretary of Agriculture incurred in connection with the development or operation of the project unit, and the Secretary is authorized to make such additional adjustments in the terms and conditions and amounts of any such obligations of such persons or in the price at which project units are sold to settlers as may be reasonably necessary to permit such persons to acquire, develop, and establish successful farming operations on their farm units and repay such adjusted obligations.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 6, following the words "settlers on", insert "the Angostura."

Page 1, line 6, strike out the word "projects" and insert the word "project" and add the words "in South Dakota."

Page 1, line 8, following the parenthesis strike the comma and insert in lieu thereof a period, and strike the balance of the bill.

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

WAR HOUSING PROJECTS, NORFOLK, VA.

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 2351) to authorize the conveyance of certain war housing projects to the city of Norfolk, Va.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Housing and Home Finance Administrator is authorized to sell and convey at fair market value as determined by him on the basis of an appraisal made by an independent real estate expert to the city of Norfolk, Va., or to the Norfolk Redevelopment and Housing Authority, or to any agency or corporation established or sponsored in the public interest by such city, all of the right, title, and interest of the United States in and to War Housing Project VA–44075 and War Housing Project VA–44184, or either of them. Any sale pursuant to this authorization shall be on such terms and conditions as the Administrator shall determine, and the amount received for each project shall be reported by the Administrator to the Committee on Banking and Currency of the Senate and the Committee on Banking and Currency of the House of Representatives.

SEC. 2. The authority conferred by this act shall terminate 6 months after the date of its enactment.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

A similar House bill (H. R. 7073) was laid on the table.

POLITICAL ACTIVITIES BY GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES

Mr. BEAMER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 3084) to amend certain provisions of the laws relating to the prevention of political activities to make them inapplicable to State officers and employees.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BEAMER]?

Mr. HAGEN. Mr. Speaker, I object.

BONDING OF CIVILIAN AND MILITARY PERSONNEL OF FEDERAL GOVERNMENT

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H. R. 4778) to provide for the purchase of bonds to cover officers and employees of the Government, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. MURRAY]?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. NO. 1568)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4778) entitled "An act to provide for the purchase of bonds to cover officers and employees of the Government," having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate to the text of the bill and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following: "That section 14 of title 6 of the United States Code is amended to read as follows:

"'§ 14. Purchase of Bonds to Cover Officers and Employees of the Federal Government

"'(a) Subject to subsection (b) of this section, the head of each department and independent establishment in the executive branch of the Federal Government shall obtain, under regulations which shall be promulgated by the Secretary of the Treasury, blanket, position schedule, or other types of surety bonds covering the civilian officers and employees and military personnel of such department or independent establishment who are required by law or administrative ruling to be bonded. The appropriate officials of the legislative and judicial branches of the Federal Government may obtain any or all of such types of surety bonds covering such officers and employees under their respective jurisdictions as such officials may deem appropriate to be bonded. Each bond obtained under this section shall be of the most economical type available for the number and type of personnel to be bonded and shall be conditioned upon the faithful performance of the duties of the individual or individuals so bonded. The bond premium may cover a period not exceeding two years and shall be paid from any funds available for the payment of administrative expenses at the time such premium becomes payable. Whenever any civilian officers or employees or military personnel are covered by a bond under authority of this section, the surety or sureties on any existing bond of any such civilian officers or employees or military personnel shall not be liable for any defaults occurring subsequent to the date of the new coverage. For purposes of this section, the term "faithful performance of the duties" shall include the proper accounting for all funds or property received by reason of the position or employment of the individual or individuals so bonded and all duties and responsibilities imposed upon such individual or individuals by law or by regulation issued pursuant to law.

"'(b) If, in the opinion of the head of the department or independent establishment concerned, the premium cost for any bond procured under this section covering officers or employees in the executive branch of the Federal Government will exceed the rate of $150 per annum, the procurement of such bond shall be made by the head of such department or independent establishment only after advertising a sufficient time previously for proposals for the furnishing of such bond, except that such advertising for proposals shall not be required when the public exigencies require the immediate procurement of such bond.

"'(c) The Secretary of the Treasury shall transmit to the Congress, on or before June 30, 1956, a comprehensive report of the operations of the departments and independent establishments under this section. Thereafter, the Secretary of the Treasury shall transmit to the Congress on or before October 1 of each year, beginning with the year 1957, a comprehensive report of such operations during the preceding fiscal year. Such report shall include, among other matters, information, in summary and in detail, with respect to operations under this section, setting forth—

"'(1) the number of officers and employees covered by bonds procured under this section,

"'(2) the number and types of bonds procured under this section and the individual penal sums thereof,

"'(3) the amounts of the premiums paid for bonds procured under this section, and

"'(4) such other information as may be necessary to enable the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service of the Senate and the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service of the House of Representatives to determine the results of operations under this section. The reports submitted by the Secretary of the Treasury under this section shall be delivered to the President of the Senate and to the Speaker of the House of Representatives (or to the Clerk of the House and the Secretary of the Senate, respectively, if the Congress is not in session) on the same day, and shall be referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service of each House.'

"SEC. 2. The last sentence of section 6 of title 6 of the United States Code is amended to read as follows: 'Except with respect to bonds obtained under section 14 of this title, no officer or person having the approval of any bond shall require that such bond shall be furnished by a guaranty company or by any particular guaranty company.'

"SEC. 3. The analysis of title 6 of the United States Code, immediately preceding section 1 of such title, is amended by striking out the item

"'14. Rate of premium on bond; premiums not to be paid by United States.'

and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"'14. Purchase of bonds to cover officers and employees of the Federal Government.'.

"SEC. 4. The amendments made by this Act shall take effect on January 1, 1956."

And the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate to the title of the bill and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the amended title proposed by the Senate amendment, amend the title so as to read: "An Act to provide for the purchase of bonds to cover civilian officers and employees and military personnel of the Federal Government."

And the Senate agree to the same.

TOM MURRAY,
J. H. MORRISON,
EDWARD H. REES,
Managers on the Part of the House.

OLIN D. JOHNSTON,
MATTHEW M. NEELY,
FRANK CARLSON,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4778) entitled "An act to provide for the purchase of bonds to cover officers and employees of the Government" submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

The Senate amendments struck out all of the House bill after the enacting clause and inserted a substitute text and provided a new title for the House bill.

With respect to the amendment of the Senate to the text of the House bill, the committee of conference recommends that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate with an amendment which is a substitute for both the text of the House bill and the text provided by the Senate amendment and that the Senate agree to the same.

The House bill related to the purchase of bonds to cover postmasters, officers, and employees of the Post Office Department and mail clerks in the armed services and in the United States Coast Guard. The Senate amendment related to the purchase of bonds to cover civilian officers and employees and military personnel of each department and independent establishment in the executive branch of the Federal Government, including the government of the District of Columbia, and officers and employees in the legislative and judicial branches of the Federal Government.

Except for technical and minor drafting changes, the differences between the texts of the House bill, the Senate amendment, and the conference substitute are explained below.

The House bill authorized the Postmaster General to purchase certain types of bonds to cover any or all postmasters, officers, and employees of the Post Office Department and mail clerks in the armed services and in the United States Coast Guard required by law or administrative determination to be bonded. Under the House bill, such purchase of bonds was authorized to be made, under regulations to be prescribed by the Postmaster General, whenever the Postmaster General determined that such purchase would be in the best interests of the Federal Government. The types of bonds so authorized to be purchased were such blanket, position schedule, or other type of surety bonds as the Postmaster General deemed appropriate to cover those individuals required to be bonded. Payment for such bonds was to be made from appropriations or other funds available to the Post Office Department.

The House bill further provided (1) that the premiums on any such bonds could cover periods of not to exceed 4 years, (2) that the bonds should contain such conditions and be in such penalty as the Postmaster General deemed necessary to protect the interests of the Federal Government, and (3) that nothing contained in the House bill should operate to relieve any postmaster, officer, employee, or mail clerk or his surety from any liability otherwise imposed by law.

The Senate amendment required the head of each department and independent establishment in the executive branch of the Federal Government and in the municipal government of the District of Columbia to obtain blanket, position schedule, or other type of surety bonds to cover civilian officers and employees and military personnel thereof who are required by law or administrative ruling to be bonded. The Senate amendment also authorized the appropriate officials of the legislative and judicial branches of the Federal Government in their discretion to obtain any or all of the above-mentioned types of surety bonds to cover officers and employees under their respective jurisdictions.

The Senate amendment further provided that each bond should be of the most economical type available for the number and type of personnel required to be bonded. The Senate amendment also provided that the bond premium might cover a period not exceeding 2 years and that such premium should be paid from any funds available for the payment of administrative expenses at the time such premium becomes payable.

A further provision of the Senate amendment was to the effect that if, in the opinion of the head of the department or independent establishment concerned, the premium cost for any bond procured under authority of the Senate amendment covering officers and employees in the executive branch of the Federal Government would exceed a rate of $250 per annum, the procurement of such bond would be required to be made through the Administrator of General Services when so required by him pursuant to section 302 of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 (41 U. S. C., sec. 252).

The Senate amendment was to become effective 60 days after the date of its enactment.

The conference substitute provides, in general, (1) for the mandatory purchase of surety bonds to cover civilian officers and employees and military personnel of each department and independent establishment in the executive branch of the Federal Government (not including the government of the District of Columbia) who are required to be bonded by law or by administrative decision, and (2) for the discretionary purchase of surety bonds to cover those officers and employees in the legislative and judicial branches of the Federal Government with respect to whom the appropriate officials of the legislative and judicial branches deem it advisable to require the purchase of surety bonds.

With respect to the executive branch, the conference substitute provides that the head of each department and independent establishment shall obtain and procure blanket, position schedule, or other types of surety bonds to cover those civilian officers and employees and military personnel of such department or establishment who are required by law or administrative ruling to be bonded. It is required that such bonds shall be obtained and procured under and in conformity with regulations which the Secretary of the Treasury is required to prescribe and issue under the provisions of the conference substitute.

With respect to the legislative and judicial branches, the conference substitute provides that the appropriate officials of those branches may obtain and procure, in their discretion, blanket, position schedule, or other types of surety bonds to cover those officers and employees under their respective jurisdictions as such officials may deem it necessary or advisable to cover by surety bonds. It may be noted that the above-mentioned regulations prescribed and issued by the Secretary of the Treasury will not be applicable with respect to the legislative and judicial branches of the Federal Government.

The conference substitute further provides that each surety bond obtained and procured, under the provisions of the conference substitute, to cover personnel in the executive, legislative, and judicial branches of the Federal Government, shall be "of the most economical type available for the number and type of personnel to be bonded." It is not the intent of this provision that a bond or bonds obtainable at the lowest premium rate per annum shall constitute in all cases a bond of the "most economical type." Such would seem to be the case as a general rule, all other factors and considerations being equal. However, in many cases, variations in such factors and considerations as differences in the relative financial standing and reliability of the surety, the terms of the respective surety bond contracts available, and the number and types of personnel to be bonded may require, in the interests of the Federal Government other than in the strictly financial sense, the purchase of such bonds at premium rates per annum which are higher than the lowest premium rates per annum actually obtainable. The above-discussed provision of the conference substitute will permit this result.

The conference substitute further provides that each bond obtained and procured, under the provisions of the conference substitute, shall be conditioned upon the "faithful performance of the duties" of the individual or individuals so bonded. The conference substitute elaborates upon the meaning of such quoted words, as an aid to the administration of the conference substitute, by providing that the term "faithful performance of the duties" shall include, for purposes of the conference substitute, (1) the proper accounting for all funds or property received by reason of the position or employment of the individual or individuals so bonded and (2) all duties and responsibilities imposed upon such individual or individuals by law or by regulation issued pursuant to law.

The conference substitute also authorizes the payment of any bond premium to cover a period of not in excess of 2 years. Existing law, however, limits any such payment to a period not in excess of 1 year. Therefore, the operation of this provision of the conference substitute, together with existing law, makes possible the payment of a bond premium to cover either a period not in excess of 1 year or a period not in excess of 2 years, whichever is determined to be the more advantageous to the Federal Government. No bond premium, however, may cover a period in excess of 2 years. The purposes of this provision of the conference substitute are to secure the advantage of more favorable premium rates on surety bonds and to effect savings to the Federal Government in administrative costs in connection with the procurement of such bonds.

With respect to the funds from which bond premiums are to be paid, the conference substitute provides that any such premium shall be paid from any funds available for the payment of administrative expenses at any time such premium becomes payable. This provision will afford necessary flexibility in entering into contracts for the

purchase of surety bonds, including (among other matters) the advertising in advance for proposals and the negotiation of terms which are most advantageous to the Federal Government. Under this provision of the conference substitute, the head of a department or independent establishment in the executive branch, or the appropriate official in the legislative or judicial branch, could enter into a contract for the purchase of a bond in advance of the date on which the bond premium is to be paid. This provision will not, however, permit the avoidance of those laws relating to the obligation and expenditure of appropriated funds or to the incurring of deficiencies, or any other laws and procedures relating to appropriations. For example, it will not permit postponement of the payment of any premium to a fiscal year which begins later than the fiscal year in which such premium is due.

The conference substitute also contains a provision the purpose of which is to clarify the liability of old and new sureties during any changeover periods which occur, with respect to surety bonds, under the provisions of the conference substitute. Such provision is to the effect that whenever any civilian officer or employee or military personnel is covered by a surety bond under authority of the conference substitute, the surety or sureties on any existing surety bond of any such civilian officer or employee or military personnel shall not be liable for any defaults occurring subsequent to the date of the coverage of such officer, employee, or personnel by a new surety bond.

Another provision of the conference substitute relates to advertising for bids or proposals for the furnishing of bonds to the Federal Government under the conference substitute. The effect of such provision is to require the head of the executive department or independent establishment concerned, when in his opinion the procurement of any bond under the conference substitute will result in a premium cost to the Federal Government in excess of $150 per annum, to advertise a reasonable time in advance of such procurement in order to obtain proposals for the furnishing of such bond. Advertising in advance to obtain proposals for the furnishing of such bond will not be required, however, in any case in which the public exigencies require the immediate procurement of such bond without such advertising.

In this connection, it should be noted that section 3609 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, contains, among other provisions, a requirement for advertising in advance for bids or proposals with respect to purchases and contracts for supplies or services for the Government if the amount involved in any case exceeds $500, except when the public exigencies require immediate procurement, when there is only one source of supply, or when the services to be procured are personal in nature.

A further provision of the conference substitute provides a means for the Congress to conduct a thorough review and analysis of the operations of the departments and independent establishments of the Federal Government under the conference substitute.

Under such provision the Secretary of the Treasury is required to furnish the Congress with comprehensive reports of such operations. The first such report is to be submitted to the Congress on or before June 30, 1956—that is, 6 months after the effective date of the conference substitute. Thereafter, the Secretary of the Treasury will be required to submit a report of such operations to the Congress by October 1 of each year, beginning with the year 1957. Each such report shall cover such operations during the preceding fiscal year. These reports will be referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service of the Senate and the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service of the House of Representatives.

The reports of the Secretary of the Treasury under the conference substitute shall include information, in summary and in detail, with respect to (1) the number of officers and employees in the executive branch covered by bonds procured under the conference substitute, (2) the number and types of such bonds and the penal sums thereof, and (3) the amounts of the premiums paid for such bonds. The reports also shall include such other information as may be necessary to enable the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service of the Senate and the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service of the House of Representatives more effectively to perform the review function, with respect to this legislation, which is contemplated by section 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946.

It is the intention of the committee of conference that, under the provisions of the conference substitute, the Secretary of the Treasury shall have full authority to require (in such cases as he deems necessary and appropriate to effect the orderly and efficient administration of the provisions of the conference substitute and to accomplish the purposes thereof) that the bonds (including representative types of bonds) obtained by the head of each department and independent establishment in the executive branch of the Federal Government shall be filed in the Department of the Treasury. It is not intended that all such bonds necessarily be required to be filed in the Department of the Treasury. It is intended, however, that there shall be filed in such department such bonds, or representative types of bonds, as the Secretary of the Treasury may deem necessary and appropriate to enable the Department of the Treasury to discharge its regular operating functions under the conference substitute and to determine whether bonds are being obtained and procured under the conference substitute in accordance with the regulations which the Secretary of the Treasury shall issue thereunder.

The committee calls attention to the fact that the conference substitute supersedes section 7803 (c) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, which provides that—

"Whenever the Secretary or his delegate deems it proper, he may require any such officer or employee to furnish such bond, or he may purchase such blanket or schedule bonds, as the Secretary or his delegate deems appropriate. The premium of any such bond or bonds may, in the discretion of the Secretary or his delegate, be paid from the appropriation for expenses of the Internal Revenue Service."

Consultations were held with representatives of the Department of the Treasury, who agreed that such section 7803 (c) is superseded by reason of the enactment of the conference substitute. However, under the conference substitute, any blanket or schedule bond obtained by the Secretary of the Treasury or his delegate pursuant to such section 7803 (c), the term of which will expire after the date of enactment of the conference substitute, may, in accordance with such regulations as the Secretary of the Treasury may promulgate for the purpose, be continued in force until the expiration of such term.

The conference substitute for the most part is composed of amendments to title 6 of the United States Code, relating to official and penal bonds. The conference substitute amends the last sentence of section 6 of such title which now provides that—

"No officer or person having the approval of any bond shall exact that it shall be furnished by a guaranty company or by any particular guaranty company."

Since such sentence is inconsistent with the purpose of the conference substitute, the effect of such amendment is to make such sentence inapplicable with respect to the conference substitute in order to give full effect to the new system for the procurement of bonds provided by the conference substitute.

In addition to making several technical amendments to title 6 of the United States Code to conform to the provisions of the conference substitute, the conference substitute further provides that its effective date shall be January 1, 1956.

With respect to the amendment of the Senate to the title of the House bill, the committee of conference recommends that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate to the title of the bill and agree to the same with an amendment to such title set forth in the conference substitute which will reflect more accurately the provisions of the text of the conference substitute and that the Senate agree to the same.

TOM MURRAY,
J. H. MORRISON,
EDWARD H. REES,
Managers on the Part of the House.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HOUR OF MEETING ON MONDAY

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet on Monday at 10 o'clock a. m.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

NATHANIEL ROSS MOORE

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill (H. R. 2043) for the relief of Nathaniel Ross Moore which was on the Private Calendar No. 791, today, be recommitted to the Committee on the Judiciary for the reason that general legislation has already been passed and signed.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

FRANCES IRENE SMART

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of a private bill which was passed over this morning for the reason that the report was not available, the bill (H. R. 1513), Private Calendar No. 777, for the relief of Frances Irene Smart.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, has the gentleman cleared this bill with the Private Calendar Committee of Objectors.

Mr. LANE. I understand that they had no objection to it except that the report was not available.

Mr. MARTIN. I believe the gentleman had better confer with them, however.

Mr. AVERY. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, I might also tell our distinguished minority leader

that the Objectors' Committee has not even seen the report.

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw the request.

AMENDING VETERANS' READJUSTMENT ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1952

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (S. 2081) to amend the Veterans' Readjustment Assistance Act of 1952 to provide that education and training allowances paid to veterans pursuing institutional on-farm training shall not be reduced for 12 months after they have begun their training.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the first sentence of subsection (d) of section 232 of the Veterans' Readjustment Assistance Act of 1952 (38 U. S. C., sec. 942) is hereby amended to read as follows: "The education and training allowance of an eligible veteran pursuing institutional on-farm training shall be computed at the rate of (1) $95 per month, if he has no dependent, or (2) $110 per month, if he has 1 dependent, or (3) $130 per month, if he has more than 1 dependent; except that his education and training allowance shall be reduced at the end of the third, and each subsequent, 4-month period as his program progresses by an amount which bears the same ratio to $65 per month, if the veteran has no dependent, or $80 per month, if he has 1 dependent, or $100 per month, if he has more than 1 dependent, as 4 months bears to the total duration of such veteran's institutional on-farm training reduced by 8 months."

SEC. 2. The amendment made by this act shall take effect as of the first day of the second calendar month which begins after the date of its enactment, but for the purposes of computing education and training allowances to be paid after such first day, such amendment shall be deemed to have been in effect since July 16, 1952.

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

A second was considered as ordered.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, this bill should only take a few minutes. Under the present law, a veteran training under the farm program under Public Law 550 has his allowance from the Federal Government reduced every 4 months. It is the opinion of the people dealing with this legislation that that is very unrealistic, and that a veteran under the farm program should not have this money reduced at least until the end of a crop cycle or an animal cycle.

This bill is identical to the bill H. R. 4006, which was reported unanimously from the Committee on Veterans' Affairs on June 22 and on which a rule has been granted by the Rules Committee. Mr. Speaker, Mrs. ELIZABETH KEE, of West Virginia, introduced H. R. 4006 and she is chairman of the Committee on Education and Training. I wish to compliment Mrs. KEE, Congressman ED EDMONDSON, of Oklahoma, Congressman B. F. SISK, of California, Congressman WILLIAM AYRES, of Ohio, and Congressman Ross ADAIR, of Indiana, for their work in behalf of this bill. Every veteran group supported the bill, the Veterans' Administration supported the bill, and we have had many, many requests from all over the United States for the enactment of this bill.

Under the existing law—Public Law 550, 82d Congress—a veteran of the Korean conflict taking on-farm training has his training allowance reduced at the end of each 4-month period.

Administration of this act shows that the veteran taking this type of training should be allowed at least one animal- or crop-production cycle before the reduction formula begins to operate.

Hearings were held on this proposal before the Subcommittee on Education and Training and, as I have indicated, the bill was reported unanimously by our committee, as well as the Senate committee.

The cost to the Government for enactment of this bill would be $324 per trainee for a 36-month course. The overall cost for the next 5 years is as follows:

Fiscal year:	*H. R. 4006 (suspend—12 months—farm)*
1956	$3,500,000
1957	4,000,000
1958	4,000,000
1959	3,500,000
1960	3,000,000

The effect on the individual veteran as a result of the enactment of this proposal would be as indicated in the table below:

Months in training	Public Law 550, 82d Cong.	H. R. 4006, 84th Cong.
1 to 4	$130	$130
5 to 8	118	130
9 to 12	107	130
13 to 16	96	115
17 to 20	85	101
21 to 24	74	87
25 to 28	63	72
29 to 32	52	58
33 to 36	41	44

There are 34,196 veterans enrolled in the program.

It should be noted that the Veterans' Administration is in favor of the bill as reported by the committee.

All this bill does is to provide for a 12-month delay in reducing the veterans' allowance.

Mrs. KEE. Mr. Speaker, after careful consideration the Veterans' Affairs Committee unanimously reported H. R. 4006, a bill to amend the Veterans' Readjustment Assistance Act of 1952. This bill provides that education and training allowances paid to veterans pursuing institutional on-farm training shall not be reduced for 12 months after they have begun their training.

The purpose of this proposed legislation is to modify the so-called automatic reduction formula applicable to on-job and on-farm trainees enrolled under the Veterans' Readjustment Assistance Act of 1952, as amended.

The automatic reduction formulae establishes the rates of education and training allowances for apprenticeship and other training on the job and for institutional on-farm training, and provides for such allowances to be reduced at the end of each 4-month period as the veteran's training progresses.

However, it has been clearly shown that this formula as applicable to on-farm training does not take into account the realities of farming operations because on-farm trainees cannot ordinarily anticipate income from their farms until the end of a crop or marketing cycle which is usually near the end of their first year of training.

This bill retains the principle of the automatic reduction formula intact, but would merely modify the formula applicable to on-farm training so as to suspend all reductions during the initial 12 months' training. This is reasonable and stimulates the veteran to progressive self-improvement during the period of training to the end that he will become sufficiently self-sustaining by the completion of his training program so as to continue with his farming operation.

In this connection, Mr. Speaker, I wish to especially thank the members of the Veterans' Affairs Committee's Subcommittee on Education and Training for the diligent manner in which they reviewed and studied this question. I wholeheartedly join with them in urging the House of Representatives to pass this bill today.

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, I want to strongly urge the Members to pass this bill so that we may have a practical, workable on-farm training program for veterans who want to go into farming as a life career and so that they may have benefits comparable to those already enjoyed by other veterans who choose education for other pursuits.

I introduced a bill which is identical with that now before you, as did other Members. They were carefully considered in the Committee on Veterans Affairs and were favorably reported out with the endorsement of veteran organizations, the Veterans' Administration and many State directors of vocational training.

The fact of the matter is that many veterans now cannot go into this program because the schedule of subsistence allowances is unrealistic and will not provide for their needs until they are able to harvest their crops and obtain income from them.

This bill would postpone quarterly reductions in allowances for a period of 12 months to permit the veteran trainee to harvest a crop and get his money. The present law requires reductions in allowances 4 months after the start of the training program, with further cuts at 4-month intervals thereafter.

I am sure many of my colleagues who have farming backgrounds, as I have, know that the present law is out of kilter and does not fit into the crop and harvest cycle these farm trainees are dependent upon for a livelihood and for the care of their families.

This legislation will benefit many thousands of veterans now practically barred from training as well as those already enrolled. It will accomplish this at a very modest increase in cost. It is good legislation and I feel sure you will approve it and merit the thanks of the coming farming generation.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, this bill was unanimously reported out of the committee. We felt

that there never should have been a reduction after the first month.

I think no Member of the House will object to the bill, as it is a very just one.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Texas that the rules be suspended and the bill be passed.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

By unanimous consent, a similar House bill (H. R. 4006) and House Resolution 313 were laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 3 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on this bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

AMENDING THE CLASSIFICATION ACT OF 1949

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H. R. 3255) to amend the Classification Act of 1949, as amended.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That title V of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"SEC. 507. (a) Each officer or employee subject to this act—

"(1) who holds, on or after the date of enactment of this section, under a career-conditional or career appointment in the competitive civil service, a position (A) which is in any grade of a basic compensation schedule of this act (other than grade 16, 17, or 18 of the General Schedule) and (B) which is placed, on or after such date of enactment, while such officer or employee holds such position, in a lower grade of such schedule under any reclassification of such position pursuant to this act;

"(2) who has held such position for a continuous period of not less than 2 years ending immediately prior to the date of such reclassification; and

"(3) whose performance of the work of such position at all times during such period is satisfactory or better than satisfactory;

shall continue to receive basic compensation at the rate to which he was entitled immediately prior to such reclassification of his position (including any increases in such rate of basic compensation provided by law at any time while such officer or employee is in such position) until (i) he leaves such position or (ii) he is entitled to receive basic compensation at a higher rate by reason of the operation of this act; but, whenever such position becomes vacant, the rate of basic compensation of any individual subsequently appointed to such position shall be fixed in accordance with this act.

"(b) Each officer or employee subject to this act—

"(1) who, during the period beginning on July 1, 1954, and ending immediately prior to the date of enactment of this section continuously held a position (A) which was in any grade of a basic compensation schedule of this act (other than grade 16, 17, or 18 of the General Schedule) and (B) which was placed, at any time during such period, in a lower grade of such schedule under one or more reclassifications of such position pursuant to this act;

"(2) who holds such position on the date of enactment of this section;

"(3) who has held such position for a continuous period of not less than 2 years ending immediately prior to the date of enactment of this section; and

"(4) whose performance of the work of such position at all times during such period of 2 years specified in paragraph (3) of this subsection and also on the date of enactment of this section was satisfactory or better than satisfactory, shall be granted, effective as of the first day of the first pay period which begins after the date of enactment of this section (if he continues to hold such position on such first day of such first pay period), the rate of basic compensation to which he was entitled immediately prior to such reclassification of his position (or, in the case of more than one reclassification of such position, the date of the first of any such reclassifications), including any increases in such rate of basic compensation provided by law at any time while such officer or employee is in such position, until (i) he leaves such position or (ii) he is entitled to receive basic compensation at a higher rate by reason of the operation of this act; but, whenever such position becomes vacant, the rate of basic compensation of any individual subsequently appointed to such position shall be fixed in accordance with this act. No officer or employee shall be entitled by reason of this subsection to basic compensation for any period prior to the first day of the first pay period which begins after the date of enactment of this section."

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, a second will be considered as ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. LESINSKI].

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, this legislation provides generally that any classified employee who has performed 2 years or more of satisfactory service in his position will continue to receive his same salary if his position is placed in a lower grade under the reclassification provisions of that act.

This legislation will apply to classified employees on the rolls on date of enactment whose positions were downgraded between July 1, 1954, and date of enactment, as well as to any classified employee whose position is downgraded later, provided the other tests are met.

This "salary savings" protection will extend to the employee until he leaves the position or becomes entitled to a higher salary by operation of law. When he vacates the position, any subsequent appointee will receive the salary of the position in the lower grade to which the position has been reclassified.

There will be no retroactive payment of compensation under this legislation. Nor will an employee whose salary is protected when his position is reduced to a lower grade receive any step increases in the grade from which the position was reduced.

According to the Civil Service Commission, approximately 11,000 positions have been reduced in grade under the Classification Act, but a proportion of the incumbents suffered no loss in salary due to, first, being eligible for the same or slightly higher rates in the lower grades; or, second, transfers to other positions at their old grade. However, witnesses testified before our committee that several thousand employees have suffered salary losses ranging from $100 to $500—and in some instances more—a year. The Civil Service Commission has issued regulations designed to partially remedy this situation. In the judgment of the committee these regulations are inadequate; they provide only partial and temporary relief.

This legislation is essential to correct existing inequities and to prevent further inequities in the future. Our committee unanimously approved this bill, and I earnestly hope that, in justice to our Federal employees who through no fault of their own have suffered substantial salary losses, it will be approved by this House.

Mr. BECKER. Mr. Speaker, I desire wholeheartedly to join with my colleague in support of H. R. 3255. This is the same bill that I introduced in the 83d Congress and again this year. This bill will correct one of the greatest injustices to Federal employees. It will not only correct the injustices, but it will also prevent a great deal of distress amongst the lower grade of classified employees. It is true that the Civil Service Commission audits the job classifications, however, a much shorter period of time should be required. There is no reason why a person classified and put to work, and remaining in that position for a period of 2 years, should not be able to feel secure. American citizens in every walk of life have a right to anticipate that, when properly performing the functions assigned to them faithfully and well, they can look forward to the upward steps to higher grades.

I am certain that the Members of Congress, after this bill passes, can go home feeling somewhat happier by this action. This action is long past due, but at least this action prevents further injustice.

I am happy to have participated in the passage of this bill.

Mrs. KELLY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I, too, support H. R. 3255 which will correct a serious injustice to our loyal civil servants. So many of my constituents were the victims of downgrading in their civil-service positions that I was prompted to introduce similar legislation early this year. My bill, H. R. 5887, is very similar to the one introduced by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. LESINSKI] which the House considered favorably last week. The only difference is that my measure included those persons who had held their jobs for 1 year while H. R. 3255 pertains to those employees with not less than 2 years of service.

I commend my colleague from Michigan for the excellent presentation of this legislation. Every employee, whether in the Government or in private industry, can do a much better job when he has a feeling of security in his position. On the other hand, an employer—in this case the Federal Government—has an obligation to its employees.

I have been impressed with the number of letters I have received from my constituents on this subject. In many cases, they have held a certain grade for 4 or 5 years, or even longer. A classification survey occurs and a decision is reached that their duties no longer warrant the grade they are holding. Or, after several years in a position of a certain grade, the employee is informed that the agency had improperly placed his position in a higher grade. Assuming this contention is accurate, it is difficult to understand how the failure of the agency to properly classify the position should be borne by the employee. If the agency has failed to apply the classification standards developed in the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, the employee should not be made to suffer a monetary loss.

Very recently, Congress approved a much needed salary increase for Federal classified workers. In those instances where jobs have been downgraded in the past several months, the effect of the salary increase has been nullified in whole or in part by the loss of pay resulting from the reduction in grade. I am most gratified that the House has passed H. R. 3255 to correct this situation this year.

The SPEAKER. The Chair understands the gentleman from Iowa does not desire to use time on this bill.

Mr. GROSS. That is right.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Tennessee that the rules be suspended and the bill be passed.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

The title of the bill was amended so as to read: "A bill to amend the Classification Act of 1949 to preserve in certain cases the rates of basic compensation of officers and employees whose positions are placed in lower grades by virtue of reclassification actions under such act, and for other purposes."

SETTLEMENT OF TEXAS CITY, TEX., DISASTER CLAIMS

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (S. 1077) to provide for settlement of claims for damages resulting from the disaster which occurred at Texas City, Tex., on April 16 and 17, 1947, as amended.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That while denying any equitable or legal responsibility on the part of the United States, but for compassionate reasons, and as a gratuity, it is the intention of the Congress to make payment on behalf of those persons who suffered death, personal injury, and property losses as a result of the explosions and fires at Texas City, Tex., on April 16 and 17, 1947.

SEC. 2. The Secretary of the Army or such persons as he may designate shall investigate and settle claims against the United States for death, personal injury, and property losses proximately resulting from the disaster at Texas City, Tex., on April 16 and 17, 1947, commonly referred to as the Texas City disaster.

SEC. 3. (a) Claimants shall submit their claims in writing to the Secretary of the Army, under such rules as he prescribes, within 180 days after the enactment of this act.

No claim shall be entertained by the Secretary of the Army unless it shall appear to his satisfaction that such claim was a part of a civil action filed against the United States in a United States district court prior to April 25, 1950, except that, for good cause, the Secretary may waive the limitation date of April 25, 1950, where it is shown that claimant, by reason of infancy, insanity, or other legal reason, was unable to bring such civil action.

(b) The Secretary of the Army shall promulgate and publish rules of procedure for handling the claims referred to in section 2 within 60 days after the date of enactment of this act.

He shall determine and fix the amount of awards, if any, in each claim within 12 months from the date on which the claim was submitted.

SEC. 4. Since it is the intention and purpose of this act, and of the Congress, to relieve the claimants hereunder, the Secretary of the Army shall limit himself to the determination of—

(1) whether the losses sustained resulted from the explosions and fires at Texas City on April 16 and 17, 1947;

(2) the amounts to be allowed and paid pursuant to this act; and

(3) the persons entitled to receive the same.

SEC. 5. (a) Claims for awards based on death shall be submitted only by duly authorized legal representatives. No claim under this subsection shall be approved by the Secretary of the Army in amounts in excess of $20,000.

(b) No claim for personal injuries may be approved by the Secretary of the Army in amounts in excess of $20,000.

(c) No claim for property losses may be approved by the Secretary of the Army in amounts in excess of $20,000.

SEC. 6. (a) In determining the amounts to be awarded for death, personal injury, or property losses, the Secretary of the Army shall reduce any such amount by an amount equal to the total of insurance benefits (except life insurance benefits), or other payments or settlements of any nature, previously paid with respect to such death claims, personal injury, or property loss.

(b) Payments approved by the Secretary of the Army on death, personal injury, and property loss claims, the same being gratuitous, shall not be subject to insurance subrogation claims in any respect.

(c) The Secretary of the Army shall not include in an award any amount for reimbursement to any insurance company or compensation insurance fund for loss payments made by such company or fund.

(d) No claim cognizable under this act shall be assigned or transferred.

SEC. 7. The Secretary of the Treasury shall pay out of moneys in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the claims referred to in this act in the amounts approved for payment by the Secretary of the Army.

SEC. 8. A payment made under the provisions of section 7 shall be in full settlement and discharge of all claims against the Government of the United States.

SEC. 9. The Secretary of the Army shall require assignment to the United States of any right of action against a third party arising from the death, personal injury, or property-loss claim with respect to which settlement is made.

SEC. 10. The Secretary of the Army shall, 24 months after the date of enactment of this act, transmit to the Congress—

(a) a statement of each claim submitted to the Secretary of the Army in accordance with this act which has not been settled by him, with supporting papers and a report of his findings of facts and recommendations; and

(b) a report of each claim settled by him and paid pursuant to this act. The reports shall contain a brief statement concerning the character and justice of each claim, the amount claimed, and the amount approved and paid.

SEC. 11. Attorney and agent fees shall be paid out of the awards hereunder. No attorney or agent on account of services rendered in connection with each claim shall receive in excess of 10 percent of the amount paid, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding.

Whoever violates the provisions of this act shall be fined a sum not to exceed $5,000.

SEC. 12. If any particular provision of this act or the application thereof to any person or circumstance is held invalid, the remainder of the act shall not be affected thereby.

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded?

Mr. MILLER of New York. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that a second be considered as ordered.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this bill, S. 1077, as amended by the committee, is to compensate to a limited extent those persons, or their survivors, who suffered death, personal injury and property losses as a result of the explosions and fires at Texas City, Tex., on April 16 and 17, 1947, commonly known as the Texas City disaster.

In 1947 a man-made disaster occurred in Texas City, Texas, of almost unbelievable proportions. Loaded bags of ammonium nitrate fertilizer—called FGAN—stowed for overseas shipment in the holds of two ships at the docks in that city blew up. The shipment was destined for France, as part of the United States Government's foreign aid program to help the war-ravaged areas and famine-stricken peoples overseas. Over 570 persons suffered violent death in that disaster, and about 3,500 more were injured and suffered either delayed death or mental and physical anguish attendant upon months of hospital confinement and medical care. In addition, approximately 1,000 residences, industrial plants and other buildings were either totally destroyed, or suffered major structural damage. Damage to these private properties ran into millions of dollars.

After the disaster court actions were instituted in the Federal courts in Texas under the Tort Claims Act by some 8,000 claimants.

After a trial of the issues, the lower Federal district court found the Government wholly responsible for this disaster in that the Federal Government negligently produced, shipped, and distributed this inherently dangerous fertilizer which blew up at Texas City. On appeal, however, both the circuit court of appeals and the Supreme Court reversed the decision of the lower district court on the grounds that the Government was performing a discretionary function and that therefore it

could not be sued under the Tort Claims Act.

In the 83d Congress our colleague, Congressman CLARK THOMPSON, who represents that particular area of Texas, introduced House Resolution 296, which was adopted by the House and which directed the Judiciary Committee to make a complete investigation and study of the disaster at Texas City.

Accordingly, a special committee was appointed, of which I was a member, and it proceeded to Galveston and Texas City, where 3 days of hearings were held. The members of the special committee not only heard some of the claimants and their lawyers, but we examined the devastation caused by the explosions, which virtually leveled the city of Texas City, Tex. In addition, we met and talked with the people who suffered serious injury, some of whom suffered the loss of an arm or a leg. The committee could not help but be deeply impressed by the stories of hardship and sorrow which these people suffered, and it is most important to note, and I therefore wish to deeply impress upon the minds of the Members of this Congress, that these people were innocent victims of the disaster. Regardless of who may or may not have been responsible for this catastrophe, the cold, hard fact is that these people, who by act of fate were in this area at the time of the explosion, not only were unaware that such fertilizer was being shipped through their city, but because of the suddenness and force of the explosions, could not escape from them.

As a result of the special subcommittee's study, H. R. 9785 was introduced in the 83d Congress, and passed by the House. Briefly, that bill conferred jurisdiction on the Army to investigate these claims and put a monetary limit of $10,000 on death claims, and a 50-percent limitation on subrogation claims. The Senate amended the bill, however, raising the limit on death claims to $20,000 and eliminating insurance subrogation claims. However, because of the lateness of the hour, no conferees were appointed to iron out the differences between the Senate and House versions of that bill, and it died in the 83d Congress.

The same legislation was introduced in both Houses this Congress, and since the Senate passed its bill first, the House Committee laid its own bill aside and directed its attention to S. 1077, which is presently before us. This committee had amended the bill by, in effect, substituting a clean bill. The important provisions of the committee amendments are four:

First. It denies any equitable or legal responsibility on the part of the United States Government. In providing compensation for these people, the committee amendment bases such relief on the theory that such payments are to be made in the nature of disaster relief benefits.

Second. It confers jurisdiction on the Army to settle the claims.

Third. It puts a maximum limitation of $20,000 on all claims for death, personal injury and property damage, and

Fourth. It expressly provides that no subrogated insurance claims may be recognized, under this bill.

Since the committee amendment eliminates subrogated insurance claims, and puts a limitation of $20,000 on all other claims, it is felt that the total amount which the Government is likely to pay will be substantially less than that claimed in the Federal court cases.

It may be well to mention also that the Department of Justice would not be opposed to legislation to provide relief along the lines contained in the committee amendment.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I wish to say that only recently the United States Government provided $1 million for the families of Japanese fishermen who were injured by the result of the setting off of atomic explosions by the United States Government in the Pacific ocean. The setting off of an atomic bomb is, of course, a discretionary function, and the United States Government is not legally liable for any damages which may result therefrom. The Supreme Court has held that the fertilizer which was being shipped to France as part of this Government's foreign aid was also a discretionary function. The only difference then between the atomic explosion and the Texas City explosion is that there Japanese fishermen were injured, whereas at Texas City American citizens were injured and killed. It is hard for the people in Texas to understand why the Japanese fishermen's families should be compensated for their injuries and not the people of Texas City.

I hope the House acts favorably upon this legislation, and provides some relief for these people. They were innocent victims. They did not contribute to or cause the disaster in any way; in fact, they were unaware of the fertilizer's presence in Texas City and when it exploded with such force and devastation, they were unable to escape from it.

We can never give them back their lives or their limbs which they have lost. The least this Congress can do is to provide some measure of assistance to help them in their losses.

Mr. MILLER of New York. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. HYDE].

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, this bill has more merit to it than any claim bill which has come before the Committee on the Judiciary since I have been a member of that committee. Justice, equity, and compassion, it seems to me, compel this Congress to adopt this bill. If there is anything wrong with the bill, I would say it is the restrictions that the committee placed upon it; that is, restrictions on the amount of individual recovery. For my own part, I think it is rather unconscionable to put a limit on the personal injury damages such as has been placed in this bill, but, of course, I am obliged to bow to the will of the majority of the committee in that respect.

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HYDE. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. WILLIS. Is there any doubt whatsoever in the gentleman's mind on the proposition that if this explosion had occurred and the operator had been a private corporation, the private corporation would have been liable?

Mr. HYDE. There is absolutely no doubt in my mind in that respect. As a matter of fact, I put the same question to the attorneys for the Government who appeared before our committee and testified on this bill, some of whom testified at one point in opposition to it, and they did not express any doubt in their minds, either, in that respect.

Mr. WILLIS. I might say that I am a member of the Committee on the Judiciary, too, and that is my opinion. But I think that is very significant and should be considered by the House, that had the plant been in the operation of an individual corporation, there would be no question as to where the responsibility would lie for the accident.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HYDE. I yield to the chairman of our committee.

Mr. CELLER. Is it not true also that the Committee on the Judiciary as a matter of grace rather than as a matter of law has allowed these claims; and furthermore, the charge that is made that the insurance companies would profit is unfounded; that is, the insurance companies will not profit by this bill?

Mr. HYDE. That is absolutely right. The insurance companies will not profit. I think one of the misunderstandings about claims bills before this Congress is the matter of legal liability. If there is any legal liability then claims bills would not come to Congress. They would be adjudicated in court.

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HYDE. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BRAY. The injured party has already exhausted his remedy at law, has he not?

Mr. HYDE. That is true.

Mr. BRAY. And this is not in the nature of any legal claim against the United States. It is a matter of relief according to who was responsible for the accident?

Mr. HYDE. Yes, that is right. I might say, however, that there probably would be some dispute here as to the matter of blame, but it is not a question of blame, and I shall try to explain that if I get sufficient time.

Mr. HAND. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HYDE. I yield.

Mr. HAND. Is this claim based on any negligence on the part of the Government of the United States?

Mr. HYDE. No.

Mr. HAND. It is a matter of grace?

Mr. HYDE. This is a matter of justice.

Mr. HAND. Has the committee considered a similar situation in South Amboy, N. J.?

Mr. HYDE. Not to my knowledge.

Mr. HAND. I thank the gentleman. We will see that you do.

Mr. HYDE. We will be glad to consider it.

I might say, on the question of negligence, that issue is not before the Con-

gress. However, the fact remains that the courts have said that here was a product being shipped under a Government program, and it was a highly dangerous product, which cannot be denied, because the product exploded and killed over 560 people and injured over 3,000. As a matter of fact, the Supreme Court in that connection said this:

> Following the disaster, of course, no one could fail to be impressed with the blunt fact that FGAN would explode.

In a dissenting opinion, the Court, on a matter of fact—this is not a question of opinion, now, but a matter of fact—said:

> In addition, there was a considerable history over a period of years of unexplained fires and explosions involving such ammonium nitrate.

So you have a dangerous product, dangerously explosive, being shipped under a Government program and exploding in this little city of Texas City. It did all of this damage. To my mind it cannot be distinguished in any manner whatsoever from the Port Chicago disaster where an ammunition ship exploded and this Congress voted to pay claims in that case.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BROOKS].

Mr. BROOKS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I am strongly in favor of the Forrester Texas City relief bill, S. 1077, as amended by the House Judiciary Committee, which grants $20,000 maximum compensation each for death, personal injuries, and property losses, and I respectfully urge its passage at this time.

In April 1947, two explosions originating in ships docked and loaded at Texas City, Tex., rocked the entire community and surrounding area. Five hundred and seventy persons were killed and an estimated 3,500 persons were injured. The entire volunteer fire department of more than 40 members was completely wiped out as the second ship exploded while the volunteers were fighting the first blaze. And, of course, along with the tragic loss of life and injury to the citizens of Texas City, was the tremendous loss of homes and property.

Under the United States Constitution setting up our courts, this matter was tried and neither the first circuit court of appeals nor the Supreme Court of the United States has held that any of the victims of the Texas City explosions has any legally established claim for compensation from the United States Government.

FORRESTER BILL COVERS 99 PERCENT OF CLAIMS

Despite this—while denying any equitable or legal responsibility on the part of the United States Government—for compassionate reasons, to alleviate hardship, and in a genuine effort to help the unfortunate victims of these tragic explosions, I wholeheartedly endorse and support the House Judiciary substitute for S. 1077, drafted by Hon. E. L. FORRESTER, of Georgia. The Forrester substitute provides for a maximum award of $20,000 each for death claims, for personal-injury claims, and for property damage.

Since the Forrester substitute was adopted by the House committee, a former colleague of mine in the Texas Legislature who represents, as an attorney, a great many of the Texas City claimants, called to talk with me. This Texas City attorney told me that the Forrester substitute would cover 99 percent of the individual Texas City claimants. This bill, as amended, is an honorable bill we can all support and which would bring long-overdue compensation for the hundreds of Texas City citizens killed and maimed and whose property was damaged in the tragic 1947 explosions.

The Forrester substitute does not, first, recognize or assume the equitable and compassionate responsibility of the United States Government for the damages sustained by reason of these explosions and fires. Insurance companies have paid out $41.2 million in claims awarded to policyholders who suffered losses at Texas City. Mr. Bryan, attorney for proponents of S. 1077, in August 1954 before a Senate Judiciary subcommittee said: "Once you waive immunity, subrogation can result."

Assuming responsibility on the part of the Government would invite these insurance companies to shift the cost of these claims to the American taxpayer, while policyholders have since 1947 already paid premiums on adjusted rates to compensate for these losses. If Uncle Sam has to cover the losses, why does not Uncle Sam collect the premiums?

The Forrester substitute does not, second, allow unlimited claims on losses at Texas City and enable large corporations which were operating in the area in 1947 to collect up to $72.8 million from the Treasury. Testimony before special House and Senate subcommittees has revealed that 6 corporations have claims on file totaling $72.8 million to compensate for their losses. Further testimony maintains that this total might be scaled down to about $43 million. That is still a pretty healthy windfall at our expense when the highest Federal courts have not held that there is any legal liability on the part of the Federal Government for this disaster.

As you gentlemen well know, time is of primary consideration in this instance, both because the first session of the 84th Congress is drawing to a close, and because the victims of the Texas City disaster are long overdue this consideration by their Government. However, in view of the approximately $38,800,000 maximum payable under this bill as amended, and the desirability for the multimillion dollar revision by this House amendment to the Senate bill, I would respectfully ask favorable consideration of this bill as amended by the House Judiciary Committee granting desperately needed compensation directly to the people who suffered injury, loss of property and for deaths in the catastrophe of April 16 and 17, 1947.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROOKS of Texas. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. I note what was said by the gentleman, and also what was said in the report, that you put a limitation on a death of $20,000. I can understand going over the normal amount paid under compensation laws in the States for injuries, to people who are still living. My question is, How is it that you allow $20,000 for a death claim here when we allow only $10,000 in the case of a soldier boy who is shot?

Mr. BROOKS of Texas. That is not exactly the same proposition. Some of the people involved here, quite frankly, were engineers, men whose life expectancy might have been 30 more years, who might have had an earning capacity of $7,000 or $8,000 or possibly $10,000 a year. The $20,000 death claim would not be unusual under the civilian laws applicable in not only Texas but many States.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROOKS of Texas. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. CELLER. This does not mean $20,000 to the family or estate of each victim, it is a maximum that may be reduced by those who are going to parcel out the damages.

Mr. BROOKS of Texas. That is exactly right.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROOKS of Texas. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. Where there is pain and suffering the amount could be unlimited in any State court.

Mr. BROOKS of Texas. I think that is true.

Mr. CELLER. Is it not true that this House passed a similar bill in the last Congress?

Mr. BROOKS of Texas. Yes; we passed a similar bill in the last Congress. I hope we get this one passed in this Congress without further difficulty.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROOKS of Texas. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. What is the overall cost of the bill, can the gentleman say?

Mr. BROOKS of Texas. The overall cost of the bill varies. The estimates run from $38 million for this particular bill on up. It is difficult to say how high you could go under the original bill as submitted, but under the Forrester bill I think $38 million would be a conservative estimate of what the cost might be.

Mr. MILLER of New York. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I think I have voted against every handout bill that has been before me since I have been in the Congress, yet I wholeheartedly endorse and support this bill and the principles underlying it. I know of no case in my experience where there has been such a manifestation of recklessness, of negligence, of irresponsibility as was manifested by the Government of the United States in connection with this matter.

This case has a record of over 20,000 pages through the courts, and more before our committee.

The production of this ammonium nitrate was solely and wholly within the jurisdiction of the Government. It made it in its ordnance plant. It labeled it

as a fertilizer. It shipped it in interstate commerce at rates which are less than the rates which would be charged by the railroads for explosives. It was unloaded in Texas City and put into the ship by longshoremen who were paid at rates less than they would have been paid for loading explosives. When these bags were loaded, the ordnance people were called on the telephone and asked if there was anything dangerous in this fertilizer, and the ordnance people informed the people at the warehouse there was nothing dangerous in this product at all. When it was stored in the hold it was treated by steam, which is the very thing you would not do if it was an explosive. It is wholly and solely the responsibility of the Government of the United States that this explosion occurred.

We have indemnified the people of Japan who were injured as the result of the explosion of the atom bombs. We have given relief to people who have suffered as the result of tornadoes. We had claims commissions running all over the world during the war indemnifying our allies for claims arising out of war damage that had no basis in negligence at all.

No court has ever said the Government was not negligent in this case. The only court that found, found that the Government of the United States was negligent, and was responsible. The appellate courts refused to entertain the cases simply because they said they did not come within the purview of the Tort Claims Act, a construction of the statute such as we had the other day with the gas bill in connection with the Supreme Court decision.

The fact remains, however, that these people never have had their day in court because the court said, "We cannot consider them, they do not come within the purview of the Tort Claims Act." But they have never said the Government was not negligent or the Government was not responsible. Only because of this cloak of immunity have we not paid these people who suffered injury, death, and property damage only as a result of the acts of negligence of this Government.

This is not a bill of charity. This is a bill of justice. It is a bill which gives a minimum of justice and not a maximum of justice.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of New York. I yield.

Mr. CELLER. Did we not establish a precedent for a bill of this character when we passed the so-called Port Chicago-California explosion bill?

Mr. MILLER of New York. It is exactly the same thing. We treated the people in the Port Chicago case just as we are attempting to treat the people of Texas City at the present time.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of New York. I yield.

Mr. McCORMACK. I understand also under this bill it is so worded that there will be no reimbursement of any insurance company.

Mr. MILLER of New York. There are no subrogated claims here. No insurance company and no corporations are going to get anything. Just the widows and orphans and those who were injured by this explosion caused by the acts of our agents, the agents of the Government of the United States, will get anything. I say it was a record of negligence and incompetency which caused this explosion.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. MILLER of New York. I yield.

Mr. CELLER. Is it not true also that we left the jurisdiction with the Secretary for the Army to settle these claims and we were loathe to put the claims in the United States district courts because of the heavily cluttered up calendars of those courts that if we superimpose on the work of the judges the handling of these claims, there would be the necessity of appointing masters and auditors and referees and that it would be more expeditious to let the Department of Defense handle these claims?

Mr. MILLER of New York. That is true. The figures involved here are not final, but whatever it is, it is justice. We do justice for everyone else and we should do justice for the people here in our own country.

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. FORRESTER].

Mr. FORRESTER. Mr. Speaker, the bill we are presently considering is the substitute that I offered in our committee. I think it well that you know a little something about the background of this legislation. When this bill came from the other body, they had a provision in their bill, and I would like some of the gentlemen who asked questions a few moments ago to listen especially—they had a provision in the bill holding that the Government of the United States was responsible for the disaster, in other words, legally responsible. In addition to that, they had the sky as the limit as to the recovery for death, personal injuries, and property damage. It just so happens that the Circuit Court of Appeals of the United States and the United States Supreme Court disagreed with their theory of responsibility. The Supreme Court and the Court of Appeals held that this did not come within the Tort Claims Act. Of course, that is completely correct. However, I part company with anyone who says that the courts did not go into the facts and rule against the claimants on the facts also. At last 6 of 7 courts of appeals judges held that there was no negligence or liability on the part of the United States Government.

Now, that appealed to me and I know it appeals to you, and it appealed strongly to a great majority of the members of the House Committee on the Judiciary who, with the exception of myself, are splendid lawyers. They just simply would not go on record as holding the Government legally responsible. We were not going to do that because of these reasons. All of this fertilizer program was occasioned by Executive order and by authority from the Congress. The plaintiffs in their cases, and in all their arguments, admit that never at any time did any employees of the Government of the United States deviate from their orders and their instructions. If that can be the basis of negligence and legal liability, then the judge of a court by the same token is liable for an erroneous decision. If the fire department goes out and tries to put out a fire in your house and fails to put out the fire, then you can sue the fire department and the city for damages.

Another objection we had to that was that if you say, as the Senate was trying to say, that there was legal responsibility—do not kid TIC FORRESTER, do not kid anybody else—if you say that there is no way on earth to shut out insurance companies, the law is absolutely plain. If anybody is entitled to recover legally then it is absurd to say that you would give John Jones a certain thing but you must deny the same to Bill Smith. It simply does not make good sense.

We put in this bill, this substitute, that there is no legal liability upon this Government.

Proceeding from that standpoint I say that instead of this bill's being unconscionable as described, I say it is a most reasonable bill. It shows a compassionate heart and a compassionate spirit upon the part of this House. I am the man who suggested it.

I will tell you now, the only way any bill could come out of this committee was on this basis.

I want to express my thanks for the assistance of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BROOKS], who, I want to tell you, is greatly responsible for the bringing of this bill here today. It was Mr. BROOKS who persuaded us to raise the recovery ceilings to $20,000 instead of $15,000. Without him there would be no bill.

The only way that you can lock up insurance companies, the only way that you can solve this question that there is no legal liability is to pass this bill. I am only telling you that I want the Senate to stay with it. If they do not stay with it I want the conferees to know that you mean for them to stay with it.

Mr MILLER of New York. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Missouri for a consent request.

Mr SHORT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that following the remarks I made in the Committee of the Whole this afternoon I may include an editorial which appeared in the last Sunday's edition of the Joplin Globe.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. MILLER of New York. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BOYLE], a member of the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. BOYLE. Mr. Speaker, I regret that a matter of this consequence comes up at this late hour. However, I can assure everybody present here that the matter received studied and careful consideration in the Judiciary Committee.

I probably am as familiar with this record as anybody in this Congress, and

I want to tell you it was a very tough and difficult problem. I want to commend all of my colleagues on the Judiciary Committee for their painstaking approach to this situation.

This is a simple matter as it is resolved in this bill. I am one who with the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. FORRESTER] feels that there is no legal liability as far as paying these claims is concerned.

Mr. FORRESTER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOYLE. I yield.

Mr. FORRESTER. The great majority of the members of the Committee on the Judiciary also felt that way and insisted on that. Is not that true?

Mr. BOYLE. That is a fact. This is a bill that is a result of true, honest compromise. The committee felt that the judiciary being the highest court in the land, being a court of conscience, recognized that that which ought to be done should be done. We feel that in this bill we have done that; we feel we have satisfield the conscience of this Congress, that this was a disaster, that a lot of people were killed and injured and a lot of property damaged as a result of this occurrence.

We have spelled out categorically so that there will not be any possible question of legal liability that this is a gratuity, this is merely a contribution, and that the door should not be left open for any subrogated claims to come in on the basis that there was a lack of real honest and fair treatment.

I submit that this bill is a law of conscience and that there is a lot of tender charity in it, and I recommend, Mr. Speaker, that it be passed.

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMPSON], author of the House bill.

Mr. THOMPSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, there is very little more to be said. I express deep gratitude to the gentlemen who have preceded me and who have presented the case well and who have spent many hours trying to do justice to my people.

There is only one piece of information I should like to give you. This comes from the studied opinion of the attorneys who have been with the case for the past 8 years. It deals with the amount that may be paid under the present bill. It is estimated the death claims will not be over $5 million, it is estimated that personal injury claims will be $1½ million and not over that and it is estimated that property damage will not be over $500,000, which makes a total of $7 million. That is a very modest sum.

Mr. DAWSON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMPSON of Texas. I yield to the gentleman from Utah.

Mr. DAWSON of Utah. Do any of the attorneys participate in these funds that might be appropriated?

Mr. THOMPSON of Texas. The attorneys are paid fees, yes, of course.

Mr. Speaker, to bring the Texas City disaster legislation into proper focus, let us first review the history of the case. There are some points which need not be discussed because, so far as I know, everyone who has paid any attention to the case concedes that they are true.

First, we all agree that the explosions were caused by a concoction labeled fertilizer grade ammonium nitrate. There was no question that the product was manufactured by and for the United States Government in Army ordnance plants, that it was under Government control at all times, and that it was being shipped to Europe as a part of our foreign-aid program.

I shall not discuss the question of negligence because for the present consideration of the House, it is not material. The fact that the product which exploded was something made by and under the control of the United States Government makes the people who were victims of the explosion as entitled to remuneration as were the victims of the Port Chicago explosion during the war.

In that case, an ammunition ship blew up in the harbor doing great damage to Port Chicago and its people. That case was handled in a manner similar to that which has been presented to you today. The Texas City case has one important difference. Between the Port Chicago explosion and the Texas City explosion, the Congress had passed what is known as the Federal Tort Claims Act.

The victims filed their claims in the Federal district court, which held in favor of the claimants. It was appealed and finally the Supreme Court, on a 4 to 3 decision, held that the Tort Claims Act did not apply. Three of the Justices held that it did. The question of responsibility was not decided by the Supreme Court. They merely said that the law did not apply.

When this decision was rendered in 1953, I discussed the matter at considerable length with the then chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. REED] and with other distinguished members of that committee. We concluded that since there was, evidently, reason to believe that the Government was responsible, the people should still have a forum in which to seek redress; and that since the Supreme Court had held that the Tort Claims Act did not apply, there remained but one such forum and that was the Congress.

The prospect of filing several thousand private claims did not appeal to me and because of the magnitude of the case, financially and otherwise, it seemed best to first establish whether or not the Government was responsible.

To accomplish this, I introduced House Resolution 296 in June of 1953. It provided that the Committee on Judiciary or a subcommittee thereof should make a full and complete investigation and study of the merits, if any, of all claims against the United States resulting from the explosions. It further provided that that committee should make recommendations as to subsequent procedure.

After extensive hearings in Texas City, Galveston, and Washington, that committee reported that the Government was responsible and recommended passage of legislation to settle the claims. In June of the following year, this House passed such legislation without a dissenting vote. It was late in the session and although the Senate passed similar legislation, it differed somewhat from the House measure and there was not sufficient time to compose the differences before adjournment. For that reason, the Texas City claimants come back to this Congress with exactly the same merits as have been acted upon favorably in both bodies.

The bill which is before you today provides for a very small settlement. It provides for a limit on death claims, claims for personal injury, and for property damage of $20,000. If the figures remain unchanged, and so far as I am concerned I am not going to suggest that they be amended here today, the total outlay should not exceed $5 million for death claims, $1,500,000 for personal injury, and $500,000 for uninsured damage to property.

I point out to you, however, that while the majority of the death claims will fall well below the $20,000 limit and while most of the injury claims would also come well within it, there are some of the latter which ought to be compensated more liberally. Fathers who were injured so seriously that they cannot earn a livelihood, men with legs blown off, cases like that ought to have more than $20,000 compensation.

I also point out that these death and injury claims should not be subject to deductions of amounts received from insurance companies. I realize the good intention of the sponsors of the substitute to the Senate measure, which is under consideration today. I agreed with them when they insisted on leaving subrogated claims out of the bill entirely.

However, if the limits now in the bill prevail, some very meritorious corporations will be shut out. One of these is the city of Texas City which suffered a loss of $231,000. They lost their entire volunteer fire department which was on the dock fighting the fire when the explosion occurred. Much of their street and sewer system was destroyed and had to be rebuilt. Public buildings were seriously damaged. Possibly in conference with the other body, which has passed unanimously a more liberal bill, these payments may be liberalized.

Under the present bill, the total claims should not be more than $7 million—$5 million for death claims, $1,500,000 for personal injury, and $500,000 for uninsured damage to property.

I urge passage of the bill and I trust that the conference committee will act promptly and grant this meager compensation to my people who have waited 8 years for their Government to pay its just debt.

The SPEAKER. The question is on suspending the rules and passing the bill.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The title was amended so as to read: "An act to provide for settlement of claims resulting from the disaster which occurred at Texas City, Tex., on April 16 and 17, 1947."

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may

have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (S. 1077) to provide for settlement of claims for damages resulting from the disaster which occurred at Texas City, Tex., on April 16 and 17, 1947, with House amendment thereto, insist on the House amendment and ask for a conference with the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. CELLER, LANE, FORRESTER, MILLER of New York, and HYDE.

FEDERAL EXECUTIVE PAY ACT OF 1955

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H. R. 7619) 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.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That this act may be cited as the "Federal Executives Pay Act of 1955."

TITLE I—BASIC COMPENSATION FOR HEADS OF EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS AND OTHER FEDERAL OFFICIALS

SEC. 101. The annual rate of basic compensation of the head of each executive department and of the Secretary of Defense shall be $25,000.

SEC. 102. The annual rate of basic compensation of the Deputy Secretary of Defense, of the Under Secretary of State, of the Director, Office of Defense Mobilization, of the Comptroller General of the United States, and of the Director of the Bureau of the Budget shall be $22,500.

SEC. 103. The annual rate of basic compensation of the Secretary of the Army, of the Secretary of the Navy, of the Secretary of the Air Force, of the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, Department of Justice, and of the Director of Central Intelligence shall be $22,000.

SEC. 104. Section 105 of title 3 of the United States Code is amended to read as follows:

"Compensation of secretaries and executive, administrative, and staff assistants to President

"§ 105. The President is authorized to fix the compensation of the six administrative assistants authorized to be appointed under section 106 of this title, of the Executive Secretary of the National Security Council, and of five other secretaries or other immediate staff assistants in the White House Office, as follows: 2 at rates not exceeding $22,500 per annum, 3 at rates not exceeding $21,000 per annum, and 7 at rates not exceeding $19,000 per annum."

SEC. 105. The annual rate of basic compensation for each of the offices or positions listed in this section shall be $21,000, as follows:

(1) Each Under Secretary of an executive department (other than the Department of State);

(2) The Deputy Postmaster General;

(3) The Administrator of Veterans' Affairs;

(4) The Administrator of General Services;

(5) The Administrator of the Housing and Home Finance Agency;

(6) The Director of the International Cooperation Administration;

(7) The Deputy Director of the Office of Defense Mobilization;

(8) The Administrator of the Federal Civil Defense Administration;

(9) The Chairman of the Renegotiation Board;

(10) The Director of the United States Information Agency;

(11) The President of the Export-Import Bank of Washington;

(12) The Governor of the Farm Credit Administration;

(13) The Chairman of the Council of Economic Advisers;

(14) The Associate Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, Department of Justice.

SEC. 106. The annual rate of basic compensation for each of the offices or positions listed in this section shall be $20,000, as follows:

(1) The Assistant Comptroller General of the United States;

(2) The Deputy Director of the Bureau of the Budget;

(3) The Under Secretary of the Army;

(4) The Under Secretary of the Navy;

(5) The Under Secretary of the Air Force;

(6) The Deputy Administrator of Veterans' Affairs;

(7) The Director of the Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service;

(8) The Chairman of the United States Civil Service Commission;

(9) Each member (other than the Chairman) of the Council of Economic Advisers;

(10) Each member of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System;

(11) Each member of the Board of Directors of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation;

(12) The Comptroller of the Currency;

(13) Each Deputy Under Secretary of the Department of State;

(14) The First Vice President of the Export-Import Bank of Washington;

(15) The Chairman of the Federal Maritime Board, Department of Commerce;

(16) The Deputy Director of the United States Information Agency;

(17) The Deputy Administrator of the Federal Civil Defense Administration;

(18) The Deputy Director of the International Cooperation Administration;

(19) The Deputy Director of Central Intelligence.

SEC. 107. (a) The annual rate of basic compensation for each of the offices or positions listed in this section shall be $19,000, as follows:

(1) The Assistant to the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, Department of Justice;

(2) Each Assistant Secretary of an executive department;

(3) Each Assistant Postmaster General;

(4) The Fiscal Assistant Secretary of the Treasury;

(5) The Director of the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics;

(6) Each member of the Civil Aeronautics Board;

(7) Each member of the Federal Communications Commission;

(8) Each member of the Federal Power Commission;

(9) Each member of the Federal Trade Commission;

(10) Each member of the Interstate Commerce Commission;

(11) Each member of the National Labor Relations Board;

(12) Each member of the National Mediation Board;

(13) Each member of the Railroad Retirement Board;

(14) Each member of the Securities and Exchange Commission;

(15) Each member of the Board of Directors of the Tennessee Valley Authority;

(16) Each member (other than the Chairman) of the United States Civil Service Commission;

(17) Each member of the United States Tariff Commission;

(18) The General Counsel of the National Labor Relations Board;

(19) The Deputy Administrator of General Services;

(20) The Archivist of the United States;

(21) The Commissioner of Internal Revenue;

(22) The Commissioner of Immigration and Naturalization;

(23) The Commissioner of Public Roads;

(24) The Administrator of Civil Aeronautics;

(25) The Administrator of the Rural Electrification Administration;

(26) The Counselor of the Department of State;

(27) The Governor of Alaska;

(28) The Governor of Hawaii;

(29) The Governor of the Virgin Islands;

(30) The Governor of the Canal Zone;

(31) The Public Printer;

(32) The Librarian of Congress;

(33) The Architect of the Capitol;

(34) The President of the Federal National Mortgage Association, Housing and Home Finance Agency;

(35) The Deputy Administrator of the Housing and Home Finance Agency;

(36) Each member of the Home Loan Bank Board, Housing and Home Finance Agency;

(37) The Public Housing Commissioner, Housing and Home Finance Agency;

(38) The Federal Housing Commissioner, Housing and Home Finance Agency;

(39) Each Assistant Secretary of the Army;

(40) Each Assistant Secretary of the Navy;

(41) Each Assistant Secretary of the Air Force;

(42) The Special Assistant to the Secretary (Health and Medical Affairs), Department of Health, Education, and Welfare;

(43) The Chairman of the Military Liaison Committee to the Atomic Energy Commission, Department of Defense;

(44) The Administrator, Bureau of Security and Consular Affairs, Department of State;

(45) Each member of the Board of Directors of the Export-Import Bank of Washington;

(46) Each member of the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission of the United States;

(47) Each member (other than the Chairman) of the Federal Maritime Board, Department of Commerce;

(48) Each Assistant Director of the Bureau of the Budget;

(49) Each member (other than the Chairman) of the Renegotiation Board;

(50) The Administrator, Wage and Hour and Public Contracts Divisions, Department of Labor;

(51) The Director of the National Science Foundation;

(52) Each member of the Subversive Activities Control Board;

(53) The Solicitor, General Counsel, Legal Adviser, or other chief legal officer of each executive department (excluding the Department of Justice);

(54) The 10 assistant directors, International Cooperation Administration, designated under section 1 (d) of Reorganization Plan No. 7 of 1953 and section 527 (b) of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, respectively;

(55) The Administrator of the St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation;

(56) The Administrator of the Small Business Administration.

(b) The first sentence of section 603 of title 28 of the United States Code (relating to the annual compensation of the Director of the Administrative Office of the United

States Courts) is amended to read as follows: "The Director shall receive a salary of $19,000 a year."

SEC. 108. The annual rate of basic compensation for each of the offices or positions listed in this section shall be $17,500, as follows:

(1) The Associate Director of the Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service;

(2) The Director of Selective Service;

(3) Each Commissioner of the Indian Claims Commission;

(4) Each Commissioner of the United States Court of Claims;

(5) The Assistant Architect of the Capitol;

(6) The Chief Assistant Librarian of Congress;

(7) The Deputy Public Printer.

SEC. 109. The annual rate of basic compensation for each of the offices or position listed in this section shall be $17,000, as follows:

(1) The Treasurer of the United States;

(2) The Commissioner, Federal Supply Service, General Services Administration;

(3) The Director of the Bureau of Prisons, Department of Justice;

(4) The Commissioner, Public Buildings Service, General Services Administration;

(5) The Commissioner of Social Security, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare;

(6) The Commissioner of Reclamation, Department of the Interior;

(7) The Commissioner of Customs, Department of the Treasury;

(8) The Commissioner of Narcotics, Department of the Treasury;

(9) The Administrator, Bonneville Power Administration;

(10) The Deputy Administrator of the St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation;

(11) The Director, Division of Slum Clearance and Urban Redevelopment, Housing and Home Finance Agency;

(12) The Director of Housing Research, Housing and Home Finance Agency;

(13) Each Deputy Administrator, Small Business Administration.

SEC. 110. Except as otherwise specifically provided in this title, the chairman or other head of each independent board or commission in the executive branch shall receive, during the period of his service as chairman or other head of such board or commission, annual basic compensation at a rate which is $500 more than the annual rate of basic compensation prescribed by this title for the other members of such board or commission.

TITLE II—INCREASES IN MAXIMUM LIMITATIONS ON BASIC COMPENSATION UNDER CLASSIFICATION ACT OF 1949 AND OTHER LAWS

SEC. 201. (a) The compensation schedule for the General Schedule contained in section 603 (b) of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, is amended by striking out:

Per annum rates and steps

	1	2	3	4	5
"GS–17	13,975	14,190	14,405	14,620	
GS–18	14,800"				

and inserting in lieu thereof:

"GS–17	13,975	14,190	14,405	14,620	14,835
GS–18	16,000".				

(b) The rates of basic compensation of officers and employees to whom this section applies shall be initially adjusted as follows:

(1) If the officer or employee is receiving basic compensation immediately prior to the effective date of this act at a scheduled rate of grade 17 or 18 of the General Schedule, he shall receive a rate of basic compensation at the corresponding scheduled rate in effect on and after such date;

(2) If the officer or employee, immediately prior to the effective date of this act, is in a position in grade 17 of the General Schedule and is receiving basic compensation at a rate between two scheduled rates of such grade, he shall receive a rate of basic compensation at the higher of the two corresponding rates in effect on and after such date;

(3) If the officer or employee, immediately prior to the effective date of this act, is in a position in grade 17 of the General Schedule and is receiving basic compensation at a rate which is in excess of the maximum scheduled rate of his grade as provided in this section, he shall continue to receive such higher rate of basic compensation until (A) he leaves such position, or (B) he is entitled to receive basic compensation at a higher rate by reason of the operation of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended; but when such position becomes vacant, the rate of basic compensation of any subsequent appointee thereto shall be fixed in accordance with such act, as amended.

SEC. 202. The Postal Field Service Schedule in section 301 (a) of the Postal Field Service Compensation Act of 1955 (Public Law 68, 84th Cong.) is amended by striking out:

Per annum rates and steps

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
"18	12,500	12,800	13,100	13,400	13,700	14,000	14,300
19	13,600	13,900	14,200	14,500	14,800		
20	14,800"						

and inserting in lieu thereof:

"18	12,800	13,100	13,400	13,700	14,000	14,300	14,600
19	14,000	14,300	14,600	14,900	15,200		
20	16,000".						

SEC. 203. Section 3 of the act of January 3, 1946, as amended (38 U. S. C., sec. 15b), is hereby amended as follows:

(1) The first paragraph of such section 3 as amended by paragraph (1) of the first section of the act of October 12, 1949 (63 Stat. 764), and the second and third paragraphs of subsection (b) of such section 3 as amended by paragraphs (3) and (4) of the first section of such act of October 12, 1949, are hereby redesignated as subsections "(a)", "(c)", and "(d)", respectively, of section 3 of the act of January 3, 1946;

(2) The last sentence of section 3 (b) is amended to read: "During the period of his service as such, the Chief Medical Director shall be paid a salary of $17,800 a year.";

(3) The last sentence of section 3 (c), as redesignated by paragraph (1) of this section, is amended to read: "During the period of his service as such, the Deputy Chief Medical Director shall be paid a salary of $16,800 a year."; and

(4) That portion of the first sentence of section 3 (d), as redesignated by paragraph (1) of this section, which precedes the proviso in such sentence is amended to read: "Each Assistant Chief Medical Director shall be appointed by the Administrator upon the recommendation of the Chief Medical Director and shall be paid a salary of $15,800 a year:";

SEC. 204. (a) Subsection (c) of the first section of the act of August 1, 1947, as amended (5 U. S. C., secs. 171p, 230, 476, and 626t; 50 U. S. C., sec. 158), relating to limitations on rates of basic compensation for research and development positions requiring the services of specially qualified scientific or professional personnel in the Department of Defense and in the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics, is amended (1) by striking out "$10,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "$12,500" and (2) by striking out "$15,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "$17,500."

(b) Section 208 (g) of the Public Health Service Act, as amended (42 U. S. C., sec. 210 (g)), relating to limitations on rates of basic compensation for research and development positions requiring the services of specially qualified scientific or professional personnel in the Public Health Service, is amended (1) by striking out "$10,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "$12,500" and (2) by striking out "$15,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "$17,500."

(c) Section 12 of the act of May 29, 1884, as amended (62 Stat. 198; 21 U. S. C., sec. 113a), relating to the maximum limitation on basic compensation for positions of technical experts or scientists for research and study of foot-and-mouth disease and other animal diseases, is amended by striking out "$15,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "$17,500."

(d) The amendments contained in subsections (a) and (b) of this section shall not affect the authority of the United States Civil Service Commission or the procedure for fixing the pay of individual officers or employees under the provisions of law amended by such subsections (a) and (b); except that the rate of basic compensation in effect immediately prior to the effective date of this act of any officer or employee to whom the provisions of law amended by this section apply, which is less than a basic rate of $12,500 per annum, shall be increased to such rate on such effective date.

TITLE III—GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 301. The following provisions of law are hereby repealed:

(1) The act entitled "An act to increase rates of compensation of the heads and assistant heads of executive departments and independent agencies," approved October 15, 1949 (Public Law 359, 81st Cong.; 63 Stat. 880), except section 2 (b), section 6 (b), section 6 (c), section 6 (d), and section 9 thereof;

(2) That part of the paragraph under the heading "Federal Bureau of Investigation" and under the subheading "Salaries and expenses" contained in title II (the Department of Justice Appropriation Act, 1956) of the Departments of State and Justice, the Judiciary, and related agencies Appropriation Act, 1956 (Public Law 133, 84th Cong.), which reads ": *Provided*, That the compensation of the Director of the Bureau shall be $20,000 per annum so long as the position is held by the present incumbent"; and

(3) That part of the first paragraph under the heading "National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics" contained in title I of the Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1956 (Public Law 112, 84th Cong.), which reads "one Director at not to exceed $17,500 per annum so long as the position is held by the present incumbent;".

SEC. 302. Nothing contained in this act shall be held or considered to affect the last proviso in the paragraph under the heading "Federal Prison System" and under the subheading "Salaries and Expenses, Bureau of Prisons" contained in title II (the Department of Justice Appropriation Act, 1956) of the Departments of State and Justice, the Judiciary, and related agencies Appropriation Act, 1956 (Public Law 133, 84th Cong.), which reads *"Provided further*, That hereafter the compensation of the Director of the Bureau shall be $17,500 per annum so long as

the position is held by the present incumbent."

SEC. 303. The rate of basic compensation of any officer or employee of the Federal Government which is in effect immediately prior to the effective date of this act shall not be reduced by reason of the enactment of this act.

SEC. 304. This act shall take effect at the beginning of the first pay period following the date of enactment of this act.

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that a second be considered as ordered.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, this legislation is known as the Federal executive pay bill. There are about 300 executive positions covered in this bill. The cost of it is approximately $1 million per year. There are 8 salary brackets in the bill, ranging from $25,000 to $17,000 a year.

In the beginning a proposal was sent down to me as chairman of the Committee on the Post Office and Civil Service setting forth salaries up to $27,500 for members of the Cabinet and certain other executive positions. I refused to introduce such a bill and I sent back word that I did not propose to sponsor any executive pay legislation which provided that any executive in our Government, outside of members of the Cabinet, shall be paid more than Members of Congress. So thereupon a new proposal was sent down to me as chairman of the committee.

After many, many hours of study and many conferences I introduced a bill which was not entirely the exact proposal sent down to me by the administration.

Now, this bill before you today provides that the 10 members of the Cabinet shall receive a salary of $25,000. Their present salary is $22,500, which makes an increase of only $2,500 in their salary. In the $22,500 bracket, which is our salary, there are only 7 members of the executive departments who are in this class. Outside of the members of the Cabinet, there are only seven persons in this bill who receive as much as Members of Congress. In the next bracket of $22,000 there are only 5 executives. In the next bracket of $21,000 there are 24 executives. In the next bracket of $20,000 there are 29 executives. In the bracket of $19,000 there are 190 executives. This is the largest bracket, because this bracket includes members of our various commissions and independent boards. The next bracket of $17,500 includes 19 executives and the final bracket of $17,000 includes 15 officials of our Government.

The last increase given to our executives was in the Executive Pay Act of 1949. These officials in this act have not received any increase in pay for 6 years, since 1949. Since that time there have been 2 pay bills for classified employees, one in 1951 amounting to 10 percent and another pay bill of 7.5 percent this year. Also, Congress has seen fit to increase its salary this year, and certainly we want to extend the same treatment to our executives as we do to ourselves and to our classified personnel.

I can assure you that this bill, containing about 300 positions, was prepared with much care and deliberation. The ranking minority member of the committee, the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES], and I collaborated together and held many conferences with officials who are interested, and we prepared our own bill. I certainly hope the House will go along with this bill. It is fair; it is just and reasonable and provides a very moderate increase to these officials. The pay raises in this bill are from $2,500 to $4,000. I appeal to you to support your committee.

Basically, this bill is a revision of the Executive Pay Act of 1949. The only change in a major rate in the Executive Pay Act since 1949 was an $800 increase for the group originally carried in the bill at $14,000. This was in order to correspond to the increase in the maximum for the Classification Act made in 1951. All other rates of the Executive Pay Act, that is, those at $15,000 or more a year have remained unchanged since their original establishment in 1949.

Since 1949 there have been substantial increases in pay for Federal employees generally. Public Law 201, 82d Congress, provided a 10 percent increase but not less than $300 per annum nor more than $800 per annum, in the rates of the Classification Act and related groups. Public Law 94, 84th Congress, provided a 7½ percent increase for the same groups. Substantial increases were made in the salary schedules of the postal field service by Public Law 204, 82d Congress, and Public Law 68, 84th Congress. The salary rates of Members of Congress and of Judiciary were increased effective March 1, 1955, by Public Law 9, 84th Congress.

However, there has been no general change in the levels of salary rates of heads and assistant heads of departments and agencies and related positions in the executive branch. Until recently, there has been no comprehensive approach to revising the Executive Pay Act.

In the meantime, nevertheless, there has been much separate legislation fixing salaries for executive positions outside the Executive Pay Act. Since 1949 about 20 separate acts of Congress and reorganization plans have fixed rates for about 50 comparable positions outside the Executive Pay Act; some of these are heads and assistant heads of recently created organizations.

Title I of the bill (a) increases the rates of the Executive Pay Act of 1949, and (b) brings it content up to date by eliminating references to obsolete or abolished positions and by consolidating or replacing many individual salary-fixing provisions in existing law.

Title I covers 299 positions at an annual cost of $1,115,000.

Title II increases the maximum rate for employees paid under the Classification Act. It increases GS–18 from the present rate of $14,800 to $16,000 a year. This was the only rate of the Classification Act of 1949 which was not increased by the recently approved employees salary increase. It makes a similar adjustment in the postal field-service schedules.

Also, title II contains adjustments in the pay for medical directors in the Veterans' Administration.

Section 204 of title II provides for adjustments in the salary rates of scientific and professional positions. These positions are limited in number, and the rates range from $10,000 to $15,000 a year. The new rate range would be from $12,500 to $17,500 a year.

This legislation was requested by the President in a letter to me as chairman of the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee. The President in his letter outlined the general principles which he believed should be followed in making this adjustment in executive salaries.

The President stated in his letter with respect to executive salaries that "the Cabinet rate be increased to a level of $25,000." With this benchmark as an important guide, this bill organizes the offices, positions, and rates below Cabinet level in such a way as to produce, in proper and logical relationship between responsibilities on the one hand, and salary rates on the other.

In general, the salary levels of the bill are as follows: First, the Cabinet office level set at $25,000 a year. The next is at $22,500 which includes such positions as Deputy Secretary of Defense, Director of Office of Defense Mobilization, Comptroller General, and Director of the Bureau of the Budget. At $22,000 are such positions as the Secretaries of the Army, Navy, and Air Force. The next group are positions established at a salary of $21,000 a year and includes the Administrators of most of the independent etablishments such as the Administrator of the Veterans' Administration and the Administrator of the General Services Administration.

The next group at $20,000 a year includes positions such as the Comptroller of the Currency and members of certain boards and commissions. The next group, which is by way the largest group, contains members of most boards and commissions and has a salary rate of $19,000 a year. The next group at $17,500 includes such positions as Commissioner of the Indian Claims Commission and Commissioners of the United States Court of Claims.

The next group at $17,000 a year includes such positions as Commissioner of Customs, Commissioner of Narcotics, and so forth.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK].

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. MURRAY] and the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES] and the members of the committee who have worked very diligently and effectively on this important measure.

I think the gentleman from Tennessee put his finger on the nub of the problem when he said that very properly in this

Congress we have adjusted and brought up to date the pay of the legislative branch of the Government and the judicial branch of the Government. I, believe we all recognize that following that precedent—and, as I say, it was a good precedent, which I supoprted; I did the best I could to bring it to passage—but, we must all recognize that these top people in the executive branch of the Government, in positions of extreme responsibility, where their labors are necessarily burdensome and where they are working day in and day out and many times through the night, are likewise entitled to an increase in their pay to bring them up to date. I do not need to remind you, because it is something that has been said to us before not only by the present occupant of the White House but by occupants of the White House preceding him in my time, that they find it increasingly difficult to get able people to give up salaries at a much higher figure in private life to come down here in the service of the Government.

It is bad enough as it is, and certainly we cannot expect our Federal Government and the executive branch of the Government to continue to function efficiently, as it should, unless we are able to attract the people with talent and capacity we need in the Government for these assignments.

As the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. MURRAY] pointed out, the original suggestions of the administrative branch of the Government were quite a bit in excess of the figures that are here presented. But I think I can say to you with complete assurance that this measure is acceptable to the administration. While it does not go in some particulars as far as they would like to have it go, it certainly is very obviously a step in the right direction. I sincerely hope that without too much delay we shall proceed to the passage of this measure.

Mr. CRETELLA. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALLECK. I yield.

Mr. CRETELLA. I should like to ask the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. MURRAY], a question.

On page 5 of the bill, each assistant secretary of an executive department is provided for. What arrangement has been made for career assistant secretaries?

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. I might state that the career secretaries are under the Classification Act. The top salaries of classified employees are raised from $14,800 to $16,000.

Mr. CRETELLA. Then I understand that the career secretaries are taken care of under the Classification Act?

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. That is correct.

Mr. HALLECK. As a matter of fact, when we dealt with the matter of pay in the legislative establishment and with the matter of pay for the judiciary, and now as we are dealing with the pay of people in the executive branch in these responsible positions, we have kept, and we must keep, in mind that in recent years the classified employees and the postal employees have had successive raises, one after another, that have kept them pretty well in line with the advance in the cost of living. But these people we seek to deal with here have not had that treatment.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, it is not my intention to labor this issue, but there are a few facts that the Members of the House ought to have before they vote upon this provision.

In the first place, the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service was called to meet at 10 o'clock last Wednesday morning. At approximately 10:45 o'clock we still had no bill before us, no executive pay raise bill. Somewhere around 10:45 or between that time and 11 o'clock a carrier pigeon arrived with copies of this bill.

What I am saying is that there has been not a single moment of hearings upon this bill. It was considered in committee for about 30 minutes, between 30 and 45 minutes, and voted out to the floor of the House.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. Yes.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. The bill was fully explained by me to the committee, and does not the gentleman know that only three members of the committee, including himself, voted against it?

Mr. GROSS. Certainly that is correct. There were only three members of the committee who voted against it. But the gentleman does not dispute the fact that the bill was still hot off the printing presses when we got it. We had never seen a copy of the bill before. The gentleman will also bear me out that not one moment of hearings was held in justification of this proposed legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I should like to call attention to the letter from the White House to the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. MURRAY] in connection with this bill. The President said, in part:

> For 85 years the pay for Cabinet members has been 50 to 60 percent higher than the pay of Members of Congress. I have always felt that this differential has been excessive, and was pleased when the Members' pay was recently increased. The effect of Public Law 9 was to put congressional pay on the same level as that of Cabinet officers. Reestablishment of the traditional relationship would require—

And so forth. I was not aware until I read that letter that Cabinet officers and perhaps others in Government are traditionally entitled to higher pay than Members of Congress. I thought it was upon a basis of justification that Cabinet officers and other officers of the Government are paid, but I learn to my dismay that the increase in pay proposed here for Cabinet officers and other officers of Government is based upon a traditional relationship over that of Members of Congress. If we are going to deal in tradition perhaps some attention ought to be given to the Cadillacs, chauffeurs, special planes, and a few other things that are furnished Cabinet officers and others.

Let us take a look at this bill. I am not fully acquainted with all its provisions, because, as I stated before, no hearings were held. Members of the committee have had no particular opportunity to acquaint themselves with all the details. But let me tell you that these increases run from 8.1 to 37.5 percent.

Mr. LONG. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. LONG. This is an administration bill and a "must"; is it not?

Mr. GROSS. It is not a "must" with me and I doubt that it is a "must" with the gentleman from Louisiana.

Let me repeat, these increases go from 8.1 percent to 37.5 percent, notwithstanding the fact that back in 1949 a pay increase was voted for the executive branch of the Government which provided for increases in some instances of approximately 100 percent. So it could be possible that with this bill some people are being increased 137.5 percent since 1949. I regret that I have not had time to make accurate totals in this respect.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Will the gentleman cite one particular example of what he is stating?

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman well knows there were some increases in 1949 that went from approximately $10,000 to $20,000.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. What cases are those, may I ask the gentleman from Iowa?

Mr. GROSS. I do not have them here but the gentleman knows that to be approximately the fact.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. No; I do not know it.

Mr. GROSS. I will be glad to present the gentleman with some figures later on.

I would not be opposed to raising some salaries if we were getting more efficiency out of some people over including the Department of Defense which suddenly discovered, a few days ago, $302 million under some mattress or on some shelf—$302 million they did not know they had. And some of these employees in the Foreign Operations Administration suddenly discovered, a few days ago, they had $66 million they did not know they had. I would be perfectly willing to pay people in Government if we were getting value received, but in all too many instances I say to you that we are not.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. May I say to my friend, the gentleman from Iowa, that I had thought that extensive hearings were not necessary since many, many hours were spent in the planning of this bill. I thought in view of the fact that Members of Congress had already increased their salaries 50 percent and had given two increases to the classified and postal employees since 1949, everyone should agree we should

treat these executive officers fairly, reasonably, and right, just as this bill does.

Mr. GROSS. I know of no reason why a Cabinet officer should be paid more than a Member of Congress. If the gentleman has some good reason for it, let him state it. I see no justification for this pay increase. We did not have any real justification before the committee and we do not have it now. The taxpayers of this country are being loaded with debt and taxes. This bill ought to be defeated.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, the chairman of the committee has made a fine, concise statement covering a very complex salary schedule. It is a subject with which he is thoroughly familiar—made doubly so by the fact that he spent so much time and so much effort in attempting to clear the salary schedules and the relative positions of the executive branch of the Government with the leadership of the Congress and responsible officials of the White House.

It is seldom, in my experience, that a bill as complex as this one, a bill which must with necessity involve so many personalities and positions of such importance, could be approved without amendment.

Our committee approved this bill without amendment by a substantial vote. I might say that this was a vote not only of a job well done but a vote of complete confidence in the Chairman of the Post Office and Civil Service Committee who has done such an outstanding job in this Congress.

Addressing myself now to the principle involved in this request of the President, in my opinion this is in much the same category as legislation which we passed involving our own housekeeping plans for the legislative budget.

The positions of the individuals covered by this legislation represent the official family of the President. With but few exceptions they are appointed by the President, and with the advice and consent of the Senate. We should treat this request of the President, and approach the consideration of this legislation, in the same spirit that he has accorded our own problems.

I can think of no more appropriate time than this to say something that has been long on my mind. It is this: Never in the history of this Government has there been a President who has been more concerned that the Congress and its Members be given proper recognition at the highest level in our Government.

The President has been most generous in his consultation with the leadership of the Congress. His thoughtfulness, his kindly consideration, have won for him many friends on both sides of the aisle. It has won for him the approval of outstanding legislative programs in the 83d Congress and this first session of the 84th Congress.

The President has consistently and strongly asserted that Congress is the very essence of the democratic government we enjoy. His request in this executive pay bill is consistent with that policy. He has recommended that only officers at the Cabinet level be paid more than Members of Congress. He has done this forthrightly, despite comments from other directions and, I am sure, many pressures, pointing out that although for years many executives of the Government were paid more than Members of Congress, this has never been justified and should be corrected.

I hope that this legislation will be adopted in the spirit in which it is sent down, a spirit of correcting inequities and of bringing into line the salaries of his official family as a final link in the many adjustments that have been made in the Federal salary schedules.

The SPEAKER. The question is, Will the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H. R. 7619?

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENDING MAILING PRIVILEGES TO MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to file a supplemental report on the bill (H. R. 7125) to extend to June 30, 1956, the free mailing privileges granted by the act of July 12, 1950, to members of the Armed Forces of the United States.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

FLOOD-CONTROL IMPROVEMENT AT ST. LOUIS, MO.

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H. R. 7092) to provide for the improvement of the Mississippi River at and in the vicinity of St. Louis, Mo., for flood control, as amended.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the following work of improvement for the control of destructive floods is hereby adopted and authorized to be prosecuted under the direction of the Secretary of the Army and the supervision of the Chief of Engineers in accordance with the plans in the report hereinafter designated and subject to the conditions set forth therein:

Mississippi River, at and in the vicinity of St. Louis, Mo., in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in Senate Document No. 57, 84th Congress, 1st session, at an estimated cost of $123,020,000.

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

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded? If not, the Chair will put the question.

The question is on suspending the rules and passing the bill, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the Senate bill (S. 56) authorizing construction of certain public works on the Mississippi River for the protection of St. Louis, Mo., a bill similar to the bill H. R. 7092, which was just passed.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate bill, as follows:

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.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The proceedings whereby the bill H. R. 7092 was passed were vacated and that bill was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER. The Chair wishes to announce that that is the last bill which will be taken up today under suspension of the rules.

TWO HUNDREDTH ANNIVERSARY OF BIRTH OF ALEXANDER HAMILTON

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 1395) to amend the joint resolution entitled "Joint resolution to establish a commission for the celebration of the 200th anniversary of the birth of Alexander Hamilton."

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 7 of the joint resolution entitled "Joint resolution to establish a commission for the celebration of the 200th anniversary of the birth of Alexander Hamilton," approved August 20, 1954, is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 7. There area hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums, not to exceed $150,000 in addition to the sum of $25,000 heretofore appropriated, as the Congress may determine to be necessary to carry out the provisions of this joint resolution."

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDING INTERNAL REVENUE BILL OF 1954

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Ways and Means, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 4582) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to deductions from gross income of amounts contributed to employees trusts, which was unanimously reported favorably by the Committee on Ways and Means.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I shall not object, we are proceeding now to take up a series of bills reported out by my committee, all of which were unanimously reported out favorably from the Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may extend my remarks on each of these bills, following the consideration of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That a new paragraph be added to section 381 (c) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to read as follows:

"(20) Carryover of unused pension trust deductions in certain cases: Notwithstanding the other provisions of this section, or section 394 (a), a corporation which has acquired the properties and assumed the liabilities of a wholly owned subsidiary shall be considered to have succeeded to and to be entitled to take into account contributions of the subsidiary to a pension plan, and shall be considered to be the distributor or transferor corporation after the date of distribution or transfer for the purpose of determining the amounts deductible under section 404 with respect to contributions to a pension plan if—

"(A) the corporate laws of the State of incorporation of the subsidiary required the surviving corporation in the case of merger to be incorporated under the laws of the State of incorporation of the subsidiary; and

"(B) the properties were acquired in a liquidation of the subsidiary in a transaction subject to section 112 (b) (6) of the Internal Code of 1939."

With the following committee amendments:

Page 2, line 4, after "transfer", insert "(but not for taxable years with respect to which this paragraph does not apply)."

Page 2, line 14, after "Internal", insert "Revenue."

Page 2, after line 14, insert:

"SEC. 2. The amendments made by the first section of this act shall apply with respect to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1953, and ending after August 16, 1954."

The committee amendments were 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.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD on the bill just passed, and also ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD immediately following the consideration of each of the bills to follow.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, cases arising under the 1939 code have been called to the attention of the Committee on Ways and Means in which a tax-free merger of a subsidiary corporation, incorporated in one State, into the parent corporation, incorporated in another State, has been prevented by reason of State laws requiring that the surviving corporation be incorporated under the laws of such State. For this reason, parent corporations have been forced to forego the tax benefits granted by the Federal income tax laws to tax-free mergers and liquidate the subsidiary thus acquiring its property via the tax-liquidation route which has liabilities. This result follows under the 1939 code because certain tax benefits and elective rights are available to a successor corporation upon a tax-free reorganization or liquidation only if the combination is effectuated in a particular legal form.

The 1954 code substitutes definitive rules for the old test of form. Under the new rule, specified tax benefits, elective rights, and obligations carry over to a successor corporation or corporations in certain tax-free liquidations and reorganizations.

H. R. 4582 extends the new treatment to corporations which, because of the State laws described above, were denied the benefits of a tax-free merger and permits such corporations to utilize any excess pension plan contributions made by the subsidiary to a qualified pension plan as though it were the subsidiary for this purpose.

This bill was unanimously reported by the Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, H. R. 4582 permits, under certain circumstances, a corporation which has acquired the properties and assumed the liabilities of a wholly owned subsidiary in a tax-free liquidation under section 112 (b) (6) of the 1939 code, to utilize any excess contributions made by the subsidiary to a qualified pension plan as though it were the subsidiary corporation for this purpose. These excess contributions are to be available as deductions in years beginning after December 31, 1953, and ending after August 16, 1954. This bill was introduced by the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SIMPSON] and was reported unanimously by the Committee on Ways and Means.

FOREIGN-TRAVEL TAXES

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Ways and Means, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 5265) to exempt certain additional foreign travel from the tax on the transportation of persons, which was unanimously reported favorably by the Committee on Ways and Means.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That subsections (a) and (b) of section 4261 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to the tax on transportation of persons) are amended to read as follows:

"(a) Amounts paid within or without the United States: There is hereby imposed upon the amount paid within or without the United States for the domestic transportation of persons by rail, motor vehicle, water, or air, a tax equal to 10 percent of the amount so paid.

"(b) Definition of domestic transportation: For purposes of subsection (a), the term 'domestic transportation' means—

"(1) Transportation which begins and ends in the United States, except (A) any such transportation, payment for which is made outside the United States, which is covered by a separate ticket or order but which is part of transportation from or to a point outside the United States, if it is established, pursuant to regulations prescribed by the Secretary or his delegate, at the time of payment that the several portions of the transportation are being purchased for use in conjunction with each other; and (B) round-trip transportation, payment for which is made outside the United States, between a point within the United States and a point outside of the United States; and

"(2) Transportation, payment for which is made within the United States, between any port or station within the United States, and any other port or station within the United States, which is part of transportation to or from a point outside the United States, except any such transportation by water on a vessel which makes one or more intermediate stops at ports within the United States on a voyage which begins or ends in the United States and ends or begins outside the United States, if the vessel in stopping at such intermediate port is not authorized both to discharge and to take on passengers.

SEC. 2. Section 4264 (c) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 is amended by striking out "or (b)".

SEC. 3. Section 4262 (a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 is hereby repealed.

SEC. 4. The amendments and repeal made by this act shall apply to amounts paid on or after the first day of the first month which begins more than 10 days after the date of the enactment of this act for transportation commencing on or after such first day.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert "That (a) subsections (a) and (b) of section 4261 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to the tax on transportation of persons) are hereby amended to read as follows:

"'(a) Amounts paid within or without the United States: There is hereby imposed upon the amount paid within or without the United States for the domestic transportation of persons by rail, motor vehicle, water, or air a tax equal to 10 percent of the amount so paid.'

"(b) Subsection (c) of such section is hereby amended by striking out 'or (b)', and such subsection is hereby redesignated as subsection (b).

"(c) Subsection (d) of such section is hereby amended by striking out 'taxes' and inserting in lieu thereof 'tax', and such subsection is hereby redesignated as subsection (c).

"SEC. 2. (a) Section 4262 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 is hereby amended by striking out subsection (a) and by redesignating subsections (b), (c), (d), and (e) as subsections (a), (b), (c), and (d), respectively, and such section is hereby redesignated as section 4263.

"(b) Part I of subchapter C of chapter 33 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 is hereby amended by inserting after section 4261 the following new section:

"'SEC. 4262. Definition of domestic transportation.

"'As used in section 4261, the term "domestic transportation" means—

"'(1) Transportation which begins and ends in the United States, except—

"'(A) any such transportation, payment for which is made outside the United States,

which is covered by a separate ticket or order but which is part of transportation from or to a point outside the United States, if it is established, pursuant to regulations prescribed by the Secretary or his delegate, at the time of payment that the several portions of the transportation are being purchased for use in conjunction with each other;

"'(B) that portion of such transportation which is outside the United States in any case where the route of the transportation passes through or over a point at least 200 miles from the nearest boundary of the United States, as measured from a direct line between the points of departure from and reentry into the United States (except that where passengers are discharged and taken on at a point or points outside of the United States, such line shall be from the point of departure from the United States to such point or, consecutively, to such points outside the United States and from there to the point of reentry into the United States); and

"'(C) round-trip transportation between a point within the United States and a point outside the United States (except to the extent specified in paragraph (2) of this section); and

"'(2) Transportation, payment for which is made within the United States, between any port or station within the United States and any other port or station within the United States (except as described in subparagraph (B) of paragraph (1) of this section), which is part of transportation to or from a point outside the United States, except any such transportation by water on a vessel which makes one or more intermediate stops at ports within the United States on a voyage which begins or ends in the United States and ends or begins outside the United States, if the vessel in stopping at such intermediate port is not authorized both to discharge and to take on passengers.'

"(c) The table of sections for such part I is hereby amended by striking out

"'Sec. 4262. Exemptions.'

and inserting in lieu thereof

"'Sec. 4262. Definition of domestic transportation.

"'Sec. 4263. Exemptions.'

"SEC. 3. The amendments made by this act shall apply to amounts paid on or after the first day of the first month, which begins more than 10 days after the date of the enactment of this act for transportation commencing on or after such first day."

The committee 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.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, the 10 percent excise tax presently levied on the transportation of persons applies only to domestic transportation and is not imposed upon travel which is outside the United States. However, the present definition of domestic transportation covers trips to Central America, the Caribbean area, Mexico, and Canada. The Committee on Ways and Means believes this treatment to be discriminatory and in opposition to the good-neighbor policy which this country has so long followed. To remove this discrimination against our closest neighbors, H. R. 5265 redefines domestic transportation to achieve the objective of taxing all transportation which begins and ends in the United States and yet not discriminate against the named countries. Therefore, with exceptions, "domestic transportation" is defined as all transportation beginning and ending in the United States.

The first exception relates to transportation which is paid for outside the United States and which is part of transportation from one point in the United States to another point in the United States, such as a trip from New York to Los Angeles where the ticket is used in connection with a ticket for transportation outside the United States, such as a trip beginning in London.

The second exception relates to trips a portion of which is out of the United States, for example, from Seattle to Anchorage, Alaska. In such cases, if the route passes at one or more points at least 200 miles from the nearest boundary of the United States, that portion of the transportation which is outside the United States will not be considered as domestic transportation. The 200 miles are measured in a direct line determined on the great circle.

The third exception relates to round-trip transportation between a point within the United States and a point outside the United States. Thus if the trip is an express trip with no stops between the point of departure and the principal destination, it would be free of tax whether made by rail or by air, or any other taxed mode of transportation.

This bill was unanimously reported by the Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, H. R. 5265, in general, exempts from the 10-percent excise tax on the transportation of persons, travel which is outside the United States. This bill was introduced by the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. REED], the ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means. It was reported unanimously by the Committee on Ways and Means.

RETIREMENT INCOME-TAX CREDIT

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Ways and Means, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 7036) to amend section 37 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 so as to conform its provisions respecting retirement income-tax credit to the corresponding liberalized provisions of the Social Security Amendments of 1954, and to extend its provisions to members of the Armed Forces, which was unanimously reported favorably by the Committee on Ways and Means.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 37 (d) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 is amended as follows:

(1) The phrase "the amount of retirement income shall not exceed $1,200" is amended by striking "$1,200" and inserting in lieu thereof "$1,500."

(2) Clause (2), which reads "In the case of any individual who has not attained the age of 75 before the close of the taxable year, any amount of earned income (as defined in subsection (g)) in excess of $900 received by the individual in the taxable year", is amended by striking "75" and inserting in lieu thereof "72" and by striking "$900" and inserting in lieu thereof "$1,200."

SEC. 2. Section 37 (f) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 is amended by striking out the following: "; except that such term does not include a fund or system established by the United States for members of the Armed Forces of the United States."

SEC. 3. The amendments made by the first section of this act shall be applicable to taxable years beginning after December 13, 1954. The amendment made by section 2 of this act shall apply only with respect to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1953, and ending after August 16, 1954.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert: "That section 37 (d) (2) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to limitation on retirement income) is hereby amended to read as follows:

"'(2) in the case of any individual who has not attained the age of 72 before the close of the taxable year, any amount of earned income (as defined in subsection (g))—

"'(A) in excess of $900 received by the individual in the taxable year if such individual has not attained the age of 65 before the close of the taxable year; or

"'(B) in excess of $1,200 received by the individual in the taxable year if such individual has attained the age of 65 before the close of the taxable year.'

"SEC. 2. The amendment made by the first section of this act shall apply only with respect to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1955."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

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

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to amend section 37 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to the earned income limitation on retirement income."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, H. R. 7036 amends the Internal Revenue Code to liberalize the retirement income credit and to conform the earnings test imposed by the Internal Revenue Code with the work test used under the social-security laws.

Under existing law an individual who is 65 years of age or older is granted a credit against his tax liability equivalent to the tax imposed, in the first bracket, on the amount of his retirement income up to $1,200. Existing law also permits an individual to earn up to $900 a year without affecting the amount of the retirement income credit to which he is entitled. Amounts earned in excess of $900 reduce, dollar for dollar, the maximum retirement income credit to which an individual under 75 years of age is entitled. For those over 75 years of age no such limitation is imposed.

This bill amends the Internal Revenue Code to increase the amount which an individual can earn without reducing the amount of the retirement income credit to which he is entitled from $900 to $1,200. It also reduces the age for which the earnings limitation will cease to apply from 75 to 72. By this action the treatment accorded under the Internal Revenue Code with respect to the retire-

ment income credit will be conformed to the changes in the social-security laws made by the amendments of 1954.

The Committee on Ways and Means unanimously reported this bill.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, H. R. 7036 liberalizes the retirement income credit provided in section 37 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 so that the earnings test under this provision corresponds with the work test under the social-security law. This bill, which was sponsored by the distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MASON], was reported unanimously by the Committee on Ways and Means.

DEDUCTIONS FOR CHARITABLE CONTRIBUTIONS

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Ways and Means, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 7094) to amend section 120 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1939—relating to unlimited deduction for charitable contributions—which was unanimously reported favorably by the Committee on Ways and Means.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 120 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1939 (relating to unlimited deduction for charitable and other contributions) is hereby amended by striking out "in each of the 10 preceding taxable years" and inserting in lieu thereof "in 8 of the 10 preceding taxable years."

SEC. 2. (a) Except as provided in subsections (b), (c), and (d), the amendment made by the first section of this act shall apply to all taxable years to which the Internal Revenue Code of 1939 applies.

(b) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, credit for any overpayment resulting from the amendment made by the first section of this act shall not be allowed, and the refund of any such overpayment shall be made only if it is established to the satisfaction of the Secretary of the Treasury or his delegate—

(1) in the case of a taxpayer who has not died at the time the refund is made, that the amount of such refund is to be paid forthwith as a charitable contribution (as defined in section 170 (c) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954), or

(2) in the case of a taxpayer who has died at the time the refund is made, that (A) the amount of the refund, under the terms of the decedent's will, will be transferred to a trustee or trustees as described in section 2055 (a) (3) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, and (B) the amount of such transfer is deductible from the value of the gross estate under such section or the corresponding provisions of the Internal Revenue Code of 1939.

(c) The amount of any refund made under this act, and the payment or transfer of such amount as described in paragraph (1) or (2) of subsection (b), shall not be taken into account in determining any liability of the taxpayer or his estate for income tax or estate tax under the Federal income tax and estate tax laws.

(d) If a claim for refund relates to an overpayment on account of the amendment made by the first section of this act, in lieu of the 3-year period of limitation prescribed in section 322 (b) (1) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1939, the period shall be 7 years from the date prescribed by law for filing the return for the year with respect to which the claim is made. In the case of a claim described in this subsection, the amount of the refund may exceed the portion of the tax paid within the period prescribed in paragraph (2) or (3), whichever is applicable, of section 322 (b) of such code, to the extent of the amount of the overpayment attributable to the amendment made by the first section of this act.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 2, line 13, after "(A)", insert "an amount equal to."

Page 2, line 15, strike out "a trustee or trustees as described in section 2055 (a) (3)" and insert "any person or organization described in section 2055."

Page 2, line 17, after "(B)", insert "an amount equal to."

Page 2, after line 20, insert "No interest shall be paid upon any overpayment resulting from the amendment made by the first section of this act."

The committee amendments were 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.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, under the Internal Revenue Code of 1939 the 20-percent limitation imposed on charitable contributions did not apply if the amount of the taxpayer's contribution plus his income-tax payments in the current year and in each of the prior 10 years equaled 90 percent or more of his taxable income. Last year the law was changed and the 1954 code provides, instead, that the 90-percent test need be met in only 8 out of 10 past years. However, the change was made effective only with respect to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1953, and ending before August 16, 1954.

Just as Congress last year considered the 10-year rule too restrictive, the Committee on Ways and Means believes it to be unduly restrictive concerning prior years; for that reason H. R. 7094 would extend the 8-out-of-10-year rule to all taxable years to which the 1939 code is applicable. Should any refund result from the enactment of this bill, it will be permitted only if the amount of the refund is paid immediately as a charitable contribution. If the taxpayer is dead at the time the refund is made, an amount equal thereto must be transferred for public, charitable, or religious uses by the terms of the decedent's will.

This bill was reported unanimously by the Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, H. R. 7094 provides that an unlimited charitable deduction is to be available for charitable and other contributions under the 1939 code where in the current year and in 8 out of 10 of the immediately preceding years the individual's contributions to charity, plus his income-tax payments, accounted for 90 percent or more of his taxable income, but only if an amount equal to any refund under this provision is paid to, or set aside for, charity. The bill was reported unanimously by the Committee on Ways and Means.

GAIN OR LOSS IN CERTAIN RAILROAD REORGANIZATIONS

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Ways and Means, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 7247) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to the treatment of gain in certain railroad reorganizations, which was unannmously reported favorably by the Committee on Ways and Means.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the title and subsection (a) of section 373 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 are amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 373. Gain or loss not recognized in certain railroad reorganizations.

"(a) Nonrecognition of gain or loss: No gain or loss shall be recognized if property of a railroad corporation, as defined in section 77 (m) of the Bankruptcy Act (49 Stat. 922; 11 U. S. C. 205), is transferred in pursuance of an order of the court having jurisdiction of such corporation—

(1) in a receivership proceeding, or

(2) in a proceeding under section 77 of the Bankruptcy Act,

to a railroad corporation (as defined in section 77 (m) of the Bankruptcy Act) organized or made use of to effectuate a plan of reorganization approved by the court in such proceeding."

SEC. 2. The amendment made by the first section of this act shall be effective with respect to transfers after the date of enactments.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert "That part IV of subchapter C of chapter I of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 is hereby amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"'SEC. 374. Gain or loss not recognized in certain railroad reorganizations.

"'(a) Exchanges by corporations:

"'Nonrecognition of gain or loss: No gain or loss shall be recognized if property of a railroad corporation, as defined in section 77 (m) of the Bankruptcy Act (49 Stat. 922; 11 U. S. C. 205), is transferred after July 31, 1955, in pursuance of an order of the court having jurisdiction of such corporation—

"'(A) in a receivership proceeding, or

"'(B) in a proceeding under section 77 of the Bankruptcy Act,

to another railroad corporation (as defined in section 77 (m) of the Bankruptcy Act) organized or made use of to effectuate a plan of reorganization approved by the court in such proceeding, in exchange solely for stock or securities in such other railroad corporation.

"'(2) Gain from exchanges not solely in kind: If an exchange would be within the provisions of paragraph (1) if it were not for the fact that the property received in exchange consists not only of stock or securities permitted by paragraph (1) to be received without the recognition of gain, but also of other property or money, then—

"'(A) if the corporation receiving such other property or money distributes it in pursuance of the plan of reorganization, no gain to the corporation shall be recognized from the exchange, but

"'(B) if the corporation receiving such other property or money does not distribute

it in pursuance of the plan of reorganization, the gain, if any, to the corporation shall be recognized, but in an amount not in excess of the sum of such money and the fair market value of such other property so received, which is not so distributed.

"'(3) Loss from exchanges not solely in kind: If an exchange would be within the provisions of paragraph (1) if it were not for the fact that the property received in exchange consists not only of property permitted by such paragraph to be received without the recognition of gain or loss, but also of other property or money, then no loss from the exchange shall be recognized.

"'(b) Basis: If the property of a railroad corporation (as defined in section 77 (m) of the Bankruptcy Act) was acquired after July 31, 1955, in pursuance of an order of the court having jurisdiction of such corporation—

"'(1) in a receivership proceeding, or

"'(2) in a proceeding under section 77 of the Bankruptcy Act,

and the acquiring corporation is a railroad corporation (as defined in section 77 (m) of the Bankruptcy Act) organized or made use of to effectuate a plan of reorganization approved by the court in such proceeding, the basis shall be the same as it would be in the hands of the railroad corporation whose property was so acquired, increased in the amount of gain recognized under subsection (a) (2) to the transferor on such transfer.

"'(c) Assumption of liabilities: In the case of a transaction involving an assumption of a liability or the acquisition of property subject to a liability, the rules provided in section 357 shall apply.'

"SEC. 2. Section 357 of such Code is hereby amended—

"(1) by deleting 'or 371' wherever appearing in subsection (a) and (b) thereof, and inserting in lieu thereof '371, or 374', and

"(2) by deleting from subsection (c) (2) (B) '371' and inserting in lieu thereof '371 or 374'.

"SEC. 3. Section 373 is hereby amended—

"(1) by deleting from subsection (a) 'transferred in pursuance' and inserting in lieu thereof 'transferred before August 1, 1955, in pursuance', and

"(2) by deleting 'December 31, 1938', and inserting in lieu thereof 'December 31, 1938, and before August 1, 1955,'."

The committee 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.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, under the 1954 code no loss is recognized where property of a railroad corporation is transferred pursuant to a court order in a receivership proceeding or in a proceeding under section 77 of the Bankruptcy Act to another railroad corporation organized to effectuate a plan of reorganization approved by a court. However, existing law makes no provision with respect to any gain realized in such a transfer.

H. R. 7247 amends the 1954 code to correct this situation by adding a new section 374 which provides that gain will not be recognized with respect to property of a transferor corporation exchanged solely for stock or securities of the transferee corporation pursuant to a court order issued in a receivership proceeding or bankruptcy proceeding under section 77 of the Bankruptcy Act. However, to the extent that the transfer of property involves "boot" gain will be recognized to the transferor corporation unless it distributes the "boot" pursuant to a plan of reorganization.

The bill was unanimously reported by the Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, H. R. 7247 adds a new section 374 to the 1954 code to provide that no gain will be recognized to a railroad corporation where its properties are transferred, pursuant to a court order in a receivership proceeding or in a proceeding under the Bankruptcy Act, in a reorganization approved by the court in exchange solely for stock or securities in another railroad corporation. H. R. 7247 was introduced by the distinguished gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS] and was reported unanimously by the Committee on Ways and Means.

MANUFACTURERS' EXCISE TAX

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 7024) 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 6, line 1, after "by", insert "the first section and section 2 of."

Page 6, after line 17, insert:

"SEC. 4. Subsection (e) of section 534 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to burden of proof in certain proceedings relating to imposition of accumulated earnings tax) is hereby amended to read as follows:

"'(e) Application of section:

"'(1) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, this section shall apply with respect to taxable years to which this subchapter applies and (except as provided in paragraph (2)) to taxable years to which the corresponding provisions of prior revenue laws apply.

"'(2) In the case of a notice of deficiency for a taxable year to which this subchapter does not apply, this section shall apply only in the case of proceedings tried on the merits after the date of the enactment of this paragraph.'

"SEC. 5. Subsection (b) of section 534 of such Code (relating to notification by Secretary) is hereby amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sentence: 'In the case of a notice of deficiency to which subsection (e) (2) applies and which is mailed on or before the 30th day after the date of the enactment of this sentence, the notification referred to in the preceding sentence may be mailed at any time on or before such 30th day.'"

Amend the title so as to read: "An act to remove the manufacturers' excise tax from the sales of certain component parts for use in other manufactured articles, to confine to entertainment-type equipment the tax on radio and television apparatus, and for other purposes."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in; and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Ways and Means may have until midnight, July 31, 1955, to file reports on the following bills which were unanimously ordered reported: H. R. 2667, H. R. 3413, H. R. 6143, H. R. 6712, and H. R. 7634.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and to include therein letters from the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare relating to the provisions of the social-security laws dealing with sharecroppers and migrant agricultural laborers.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

FRANCES IRENE SMART

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 1513) for the relief of Frances Irene Smart.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Frances Irene Smart, of Frederick, Okla., the sum of $25,000 in full satisfaction of her claim against the United States for compensation for personal injuries, and resulting pain, suffering, permanent disability, hospital and doctor bills, and other expenses, caused to her by the negligent and reckless operation of an automobile on or about the 31st day of October 1951, at excessive speed by an insane Army veteran prematurely and negligently released from a hospital of the Veterans' Administration by employees of the United States, and any claim of her husband in connection therewith: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "$25,000" and insert "$6,000."

The committee 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.

BERNARD L. DENN

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 2465) for the relief of Bernard L. Denn.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, is this a Senate bill?

Mr. LANE. No. This is a House bill that has been cleared through the official objectors on the gentleman's side. The report was not available this morning. Your objectors have now seen the report.

Mr. MARTIN. It was on the calendar this morning?

Mr. LANE. It was.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Bernard L. Denn, or Portland, Oreg., the sum of $2,443.57. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of the claim of said Bernard L. Denn, an employee of Bonneville Power Administration, Department of the Interior, against the United States for retroactive pay adjustment to reimburse him for loss resulting from administrative error: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

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.

PROVIDING THAT CERTAIN LANDS ACQUIRED BY THE UNITED STATES SHALL BE ADMINISTERED BY THE SECRETARY OF AGRICULTURE AS NATIONAL FOREST LANDS

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 72) to provide that certain lands acquired by the United States shall be administered by the Secretary of Agriculture as national forest lands. I may say, Mr. Speaker, this bill was on the calendar this morning and was passed over at the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SAYLOR]. The gentleman from Pennsylvania has looked into the bill and is now agreeable to its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Mexico?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That those certain lands situated within the boundaries of the Lincoln National Forest, New Mexico, which were conveyed to the United States by the State of New Mexico, by deeds dated December 3, 1951, and recorded in book 142 at pages 547 to 556, inclusive, records of Otero County, N. Mex., in exchange for lands of the United States pursuant to the act of June 28, 1934 (48 Stat. 1269; 43 U. S. C. 315g), as amended, are hereby made parts of said Lincoln National Forest and hereafter shall be subject to all laws, rules, and regulations applicable to that national forest.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM FOR MONDAY

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire of the majority leader as to the program for Monday?

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, the program for Monday, without being confined completely to the following, is as follows:

There will be consideration of a House bill extending the Small Business Administration brought up under suspension of the rules. There will be a rollcall on that matter and Members should be governed accordingly.

Then there are the following:

H. R. 7541, increasing the borrowing power of the Commodity Credit Corporation.

S. 1894, the International Finance Corporation.

H. R. 7126, Poliomyelitis Vaccination Assistance Act of 1955.

S. 890, strengthening the Water Pollution Act.

S. 1189, national banks, real-estate and construction loans. That was on today's list, but we did not reach it.

H. R. 2552, Great Lakes connecting channels. That was on today's list.

H. R. 6309, the Mississippi River-Gulf outlet. That was on today's list also.

H. R. 2097—S. 1287—increase in the annuities of Foreign Service officers.

There will be consideration in some form or another—I am unable to state or advise just now—of legislation relating to an increase in pay for employees of the House and increasing clerk hire for Members. In what form it may come up I do not know.

There may be consideration of legislation in connection with the present strike going on in Washington. The Senate has been considering a bill today and may have passed it by this time relating to that matter. I understand the House Committee on the District of Columbia has reported out a bill. My personal opinion is, and speaking for myself only, I think it would be a mistake if we were to adjourn without something being done from a legislative angle to meet that situation. Then there is S. 2237, which was not reached today, a bill relating to State Department personnel. If that does not come up under suspension, there is a rule out and it will come up under a rule. The bill relates to an additional Under Secretary or some other high official, and I understand it is a matter of concern to the State Department. Then there is H. R. 5222, and there is a rule out on it, a bill to amend the Flammable Fabrics Act.

Mr. MARTIN. I will say to the gentleman he had better put that on the foot of his list if he does not want considerable time consumed, if he expects to adjourn on Monday. That is just a little advice.

Mr. McCORMACK. I appreciate the observation of the gentleman, and I might say I have alerted my mind along the same line. There are bills on the Speaker's desk that have passed the Senate, and some of those bills, of course, will be brought up by unanimous consent. There are conference reports and other matters that might develop.

Mr. MARTIN. Is there any chance that the President's atomic ship bill could be placed on that list?

Mr. McCORMACK. I do not see it on this list.

Mr. MARTIN. I notice the gentleman did not read it, so I presume it was not on the list.

Mr. McCORMACK. But I did make a reservation that I was not confining myself to this list.

Mr. MARTIN. If I might make a suggestion, we have to commence to confine ourselves to the list pretty soon if we are going to get out Monday.

Mr. McCORMACK. I thoroughly agree with the gentleman. Of course, this is not such a tremendous program as it appears to be when one is reading it and when the House wants to function.

Mr. MARTIN. It is a question of how they want to function. That word can be interpreted two ways.

Mr. McCORMACK. I always have confidence in the House functioning in the right direction.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARTIN. I yield to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I would like to ask the gentleman if it could be arranged so that if there is a vote it could be taken immediately after 10 o'clock. Senator GEORGE has arranged a meeting with the President on the cotton and the cotton textile situation for 9:30. I wonder if it could be arranged so that any votes could be taken after 10 o'clock. The President is inclined to help us. I hope so, anyway.

Mr. McCORMACK. I think the gentlewoman is entitled to an answer. I wish I could do that, and it may be in practical operation we can work it out. But, I do not want to be bound by it. When I make a bargain, I will keep it, but on Monday I cannot make any definite commitment.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. The gentleman's word has always been his bond so far as I ever knew.

Mr. McCORMACK. I thank the gentlewoman.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. If I might inquire of the majority leader, the Defense Production Act extension is in conference, as is the housing bill. Both of those,

of course, are working against the deadline as of tomorrow midnight. Apparently the conference reports will not be acted upon today. Could the gentleman say whether or not if they are before the House Monday morning they would be the first order of business ahead of other action?

Mr. McCORMACK. I would say they would be, because naturally we have to give consideration to legislation which is expiring unless there is legislation which will extend it.

The information I received from members of the Committee on Banking and Currency is that if we get those conference reports through Monday, no extension resolution would be necessary. Of course, if a situation develops where that does not happen, then we have already anticipated that in relation to expiring legislation.

Mr. HALLECK. A further question, if the gentleman please. A bill having to do with impacted school areas has been listed for consideration. I did not notice it in the list the gentleman just read.

Mr. McCORMACK. My recollection is that that bill was passed on the Unanimous Consent Calendar. There were 4 or 5 bills on this list, I might advise the gentleman, that were passed on the Consent Calendar.

Mr. MARTIN. For the information of the men who work on the Consent Calendar, is there liable to be another call of the Consent Calendar on Monday?

Mr. McCORMACK. No.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will state that he thinks it would be a waste of time to pass House bills on Monday; that we shall only consider Senate bills and concur in Senate amendments.

Mr. MARTIN. I agree with the Speaker.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to extend their remarks in the body of the RECORD immediately prior to the vote on H. R. 7470.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 2 legislative days within which to extend their remarks in the RECORD on the bill H. R. 3255.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Mr. SIEMINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I be granted a leave of absence on Monday.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

Mr. MINSHALL asked and was given permission to address the House for 60 minutes on Monday next, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered.

Mr. MERROW asked and was given permission to address the House for 10 minutes on Monday next, following any special orders heretofore granted.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may be permitted to extend their remarks in the RECORD immediately preceding the vote on the bill H. R. 7619 today.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

ANNUITABLE SERVICE UNDER THE CIVIL SERVICE RETIREMENT ACT

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to include a bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced a bill, H. R. 2090, which provides that those working in the House of Representatives at the present time and who have rendered service for Members of Congress at a previous time but paid salary of the Members, may apply for retirement and be included in the Retirement Act on making the necessary back payments. This is a just bill, and I hope it will be passed. It is very hard to work side by side in an office with an employee who has the benefit of long-service contributions and retirement when one has had equally long service but cannot get full retirement benefits because the Member paid him or her in a time from his salary—it makes for great bitterness. Not many would be involved. All kinds of retirement benefits have passed, including those employed by the States. Please, oh please, pass this and right a great injustice. Millions and millions of dollars have been spent in civil-service benefits this year. I cannot understand the failure of this bill.

THE LATE HONORABLE RICHARD B. VAIL

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. O'HARA].

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, it is my sad duty to announce the passing in the city of Chicago on July 29 of the Honorable Richard B. Vail, who represented the 2d District of Illinois in the 80th and 82d Congresses. Funeral services will be held on Monday. Mr. Vail was born on August 31, 1895, on the South Side of Chicago, which later he represented in the Congress of the United States and in which his father and grandfather had been pioneer residents.

When World War I broke out he was a student in John Marshall Law School. He laid aside his books to enlist in the service of his country and became a lieutenant of infantry. In World War II, he was chairman of the selective service appeals board and a member of the War Labor Board. He generously endowed a service center on the South Side which will be remembered in warm appreciation by many servicemen of that period.

He was an active member of the American Legion giving to his own post not only the contribution of his devotion but also most generous financial aid enabling it to own one of the finest Legion homes in Chicago.

At the time of his death, Mr. Vail was board chairman of the Vail Manufacturing Co., the makers of wire specialities. His brother, Walter Vail, Jr., is the company president. To him and to the two sisters surviving, I extend my deepest sympathy in their great loss.

The Honorable Richard B. Vail will long be remembered as a man of deep convictions and courage in championing that in which he believed. He was held in warm affection by a host of friends with many of whom he had grown up from boyhood.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. I yield.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I am deeply grieved to learn of the death of Congressman Vail. He was on the Committee on Veterans' Affairs when I was chairman of the committee in the 81st Congress. He was an extremely fine, courageous, and extremely able gentleman and Member of Congress. The Congress passed a great deal of veterans' legislation in that session and he was always active in its passage. He will also be remembered for his great contribution in fighting un-American activities. My deepest sympathy goes to his family and friends and to the State of Illinois. We can ill afford to lose men of his caliber.

Mr. REED of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. I yield.

Mr. REED of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, It is with deep regret and great sorrow that I learned of the sudden death of Richard B. Vail at the Presbyterian Hospital in Chicago on Friday, July 29.

We all remember his great services and untiring efforts in combating communism during his tenure as a Member of Congress when he served on the Committee on Un-American Activities. His utter fearlessness in taking a definite position in all controversial issues endeared him to all who had the privilege of serving with him.

Not only was he a faithful representative of his constituency but was active in many civic and charitable organizations benefiting mankind in his community. He will be sorely missed by the people of Illinois and the Members of this body.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. I yield.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, when I learned of the passing of Dick Vail it made me very, very sad. I shall always remember him as one of the finest, friendliest and nicest Members of the

House that I have known in my time in the House of Representatives. With all of that, Mr. Speaker, he was an able and effective Member of this body. His service will always be remembered by us. It is a service that has been useful to the State and to the country. I am, indeed, sorry to learn of his passing and to his loved ones, I extend my deepest sympathy.

Mrs. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. I yield.

Mrs. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, I was shocked and saddened this morning on learning of the passing of Dick Vail. I know of no Member of the House who was so generous in his friendship and so unfailing in the good cheer that he gave every day. I am thinking tonight of the sisters in particular to whom he was more than the usual good brother. I wish to extend to them and to his brother my deepest sympathy. I would like to think of Dick Vail as he came through the door with a smile on his face and with his shoulders set back, ready to battle for the things in which be believed. I know of no man in the House who more thoroughly showed at all times the courage of his convictions. I know what his loss will mean to his many friends in his district. I, as well as the many Members of the House who were privileged to call him friend, will miss him.

Mr. McVEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. I yield.

Mr. McVEY. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join with my colleagues in lamenting the passing of my good friend, Richard Vail. It was my privilege while he was a Member of the House to become very well acquainted with Mr. Vail.

I can say without reservation that I have never found anyone more thoroughly devoted to those principles that have made this country great than was Mr. Vail. In his passing we have lost a wonderful American.

I wish to extend my deepest sympathy to the remaining members of his family.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 days in which to extend their remarks on the life and public service of Mr. Vail.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I was shocked beyond measure when I heard of the passing of my good friend Richard B. Vail. He was possessed of great character and integrity. During the years he was in Congress he served his country, his State, and his district with distinction.

I know every Member of Congress who was privileged to serve with Dick Vail, will remember his many courtesies and acts of kindness.

I join with all his many friends in expressing my heartfelt sympathy to the members of his family.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, it was with a deep sense of personal loss that I learned of the untimely death of Dick Vail, whose friendship I valued highly. He was a man whose many fine personal qualities endeared him to all who knew him, a charming person with whom it was a pleasure to be associated.

But he was a great deal more than that, and it is these additional qualities which make his death a public as well as a private loss. Richard B. Vail was devoted to the principles of republicanism, of democracy, to those qualities which have made America great. He was an ardent anti-Communist and performed a significant service to his country through his participation in the work of the House Committee on Un-American Activities in the 80th Congress. He saw clearly the danger to the strength of this country which lay in the growing power of the Federal Government, and he opposed vigorously, both as a Member of the 80th and 82d Congresses and as a private individual, the impending threat of the trend toward socialism.

Dick Vail was a Christian gentleman, whose deep and real kindness was evidenced by frequent and generous contributions made quietly and privately to many needy individuals and organizations. He was a man who never knowingly injured another, and who was scrupulously fair to all.

His death is a great loss to the people he served, to his friends, and to his family. I should like to extend to his sisters, Emily and La La, and his brother, Walter, my deepest sympathy.

Mr. VELDE. Mr. Speaker, I know many Members of this House are sorely grieved as I am to have learned this past weekend of the passing of our former colleague, Richard B. Vail, of Chicago.

There was no more militant foe of communism in the Congress than Dick Vail. He was known for his steadfastness and firmness of conviction. Dick always spoke out as his conscience dictated regardless of political considerations and everyone respected him for it.

Those of us who knew Dick so well will miss the warmth of his friendship, the wisdom of his counsel, and the determination of purpose with which he met every problem.

Our deepest sympathy goes out to Dick Vail's family and close associates in their hour of bereavement.

NORTH AMERICAN AIRLINES

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentletman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, on July 1 the Civil Aeronautics Board issued an order revoking the operating authority of North American Airlines, the company which originally introduced air coach to American aviation, a company with a perfect safety record. This action comes as the culmination of a many-year effort to banish this airline. The carrier was charged with flying too frequently and regularly, allegedly in violation of its temporary operating authority.

In the words of one of the carriers' executives, James Fischgrund:

> We are evidently guilty of flying too many people too often, too cheaply, and doing this profitably without any subsidy from the Government.

In the light of all the facts, I should like to issue this warning: that the elimination or the crippling of North American will result in a general increase in the cost of airline transportation. Fares will go up once the air-coach pioneer is put out of business.

There has been a tremendous impatience in certain quarters to get North American on the ground and let fares go sky high. This is why cease-and-desist orders curtailing North American are cause for celebration among the high-fare, subsidy-minded carriers, while a genuine cause of worry to the traveling public.

For years the major airlines have resisted any investigation of passenger rates. In the entire history of the CAB there has never been a fare investigation. Some years ago the Board voted to hold such an investigation, and then, under pressure from the industry, the Board reversed itself and called off the rate investigation. Thus, there still has been no study or analysis of passenger fares, from which the industry derives 90 percent of its revenue.

North American has been the pace setter in low fares. It provides the yardstick, because its rate of 3.2 cents per mile is based on realistic costs. There is no mail pay, and if the company goes into the red it cannot fall back on subsidy. Therefore its rates have become a practical criterion and we find major airlines fares closely parallel those of North American on those segments where North American also offers service. On segments where there is no independent competition, the rates are substantially higher.

In 1953 a majority of the Board permitted all carriers to arbitrarily up their fares by $1 per ticket. Two members of the CAB, Josh Lee and Joseph Adams, dissented on the grounds that there was no supporting evidence of any need. This capricious increase costs the public $30 million annually.

We now have considerable talk in the industry of a further fare increase, despite the fact that the financial picture for most of the major airlines has been exceptionally good in recent years. The claim is that costs have been rising, therefore fares should go up. This, despite the fact that the industry is the fastest growing in the country and is evolving away from the exclusive, luxury concept into a mass consumer industry.

The only thing that stands in the way of an arbitrary fare increase is North American. Although this company is relatively small, it has pursued a policy of national advertising which has educated the public to the idea of $99 fares for transcontinental travel and similar low rates on shorter runs. As long as there is one company which insists on low fares, and high utilization of equipment, the rest of the industry must follow. Large volume at a small profit is

the keystone of American abundance—this was North American's contribution to aviation.

For this reason, Mr. Speaker, I fear any steps to hobble or curtail North American will have industrywide repercussions which will ultimately cost the traveling public millions of dollars in additional fares.

This will be the major effect of the CAB's move to kill this company. I should like to know any beneficial results that come from banishing the one independent company which survives in passenger air transportation, and which bases its business success not on charging what the traffic will bear but rather on the basis of attracting the greatest number of customers.

I know all of the negative consequences of grounding this company: the effect on fares, the elimination of the one company that might possibly win a certificate for permanently supplying air coach, the tightening of monopoly control on aviation. But I fail to see any specific good, or gain to the traveling public, to the taxpayer, or to the national defense by killing off an enterprise that has shown great creative ingenuity, that has stood on its own feet financially, that has a perfect safety record, and that has tried and is trying to be certificated to provide the kind of air transportation which the great mass of the American people seek and require. In the eyes of the CAB, self-reliance appears to be a crime punishable by death.

Obviously, the only ones who want to see a company like this eliminated are those special interests which regard subsidy as sacred, and who believe that the air belongs exclusively to the grandfather carriers and think of any newcomer as a trespasser.

Mr. Speaker, this is most serious. I am impelled to say these things so that we will be alert to developments now in the making. Too often administrative agencies have waited for Congress to recess to perform some objectionable and irrevocable act.

I should like to urge that the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce move swiftly and directly and examine the entire policy of the Board as regards fares, competition, right of entry, subsidy, and development of air coach. Above all, Congress should be advised as to whether the Civil Aeronautics Act is being administered fully and intelligently by the CAB. We know that the Board has been extremely conscientious about enforcing its so-called "economic regulations," those special rules which it has used to revoke the small veteran enterprises and which are now being used to strangle North American. Has the Board been acting merely as the protective arm for the chosen few grandfather carriers, or has it been concerned with the development of a dynamic public service industry? I urge that the distinguished Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee be especially vigilant.

After all, the day when air travel was merely a frill for the wealthy and for those who traveled on lush expense accounts is over. Today it is a major means of interurban travel for all citizens. The hothouse days are over—today one-third of all air travel is by air coach, thanks to North American. Any attempts by the CAB to hold back dynamic new enterprise must be prevented. The country needs all of the safe, sound, and economical air service it can get. We are entitled to know what the real effect of the CAB's policies are in this respect.

COMMITTEES OF CONFERENCE

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the committees of conference on the bills H. R. 100 and H. R. 6373 may have until midnight tonight to file conference reports.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

MINING, DEVELOPMENT, AND UTILIZATION OF MINERAL RESOURCES OF PUBLIC LANDS WITHDRAWN OR RESERVED FOR POWER DEVELOPMENT

Mr. ENGLE submitted a conference report and statement on the bill (H. R. 100) to permit the mining, development, and utilization of the mineral resources and for other purposes.

ENCOURAGING THE DISCOVERY, DEVELOPMENT, AND PRODUCTION OF CERTAIN DOMESTIC MINERALS

Mr. ENGLE submitted a conference report and statement on the bill (H. R. 6373) to amend the Mineral Program Extension Act and for other purposes.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to revise and extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. PATMAN to revise and extend the remarks he made in the Committee of the Whole this afternoon and include extraneous matter.

Mr. WICKERSHAM.

Mr. DODD.

Mr. MATTHEWS.

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi in two instances.

Mr. KILDAY and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. RIVERS (at the request of Mr. BOYKIN).

Mr. STAGGERS (at the request of Mr. SIKES).

Mr. FLOOD and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. CARNAHAN and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. JONES of Missouri.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska.

Mr. JUDD and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri.

Mr. BYRD.

Mr. DAVIDSON.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas.

Mr. CELLER.

Mr. HARRISON of Nebraska (at the request of Mr. SCHWENGEL).

Mr. SCHWENGEL in three instances, and in one to include the remarks of the president of the University of Iowa, notwithstanding the fact that they will exceed two pages of the RECORD and are estimated by the Public Printer to cost $267.

Mr. BRAY and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. FORD.

Mr. YOUNG in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. MAILLIARD.

Mr. UTT and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. MCCULLOCH.

Mr. HAND.

Mr. ADAIR in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. REES of Kansas and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin in two instances, in one to insert a voting record and in the other extraneous matter.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts and to include a release from the Veterans' Administration.

Mr. RABAUT.

Mr. FISHER (at the request of Mr. PRIEST) and include extraneous matter.

Mr. MCDOWELL (at the request of Mr. PRIEST).

Mr. MACK of Washington in two instances.

Mr. WAINWRIGHT.

Mr. LIPSCOMB.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. KRUEGER (at the request of Mr. LOVRE) from July 28 to August 1, on account of illness.

Mr. CRETELLA, for August 1, on account of death in family.

SENATE ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 34. An act to authorize the leasing of restricted Indian lands for public, religious, educational, recreational, residential, business, and other purposes requiring the grant of long-term leases;

S. 665. An act to revive section 3 of the District of Columbia Public School Food Services Act;

S. 1138. An act to continue the effectiveness of the act of July 17, 1953 (67 Stat. 177), as amended, providing certain construction and other authority; and

S. 2171. An act to amend the Subversive Activities Control Act so as to provide that upon the expiration of his term a member of the Board shall continue to serve until his successor shall have been appointed and shall have qualified.

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 ap-

proval, bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 291. An act to extend the retirement income tax credit to members of the Armed Forces;

H. R. 542. An act to amend the Internal Revenue Code;

H. R. 727. An act to authorize the conveyance of certain land to the Pecwan Union School District for use as the site of a school;

H. R. 898. An act to provide for the approval of deeds executed by the heirs of Anna Hollywood Fickz;

H. R. 910. An act to authorize and direct the sale of certain land in Alaska to John Ekonomos, of the Fairbanks Precinct, Alaska;

H. R. 939. An act for the relief of Laura Safir;

H. R. 999. An act for the relief of Nurith Spier;

H. R. 1159. An act for the relief of Anna Histed (nee Wiesneth);

H. R. 1160. An act for the relief of Vittorio Capano;

H. R. 1408. An act for the relief of Caterina Ruello;

H. R. 1976. An act for the relief of Luigi Tomasella;

H. R. 2788. An act for the relief of Miguel Sandoval-Michel (also known as Arturo Rodriguez-Gomez);

H. R. 2851. An act to make cornmeal and wheat flour available to needy persons;

H. R. 3437. An act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide for a maximum manufacturers' excise tax on the leases of certain automobile utility trailers;

H. R. 3587. An act granting the consent of the Congress to the negotiation of a compact relating to the waters of the Klamath River by the States of Oregon and California;

H. R. 3626. An act for the relief of Ilse Werner;

H. R. 3712. An act to extend the period during which claims for floor stocks refunds may be filed with respect to certain manufacturers' excise taxes which were reduced by the Excise Tax Reduction Act of 1954;

H. R. 3822. An act to amend title V of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended;

H. R. 3856. An act for the relief of Leopoldine Simonetti;

H. R. 3956. An act for the relief of Elizabeth Rotics Whitney;

H. R. 3990. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to investigate and report to the Congress on projects for the conservation, development, and utilization of the water resources of Alaska;

H. R. 4718. An act to authorize and direct the issuance of patent to Robert W. Retherford, of Anchorage, Alaska, to certain land in Alaska;

H. R. 4970. An act for the relief of Edeltraudt Margot Gallagher, nee Hackelberg;

H. R. 5080. An act for relief of Florence E. McConnell;

H. R. 5767. An act for the relief of Sally S. Shulman or Zeli Sholman;

H. R. 5936. An act 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;

H. R. 6002. An act for the relief of Helene Rapp;

H. R. 6036. An act for the relief of Mrs. Florentine Kintzel;

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. 6896. An act for the relief of Luisa Guidi Miller;

H. R. 7148. An act to amend the Internal Revenue Codes so as to provide a personal exemption with respect to certain dependents in the Republic of the Philippines;

H. R. 7224. An act making appropriations for mutual security for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 7301. An act to amend the Rubber Producing Facilities Disposal Act of 1953, as heretofore amended, so as to permit the disposal thereunder of Plancor No. 980 at Institute, W. Va.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 7 o'clock and 38 minutes p. m.) the House, pursuant to its previous order, adjourned until Monday, August 1, 1955, at 10 o'clock a. m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1055. A letter from the Acting Director, Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President, transmitting a report that the appropriation to the Veterans' Administration for "General operating expenses," for the fiscal year 1956, has been apportioned on a basis which indicates a necessity for a supplemental estimate of appropriation, pursuant to paragraph 2 of subsection (e) of section 3679 of the Revised Statutes, as amended; to the Committee on Appropriations.

1056. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, United States Department of Justice, transmitting relative to the case of Mei Chio Chen, A–6967742, involving the provisions of section 4 of the Displaced Persons Act of 1948, as amended, and requesting that the case be withdrawn from those before the Congress and returned to the jurisdiction of this Service; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1057. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, United States Department of Justice, transmitting copies of orders granting the applications for permanent residence filed by the subjects, pursuant to section 4 of the Displaced Persons Act of 1948, as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

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. MURRAY of Tennessee: Committee on Post Office and Civil Service supplemental report. H. R. 7125. A bill to extend to June 30, 1956, the free mailing privileges granted by the act of July 12, 1950, to the members of the Armed Forces of the United States; without amendment (Rept. No. 1131, pt. 2). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BONNER: Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. House Joint Resolution 380. Joint resolution to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to sell the steamship *Monterey;* with amendment (Rept. No. 1600). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 331. Resolution to authorize the Committee on Ways and Means to conduct studies and investigations relating to matters within its jurisdiction; without amendment (Rept. No. 1601). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. COOLEY: Committee on Agriculture. H. R. 4054. A bill to encourage the improvement and development of marketing facilities for handling perishable agricultural commodities; without amendment (Rept. No. 1602). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. McMILLAN: Committee on the District of Columbia. H. R. 7718. A bill to authorize the Capital Transit Co., under certain conditions, to surrender its franchise, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 1603). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. PRICE: Joint Committee on Atomic Energy. H. R. 7038. A bill to authorize appropriations for the Atomic Energy Commission and Maritime Administration for the design, construction, and installation of a nuclear propelled merchant ship; with amendment (Rept. No. 1604). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania: Committee on Ways and Means. H. R. 2667. A bill to amend section 208 (b) of the Technical Changes Act of 1953 (Public Law 287, 83d Cong.); without amendment (Rept. No. 1605). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri: Committee on Ways and Means. H. R. 3413. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that the tax on amounts paid for communication services or facilities shall not apply to amounts paid for the installation of equipment; with amendment (Rept. No. 1606). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. SADLAK: Committee on Ways and Means. H. R. 6143. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1939 to provide that for taxable years beginning after May 31, 1950, certain amounts received in consideration of the transfer of patent rights shall be considered capital gain regardless of the basis upon which such amounts are paid; without amendment (Rept. No. 1607). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BOGGS: Committee on Ways and Means. H. R. 6712. A bill to amend section 1237 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954; without amendment (Rept. No. 1608). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. KEAN: Committee on Ways and Means. H. R. 7634. A bill to provide that amounts which do not exceed 61 cents shall be exempt from the tax imposed upon amounts paid for the transportation of persons; without amendment (Rept. No. 1609). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. ENGLE: Committee of conference. 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 (Rept. No. 1610). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. ENGLE: Committee of conference. H. R. 6373. A bill to amend the Domestic Minerals Program Extension Act of 1953 in order to extend the programs to encourage the discovery, development, and production of certain domestic minerals (Rept. No. 1611). Ordered to be printed.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CURTIS of Missouri:

H. R. 7746. A bill to provide tax relief to a charitable foundation and the contributors thereto; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KARSTEN:

H. R. 7747. A bill to provide tax relief to a charitable foundation and the contributors thereto; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ALGER:

H. R. 7748. A bill to repeal the Federal gasoline tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BARTLETT:

H. R. 7749. A bill to encourage the discovery, development, and production of tin in the United States, its Territories, and possessions; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BENTLEY:

H. R. 7750. A bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 so as to apply the same duty to wheat unfit for human consumption as applies to all other wheat; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 7751. A bill to reduce individual income taxes and certain excise taxes, and to provide that the 52 percent rate of income tax on corporations shall drop to 50 percent on April 1, 1956; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BROYHILL:

H. R. 7752. A bill to provide that all service of postal employees in the Armed Forces of the United States shall be credited for longevity purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. DONOHUE:

H. R. 7753. A bill to provide that no fee shall be charged by any branch of the Defense Department for furnishing copies of official documents related to a veteran's or a serviceman's military record; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mrs. FARRINGTON:

H. R. 7754. A bill to authorize an appropriation for the establishment of a geophysical institute at the University of Hawaii; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 7755. A bill to enable the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii to authorize the city and county of Honolulu, a municipal corporation, to issue general obligation bonds; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 7756. A bill to enable the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii to authorize the city and county of Honolulu, a municipal corporation, to issue public improvement bonds; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 7757. A bill to enable the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii to authorize the Board of Supervisors of the City and County of Honolulu to issue certain bonds for the completion of the construction of the Kalihi tunnel and its approach roads and for the construction of a second bore; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. FERNANDEZ:

H. R. 7758. A bill to amend section 4 of the act of May 31, 1933 (48 Stat. 108); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mrs. GRIFFITHS:

H. R. 7759. A bill to prohibit discrimination on account of sex in the payment of wages by employers engaged in commerce or in operation of industries affecting commerce, and to provide procedures for assisting employees in collecting wages lost by reason of any such discrimination; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. GUBSER:

H. R. 7760. A bill to provide for the establishment of rates of compensation for positions in the Federal Government in appropriate relationship to local prevailing rates for similar positions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. JOHNSON of California:

H. R. 7761. A bill providing for the conveyance of a portion of the Sharpe General Depot, Calif., to the Stockton Port District; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mrs. KNUTSON:

H. R. 7762. A bill to amend the National School Lunch Act so as to authorize assistance to the States in furnishing two half pints of milk a day to school children; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. LANE (by request):

H. R. 7763. A bill to amend the Japanese-American Evacuation Claims Act of 1948, as amended, to expedite the final determination of the claims, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota:

H. R. 7764. 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.

By Mr. QUIGLEY:

H. R. 7765. A bill to amend the Federal Deposit Insurance Act to increase the amount of a deposit which may be insured under that act; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H. R. 7766. A bill to permit the interment of the last survivor of the Union Army and the last survivor of the Confederate Army within the Gettysburg National Military Park, and to provide for the erection of a suitable memorial therein; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey:

H. R. 7767. A bill to permit payments under Public Laws 815 and 874, 81st Congress, with respect to certain children of members of the Armed Forces stationed overseas; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. R. 7768. A bill to revise, codify, and enact into law title 39 of the United States Code entitled "The Postal Service"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. FARRINGTON:

H. R. 7769. A bill to extend the benefits of the Watershed and Flood Prevention Act to Alaska, Hawaii, and Puerto Rico; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. JENKINS:

H. R. 7770. A bill to amend the provisions of the Federal old-age and survivors insurance program relating to the investment of the assets of the trust fund, to consolidate the reporting of wages by employers for income tax withholding and old-age and survivors insurance purposes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SCHWENGEL:

H. R. 7771. A bill to amend sections 4081 and 4082 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to include wholesale distributors within the definition of "producers" of gasoline, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SMITH of Virginia (by request):

H. R. 7772. A bill to authorize the appropriation of funds for the construction of certain highway-railroad grade separations in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. HIESTAND:

H. R. 7773. A bill to provide for the conferring of cash awards for distinguished achievements in various fields, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. OSTERTAG:

H. R. 7774. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide benefits thereunder for all individuals over 65; to terminate old-age assistance under title I, and to provide aid to dependent children in foster care; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. FARRINGTON:

H. J. Res. 427. Joint resolution authorizing and directing the Secretary of the Army to enter into an agreement with the Governor of Hawaii whereby a certain portion of Kapalama Military Reservation, Oahu, T. H., not needed for the military reservation, will be placed in the possession, use, and control of the Government of the Territory of Hawaii and given the status of land ceded to the United States by the Republic of Hawaii, in return for which an equal area of land needed for the military reservation and presently having the status of land ceded by the Republic of Hawaii will be given the status of land acquired by eminent domain proceedings; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. J. Res. 428. Joint resolution to direct the Secretary of the Army to restore white crosses or other religious markers which until recently were above the graves of the honored war dead at the National Memorial Cemetery in Hawaii; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. POWELL:

H. J. Res. 429. Joint resolution designating the period beginning September 9, 1955, and ending September 16, 1955, as Salute to Italy Week; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JENKINS:

H. J. Res. 430. Joint resolution for the incorporation of the Ladies of the Grand Army of the Republic; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. COOPER:

H. Res. 331. Resolution to authorize the Committee on Ways and Means to conduct studies and investigations relating to matters within its jurisdiction; to the Committee on Rules.

H. Res. 332. Resolution providing funds for the expenses of studies and investigations authorized by House Resolution 331; to the Committee on House Administration.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BAUMHART:

H. R. 7775. A bill for the relief of Haralambos Pavlides (Harry Pavlos); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOLIFIELD:

H. R. 7776. A bill for the relief of Shinichi Hiraga; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOSMER:

H. R. 7777. A bill for the relief of Panagiotis Kalatjis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JUDD:

H. R. 7778. A bill for the relief of Yvonne Rohran (Tung) Feng; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LIPSCOMB:

H. R. 7779. A bill for the relief of Tai Win Wong; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MARTIN:

H. R. 7780. A bill for the relief of Chang Hong; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PHILBIN (by request):

H. R. 7781. A bill for the relief of Socrates Nikopoulos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 7782. A bill for the relief of Cho Hung Choy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SMITH of Virginia (by request):

H. R. 7783. A bill to authorize the Philadelphia, Baltimore & Washington Railroad Co. to construct, maintain, and operate a branch track or siding over Second Street SE. in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. WILSON of Indiana:

H. R. 7784. A bill for the relief of Demetrios Tsalikis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. YOUNG:

H. R. 7785. A bill for the relief of Friederike Strachwitz; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.