4. During this period of notable cooperative progress in the free world, those who assert the supremacy of the state and deny the inherent rights of man have also been active. Millions of people of different blood, religions, and traditions have been forcibly incorporated within the Soviet Union, and many millions more have in fact, although not always in form, been absorbed into the Soviet Communistic bloc. In Europe alone, some 100 million people, in what were once 10 independent nations, are compelled, against their will, to work for the glorification and aggrandizement of the Soviet Communist state.

The Communist rulers have expressed, in numerous documents and manifestos, their purpose to extend the practice of communism, by every possible means, until it encompasses the world. To this end they have used military and political force in the past. They continue to seek the same goals, and they have now added economic inducements to their other methods of penetration.

It would be illusory to hope that in their foreign policies, political and economic, the Soviet rulers would reflect a concern for the rights of other peoples which they do not show toward the men and women they already rule. Any free nation that may be persuaded by whatever threat, promise, or enticement to embrace communism will lose its independence and its people will forfeit their rights and liberties. These contrasting records of recent years reflect the essence of the struggle between free countries and the Communist rulers.

5. In the face of the Communist challenge, almost 50 nations which cherish freedom have drawn together in voluntary associations for their collective security. These associations uphold for all their members the right to independent existence, the right to free expression and the right to differ. The purpose of their union is to preserve those national rights, just as within a state people join together to preserve their individual rights.

6. We reject any thought that the cleavage we have described should be resolved by force. We shall never initiate violence. Moreover, we shall use our full influence to assure that Soviet efforts to inflame old antagonisms will not succeed in breaking the peace. The United Nations provides appropriate machinery to assist countries desiring peacefully to bridge their differences and to settle disputes.

Many nations of the free world are ever anxious to proffer their good offices to promote the same end. Our two countries stand constantly ready to aid in negotiation and conciliation with others directly concerned, so as to achieve just settlements of the concrete issues that now trouble the world.

7. We shall persevere in seeking a just and lasting peace and a universal and effectively controlled disarmament which will relieve mankind of the burden and the terror of modern weapons. Meanwhile, the society of free nations must retain the power needed to deter aggression. We recognize that such power should never serve as a means of national aggrandizement but only as an essential shield for every member of the community of nations.

We are determined to make the conquest of the atom a pathway to peaceful progress, not a road to doom.

8. We will not be deflected from the policies and purposes we have herein stated. On the contrary, we will maintain and, where necessary, strengthen and extend them. Thus, we shall help ourselves and others to peace, freedom, and social progress, maintaining human rights where they are already secure, defending them when they are in peril and peacefully restoring them where they have temporarily been lost.

While resolutely pursuing these aims, which are the products of our faith in God and in the peoples of the earth, we shall eagerly grasp any genuine opportunity to free mankind of the pall of fear and insecurity which now obscures what can and should be a glorious future.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.
ANTHONY EDEN.

Mr. President, in my judgment, the joint declaration by the President and the Prime Minister ably states the case of the free world in seeking peace with honor.

But it makes clear that the free world will not be paralyzed in the event of Communist aggression. Rather than to submit new propaganda proposals, the Soviet Union is in effect reminded that a compliance with the Atlantic Charter, the United Nations Charter, and other treaties, which they have signed and violated, would be a more effective demonstration of good faith and peaceful intent.

In any event, we are not going to yield to Communist threats or consent to the destruction of our friends and allies by any international outlaws.

RECESS TO 11 A. M. TOMORROW

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, pursuant to the order previously entered, I move that the Senate stand in recess until 11 o'clock tomorrow morning.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock and 51 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess, the recess being under the order previously entered, until tomorrow, Thursday, February 2, 1956, at 11 o'clock a. m.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 1, 1956

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Rev. Dwight L. Baker, missionary to Nazareth, Israel, Blawenburg, N. J., offered the following prayer:

Our Father, we humbly beseech Thy blessings upon this land of ours, and upon our President and his Cabinet, and upon those who shoulder the great responsibility of formulating, interpreting, and executing the laws by which we live.

Bless those who represent our Nation in world capitals and those who watch in vigilance over our shores to keep them safe.

We pray Thee to give divine wisdom and guidance to President Eisenhower and Prime Minister Eden as they confront themselves with the urgent problems of the Middle East and other areas strained by tension.

We would ask of Thee to let flow through the channels of all our hearts the interests of the whole world as well as our own interests as we dedicate ourselves to the cause of world peace and justice.

May we at all times maintain our souls open to the fact of God's creative purposes which alone can make ours a better world.

In Jesus' name we pray. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

PROVIDING FOR THE SALE OF A GOVERNMENT-OWNED HOUSING PROJECT TO THE CITY OF HOOKS, TEX.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 7540) to provide for the sale of a Government-owned housing project to the city of Hooks, Tex.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, this bill was on the Consent Calendar and when called an objection was made, but as I understand the situation now, the objections that were advanced at that time have been withdrawn; is that so?

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. CUNNINGHAM] has authorized me to say that although he objected to the bill at that time, since we have a report from the Budget recommending the bill with an amendment which I shall offer, he will have no further objection.

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

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

Be it enacted, etc., That, notwithstanding the provisions of any other law, the Housing and Home Finance Administrator (or the head of any department of the United States Government to whom said Administrator may have transferred title to North Village project, Texas 41142) on behalf of the United States is authorized and directed to sell and convey, whenever said project is declared surplus to the needs of the Government, to the city of Hooks, Tex., at fair market value as determined by him on the basis of an appraisal made by an independent real-estate expert, all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to said North Village project, Hooks, Tex., consisting of 248 dwelling units.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. PATMAN: Page 1, strike out lines 4 through 9, inclusive, and insert in lieu thereof the following: "Administrator of General Services on behalf of the United States is authorized and directed to sell and convey the North Village project, Texas 41142, whenever said project is determined by him to be surplus to the needs of Government."

The amendment was agreed to.

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

House Resolution 390 was laid on the table.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

THE LATE JOE JONATHAN MANLOVE

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHORT].

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, I regret to inform the House at this time of the death of a former distinguished Member of this body. Yesterday I received a telegram advising me that my old

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

friend and colleague in the House, the Honorable Joe Jonathan Manlove, who served for 10 years as a Member of this body, passed away after a rather prolonged and serious illness.

Older Members of the House, of course, will remember and anyone who ever met him will never forget Joe Manlove. He was born on a farm near Carthage, Mo., October 1, 1876, educated in the public schools down in the Ozarks, and after graduating from Presbyterian Academy at Mount Vernon, Mo., he studied law and was admitted to the bar. Most of his time and effort, however, were devoted to agriculture, livestock, real estate, and the development of southwest Missouri. As secretary of the Ozark Playground Association from 1920 to 1922, he coined the phrase that "The Ozarks is a land of a million smiles." He loved sports and outdoor life.

He served in this body from 1923 to 1933 after making two unsuccessful attempts to come to Congress. I am sure that the older Members here will remember him because of his affability and amiability, his friendliness, his kindness. It was his warm human qualities which made him personable and likable.

In the quarter of a century that I have been around here I have never served with any Member of the Congress more accommodating or who would go further out of his way to do a favor for not only any constituent but any friend than would Joe Manlove. He was also a clever, astute, and resourceful politician; not quite as good as his dear and devoted wife, Alma. I can assure you he was a most formidable opponent. I learned that when I defeated him in 1934 for the Republican nomination for Congress by a mere margin of 2,100 votes, as I recall, the closest race and the hardest that I ever had. It not only nearly killed Joe, but it nearly killed me. Notwithstanding that contest of ours, my sister did most of his abstract work, because he was a large landholder in southwest Missouri. Our families remained good friends. Joe and I forgot our political battle much more quickly than did many of our friends.

In 1943 Mr. Manlove was elected as one of the delegates to write a new constitution for the State of Missouri. He served his State and country well not only in Congress, but out of Congress, and will be remembered as the founder of the Missouri State Society in Washington, D. C. In his death our beloved Ozark country has lost a real booster and genuine friend, the Republican Party a strong champion, and our State and Nation a true patriot and loyal citizen.

Today my sympathy goes out to a fine son, Col. A. W. Manlove, and his splendid family—a young man who made a wonderful record in World War II and is now serving his country in Alaska. Joe will be missed by his many friends left here but I know he is very happy again to be with Alma.

Mr. Speaker, I now yield to the former distinguished Speaker, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN].

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, I join with my good friend the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHORT] in expressing my deep regret at the passing of Joe Manlove. It was my privilege to enjoy his friendship for a good many years. He was a friendly man and loved by all who knew him. He was a conscientious legislator, one of lofty ideals and in his death Missouri has lost one of its great men.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. REED].

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I wish to pay tribute to Joe Manlove. He was a great friend of mine, and we kept up a correspondence over the years until recently. He was a very genial, fine man, and a great patriot, and I regret exceedingly his passing.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks, and I also ask unanimous consent that all Members may extend their remarks at this point in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

AMENDING AGRICULTURAL ACTS OF 1949 AND 1954

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 8320) to amend the Agricultural Act of 1949 and the Agricultural Act of 1954 with respect to the special school milk program and the brucellosis-eradication program for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I do not intend to object, I would like to ask the gentleman from Mississippi to give me a brief explanation of the bill.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Speaker, H. R. 8320 is in two sections and is designed to accomplish two distinct purposes.

First, the bill increases the authorized use of Commodity Credit Corporation funds for the special school milk program from $50 million to $60 million for the current school year.

Second, the bill provides for a further acceleration of the brucellosis-eradication program among cattle by authorizing an increase from $15 million to $17 million in the Federal funds available in this joint Federal-State activity for the fiscal year ending this June 30.

These increases in funds follow Department of Agriculture recommendation as to the amount that can be expended advantageously in these programs.

This bill insures that the special school milk program will continue uninterrupted during the remainder of the present school term. This program, which Congress authorized in 1954, has been very successful in disposing of surplus milk and improving the health of our children. There is no way of measuring its value in terms of the health of our schoolchildren. More than 62,000 schools already are participating in this program, which represents about a 50-percent increase within a year.

It is estimated that this school milk already reaches approximately one-half the Nation's children up through the high-school grades, and the distribution in the current school year will amount to almost 1 billion half pints. More schools are joining the program constantly, as they complete arrangements for distribution of milk.

The Federal Government pays up to 4 cents a half pint on the cost of this milk.

I want to emphasize that this is one of the most important programs ever operated by our Government in the interest of the health of our children. I am sure that everyone here wants to see the program continued throughout this fiscal year. Failure to pass this bill will result in the program being completely halted in most sections of the country.

I should point out that H. R. 12, already approved by the House and now pending before the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, would provide $75 million for the school milk program for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1956.

Mr. Speaker, the second section of this legislation also is of utmost importance. It expands our program to eradicate brucellosis among cattle.

Considerable progress has been made since the accelerated program was authorized by Congress in 1954. This is a cooperative program with the Federal Government and the States sharing the cost. The purpose of this program is to eliminate both the disease and the infected cattle as rapidly as possible.

Such elimination has been speeded up by increased Federal and State indemnity payments for animals slaughtered because of brucellosis.

The Department of Agriculture, in supporting the increased authorization said that even though State funds for carrying out the cooperative eradication project have been increased from $11,233,731 in fiscal 1955 to $15,775,099 for 1956, they, with the Federal support available, have not been adequate to meet program demands in the current fiscal year.

Federal funds are being used to carry out the cooperative program with the States and have not supplanted State funds.

The interruption or disruption of any disease control program through a lack of funds has a very serious effect because the disease is allowed to spread and gain in areas that have been cleaned up. Both the State and Federal Governments have invested heavily in programs in certain States where the program is making such substantial progress that it seems possible to certify the States as brucellosis-free during this fiscal year.

Large investments of State and Federal funds have been made in programs in many other States that have now reached the point where any interruption of the program would result in costly delays which would necessitate additional expenditures in the future to regain lost ground.

H. R. 8320 is intended to prevent loss of ground in this important program, and to keep this program at its full effectiveness. I am sure the Congress wants to participate fully with the States in the eradication of brucellosis until the job is done.

Mr. Speaker, this bill is in the interest of all our people and it deserves the unanimous support of the Congress.

Mr. Speaker, I might say that there is a unanimity of opinion on the bill. It was reported unanimously from the Committee on Agriculture. It had a favorable report from the Department of Agriculture and has been cleared by the leadership on both sides of the aisle.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ABERNETHY. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, I do not intend to object to the consideration of this measure. This is emergency legislation. It should be passed now in order to carry on two very important programs dealing with the health and welfare of the American people.

I withdraw my reservation of objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, as the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN] said, this is emergency legislation.

Mr. ABERNETHY. That is correct.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object—and I shall not object—I wish to commend the committee for the action they have taken. I introduced this legislation, along with the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. ABERNETHY]. There are 22 States in need of funds under the brucellosis eradication program in this fiscal year. There are 19 States in which the School Milk Program funds are running out at the present time and they will need funds at the close of this quarter. For that reason, this bill is of an emergency nature and should be passed as soon as possible by the Congress.

Outstanding increases in milk consumption are being obtained this year under the special milk program. In fact, the program is expanding so rapidly that additional legislation is required in order to keep the program running without disruption until the end of the current school term.

This action today is an immediate need and is separate from legislation that I have introduced in the House which calls for the extension of the program beyond this school year at a minimum level of $75 million each school year.

The school milk program was developed by our committee as an additional and beneficial means of providing price supports for dairy products. I felt that no finer use could be made of our abundant milk supply than its increased consumption, as fluid milk, by our school children. I also felt that rather than depend solely upon the purchase and storage approach, increased efforts should be made to move more milk directly into consumption.

The actual results under the program are more than living up to our expectations. By mid-December of 1955, more than 62,000 schools throughout the country were in the program. This was more schools than are now in the school lunch program, which has been operating since 1946. Total fluid milk useage under the program this year is expected to be about 800 million pounds.

The Department of Agriculture has reported that, in a study covering more than 1,400 individual schools in 15 States, sales of milk under the program in October 1955 were 80 percent above sales in October 1953. This increase was over and above any increase in milk sold as part of a complete lunch in these schools.

I feel certain that every member of the House wants this program to continue its fine contribution—both to the expansion of dairy markets and to the health of children. The bill being discussed here today was introduced by Congressman ABERNETHY and myself and would increase the amount of Commodity Credit Corporation funds that may be used for the program this year from $50 million to $60 million, or by $10 million.

I understand that the Department does not expect that the full $60 million will be needed this year. However, in 19 States the program has already expanded to a point where they will exhaust their share of the $50 million in the near future. Some of the additional funds needed by these States are now being met out of funds that are excess to the needs of other States.

However, the whole situation has tended to create uncertainties in the minds of both school and dairy people in some States. They are wondering if they should cut back their efforts to promote the program. They do not want to do this. Neither do they want to place schools in the position of risking any financial losses.

Action by the Congress to increase the authorization to $60 million will eliminate these uncertainties on the part of people in the States and will insure the full continuance of the program this year.

I feel that this bill deserves the full support of the Congress.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to include here the testimony of Roy Lennartson, Deputy Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service, before the Dairy Subcommittee of the House Committee on Agriculture relating to the 1955–56 special school milk program, January 24, 1956, at 10 a. m.:

We in the Department of Agriculture very much appreciate this opportunity to discuss legislation designed to insure that the special school milk program will continue intact during the remainder of the present school year.

The legislation with which this hearing is concerned would amend section 201 (c) of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, to increase the maximum authorized use of Commodity Credit Corporation funds for the special school milk program from $50 million to $60 million for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956. The Department of Agriculture favors the enactment of this amendment as promptly as possible.

In his farm message to the Congress, the President reported that this program to increase fluid milk consumption by schoolchildren had met with gratifying success—both as a means of contributing to better health habits and to expanding present and future farm markets. He recommended that the program be extended and enlarged and also reported:

"I have been advised that, in some States, milk program funds are nearing depletion. We must see to it that the program is carried forward intact through this fiscal year."

It is this immediate problem that the legislation now under discussion is designed to meet.

As you know, the special school milk program was authorized by the Agricultural Act of 1954, which became law just as most schools were opening for the fall term in 1954. Despite this necessarily late start—with the excellent work of State educational agencies and the dairy industry—the program was rapidly put into operation. Almost 42,000 schools entered the program last year and substantial consumption increases were obtained in a large proportion of the schools.

However, as operating experience was gained last year, it became evident that some revisions were required to obtain the program's full potential. Last spring the Department took the leadership in working with school and dairy people to institute needed improvements in the program for this year. These improvements were primarily directed toward making it possible for more schools to institute price reductions as a starting point in a many-sided effort to make milk more available to children.

The revised program has met with wide approval. By early December this year, 62,00 schools were in the program, an increase of more than 48 percent over last year's excellent record. A special study conducted by the Department in over 1,000 individual schools in 13 States showed that in October there was an 81-percent increase in extra milk servings over 1953. This is in addition to the additional milk served as part of complete lunches under the national school-lunch program.

In fact, the immediate problem in at least a dozen States is not expansion of the milk program. Right now they are concerned that action may soon be necessary to discontinue or dilute the program because of the uncertainties in the fund situation.

This is the situation that would be forestalled by the early enactment of the proposed legislation.

In the absence of any reliable basis for forecasting the probable performance under the revised program, it was agreed that funds should be temporarily divided among the States on the basis of the National School Lunch Act formula and that funds would be advanced to States on a quarterly basis. In addition, the Department withheld, in reserve, 25 percent of the $50 million, as a means of meeting the needs of those States where the program might expand most rapidly. In spite of these precautions, the sharp expansion this year is placing a serious strain on the maximum authorization for the program.

In summary, this is the current situation, based upon the best estimates States have been able to make:

There are 12 States that will have spent their entire allotment of funds by March 1. These States are already asking the Department if schools should be put on notice that funds to finance price reductions may be exhausted prior to the end of the school term.

An additional seven States are likely to exhaust their allotment prior to the end of the school year.

The fund situation in five States appears to be in balance.

The remaining 25 States do not appear to need their full allotment and the unneeded funds can be shifted to meet the needs of the 19 States in a deficit position as the year progresses.

We have already moved rapidly to effect these transfers and have already obtained releases on $3.7 million of the remaining funds scheduled for advance to the surplus States. Additional releases are expected when States have had an opportunity to make an accounting of their funds through December.

In our judgment, however, maximum possible steps in this respect are not sufficient to meet the immediate situation in the 12 most critical States.

In view of the uncertainties, these States are not attempting to expand the program to additional schools.

The best estimates that States have been able to make indicate that total program expenditures this year, assuming no limitation on available funds, may not be much in excess of $50 million. However, to insure that adequate funds can be made available at the right times and in the right places, we believe it essential that the authorization for this year's program be increased to $60 million. This increase will not mean an increase in the current estimate of expenditure. Rather, it is designed to provide needed flexibility to shift funds among States in accordance with program needs and, thus, assure full development of the program in all States.

Early action to increase the maximum authorization would provide assurances to all States that they would not be asking schools to underwrite price reductions to children for which reimbursement would not be forthcoming. The increase in the maximum authorization by the proposed $10 million is needed primarily to provide sufficient flexibility in the management of program funds to prevent the discontinuance of the program in any State before the end of the school year.

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I wish to commend the chairman of the Dairy Subcommittee, Hon. TOM ABERNETHY, of Mississippi, and the chairman of the House Committee on Agriculture, Hon. HAROLD COOLEY, of North Carolina, on the prompt action that has been taken on H. R. 8320. They considered it must legislation.

This bill increases by $10 million the Federal funds available for the school-milk program and by $2 million the funds for the brucellosis program, both for the current fiscal year. I am very much interested in the passage of this legislation, since my State, Wisconsin, is in need of funds to finish the current year, as are 11 other States. It is my understanding that if this money is not appropriated the State of Wisconsin will be out of funds by April 1.

The school-milk program has met with great success. In December 62,000 schools were in the program, representing an increase of more than 48 percent within a year. The increase in the authorization for this program is now needed primarily to provide sufficient flexibility in the management of the program funds to prevent the discontinuance of the program in any State before the end of the school year. I hope that the House will unanimously approve this bill today.

I have introduced bills in this session and in the last session to increase the funds available for the school-milk program. In the last session I supported H. R. 12, which would have provided $75 million for the school-milk program for the current fiscal year if it had passed the Senate.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, I, too, commend the gentleman and his committee for the action they have taken. I should like to point out that the present Secretary of Agriculture and the present administration attempted to eliminate the brucellosis eradication program the first year in office. It was through the action of the chairman of the Agriculture Subcommittee on Appropriations, Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN, that this program was kept alive. I think now the administration seems to be proud of it, but these are the circumstances under which it has been retained.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I wonder if the gentleman could give us a further explanation of the progress made in the brucellosis eradication program; how far they have gone, what progress they are making and whether they are getting the disease under control.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Yes, I should be glad to give the gentleman some information on that. But, in order to save just a little time, I will say that the report fully covers the matter, particularly on page 3 where the gentleman will find a table setting forth the number of reactors found during the years 1954, 1955, and 1956, and the progress made during those particular years. Incidentally, there has been excellent progress made in the brucellosis eradication program. It is a very popular program throughout the country. The States have responded to it remarkably well. They have made very substantial monetary contributions to the program.

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 the last sentence of section 201 (c) of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, is amended to read as follows: "For the period beginning September 1, 1954, and ending June 30, 1955, not to exceed $50 million, and for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, not to exceed $60 million, of the funds of the Commodity Credit Corporation shall be used to increase the consumption of fluid milk by children in nonprofit schools of high-school grade and under."

SEC. 2. Section 204 (e) of the Agricultural Act of 1954 is amended to read as follows: "As a means of stabilizing the dairy industry and further suppressing and eradicating brucellosis in cattle, the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to transfer not to exceed $20 million for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, from funds available to the Commodity Credit Corporation to the funds appropriated to the Department of Agriculture for such fiscal year for the purpose of accelerating the brucellosis eradication program, for the purpose of increasing to not to exceed $50 per head of cattle the amount of the idemnities paid by the Federal Government for cattle destroyed because of brucellosis in connection with cooperative control and eradication programs for such disease in cattle entered into by the Secretary under the authority of the act of May 29, 1884, as amended, for the purpose of increasing the number of such indemnities, and for the purpose of defraying any additional administrative expenses in connection therewith. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to reimburse the Commodity Credit Corporation for expenditures pursuant to this section."

With the following committee amendments.

On page 2, line 6, strike out "of Agriculture."

On page 2, line 7, strike out "$20,000,000" and insert "$17,000,000."

Page 2, lines 9 and 10, strike out "funds appropriated to the Department of Agriculture", and insert "appropriation item 'Plant and Animal Disease and Pest Control' in the Department of Agriculture Appropriation 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.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have permission to revise and extend their remarks on the bill just passed at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

FISCAL YEAR 1957 NAVY SHIPBUILDING AND CONVERSION PROGRAM

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 392 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for consideration of the bill (H. R. 7993) to authorize the construction and conversion of certain naval vessels, and for other purposes. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill, and shall continue not to exceed 3 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Armed Services, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ALLEN], and pending that I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules I call up House Resolution 392 which will make in order the consideration of H. R. 7993, to authorize the construction and conversion of certain naval vessels and for other purposes.

House Resolution 392 provides for an open rule and 3 hours of debate on the bill.

The purpose of H. R. 7993 is to authorize the construction of 23 new ships, of which 22 are combatant types, 5,000 tons of landing craft, and for the conversion and modernization of 23 vessels.

Except for 2,800 tons of escort vessels this is not a naval tonnage authorization bill. There is available sufficient

unobligated tonnage from shipbuilding authorization acts. However, the Armed Services Committee feels that the shipbuilding and conversion programs of the Navy should be reviewed by them so that they, and the Congress, will be aware of what ships are proposed for construction and conversion.

The Department of Defense has requested, and there is included in the 1957 budget $1,429,000,000 for the program. Included in this program is authorization to commence design and advance procurement of a nuclear-powered aircraft carrier in order that such a carrier may join the fleet at an earlier date than would otherwise be possible.

Officials of the Department of the Navy have assured the Armed Services Committee that there will be an appropriate distribution of the construction program between private and Government shipyards throughout the United States.

I urge the adoption of House Resolution 392 to prompt consideration may be given H. R. 7993.

I know of no objection to the rule nor have I heard of any objection to the bill itself.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I have no objection to the rule, and I do not know of any objection to it. I have no requests for time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON HEALTH AND SCIENCE

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Speaker, at the request of the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. PRIEST], chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Health and Science be permitted to sit this afternoon at 2 o'clock during general debate.

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

There was no objection.

GENERAL RIDGWAY

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the reqeust of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, as can be expected, there are now certain desk jockeys and lick-spittle swivel-chair cocktail commandos who are attacking the integrity of the great General Ridgway because of certain charges he has made against the Department of Defense and certain personalities.

I would like to remind you, Mr. Speaker, that General Ridgway commanded the United Nations forces in the Far East. General Ridgway commanded the NATO forces in Europe. General Ridgway is a soldier's soldier. And General Ridgway was Chief of Staff of the United States Army.

Mr. Speaker, the great General MacArthur commanded in the Far East, but not in Europe. The great General Eisenhower commanded in Europe, but not in the Far East. These men were also Chiefs of Staff. But the only great general to command troops in the field in the Far East and in Europe and to be Chief of Staff is the distinguished soldier General Ridgway.

THE STATUS OF FORCES TREATY

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimouse consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, during recent months the case against the Status of Forces Treaty has been fully outlined in the record of our proceedings by the proponents of House Joint Resolution 309. This morning I presented a statement to the House Committee on Foreign Affairs which sets forth some of the facts and arguments on the other side of this question. The text of my statement is set forth below for the benefit of our colleagues who are interested in studying the many aspects of this problem.

STATEMENT OF REPRESENTATIVE STEWART L. UDALL TO HOUSE COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS, FEBRUARY 1, 1956

Mr. Chairman, I wish to present a statement this morning in opposition to House Joint Resolution 309. I have made a careful study of the issues framed by this resolution, and I am convinced that it is against the national interest. If enacted it would imperil the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, and disturb the spirit of cooperation which exists between the nations allied with us as partners in programs of common defense.

One of the reasons which impels me to appear before your committee is that the transcript of the July hearings disclosed that not a single Member of the House—of either political party—appeared in person to present the negative side and say the hard things which must be said against this resolution. I am confident, however, that there is a substantial segment of responsible opinion in the House (and in this committee) which supports the forthright position taken by the President and his administrators. Therefore, I think it is important that someone attempt to summarize, for the record, the arguments which make mandatory the defeat of this resolution.

Let me add one other comment before discussing the merits of this controversy. Although the proponents have been at pains to phrase their charges in vague terms (some unidentified "they," we are told, have been parties to a "sellout of American rights") this resolution is an attempt to bully President Eisenhower, and represents a frontal attack on his administration.

Why, you ask, should a member of the Democratic Party take the part of the administration in this quarrel? The answer is quite simple. The Status of Forces Treaty is a prime example of the bipartisan approach in foreign affairs. The NATO council formulated this treaty during one administration, and it was sanctioned and ratified by a successor government. The essence of the nonpolitical approach is that it places the national welfare above party advantage, and it is not difficult for me, in that spirit, to rally behind the President on this unpopular issue.

It seems to me that this resolution poses several questions. The first of these is: Did our Government, as charged, abandon established principles of international law in acceding to this treaty?

WAS INTERNATIONAL LAW ABANDONED?

As usual, international law disputes spawn two schools of thought. As a lawyer I am unable to agree with the interpretation placed on the United States Supreme Court cases by the advocates of this resolution. However, this lawyers dispute is irrelevant and takes place in a vacuum for the plain reason that theories of international law have no practical worth unless they are cognizable in foreign courts. The facts adduced before this committee indicate indisputably that the courts of all 15 NATO countries uniformly have never taken cognizance of such legal theories, and retain full sovereign powers in dealing with military forces of other nations.

Clearly then, the contention that local law-enforcement agencies, without the Status of Forces Treaty, would not have jurisdiction of our troops in NATO countries is thoroughly untenable. This is the central argument of the proponents, and once it has been exploded the second logical inquiry should be:

DID THE TREATY ENLARGE OR RESTRICT RIGHTS?

If, indeed, this treaty confers on our citizens the maximum rights obtainable under the circumstances, we should commend the President and his Secretary of State and their critics should be put to silence.

The evidence now before your committee on this point is uncontradicted and of one tenor:

President Eisenhower: "The NATO status of forces agreements represent the maximum concessions obtainable from the foreign governments concerned, and the agreements are working well in practice." (Transcript, p. 38.)

Gen. Walter Bedell Smith: "* * * It would most certainly follow * * * if the multilateral treaties should not become effective, that less favorable terms than those of these treaties would result from separate negotiations with the respective countries." (Transcript, p. 64.)

Deputy Under Secretary Robert Murphy: "We believe that the arrangements we do have are, in general, the best that we can obtain today. We believe that these arrangements are reasonable and practicable and represent considerable concessions to the viewpoint of the United States by our allies." (Transcript, p. 160.)

CONSTITUTIONAL CONSIDERATIONS

One other, more basic, question should command the attention of this committee. I note, Mr. Chairman, that you and other members have directed questions which exhibit a deep concern, constitutionwise, over the wisdom of enacting this resolution.

I refer, of course, to the propriety of a resolution directing the President to act when the constitutional treatymaking power is lodged in the President himself.

At first blush it would appear that the passage of House Joint Resolution 309 would, in effect, censure the Senate for having been foolish enough to ratify the Status of Forces Treaty in the first place. In any event, there is a grave doubt that the Senate could unratify a treaty once approved. Consequently, would not the House, by passing this resolution, be guilty of arrogating to itself a right to give the Executive advice and consent on treaty matters, a prerogative solely vested in the Senate by the Founding Fathers. One wonders, knowing the propensities of our brethren, if the Senate would not look with seemly scorn on such action?

As for the President's powers, the enactment of this resolution would be nothing

less than a crude legislative encroachment wholly unwarranted by the Constitution. In the present state of the world, with our enormous responsibilities in foreign affairs, this is no time for Congress to weaken the Executive by attempting to usurp Presidential powers. Under our system, the President carries the seals of the office of foreign relations; congressional intrusion in this field can only hinder and harass the Executive in the performance of his constitutional functions.

NATO: A NEW CONCEPT

It would be carrying coals to Newcastle for me to make to this committee more than a few passing remarks concerning our NATO enterprise.

I am fearful that many of the arguments which have been presented here in support of House Joint Resolution 309 show an utter disregard of the basic concepts which make up the NATO idea.

As a peacetime military economic alliance, NATO is without precedent in history. Its member nations stand on equal ground as partners. Its council operates, not by majority vote, but by unanimous agreement. As the founding partner in this free world alliance, it is only fitting that our representatives foster that spirit of mutual regard which in the long run will alone ensure NATO's survival and success. Of necessity, they must deport themselves with wholesome restraint and instill cooperation by respecting the sovereignty and rights of our allies.

Much is said about the fact that our country contributes a lion's share of the men and materiel which form the backbone of NATO. Some do not fully realize, however, that the military bases contributed by many of the member countries, in addition to their other commitments, have an incalculable value—and entail an awesome risk in the bargain. (Experts have estimated that the striking power of our Strategic Air Command would be cut as much as 80 percent if we were denied access to our foreign bases.)

The first objective of Soviet foreign policy since 1950 has been the disbanding of the NATO alliance. Our country should take great care to avoid unwitting actions which might lead to the dissolution or enfeeblement of NATO. Such a misstep could hand the Communists a bloodless victory which might tip the scales against us in the cold war.

CONCLUSION

I would like to conclude my statement with a few general comments on these hearings.

First, I feel that the sincere people who have proposed these resolutions have already accomplished a useful purpose. I have no doubt, Mr. Chairman, that by conducting this inquiry your committee has served notice on our coworkers in the Defense and State Departments that we expect them to exercise the utmost vigilance within the framework of these treaties in protecting the rights of our young soldiers.

It is apparent, too, that there is considerable room for improvement in the protection and assistance accorded our soldiers, and I hope legislation will be enacted, (along the lines suggested by Secretary Brucker), to provide free local counsel for our servicemen who stand accused before foreign courts. We can do this and more to preserve the freedom of our men; and simultaneously we can and must wisely preserve our system of alliances which has done so much to keep the peace of the world.

RELIEF FOR FARMERS

Mr. HARVEY. 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 Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. HARVEY. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I introduced a bill which I believe will have the desirable effect of easing the burden the American farmer is presently forced to bear. This legislation will require the Department of Defense to refrain from leasing for agricultural purposes approximately a million acres of land that is temporarily excess to the needs of the Army and Air Force. By taking this public land out of competition with the farmer for the duration of the present agricultural crisis, I am confident that we will be doing substantial service to the farmer and consequently to the American people.

PRICE OF NATURAL GAS

Mr. HIESTAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. HIESTAND. Mr. Speaker, we hear much these days about special interests and little people, particularly in reference to the Harris-Fulbright bill to decontrol the price of natural gas at the wellhead.

Unfortunately those who raise the loudest cries against special interests have not bothered to define what a special interest is. Either they do not know, or they are deliberately hiding the facts for their own political purposes in order to make unjust accusations against the administration.

The Council of Local Gas Companies, which is fighting against the Harris-Fulbright bill, claims to represent more than 60 local gas distribution companies.

But who are these companies? Are they little utility companies serving the so-called little people?

Absolutely not. On the other hand they are composed of great holding companies, namely:

The United Cities Utility Company of Chicago, which controls many companies in North Carolina, Wisconsin, Georgia, South Carolina, southeastern Illinois, and Tennessee—none of which is locally owned.

The Consolidated Natural Gas Company of New York, which controls companies in New York, Ohio, and the Middle Atlantic States—none of which is locally owned.

The New England Gas & Electric Co., which owns a number of New England companies.

The Algonquin Gas Transmission Co., which is a major shareholder of pipelines in New England.

The United Gas Improvement Company of Philadelphia, which controls four other associated companies in New Jersey and Connecticut.

These big holding companies—all in the $100-million class—are fighting against the Harris-Fulbright bill. Do they sound like little people?

In contrast, the 8,000 little independent gas producers all favor the bill.

Another point:

The opponents of the bill claim that the housewives' gas bills will go up $800 million a year if the bill passes.

Actually the total gross return to these 8,000 little producers is far less than one-third that figure. The only way that consumers' bills could go up $800 million would be for the producers to receive nearly three times the total present price they are getting for selling gas to the transmission lines, which in turn wholesale natural gas to the utility companies.

Also, how can the release of control at the wellhead possibly result in an increase to the consumer? The contract price to the pipelines have been fixed for the next quarter century or so.

Four contracts with the Transcontinental Gas Pipeline Corp. provide for more than four times the daily requirement of gas users of the East. There is no chance for gas coming out of the pipeline to cost more than 1 cent per 1,000 cubic feet of gas—unless these big special-interest gas companies who take nine-tenths of the housewives' gas dollar decide they are going to take some profit, and use this bill as an excuse.

Could it be that the big special-interest gas holding companies are simply tricked into fronting for the Socialists who sponsor controls of all sorts?

How can we refrain from controls at the mine for coal, on the farm for poultry, in the forest for timber, if we justify controlling the price of gas at the wellhead?

Could the opposition to this bill be simply another Socialist plot to undermine our free enterprise system?

USE OF EXCESS WHEAT FOR CHICKEN FEED

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, the other day I called attention to the fact that in Michigan, farmers who planted and harvested too much wheat and fed it to their chickens and poultry, are being prosecuted and some of them threatened with jail sentences. Then I suggested that the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY], chairman of the Committee on Agriculture, was sitting on that bill. Now I find I must apologize to him, because coming from the other body yesterday I met him in the corridor, together with the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE] and they both advised me that Mr. COOLEY had not been sitting on that bill as chairman of the committee. I cannot but accept his statement until I learn otherwise. So, I apologize. He said it was a Republican, the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE] who was holding up the bill to amend the act. It may be that tomorrow I will have to apologize to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE]. I am relying on the information I received.

Mr. REED of New York. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I yield.

Mr. REED of New York. They are not sitting on it. The trouble is coming from our side of the House.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. When will we get the bill?

Mr. REED of New York. My small farmers up home have to pay a fine if they do not store this wheat.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I know all about that, but that bill has not been reported out.

Mr. REED of New York. It is the most un-American bill that I know of.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I agree with that.

PLAY BALL—THE BROOKLYN DODGERS WILL DO JUST THAT IN JERSEY CITY THIS YEAR

Mr. SIEMINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SIEMINSKI. Mr. Speaker, this evening in Jersey City, the world famous champions, the Brooklyn Dodgers baseball team is to be welcomed at the Jersey City Armory by the people of Jersey City and Hudson County. This season, as you have probably read in the papers, the Dodgers will play eight games at Jersey City's Roosevelt Stadium.

It was early in 1955 that the Brooklyn Dodgers Baseball Club showed an interest in locating some of its National League games at our Roosevelt stadium.

In the beginning, Walter O'Malley, president of the Dodgers; Mayor Bernard Berry, Commissioners Lawrence Whipple, Joseph Soriero, Donald Spence, and John Ringle sat down to discuss this possibility. At the time, the metropolitan press and people in the area scoffed at the possibility that the world championship Dodger baseball team would come to Jersey City. There was a protracted period of negotiations between the two parties. Mr. O'Malley, Mayor Berry and the commissioners steadfastly held to their respective views. Finally, after a long series of conferences, the negotiations bore fruit. On January 24, 1956, a 3-year contract was signed between the Brooklyn baseball organization and the city of Jersey City, whereby for the next 3 years, the Dodgers would play 8 games at the Roosevelt Stadium in Jersey City. The contract contains a 3-year option, the yearly rental will be $10,000. The Dodgers organization also under the contract are permitted to promote other sports events at the stadium and the city of Jersey City will share in 60 percent of the net receipts of such engagements.

This decision of the Dodger association to come into Jersey City represents a milestone in the advancement of sports in the metropolitan area. Jersey City will become the mecca of sports activity in the years ahead.

The Roosevelt Stadium is second to none in architectural design and modern facilities for athletic games. The people of Jersey City and Hudson County have always been sports-minded. They will support the Dodgers wholeheartedly and they will welcome their entry into Jersey City with outstretched arms. The Dodgers are now part of our Jersey City and greater Hudson County family. We are proud to have them, and we will show them by our attendance at their sports games that we are for them 100 percent.

On Wednesday night, February 1, at the Jersey City Armory, thousands from Jersey City and Hudson County will welcome the Dodger baseball organization. The Governor of the State of New Jersey will be there with Mayor Berry, Commissioners Whipple, Soriero, Spence, and Ringle, and all of the officials of the 11 municipalities throughout Hudson County, in addition to municipal officials from the metropolitan area. The Dodgers organization will be represented by its president, Walter O'Malley, its Vice President Bavasi, and a host of the team, including Walter Alston, the world champion manager; Jackie Robinson, Junior Gilliam, Don Newcombe, Sandy Kovacks, Roy Campanella, Carl Furillo, Gil Hodges, and so forth. This will be our official welcome by the city of Jersey City to this world championship Dodger team. It is going to be a gala affair. We are proud to have them. We are going to do our part in giving the team that moral and enthusiastic support which we hope will carry them to another world championship. Play ball, Dodgers, play ball.

PROPOSED SALE OF SYNTHETIC RUBBER PLANT AT INSTITUTE, W. VA.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, in submitting my resolution disapproving the proposed sale of the synthetic rubber plant at Institute, W. Va., to Goodrich-Gulf Chemicals, Inc., I am mindful of the interest and desire of the State of West Virginia and its congressional delegation to see that this plant is put into production as rapidly as possible. I, too, join with my colleagues from West Virginia in hoping that the Institute plant will soon be opened, bringing employment and other benefits to the people of West Virginia. My resolution for disapproval at this time of the sale of the Institute plant is not based upon any desire to block such a sale. Instead it is based upon my desire, and I believe the necessity, of getting on the record before Congress all of the facts behind the sale so that all of us can feel that it is truly in the best interest of the public and the State of West Virginia.

For instance, the Attorney General in his statements approving the report of the Disposal Commission says that during the course of negotiation he wrote the Disposal Commission that the sale of the facilities to Goodrich-Gulf did not best foster the development of a free competitive industry, since such disposal would add significantly to the substantial position held by Goodrich-Gulf in the field of synthetic rubber. The Attorney General further stated that were this a private transaction rather than a sale by the Government subject to review of the Congress, I would probably request a Federal court to enjoin consummation pending a determination of legality by the court under section 7 of the Clayton Act. In other words, the effect of the sale by the Government to Goodrich-Gulf, as opposed to a sale to one of the other bidders, in the opinion of the Attorney General, may be substantially to lessen competition, or to tend to create a monopoly.

Finally, the Attorney General says that the sale and the contract for sale to Goodrich-Gulf does not adequately protect the right of the small-business man to acquire a fair share of the end product of that facility at a fair price.

Certainly these statements by the Attorney General raise the most serious questions as to why the Attorney General and the Disposal Commission approved the sale as one best designed to foster free competitive industry and to afford small business enterprises the opportunity to obtain a fair share of the end product at fair prices.

These questions are so serious that I believe they must be the subject of congressional inquiry and discussion. My resolution will give to Congress this opportunity.

ATTORNEY GENERAL BROWNELL MISSES AGAIN

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the Small Business Act of 1953, as amended last year, requires the Attorney General or, if requested by him, the Federal Trade Commission to make surveys for the purposes of determining any factors which may tend to eliminate competition, create or strengthen monopolies, or injure small business. The same act also requires the Attorney General to report to the Congress the result of such surveys, together with his recommendations concerning them. Under date of November 9, 1955, Attorney General Brownell sent to the Congress a report pursuant to that law. I have read the report very carefully, as have many other Members.

Obviously, the Attorney General has surveyed nothing. He has reviewed the law we wrote and made some incorrect statements about its application. He has not touched upon a single matter dealing with the elimination of competition, creation or strengthening of monopolies, injuries to small business, or undue concentration of economic power. He has not mentioned either the words or the subject matter.

THE LATE HONORABLE FREDERICK WILLIAM DALLINGER

Mr. MACDONALD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MACDONALD. Mr. Speaker, it is with regret that I announce to the House the death of a former Member who repsented the Eighth Congressional District of Massachusetts from March 4, 1915, to March 3, 1925, and again from November 2, 1926, to October 1, 1932, Frederick William Dallinger.

Judge Dallinger passed away on September 5, 1955, at a North Conway, N. H., hospital at the age of 83 years. For several years prior to his death he had lived in retirement at Center Lovell, Maine.

Judge Dallinger led a full and useful life, serving his community and State in many public offices. He was born in Cambridge, Middlesex County, Mass., October 2, 1871. He attended the public schools of that city, was graduated from Cambridge Latin School in 1889, from Harvard University in 1893, and from the Harvard Law School in 1897. He was admitted to the bar the same year and commenced private practice in Boston, Mass. He was a member of the American, Massachusetts, and Boston bar associations.

Judge Dallinger was a good Republican and was elected to the State legislature, as a member of that party, serving as a member of the State house of representatives in 1894 and 1895 and served in the State senate, 1896 to 1899. He was public administrator of Middlesex County, 1897 to 1932, and served 3 years as president of the Cambridge Board of Trade. In 1912 and 1913 he was a lecturer on government at Harvard University. He was the author of Nominations for Elective Office in the United States.

Judge Dallinger was elected to the 64th and to the 4 succeeding Congresses—March 4, 1915, to March 3, 1925. He was an unsuccessful candidate for the Republican nomination for the United States Senate. Subsequently he was elected to the 69th Congress to fill the vacancy caused by the death of Harry I. Thayer. He was then reelected to the 70th, 71st, and 72d Congresses and served from November 2, 1926, until his resignation, effective October 1, 1932, having been appointed to the bench. He then served as judge of the United States Customs Court from October 2, 1932, until his resignation, on October 2, 1942.

While it was not my good fortune to be intimately acquainted with Judge Dallinger, I want to pay tribute to his highly distinguished record of service to the Nation and to his native State of Massachusetts. He was known for his devotion to the highest standards of legislative service, first in the State Legislature of Massachusetts and later in the Congress of the United States. Everyone who knew him appreciated his fine character, his generosity and fairness and loved him for those qualities. He was indeed a real American and a true Christian gentleman. Our State and Nation have profited by his life and by his service and will be poorer because of his loss. To all of his loved ones I extend my deepest sympathy. I know that Frederick William Dallinger's memory will live on in the hearts of all the citizens of the Eighth Congressional District of Massachusetts which I have the honor of representing.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, as this 84th Congress convenes for its 2d session I take a reverent and respectful moment to note the passing of a former Member of this House from the Commonwealth of Massachusetts. He is Judge Frederick William Dallinger who died in his 84th year on Labor Day, last September 5. Judge Dallinger, who presided over the United States Customs Court for 10 years up to his retirement in 1942, was a man of learning and background. He was a public servant in the best sense of the term, and the kind of scholar whose public life became a part of his material in the teaching of political science. For he lectured on the subject at Harvard and wrote about his public life and the great men of his time with good taste and largely from personal knowledge and contact.

Judge Dallinger served in the House of Representatives from 1915 to 1933 so that he was a Member here from the 64th to the 72d Congress. He was a Republican and liked to refer to himself as an "old-fashioned New Englander." Judge Dallinger and I were participants in the affairs of Government during the latter days of his service in this House and the early days of my career here. He was of one political persuasion and I of another, and I may not have found it possible in my frame of political thinking to go along with Congressman Dallinger on all his views. But I would never hesitate to testify to his integrity, to the honesty of his political convictions, and to his stature as a patriot and a gentleman. Judge Dallinger belonged to the era and was of the genre of such distinguished Americans as Theodore Roosevelt and Charles Evans Hughes. He wrote about his times knowingly and with the validity of the educated man whose approach is factual and well grounded. It may be that his passing will again attract attention to the summary of his views found in his book Recollections of an Old Fashioned New Englander. I commend to your reading also—if alone for its nostalgic interest—his brief work, Some Personalities I Have Known. These personalities include William E. Russell, the late Democratic Governor of Massachusetts; Frederick T. Greenhalge; Roger Walcott; Curtis Guild; Father Thomas Scully, a Catholic Army chaplain; Benjamin Harrison; William McKinley; William Howard Taft; Woodrow Wilson; Warren G. Harding; Calvin Coolidge; and Herbert Hoover. Another of his books worthy of our interest in the political field is Nominations for Elective Office in the United States.

But Judge Dallinger was not only a student and an observer, a public official, a lawyer, and a writer. His influence extended to business and business organization. Born in Cambridge, he was a member of the Massachusetts House and the Massachusetts Senate before the turn of the century and became president of the Cambridge Board of Trade and president of the Cambridge Chamber of Commerce. After his retirement from the bench he engaged in agricultural pursuits, living for years at Center Lovell in Maine. Judge Dallinger was a graduate of Harvard and of the Harvard Law School and will be identified in history as a typical American gentleman ideally prepared for a life of leadership in his time and justifying by his performance the superior advantages which life had given him. He was a Congressman whose ideals of service may well be emulated in our time.

COMMITTEE ON RULES

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Rules may have until midnight tonight to file certain privileged resolutions.

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

There was no objection.

AUTHORIZING CONSTRUCTION AND CONVERSION OF CERTAIN NAVAL VESSELS

Mr. VINSON. 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. 7993) to authorize the construction and conversion of certain naval vessels, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 7993, with Mr. DELANEY 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 Georgia [Mr. VINSON] is entitled to 1 hour and 30 minutes and the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHORT] to 1 hour and 30 minutes.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 30 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Georgia is recognized.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, the bill we have before us today, H. R. 7993, represents the shipbuilding program for fiscal year 1957 which the President has submitted to the Congress as a part of the budget for this year.

This portion of the budget will be studied by the Appropriations Committee in the near future.

I want to point out at the outset that this bill is not necessary to make it in order for the Appropriations Committee

to make funds available for the ships proposed for construction and conversion in this bill. As the report on the bill indicates, there is available about 1⅓ million tons of ship authorizations from laws which have passed the Congress over the past 20 years.

It is clearly, then, within the province of the Appropriations Committee to provide the Navy with the funds for the 1957 program without the Congress passing this bill.

There is one exception to this and that is the escort vessels totaling 2,800 tons which you will see referred to on page 2 of the bill. The Navy does not have any tonnage in this particular category.

Let me quote from that portion of the President's budget message which deals with this year's shipbuilding program:

> This budget provides for continuation of the Navy shipbuilding program at a slightly higher level than in the fiscal year 1956 in order to carry forward the modernization of the fleet, most of which was built during World War II. In addition to those already authorized by the Congress, there is included in the proposed shipbuilding program for 1957 the construction of a sixth carrier of the *Forrestal* class, additional nuclear-powered submarines, guided-missile destroyers and frigates, and an experimental nuclear-powered cruiser. Provision is also made for developing a practical nuclear powerplant for future installation in ships of the large carrier class. Conversion of ships now in the fleet will be undertaken to provide them with additional nuclear weapons and with guided missile capabilities, and to permit them to operate modern high-speed aircraft.

That is what the President had to say in his budget message concerning shipbuilding for this year.

Now, it is the view of the House Armed Services Committee, and one which I think every Member will agree, that the Congress and the public should know—and know in considerable detail—exactly what ships our Navy proposes to build.

I do not mean by this that they would not know as a result of the study of this portion of the budget by the Appropriations Committee, because that committee would bring out all of the pertinent facts during its hearings.

Also, there would appear in the appropriations bill an item for shipbuilding which would spell out in dollars and cents the amount of money which would be used for shipbuilding during the coming fiscal year. However, in order to obtain the details with respect to the individual ships in the program, it would be necessary to examine the somewhat voluminous hearings of the Appropriations Committee.

Now, the Armed Services Committee is of the view that this is such an important part of our defense program that there should be provided easy opportunity to examine the individual ships to be built and the individual conversions to be made so that the matter can be the subject of full and free discussion and debate. And, that is the real and fundamental purpose of presenting this bill to the House.

I think this is a wholesome way to approach our Navy shipbuilding program not only because of our very natural interest in the progress and development of our naval forces but also because a billion four hundred and fourteen million dollars, the cost of this year's program, is a great deal of money.

With these thoughts in mind, the Armed Services Committee held a hearing and took testimony from the Secretary of the Navy; our new Chief of Naval Operations, Admiral Burke; and the constructor of the ships, Admiral Mumma, the Chief of the Bureau of Ships.

The remarks I am going to make will brief the testimony which we received from these officials and let you and the public know the condition of our Navy today and what it will be in the near future.

I want it clearly understood that the hearings held by the Armed Services Committee and the presentation of this bill to the House in no way should be construed as an attempt to put pressure on the Appropriations Committee. Nothing is further from our minds.

As a matter of fact, during the debate on the appropriations bill any member could offer an amendment to add more money to the bill for particular ships which he might believe we need. Or, he might move to strike some of the funds because of his belief that the Navy was not going in the right direction.

I cannot emphasize too much the importance of this bill because it represents the transition of our Navy from conventional power to nuclear power. It also represents the transition from conventional weapons to guided missiles. All of this I will go into in more detail a little later on.

Although the ships in the program will take various lengths of time to complete, the entire program will be completed four years from now.

I think it will have much more meaning for you if I describe briefly the status and condition of our Navy as it exists today and in the shipbuilding program that is now going on. First, our Navy today. We have 985 ships of all kinds in commission today and we have almost 1,800 ships in mothballs. The personnel strength of the Navy today is 662,000 men. We have over 16,000 airplanes in the Navy.

Of the 985 ships in commission, 404 are combatant ships which includes battleships, aircraft carriers, cruisers, destroyers, and submarines. The aircraft carriers in this number are 26.

That is the picture of the existing Navy.

There are being built today in the United States at some 58 private and naval shipyards throughout the United States 73 fleet vessels. There are 15 more which are authorized but not yet awarded or assigned, making a total of 88 naval vessels in the current building program. In addition, there are being constructed some 1,069 service and landing crafts. There are 1,235 more service and landing craft authorized but not yet awarded or assigned, making a total of 2,304 such craft in the current program.

Of the 88 vessels either under construction or to be placed under construction in the near future, 42 are classed as major combatant ships. Four of them are *Forrestal*-class aircraft carriers, 10 are destroyers, and 1 is a frigate. In addition there are 10 escort vessels and 3 guided missile frigates in the program. Fourteen submarines are being built, or will be very shortly, including 6 with nuclear power.

As I said, these ships are being built in 58 private and naval shipyards throughout the United States. Some of them in Maine, some in New York, some in Massachusetts, some in Washington, California, Connecticut, and Virginia.

All of these ships will cost about $2,785,000,000. Appropriations to cover all of this construction have already been made and the funds are available.

Now that is the Navy as it is and as it will be when these ships are constructed, not counting, of course, the ships in this bill.

The budget which the President recently submitted to the Congress contains an item of $1,429,000,000 for shipbuilding by the Navy. That is the shipbuilding authorized by this bill. This budget requests money for 23 new ships, 5,000 tons of landing and service craft, and for the conversion and modernization of 23 vessels.

The cost of the 23 new ships and the 5,000 tons of landing craft is $1,086,269,000. The cost of modernizing the 23 vessels is $306,393,000. In addition, there is included authorization to commence design and advance procurement for the reactor for a nuclear-powered aircraft carrier. This will cost $22 million.

The total cost of this program, taking into account adjustments from previous programs, is $1,429,000,000. As I have previously stated, this is contained in the President's budget and will soon be considered by the Appropriations Committee.

It is my sincere hope that the Appropriations Committee will see fit to recommend enactment of the shipbuilding funds necessary for the building of the ships contained in this bill and requested by the Navy.

In the case of combatant ships there are over 1,300,000 tons authorized and as yet unobligated and unfunded. In the case of ships other than those of the combatant categories there is less surplus tonnage in the books, but enough to cover everything requested in the current budget except the 2 escort vessels.

It is the province, the duty, and the responsibility of the Congress to choose the ships which shall be provided for our armed services and not to leave the choice of such ships entirely in the hands of the Department of Defense.

It is appropriate that the Congress express its desires in this matter and that the executive branch of the Government take the money appropriated by Congress and provide with it the precise ships specified by the Congress.

H. R. 7993 provides that the tonnage for the ships specified in the bill shall be charged against tonnage already existing and authorized by law. Thus the bill gives the Department of Defense a mandate from the Congress that certain specific vessels shall be built within the broad framework of the general tonnage authorizations already on the books.

At this point I would like to describe some of the more important vessels in

the Navy's building and conversion program. The emphasis is on three things: First, high-performance jet aircraft and, specifically, aircraft carriers designed to carry them; second, guided missiles; and, third, nuclear propulsion.

The major vessel in the shipbuilding program is the sixth aircraft carrier of the *Forrestal* class. We must continue to build these carriers to avoid mass obsolescence in existing carriers in the early 1960's. The bill also authorizes the Navy to commence design and procurement for a nuclear powerplant suitable for installation in a carrier of this class. The Navy hopes to install this nuclear powerplant in an attack aircraft carrier scheduled for next year's shipbuilding program.

I want to draw the attention of the Members of this House to the fact that this bill contains the first nuclear-powered surface ship. It will be a guided missile cruiser of about 11,000 tons. Through the building and operation of this ship the Navy will gain information which will be extremely helpful in developing the nuclear plant which the bill authorizes for an aircraft carrier.

Also, this ship will be the first one designed from the keel up to handle guided missiles and it will add greatly to the offensive and defensive abilities of the carrier task force which is, of course, the main striking arm of the Navy.

Additional guided missile abilities will be supplied to the fleet by the 4 guided-missile frigates and the 8 guided-missile destroyers in the building program.

Now, those are the new ships.

The conversions in the bill involve five existing light cruisers which will be converted to carry guided missiles. These, in addition to those currently underway and recently completed, will provide substantial guided missile capabilities for the fleet, quickly, at relatively low cost, and without greatly detracting from the other weapons potentials of these vessels.

The shipbuilding program for submarines marks the first building program since the war which does not contain any conventionally-powered submarines. All six of the submarines in this program will be nuclear powered. This makes a total of 14 nuclear submarines planned, building, or completed. The day is not far distant which the bulk of our active submarines will be atom powered. The Navy has made tremendous strides in the development of this potent new weapon and this year's program will make substantial contribution to its ability to retain control of the sea.

Other vessels in the bill represent continuation of long-range building programs of the Navy aimed at avoiding the prospect of mass obsolescence of vessels built in World War II. For example, eight destroyers previously mentioned in connection with their guided-missile capabilities, the escort vessels, and an ammunition ship.

In order to extend the useful life of existing carriers, the Navy is also converting four aircraft carriers to take the angled deck and other features necessary for handling the high-performance aircraft coming into operational use. This includes the conversion of the remaining unconverted carrier of the 45,000-ton *Midway* class.

The Navy is also going ahead with the development of amphibious warfare techniques. The conversion of a second escort carrier to an amphibious assault ship will permit the transportation, equipping, and landing of a considerable number of troops by helicopter. Also, the conversion of a modern high-speed vessel of the *Mariner* class to an attack transport will add to our amphibious capabilities.

The Navy is also planning to build hydrofoil landing craft—a small craft which will ride on skis at speeds of up to 30 knots to enable rapid loading of troops and equipment.

Now, I have described both the shipbuilding program that is now underway for which authorizations and appropriations have been made in previous years and I have also described the program for the coming year.

I hope I have been able to get all of these facts clearly in the mind of each Member; but, in any event, I would like to draw the attention of everyone to the report on this bill.

I have had the report prepared this year so as to give a good bit of the historical background of our naval authorizations, a brief summary of the costs of the various parts of the program, the basic considerations on which the program is based, and a fairly detailed description of each of the ships in the new program.

In addition, I have set out in the report not only how many ships are being constructed under the current program, but also the names of the shipyards where the work is going on.

I would like to direct the attention of each Member to this report because it is very detailed, and I think it will answer the great majority of questions which he may have in his mind.

All in all, I believe this to be a well-rounded program, one which merits the support of every Member of the Congress—a program which will make it clear to everyone that our Navy intends to continue to control the seas and back up our foreign policy with invincible strength; that we will always have effective force available on short notice off any shore where it is needed; and that those who engage in aggresison against any part of the free world do so at their peril. In summary, then, we have 985 ships in commission, 1,800 ships in mothballs.

The strength of the Navy is 662,000 men, 16,000 airplanes.

Of the 985 ships in commission, 404 are combat ships, 26 aircraft carriers in commission.

The above is a picture of the existing Navy today.

In the United States, private and Navy shipyards throughout the country are building 73 fleet vessels; 15 more are authorized but not yet awarded or assigned, making the present shipbuilding program a total of 88 vessels.

In addition, we are constructing 1,069 landing craft; 1,235 more service and landing craft authorized but not yet assigned, making a total of 2,304.

In the present shipbuilding program of 88 vessels, 42 are classified as major combatant ships; 4 of them are *Forrestal*-class aircraft carriers, 10 are destroyers, and 1 is a frigate.

In addition, there are 10 escort vessels and 3 guided-missile frigates in the program.

Fourteen submarines are being built, including 7 with nuclear power.

These ships are being built, some in Maine, New York, Massachusetts, Washington, some in California, Connecticut, and Virginia.

The cost of this program is $2,785,000,000.

Appropriations to cover all of this construction has already been made and funds are available.

The cost of these ships is $1,429,000,000.

The budget requested money for 23 new ships, 5,000 tons of landing and service craft, and for the conversion and modernization of 23 vessels.

Now, that is the program referred to in this bill.

Now, let us break it down:

The cost of the 23 new ships and the 5,000 tons of landing craft is $1,086, 269,000. The cost of modernizing 23 vessels is $306,393,000.

In addition, there is included authorization to commence design and advance procurement for nuclear reactor for aircraft carrier. This will cost $22 million.

The conversion program of the 23 vessels involve converting 5 existing light cruisers to carry guided missiles.

The conversion of the *Coral Sea*, the last of the 3 large *Midway* class, will provide for modernization of that vessel. The other three aircraft carriers, the *Intrepid*, the *Oriskany*, and the *Lake Champlain* will be converted by modifying them to an angled deck and receiving other alterations which will enable them to handle advanced types of naval aircraft for a period of several years.

The conversion of the submarine will launch guided missiles.

The Navy contemplates the conversion of a second escort carrier capable of landing large numbers of troops by helicopter.

These conversions, as I have previously stated, are referred to in greater detail in the report. They will cost $306,393,000.

There are 23 new ships, 5,000 tons of landing craft, and 23 vessels to be converted in this manner.

Now, that is the program.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. GROSS. Did I understand the gentleman to assure us that none of the conversion program or the construction program will be done in foreign shipyards?

Mr. VINSON. Every ship in this program will be built in a United States shipyard.

Mr. GROSS. That is good.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlemen yield briefly?

Mr. VINSON. With pleasure.

Mr. COLMER. I noticed in the report on page 9 that the committee has received assurance of officials in the Department of the Navy that there will be appropriate distribution of the construction program in accordance with the foregoing and also between private and Government shipyards.

I recognize the difficulty the committee would have in trying to spell out just where these ships will be constructed. But am I justified in assuming from that language that the committee did go into that matter and that there will be substantial distribution so that the yards in all sections of the country will be used?

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I am glad the distinguished gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. COLMER] has brought that up. A moment ago I stated that under the present shipbuilding program, and even under the law, construction must be divided 50–50 between industrial yards and Navy yards. During the hearing, I particularly asked the Secretary about that and the Ship Constructor, the head of the Bureau of Ships. I told them that it was the opinion of the committee that we should endeavor to distribute this shipbuilding program throughout the length and breadth of the United States, that we should give it to yards all over the country. It is a large, healthy program and it is to be hoped that all yards will have an equal opportunity to build these ships, if they meet competitive prices when bids are asked for.

Mr. COLMER. And competitive prices will be an important factor in this consideration?

Mr. VINSON. Of course, they will.

Mr. COLMER. I thank the distinguished chairman.

Mr. VINSON. I say that in this bill we are right at the borderline of the transition from conventional steam propulsion to the use of nuclear power in operating our ships. This measure is an important and historic one because, as I say, it marks this transition. You will find that in this bill, for the first time in the history of this Government, we are laying down, from the keel up, the construction of the ship designed, in the first place, for guided missiles and in the second place, the first surface ship with nuclear propulsion.

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. I congratulate the gentleman on the statement he is making. Certainly he realizes that as I have the honor to represent the New London-Groton area, I am very much interested in his statement. I wonder if the gentleman could elaborate in more detail than is in the bill and in the printed report on submarine development, particularly in connection with the development of nuclear power.

Mr. VINSON. I do not believe I should go into detail for various reasons which include very technical matters which I am not qualified to talk about. We are merely providing that there will be 6 more nuclear-powered submarines. The *Nautilus* is already in existence, the *Seawolf* not far behind. The information we have obtained in regard to the operation of the *Nautilus* will be of great benefit in all the work in connection with nuclear propulsion.

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. I thank the gentleman.

If I may ask one further question, Is it the gentleman's personal conviction and belief that the development of nuclear-powered submarines is going to be an expanding operation in the future?

Mr. VINSON. The bill right now provides for several more of these nuclear submarines. Of course, it is going to be expanding. The day is not far distant when every ship in the American Navy will be operated under nuclear power.

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. BONNER. The gentleman is talking about something in which I am very much interested from the experience we had here in the House. We passed in the House an authorization for the construction of a practical combination of cargo-passenger vessel powered by nuclear energy. That bill went to the other body and was transferred around winding up not to the committee that handles legislation parallel to that handled by our Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries here in the House, but to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

The question I want to ask is this: You are dealing here with nuclear energy for the propulsion of aircraft carriers, submarines, destroyers, and so forth. When this bill goes to the other body, will it be handled by the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, or what will be the policy in the future with respect to such matters?

Mr. VINSON. This bill will go to the Armed Services Committee of the Senate.

Mr. BONNER. This bill will go that way but other legislation has not. Can the gentleman explain that?

Mr. VINSON. The only explanation I can give, and the gentleman will pardon me for the explanation, is that I am going to try to channel mine to where it should go.

Mr. BONNER. I want to get some of the gentleman's wise counsel.

Mr. VINSON. I will take that up with the gentleman at any time.

Mr. BONNER. I appreciate it, but I want to go further with this. Does the gentleman understand in his committee that in dealing now with atomic energy for vessels you have to confer with the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy before you can do anything with that subject?

Mr. VINSON. In reply to that statement, may I say that there are 37 men on the committee that I have the honor to serve as chairman, and when we make up our minds about something we do not consult anybody. We come on the floor of the House with the matter.

Mr. BONNER. The House sustained the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries in this same proposal. I want to know if in the future these bills will go to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy from the standing committees of the House such as the gentleman's committee?

Mr. VINSON. I would say with all deference to the gentleman, and in all seriousness, and I have great respect for the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, that this bill will not go there. We have no requirements to consult them, because we think the facts the Navy faces today warrant it in going ahead and building nuclear power into the ships that are called for in this bill. Each of the committees has its own proper sphere.

Mr. BONNER. I agree with the gentleman and I should like to state at this time that if there is referred to this body, either from the Senate or from any other source, a legislative proposal contemplating the construction of a nuclear-powered merchant ship or for that matter any other kind of merchant ship, I shall expect that the proposal will be referred to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. There can be no question but that the Merchant Marine Committee has jurisdiction under the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 to consider proposals of this nature.

Did your committee authorize the construction of the *Nautilus*?

Mr. VINSON. Yes.

Mr. BONNER. And not the Atomic Energy Commission?

Mr. VINSON. Of course not, we authorized it ourselves just as we are authorizing this. If there is one thing that these 37 men on our committee are very jealous of, it is our prerogatives. We do not want to trespass on anybody else's prerogatives and we certainly are not going to let anybody trespass upon us.

Mr. BONNER. I want the House to know I am very jealous of the authority vested in the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. I have no ill feeling toward the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

Mr. VINSON. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. HALE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON. I yield.

Mr. HALE. I am surprised to note on page 2 of the report under the paragraph captioned "Legislative Background" references to statutory limitations of Navy ship tonnage contained in the Washington and London Naval Treaty of 1922 and 1930. What I would like to know is whether there is any treaty inhibition applicable at the present time to the size of our fleet?

Mr. VINSON. The gentleman means whether there is any inhibition on the size of our fleet without authorization?

Mr. HALE. That is right.

Mr. VINSON. The answer is "No." But let me also point out that there were 1,300,000 tons previously authorized, starting on March 7, 1934, down to date. That is the tonnage which remains on the statute books which would permit the Committee on Appropriations to make appropriations for the construction of ships. As I have said at the outset, it is not necessary to have this bill here today to make it in order for the

Committee on Appropriations to grant the necessary funds when it brings in a line item and a money figure for so many ships.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON. I yield.

Mr. SHORT. I merely want to point out to the gentleman from Maine that there is no limitation by any kind of treaty at all. It is entirely up to the will of the Congress.

Mr. VINSON. That is correct.

Mr. HALE. That is exactly what I wanted to know and it troubled me.

Mr. VINSON. It was merely referred to because the buildup of the Navy started after the Washington-London Treaty.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHORT].

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. Chairman, the record of carrier task force operations in World II, the Korean war, and recently in operations in the Formosa area, attests to their indispensability in the discharge of basic naval missions. Never in the history of warfare has naval power attained such undisputed offensive capabilities as by the current exploitation of naval airpower. This has been achieved by an aggressive, orderly development of the best possible ships, weapons, and aircraft. Modernization of ships has long been a Navy policy. Since 1946 the Navy has kept pace with the advancement of aircraft of higher speeds, greater weights, and longer ranges by means of converting existing aircraft carriers. There is a limit, however, to the improvements which can be achieved by modernization. Today the Navy is faced with a situation where it can no longer improve its World War II aircraft carriers to the extent necessary for them to fully meet the needs of future operations. The Navy realized at the end of World War II that such a situation would exist in the foreseeable future. Therefore, it began early to press for new and larger carriers. In 1949 the first of this class of carriers was authorized. This was the *United States*, but shortly after the keel of the *United States* was laid, it was ordered canceled by the Secretary of Defense for economy reasons. However, in 1951 it became apparent that it was a grave mistake to deny new, modern carriers to the Navy and the U. S. S. *Forrestal* was authorized to be built. Succeeding Congresses have authorized and appropriated for a total of four *Forrestal* class carriers. Many experts on naval warfare have stated that it is necessary for the Navy to build up to a strength of at least 10 to 12 *Forrestal* class carriers if it is to retain its offensive combat capabilities. The aircraft carrier who construction is authorized by this bill, will be the sixth of the *Forrestal* class carriers.

There are many important reasons why the Navy needs carriers of the *Forrestal* class to accomplish its mission. The weight of aircraft has been steadily progressing in an upward direction since the *Essex* carriers were laid down. The upward trend became even sharper with the introduction of jet aircraft burning aviation fuel at a rate over three times the normal reciprocating engine rate per sortie. In order to get any range at all, it has been necessary to put more gasoline in each airplane. In order to carry this additional gasoline the plane has become larger, thus increasing in weight. A look at the airplane weights will show that if the Navy is to continue the development of aircraft of higher performance at longer range the carriers must have stronger decks. This can be done in the *Forrestal* class, but otherwise the Navy will be forced to use inferior aircraft because the decks of existing carriers can no longer be improved, particularly the flight decks of the relatively numerous *Essex* type.

The matter of aviation fuel is important since the introduction of jets has caused fuel requirements to more than triple. This problem has been partially solved in conversion by fuel blending. The process of fuel blending involves mixing high-octane gasoline with a low flash-point type of kerosene which can be carried outside protected stowage. The resulting mixture of aviation fuel can be burned in jet engines. Except for this solution of the problem, it is necessary to utilize the ships' fuel oil stowage which reduces the cruising radius of the ship. The point has been reached where fuel blending is no longer sufficient to provide the needed fuel capacity. Therefore the cruising radius of carriers has been reduced as low as possible, but by so doing only sufficient aviation fuel capacity has been provided to account for expected aviation development during the next few years. After this, as jet fuel consumption further increases, there will be nowhere further to go. The limit with the old ships will have been reached. The only way of getting sufficient fuel will be through the use of a new type of ship.

All of the Navy's present carriers were designed during an era in which most planes were deck-launched. This permitted short intervals between aircraft launchings; much shorter than for catapult launchings. In addition until very recently, air defense has been provided primarily by fighters remaining aloft on 3-hour combat air patrols. In other words, there was a constant covey of defensive fighters in the air. These fighters were supplemented by launching a smaller number of fighters with equal endurance as enemy raids approached. At present, however, because of the switch to jet fighter planes which require longer and longer decks for conventional takeoffs, all fighter-type aircraft are launched from aircraft carriers by the use of catapults. Due to the limited endurance of a jet fighter, more reliance is placed on rapid launching of fighters to meet raids. A *Forrestal*-type carrier will excel for operations of this type because of its four catapults. These 4 catapults would permit the launching of 32 interceptors in as little as 4 minutes.

Those of us who have visited the *Forrestal* are utterly amazed—and I might say that the Secretary of the Navy in the near future is going to extend an invitation not only to the members of the Committee on the Armed Services, but also to all Members of the House, and I suppose to Members of the other body also, to take a little trip on the U. S. S. *Forrestal* as well as the *Nautilus*, the atomic-powered submarine that has far surpassed the expectations of the most optimistic, and also one of our guided missile launching ships. I hope all of the Members when they receive that invitation will find it possible to accept.

If one of the *Forrestal's* catapults is out of order the reduction is only 25 percent; there are still three left. On the other hand, existing carriers, which have only 2 catapults, could approach only half of this rate, and if 1 of these 2 catapults were out of commission the rate would be reduced by 50 percent. It is important to realize the impossibility of installing additional catapults on a ship designed for only two. There is not enough moment or weight compensation available and far too little deck area in present carriers for the installation of additional catapults.

The requirement for aviation ordnance stowage space constitutes another factor requiring a completely new carrier design. Existing carriers were designed for planes which would carry not over a ton of bombs or rockets. The present single-engine attack type alone can carry 4½ tons and regularly carried 3 tons in Korea. Present carriers, even when converted, have barely enough stowage space for present demands for aircraft ordnance. While no further increase in tonnage per plane is to be anticipated, new weapons are being developed which will require more stowage space per ton. These weapons include atomic bombs, guided missiles and a new series of conventional bombs with long, streamlined shapes which do not stow as efficiently as the blunt end cylindrical types. All ordnance and all fuel compete for space inside the armored box of the modern carrier; in existing carriers this box is only so big. It cannot be increased. Consequently, space is the controlling factor. A larger carrier is necessary if the situation is to be improved. While the fully converted carriers now at sea have barely enough room for a minimum stock of air-to-air missiles, the new large carrier will have ample room for at least three times this quantity. Also, the Navy's converted carriers have only a minimum amount of 20-millimeter ammunition and rocket capacity over present needs. It is to be expected that the consumption of these items will grow; the large new carriers will provide for about one-third additional growth for 20-millimeter ammunition and rockets. Also, in using the converted carriers for mine warfare it is necessary to displace bombs with aerial mines. In the new carrier it will be possible, because of additional stowage space, to carry significant stocks of mines without displacing bombs.

It is important to note that the largest tonnage requirements for ordnance do not arise incident to the operation of long-range aircraft from carriers. The maximum demands for ordnance come into existence when many planes of the smaller type are operated at short ranges, such as in Korea. Therefore,

the expanded ordnance space on large carriers is primarily the result of needs for short-range tactical operations.

Each class of Navy carrier was initially designed to acommodate approximately 100 aircraft, depending, of course, on types and sizes. Approximately one-half of these aircraft are stowed in the hangar deck. If the hangar deck is not of sufficient size or the elevators which carry the planes from the flight deck to the hangar deck are not of sufficient capacity and size to accommodate aircraft, approximately 50 percent of aircraft capacity will be lost. In other words, the hangar deck space can be utilized only if it is high enough to accommodate existing aircraft or if the elevators have sufficient capacity to take the airplanes below. In order to utilize the existing carriers, it has been necessary to adapt such expedients as folding tails, folding wings, kneeling airplanes, and so forth. All of these methods of making sure that the airplane will fit in the hangar deck have an effect upon the design of the aircraft. The major deficiency in existing carriers is hangar height. Since the *Essex* class, all Navy carriers have been built around a 17-foot-6-inch hangar deck. Aircraft designed for higher speeds, approaching the supersonic, requires higher and higher tail fins. In the latest classes of aircraft it has been necessary to incorporate a folding tail fin in order to stow them in the existing carriers. This adds weight to the aircraft and adversely affects its design. In the *Forrestal*-class carrier the hangar deck height has been increased to 25 feet which should permit avoiding most of the expedients which have limited advancements in design.

It seems certain that if fighter performance is to increase, landing speeds must also increase. In the case of land based aircraft, airports are becoming longer and longer to accommodate the newer types. While in carriers arresting gear is used, the space which the aircraft must utilize to land will of necessity increase due to higher landing speeds. The new carrier provides for this growth through increased length and width of the landing area.

Finally, there is a need for better protection against torpedoes, bombs and other weapons. In the Navy's existing carriers of the *Essex* class, there is a wooden flight deck which is most susceptible to top-side damage. On the other hand, the *Midway* class of carriers has a steel flight deck which is considered by the Navy to provide ample protection from top-side damage.

This type of flight deck will be installed on the new carriers of the *Forrestal* class. Installation of a steel flight deck on conversions of the *Essex* type carriers would be prohibitive both as to weight and as to cost. In the *Forrestal* class carriers there will be installed an additional holding bulkhead which will enhance protection against underwater damage and, which, the Navy is very sure can repel any known torpedo. More and more weight has been added to the hull of the *Essex* carriers so that these carriers now displace in the neighborhood of 36,000 tons in comparison with their original displacement of 27,000 tons. Naturally it has been necessary to sacrifice some underwater damage control features in order to accomplish this increase in displacement. The design is still within a safe range but to exceed the current displacement would amount to too great a risk, particularly if a ship were damaged in its full-load condition.

To sum up, the requirement for the large carriers is completely analogous to the problem of airfields—civilian and military. Modern aviation can no longer operate satisfactorily and safely from airfields which were constructed a few years ago and which were then entirely adequate. In the same way that older airfields have been stretched and improved, so have our present carriers been modernized through conversion. But as airfields reach a limit of elasticity, so there is a limit to the possibilities of carrier conversion. If naval aviation is to make full use of the weapons and aircraft coming into being in the near future larger carriers are an imperative necessity. I strongly urge that the Congress support a program of adding one aircraft carrier of the *Forrestal* class or better to the fleet each year as long as it continues to be apparent that the aircraft carrier will play a vital part in the defense needs of the Nation. By continuing the orderly replacement of older carriers with one *Forrestal*-class carrier each year, the Navy will be able to keep pace with the new types of aircraft as they develop and will retain the great combat potential which it now possesses. This does not mean that the older aircraft carriers of the *Essex* class will be discarded. They will remain valuable for the accomplishment of many missions which are now relegated to the smaller CVL and CVE classes of aircraft carriers. Support operations just like combat operations are developing newer, larger, and faster aircraft, and requiring larger aircraft carriers for their operation. The orderly development of the aircraft carrier building program will insure that the Navy's emergent requirements are met in the most expeditious and economical manner possible.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHORT. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. SPRINGER. In this new construction of aircraft carriers and in the conversion of others, will this make possible a wider range of coverage by airplanes from those carriers?

Mr. SHORT. It will. I am confident that it will.

Mr. SPRINGER. Now, will it be substantial?

Mr. SHORT. I think it will be substantial, because they are larger planes with longer range.

Let me take time right at this point to say this: I think the distinguished chairman brought it out in his statement, but we cannot overemphasize that we are at the dawn or the beginning of an era of transition from the conventional method of propulsion to that of nuclear power.

There is provision in the bill for an atomic-powered cruiser, whose sole mission is to carry guided missiles. Its range will be limited only by the endurance of the crew, just as we hope that in future years a B-52, or a comparable aircraft, will be able to fly indefinitely around the world, 2 or 3 or a half dozen times, perhaps, without refueling, whose range and length of operation will be limited more by the endurance of the crew than the machine itself. I think I can make that rather startling statement, although I am no scientist or the son of a scientist. I think even in my advanced years, I am going to live long enough to see that accomplished, because of the tremendous strides in science we have made since the close of World War II.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for one more question?

Mr. SHORT. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. SPRINGER. I read from the report that was submitted; and this refers to the U. S. S. R.:

> Her submarine fleet now numbers over 400, of which a large percentage are new construction, long-range boats. In each of calendar years 1956 and 1957, she will commission about 75 to 85 new modern submarines. Besides this huge underseas fleet, the U. S. S. R. has built more destroyers and cruisers since World War II than all of the nations of the rest of the world combined. These surface ships are modern and incorporate the latest technological equipments.

Is there any intelligence or evidence before the committee that these will carry guided nuclear-powered missiles?

Mr. SHORT. Our intelligence is only fair, and of course it is impossible for us to know all of the details of the various weapons that the Soviets are now manufacturing. But that statement, that was given to us by no less a witness and authority than the Chief of Naval Operations, was quite shocking and startling, at least to me. But, from the best intelligence it would seem the Russians now have more than 400 snorkle submarines. We have no evidence that they have any driven by atomic energy or nuclear power.

Mr. SPRINGER. Does the gentleman's committee have any intelligence or any credible evidence that these vessels are using or contemplate using guided missiles?

Mr. SHORT. If we can achieve that, it is only reasonable to suppose that the Soviets, who have the advantage of the services of many German scientists whom they took at the close of World War II can achieve it, just as they are catching up with us in the development of the atomic and the hydrogen bombs. Of course they will develop guided missiles, and they are not making them to sit on. We are not so different from other people. We have no monopoly on the brains and genius of the world. I think that at the present time we are superior to the Soviets not only in our naval strength but also in our scientific research and technological development. We must maintain this superiority. But we should not be so foolish as to bury our head in the sand and feel safe, because certainly we have enough intelligence to know that the Communists have

made such tremendous strides in building up all branches of their armed services, such as the new fast type interceptor and long-range bomber, that it is frightening.

The most disconcerting thing in connection with these 400 large, fast submarines of the snorkel type is that the Nazis had only 150 in World War II, but they sank 54 of our 59 tankers off the eastern coast, carrying oil from Aruba and Curacao to our eastern seaports, and came dangerously near winning the war. If the Nazis could do that with 150 submarines, imagine what the Russians could do with over 400 submarines. Despite the fact she has been traditionally a great land power depending on her army, she has made more progress in building up her navy since the close of World War II than any other country in the world. She is the second maritime power now, far ahead of Britain and next to the United States.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHORT. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. FULTON. May I compliment the gentleman on his good, intelligent statement, and the excellence of his technical approach. I served on a carrier in World War II. When we hear that a carrier can now launch in 4 minutes 32 planes, it almost makes us feel we were in a different kind of war in the South Pacific. We do need this additional striking power, as the gentleman pointed out, because it makes us able to hit a possible enemy in half the time and at half the distance at which they can hit bases in the United States.

I thank the gentleman again. I think he has made a fine satement.

Mr. SHORT. I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania, who has had first-hand experience and usually knows what he is talking about.

Mr. McVEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHORT. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. McVEY. I want to compliment the gentleman from Missouri on his very excellent presentation of certain phases of this subject.

There is one question of interest to me. If this bill passes and carries an authorization for a fairly large appropriation of money, I am wondering, if such appropriation is recommended by the Committee on Appropriations, if such action will be in keeping with our efforts to balance the budget.

Mr. VINSON. This is in the President's Budget. The President's Budget makes this money available.

Mr. SHORT. But there is no increase over the recommendations of the President?

Mr. VINSON. That is right.

Mr. SHORT. The money will have to be appropriated, of course, to carry out the authorization.

Mr. McVEY. The amount is an accordance with the President's recommendation?

Mr. SHORT. It is not in excess of what the President has recommended; in fact, it carriers out his recommendation.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHORT. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. In addition to the program being in accordance with the President's Budget, is it not true that it has the approval of the Joint Chiefs of Staff?

Mr. SHORT. It does have such approval, not only of members of the Joint Chiefs of Staff but the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs and the Secretary of Defense. I think it has cleared all agencies in the Department of Defense.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHORT. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. EDMONDSON. I want to thank the gentleman and also the committee for the very fine report which has been made available to the House in support of this bill.

Mr. SHORT. That is because we have a marvelous professional staff on our Armed Services Committee.

Mr. EDMONDSON. I am particularly impressed by the emphasis which is placed in this report on the advantages of carrier-type preparation for nuclear war. I refer particularly to the paragraph on page 6 dealing with vulnerability, pointing out that a modern carrier task force can spread out over an area of 31,000 square miles. Obviously, a force spread over an area this size does not present a profitable target to an enemy regardless of the type of bomb he may use.

I think this emphasis on the possibility of maximum dispersal in connection with carrier operations is very well placed. Certainly, we are seeing in our other branches of the Armed Forces an increasing emphasis upon this dispersal and its importance in a nuclear-type war. Certainly the committee has pointed out very well the importance of this dispersal in connection with carrier-type operations. I think anyone who questions the desirability of aircraft carriers and their continued construction and use will have to recognize that here we have a maximum degree of dispersal for a nuclear-type war and a defense against a strike by the enemy. I think the gentleman has made a real contribution to our understanding of the need for these aircraft carriers and their continued modernization. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. SHORT. We appreciate very much the kind words of the gentleman from Oklahoma. He can speak from some personal experiences of his own.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHORT. I yield.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. I am sorry I missed the statement of the gentleman from Missouri, but a constituent called me off the floor. In addition to the fact that this program represents, we will say, an initial effort of the Navy to move into the atomic and hydrogen age, is it not true the Navy is expanding its atomic shipbuilding capabilities on both coasts to the point where they will soon be in a position to start work on various types of ships necessary for nuclear power task forces.

Mr. SHORT. That is my understanding but the gentleman from Pennsylvania knows more about that than I do.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri has consumed 26 minutes.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. 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 California?

There was no objection.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Chairman, I am heartily in favor of the bill before us and intend to vote for it in the event of a rollcall.

When I first became a Member of Congress I had the Mare Island Navy Yard within my district. In that way I frequently called on Frank Knox, Secretary of the Navy, and discussed Navy problems. It is interesting to remember that at that time his executive assistant was one Adlai Stevenson, who has been a candidate for President, and may become a candidate for President again. He treated me very courteously and I have always remembered the help that he and Secretary Knox gave us.

One matter that he kept drilling into my mind was that the Navy must let contracts out for the construction of ships to private-enterprise yards. The idea was that the skill of building ships must in that way be kept alive, and also abreast of the new ship designs and other things which had the effect of changing shipbuilding skills. The purpose that was continually emphasized was that these skills should be kept alive so that the navy yards operated by the Navy Department would, in the event of an emergency, have a pool of skilled manpower that could be brought into the yards in order to maintain the proper strength.

I note with much pleasure the statement on page 9 of the report. I am using this statement at this point as part of my remarks:

CONSTRUCTION THROUGHOUT THE UNITED STATES

Although the bill does not so provide, it is obviously in the interest of the country that shipyards, Government and private, throughout the United States be afforded opportunity to construct and convert the vessels in this program. A healthy, vigorous, and easily mobilized shipbuilding industry is an essential element of our national defense. The rapid expansion which would be necessary in the event of war or an emergency would heavily tax all of the shipyards in the United States. Clearly, then, the lack of readily expandible shipyard facilities throughout the country would constitute a serious impediment to our defense effort. This is a mere reiteration, of course, of what has been in the past our national policy in this respect. Existing law—act of May 17, 1938 (34 U. S. C. 498j)—makes provision for the construction of ships on the west coast where the President deems such to be necessary in order to maintain facilities needed in our national defense. The committee has received the assurance of the officials in the Department of the Navy that there will be appropriate distribution of this construction program in accordance with the foregoing and also between private and Government shipyards.

I am particularly pleased that there is a reference to the maintenance of construction in west coast yards.

It happens that in my little city of Stockton, we have a very excellent inland port, 80 miles from the Golden Gate in which practically every type of merchant ship may dock. Our depth of water is 30 feet, and millions of tons of shipping were carried out from this port to the Pacific areas during World War II. We have two excellent shipyards in Stockton. One is owned by the company Guntert and Zimmerman, and the other is known as the Colberg Boat Works. Each of these plants did a remarkable job during the war. They built vessels by the score and I believe that they are more than capable of building some of the small craft described in this bill. I sincerely hope that the Navy will take a look at these yards and find some way to grant them the opportunity to display their shipbuilding skills. Their past record is what they are wiling to stand on. That is the one item in which I believe the Navy would be interested. I am confident that after their record has been examined and if the Navy can find an opportunity for construction of some of this tonnage in either or both of these yards, they would make a success of the job. Furthermore, these plants are now idle and I think that the Navy should consider using them for some type of work, especially since the report indicates that the west coast yards should be utilized so the civilian shipbuilding skills may be preserved.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WOLVERTON] such time as he may desire.

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Chairman, I am in full accord with the Navy shipbuilding and conversion program for 1957 as outlined in the legislation —H. R. 7993—now under consideration.

The Committee on Armed Services has made clear in its report, and, supplemented by the remarks of Chairman VINSON and the ranking Republican member of the committee, DEWEY SHORT, that it is the intention, by fulfilling this program, to keep our Navy not only equal to but better than the Navy of the Soviets.

It is indeed encouraging to realize that our Defense Department is keeping aware of the extent of the shipbuilding program of the Soviets and alert to the importance of our keeping ahead of them. Otherwise, we could be caught napping and be weak when we should be strong. Our security should not depend upon our being only equal to our enemy in a time of war, whomever it might be, but should be strong enough to give us precedence over any nation who might challenge our peaceful existence. And, this is what this bill seeks to accomplish by making the authorizations previously adopted to be effective during the fiscal year 1957.

The program as set forth in this bill provides for the construction of 23 new ships, of which 22 are combatant types, 5,000 tons of landing craft, and for the conversion and modernization of 23 vessels. The estimated total cost for new construction and conversion amounts to $1,414,662,000. The new ships total 144,800 tons. The ships involved in the conversion portion of the program total 282,700 tons.

The basic purpose of this shipbuilding program at this time is to make certain that our Nation is well prepared to meet the progress being made by the U. S. S. R. as it seeks to bring its naval strength up to a position of major naval importance. It is considered on good authority that it now ranks second only to the United States. During the years succeeding World War II the U. S. S. R. has made tremendous advancement in its military strength. This has been particularly noticeable in its increased naval strength. It now has a submarine force numbering over 400. A large percentage of this is new construction, long-range boats. In 1956 and 1957 it is expected the Soviets will commission about 75 to 85 new modern submarines. Furthermore, we are told that the U. S. S. R. has built more destroyers and cruisers since World War II than all the nations of the rest of the world combined. These are startling facts. It behooves us to take notice and not let our Navy drop behind.

Never has it been more essential to keep our Navy strong. The stronger its striking power the more effective it will be as a deterrent to other less peacefully inclined nations. The Soviets respect power more than anything else. Therefore, to keep our Navy strong is to promote peace and prevent war. As has been well said, "Our Navy is essential in the cold war, vital in limited war, and indispensable in general war." Therefore, let us as a nation have a Navy that can do its full part in maintaining national peace and world peace.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS].

Mr. GROSS. I am glad the gentleman from Oklahoma brought up the subject of dispersal of aircraft carriers. In December, I was startled to receive from a constituent Mr. Verle Allbee, of Waterloo, Iowa, a clipping from the picture page of the Chicago Tribune under date of December 21, 1955, showing the carriers *Hornet, Princeton, Shangri-La, Lexington, Philippine Sea,* and the *Wasp*—all berthed within an area of about 2 miles in the harbor of San Diego, Calif., and the Naval Air Station. I wrote to the Secretary of Defense, Mr. Wilson, on January 3, the following letter:

JANUARY 3, 1956.

Hon. CHARLES E. WILSON,
Secretary of Defense,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. WILSON: A constituent has called my attention to the December 21, 1955, issue of the Chicago Tribune wherein is reproduced an Associated Press aerial photo showing six of our finest aircraft carriers berthed in one small area near San Diego, Calif.

The descriptive material accompanying the picture says this:

"Six carriers of the Pacific fleet tied up at the naval air station at San Diego so that as many as possible of their 15,000 crewmen may have holiday leave in United States."

I am sure the citizens of this country completely approve the policy of giving the greatest possible number of military personnel holiday leave, but it is astounding to the point of unbelief that the bulk of the carrier fleet in the Pacific together with its planes, should be concentrated in one nest and subject to destruction by a single atomic weapon in the hands of the enemy.

Has the Defense Department forgotten the tragic lesson of Pearl Harbor?

With hundreds of miles of Pacific coast line, and a number of excellent port cities, why were these carriers and their planes not dispersed?

I await your explanation.

Sincerely yours,

H. R. GROSS.

I did not have a reply from the Secretary of Defense—unlike the Secretary of Agriculture, he apparently does not answer too much of his own mail—but I did have the courtesy of a reply from a colonel in the Air Force. How he got into the picture, I do not know. But he said he was referring my letter to the Navy Department. Eventually, on January 23, I had an answer from Rear Adm. E. B. Taylor, chief of information for the Department of the Navy.

I will not read the entire letter; simply a few quotations from it. He says:

The presence of six carriers in San Diego Harbor, while not an everyday occurrence, is not considered unusual.

Further he says:

Please be assured that these deployments received most careful study and review prior to being implemented.

I should like to say to the chairman of the Armed Services Committee that his committee ought to ask the Navy Department why we must have six carriers, representing the backbone of the Pacific Carrier Fleet, the backbone of the Pacific Fleet I might say, if the air arm of the fleet means what you say it does, why were they all put in one nest in close proximity to a Soviet airbase, during the last holiday season. Surely we all want to see navy personnel given all possible holiday leave, but there are plenty of ports up and down the Pacific coast where those carriers could have been dispersed. This was not a "calculated risk." It was an open invitation to an enemy to destroy the backbone of our entire Pacific Fleet.

Mr. VINSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I gladly yield to the chairman of the Armed Services Committee.

Mr. VINSON. I congratulate the gentleman in calling this to the attention of the committee and I heartily agree with every word he said. I can see no reason why airplane carriers could not have been berthed at Bremerton or Hunters Point or San Pedro, rather than concentrating all at the port of San Diego. I think your point is well taken and the Department should not, under any circumstances, berth these big ships, particularly these aircraft carriers, all in one port at any one time.

Mr. GROSS. I want to support the chairman and his committee in giving the Navy all the warships that are necessary to have the finest and most efficient fighting force, but I do not want to see these warships destroyed as they were at Pearl Harbor under a single and tragic bombing attack.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has expired.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 3 additional minutes.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield.

Mr. PELLY. I, too, want to commend the gentleman for raising this point. During the last session of this Congress I wrote the Secretary, urging that the Navy base some of their combat ships up on Puget Sound. I received an answer that during this particular period so many of our ships are in the Far East that it was not practicable, but I think the gentleman has pointed out a very important and dangerous situation, and I certainly agree with him that we should disperse our vessels.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RIVERS].

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Chairman, the construction program planned by the Navy for fiscal year 1957 includes six nuclear-powered submarines. The Navy has reached the stage in its development of nuclear power for submarines, that it has, for the first time since the end of the last war, not asked for conventionally powered submarines, as replacements for existing craft which are rapidly becoming obsolescent.

The Navy now has under construction or complete, eight other submarines including the *Nautilus* which continues its highly successful career. Soon to join the operating forces is the United States ship *Sealion*, designed around an advanced type of reactor. Most of the later nuclear-powered submarines being built will incorporate the hull-design features recently tested and proven in the United States ship *Albacore*, which is reputedly the fastest submarine in the world.

The development of the nuclear-powered submarine, along with advances in hull design and experimental use of submarines for the launching of guided missiles, has served as a veritable rebirth of the submarine. In essence it is a new weapon of far-reaching potentialities, one which may well decide the outcome of any future war.

Let us consider some of the potentialities of the atomic-powered submarines.

DEFENSIVE POTENTIALITIES

The two fundamental problems in combating the submarine are detection and destruction.

First, let us consider detection. A nuclear-powered submarine can maintain speeds in excess of 20 knots for weeks at a time—long enough to cruise around the world, if necessary. The dampened whine of steam turbines is the only sound emanating from her hull.

There is no need to raise anything above the surface which might give away her position by alerting radar-equipped surface ships or aircraft.

Destruction, the other fundamental problem, is equally frustrating. Contact with a completely submerged submarine cannot be maintained by radar. To destroy a submerged submarine surface ships must maintain contact with their sonar gear. The sustained speed of the atomic submarine is above that at which surface ships can maneuver and effectively retain sonar contact.

OFFENSIVE POTENTIALITIES

Modern underwater sonar gear and advanced weapons permit a submarine to attack a surface ship successfully without ever seeing it through the periscope. With the speed advantage provided by nuclear power, the submarine need no longer sit and wait for targets to come by. Active scouting is now possible. Coverage of large areas with improved detection devices and the high sustained speeds available, will make it extremely difficult, if not impossible for any surface vessel to escape destruction.

The submarine possesses many inherent advantages as an antisubmarine craft. Addition of nuclear power and other modern innovations serves to greatly enhance this ability. Of course, many of these advantages disappear when opposing submarines which are also nuclear powered. However, our continued advances in this field should serve to retain our superiority in this regard for years to come.

The advent of nuclear power and guided missiles opens wide the door for many other missions to be performed by submarines (in this regard it should be pointed out that a single submarine will be able to perform many of these missions, some specialization of types will be necessary, however). These missions include: Launching of guided missiles, control and direction of guided missiles, minelaying, cargo carrying, serving as a tanker, tending aircraft, even possibly serving as an aircraft carrier. The future appears unlimited.

We must continue to see that the Navy receives the encouragement and the money necessary to develop the nuclear submarine as rapidly as possible.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. DEVEREUX].

Mr. DEVEREUX. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this legislation.

I feel that the Navy has a very reasonable approach to the new construction and conversion program that has been set before us and I want to take this opportunity to congratulate the Navy on a new approach toward amphibious shipping. This is the first time in recent years that any serious consideration has been given to this very important branch of naval warfare.

I would like to say a few words about the conversion program set forth in H. R. 7993. As you all know most of the vessels which the Navy now has were built during World War II. This means that each class of vessel built during this period would ordinarily tend to become obsolete at about the same time. Of course, many of the ships built in World War II are now in the mothball fleets. The hulls and machinery of these vessels, in general, are in good state of preservation as a result of the Navy's farsighted mothball techniques. We can keep hulls and machinery from deteriorating to a great extent, but the ships continue to grow less useful because weapons and equipment, as well as the basic design features become outdated. The ships cannot economically or militarily compete with more modern designs.

To avoid having all of these ships become obsolescent at the same time, the Navy has converted, on a selective basis, many of the ships capable of economical modernization. For example, a certain number of submarines have been converted to the guppy type. These ships are not in every respect as modern, comfortable, or combat worthy as the new fleet types built from the keel up in recent years, and certainly they would be unable to compete with any nuclear submarine; but they can continue to serve economically and perform functions similar to the conventionally powered submarines recently or currently being completed. The other unconverted submarines left over from World War II can still be utilized for limited purposes, but in most respects are now obsolete. Development of nuclear power for submarines has made it infeasible, from the point of military value to convert any additional World War II hulls for use as attack submarines.

To a large degree our many mothballed destroyers and other small types are becoming obsolete. We have about reached the point where the extent of conversion necessary, new equipment to be procured, and prospective additional life, makes it economically unjustifiable to convert them, as compared to building new ones.

However, the Navy is continuing its program of conversion for certain other valuable ships. The remaining unconverted large aircraft carrier of the three *Midway* class, carriers, the *Coral Sea*, will be converted under the 1957 program to receive the angled deck and other improvements. Three *Essex* class carriers will receive what is regarded as the ultimate conversion for that class. The remaining unconverted *Essex* class carriers will be reclassified for support missions, since they are no longer capable of operating the advanced aircraft coming into service.

Five light cruisers are being converted to receive guided-missile installations. This improvement will add, substantial antiaircraft defense capabilities to the fleet, quickly and at relatively low cost.

A submarine will be converted under the program for use in the submarine guided-missile program. This addition will be needed to handle improved missiles being developed for submarine use.

The amphibious warfare capabilities of the Navy and Marine Corps will be enhanced by the conversion of an escort carrier of World War II vintage for service as an amphibious assault ship. This vessel will provide complete facilities for the loading of a large number of marines by helicopter.

In addition, a large vessel of the *Mariner* class is being converted to an attack transport. This will improve our amphibious warfare capabilities by providing a fast transport with large cargo and troop-carrying capacity.

Our early warning radar network will be enhanced by the conversion of 4 Liberty ships to ocean radar station ships and by the conversion of 6 escort vessels

to equip them to perform radar picket duties.

And finally, the Navy is converting a seaplane tender to permit its use for tending the modern jet seaplanes, such as the *Sea Master*, which are coming into service.

Keeping the fleet modern, will continue to require conversion and modernization of some of our large inventory of World War II ships. The Navy is striking a proper balance between new construction and construction and conversion. It is a balance which will give us the greatest naval power in the long run with the least expenditure of funds. Furthermore through the widespread distribution of shipbuilding work between private and Government yards, it permits us to preserve the large mobilization base of facilities and skills which we will need in case of war.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I ask that the Clerk read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the President is authorized to undertake the construction of, or to acquire and convert, the following modern naval vessels:

One aircraft carrier of about 60,000 tons.

One nuclear-powered guided missile light cruiser of about 9,000 tons.

Four guided missile frigates, each of about 4,000 tons.

Eight guided missile destroyers, each of about 3,000 tons.

Six nuclear-powered submarines, each of about 3,000 tons.

Two escort vessels, each of about 1,400 tons.

One ammunition ship of about 8,000 tons.

Landing and service craft not to exceed 5,000 tons.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 8, strike out "nine" and insert "eleven."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CRUMPACKER: On page 1, line 6, strike out all of line 6.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Indiana is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Mr. Chairman, when I was in college I had a professor who used to delight in sitting back impressively at his desk and announcing in stentorian tones: "America, steadfastly gazing into the past, is backing into the future."

It seems to me that the leadership of the Navy has demonstrated a capacity and a talent for this type of viewpoint in many many instances. At the present time they are suffering very much from a mental block that compels them to look at future wars only in terms of past wars, and specifically in terms of World War II. Just as prior to World War II and in the early phases of that war they were devoted wholeheartedly to the battleship as the ultimate weapon in sea warfare today they can think only of the aircraft carrier. The aircraft carrier was the primary naval weapon of World War II, but since that time it has been suffering continually from a technological lag, a technological obsolescence which is not being reduced by the construction of supercarriers but instead is continually growing more pronounced.

During World War II when planes were all propeller-driven, piston-engined craft, it was possible to launch planes from a carrier deck at several times the rate now possible when jet craft must all be launched by catapults. It is true that the *Forrestal* class carriers have four catapults which would perhaps double the rate at which planes could be launched, or possibly even more than double it; but even after that has taken place the rate of launching is infinitely slower than it was in World War II. The planes themselves which are operating from aircraft carrier decks are not of the latest, fastest, most effective combat types but lag considerably behind the performance and efficiency of the latest land-based aircraft.

During the Korean war the most effective fighter that the Navy had in operational use on aircraft carriers was the straight-wing F-9-F jet. These planes were in no sense comparable to the jets with which the air war over Korea was fought, the MIG-15 of the Russians and the F-86 Saberjet on the American side.

Today, almost 5 years after the start of the Korean war and almost 3 years after the end of it, the very best and latest type of operational carrier-based fighter is a warmed-over version of the old F-86 Saberjet, the North American FJ-3 Fury. Today the Air Force and the Russians have moved beyond the subsonic into the transsonic and the supersonic fighters, the latter of which will soon be in operational use. The Navy has some more modern prototypes. They always have some prototypes. But they have had a gerat deal of difficulty getting production planes which could operate from carriers that were anywhere comparable to the current land-based types. This is not a situation that is on its way to be remedied, and it is growing worse.

Mention has been made of the difficulties of carrying jet fuel on board these carriers. It is true that the jet planes use a great deal more fuel than the older types do. In fact, the land-based aircraft have used such great quantities that in most instances we have had to go to the use of pipelines to transport sufficient quantities of fuels to the airfields to supply the needs because the old types of surface transport were not able to keep up with it. While the increase of 10,000 tons in the size of a carrier undoubtedly makes more fuel capacity available, the increase is nowhere near on the order of the increase in fuel that is consumed by these jet craft.

If this proposition was for a nuclear-powered carrier, it might have some merit to it, because if it were that would make available for jet fuel storage the space and capacity on the ships now occupied by the fuel used for propulsion purposes. But it is not. It is 1 more conventional powered carrier to add to the 5 that have already been authorized.

Mr. Chairman, I commend the committee for certain language which it used in its report and I wish it had paid more attention to its own words. I should like to quote from page 3 of the report where we find the following language:

The rapid ascendancy of the U. S. S. R. has brought it to the position of a major naval power second now only to the United States. It is the most significant development in Soviet grand strategy since World War II. It is obvious that the U. S. S. R. has one purpose in mind and that is to prevent United States naval forces and shipping from entering the waters surrounding Europe and Asia. Her submarine fleet now numbers over 400, of which a large percentage are new construction, long-range boats. In each of calendar years 1956 and 1957, she will commission about 75 to 85 new modern submarines. Besides this huge underseas fleet, the U. S. S. R. has built more destroyers and cruisers since World War II than all the nations of the rest of the world combined. These surface ships are modern and incorporate the latest technological equipments. They are fully manned in active commission and are continuously undergoing rigorous training operations. These startling facts demonstrate the important position the control of the seas holds in Soviet grand strategy.

If the Navy were seeking solely to meet this threat, which they themselves admit is the most significant development in Soviet military power, I would support them all the way. If they would take the money that they propose to spend for this carrier and put it into additional guided missile ships, additional submarines, and additional antisubmarine devices, I would go with them all the way. But these super aircraft carriers are not designed for defense against submarine fleets. The type of planes now in use whose primary mission it is to seek out and kill submarines are piston engine types that can take off from the decks of any of our carriers even the "jeep" carriers from World War II. These supercarriers are designed not to meet the threat of the Soviet undersea might and the threat of their surface vessels. The threat of attack by missiles launched either from their submarines or from their surface vessels is very serious, but it is largely being ignored in the rush to build more carriers. That is the greatest threat to our naval supremacy. That is the greatest threat to the coastal areas of the continental United States. But the Navy cannot see this danger for their concentration and preoccupation with the super aircraft carriers. They have to have a great big ship, a large capital ship that takes a big crew, rather than to concentrate on the smaller vessels, the more modern weapons, the missiles, and other new developments that are the coming weapons of war.

I cannot see how they can continue to ignore technological developments which obviously point to big changes in warfare of the future and continue to concentrate on the past and the experience of

the past to the degree they are in continuing to push this program. They cannot, as they always assume in every argument they make in favor of the aircraft carrier, operate equivalent airplanes off of carrier decks. If they could, the value of the ship would be a great deal more than it is. But, instead of operating equivalent aircraft, they are continually lagging in their technological development so that the planes they launch from carriers are always several years behind land-based craft in their performance and development and, by the same token, they are equally far behind the planes that they would have to meet operating from Communist land bases. I cannot see any justification for authorizing another carrier of this type at this time. Let us wait a while until we have had some experience with those already authorized; wait a while until the possibility of nuclear propulsion has been further explored; wait a while until the development of guided missiles has reached the point where we know more what their capabilities will be and what defenses, if any, can be developed against them. I do not think an additional carrier of this type is justified at this time.

Mr. Chairman, I ask for a vote on my amendment.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I will not trespass on the committee's time but very briefly. At the outset I regret that the distinguished gentleman from Indiana finds himself out of step not only with the President of the United States, who in his budget message made this specific recommendation: That there be included in the proposed shipbuilding program for 1957 the construction of six carriers of the *Forrestal* class. The gentleman from Indiana now proposes to strike that from the bill. He points out that probably other types of ships should take the place of the carrier, perhaps destroyers and other smaller ships. All the experts in the Navy Department find themselves in complete accord with the continuation of a program to build this type of carrier at this time. The gentleman from Indiana feels that some of his objections would be met by the use of nuclear power as the propulsion for our large carriers. I am in full agreement that that is what we should aim toward; and, indeed, this very bill contains an item for a nuclear reactor for the next *Forrestal*-type carrier. It is my sincere hope that the Appropriations Committee when it brings in its bill will permit the construction of this nuclear propulsion element in order that our next *Forrestal*-type carrier will be of the type which will meet the objections of the gentleman and, indeed, conform to the desires of all of us. This, then, we hope will be the last carrier with conventional propulsion.

Mr. Chairman, I certainly hope that the views of the Navy Department, the recommendation of the Chief of Naval Operations, and the other naval experts will prevail so that this program of constructing the *Forrestal*-type carrier will not be cut off until the nuclear type has been fully developed.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, on five different occasions Congress has approved the construction of a carrier; in other words, on each occasion we defeated an amendment similar to the Crumpacker amendment, thus placing our stamp of approval on the Navy's construction program of new and modern aircraft carriers.

To begin with, it might be well to point out that the Joint Chiefs of Staff speak for the armed services of this country, and on their shoulders rests the responsibility of giving to the American people an adequate national defense. The Joint Chiefs of Staff have given to each branch of the service a mission to perform, and Congress has never hesitated to provide each branch of our Armed Forces the necessary tools to carry out its mission. When the Army said they wanted a special kind of tank we gave it to them. We did the same with helicopters for the marines, and planes for the Air Force.

The carrier involved in this bill is a tool needed by the Navy in carrying out the mission assigned to it by the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

Today's and tomorrow's carriers must be completely adequate to handle the best planes America can produce, and we must have them in sufficient numbers to provide the Navy with the airpower it must have to successfully carry out its mission as the naval arm of our national defense.

The type of carrier we are authorizing in this bill is nothing more than a portable airfield that can sail the seas of the world at a speed of nearly 35 miles an hour.

Today it can be at the mouth of the Mississippi River and tomorrow afternoon at this time 500 miles away. This modern aircraft carrier functioning as a portable airfield with supporting facilities for itself as well as all of its aircraft is an indispensable tool in the defense of this Nation.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VAN ZANDT. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I think I understood the gentleman correctly to say that the vote by the Joint Chiefs of Staff was a unanimous approval; is that correct?

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Exactly.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. And that included a member who represented the Air Force, probably the most experienced airman in the whole United States.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Exactly.

Mr. DEVEREUX. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VAN ZANDT. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. DEVEREUX. I am sure from the gentleman's experience that he will agree that the philosophy that is being presented by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. CRUMPACKER] represents simply a defensive posture, whereas with such aircraft carriers as we have included in our bill which will give us the capability of carrying the war into enemy territory, we are taking an offensive position which in everybody's concept is the proper way to wage a successful war.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. That is correct. The carrier is part of the global strategy that has been laid down by the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

Mr. OSTERTAG. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VAN ZANDT. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. OSTERTAG. Is it not true that the budget that is now before the Congress provides for a stepup of the antisubmarine forces of the Navy?

Mr. VAN ZANDT. That is true. Let me add that our present antisubmarine equipment is obsolete because of the increased speed of submarines. If we are going to develop a new defense against submarine attack we must have faster ships. These new carriers are faster ships and will have capabilities of playing a very important part in antisubmarine warfare.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VAN ZANDT. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, I want to compliment the gentleman on making a very fine statement. I listened with a great deal of interest to the remarks of our very able friend from Indiana [Mr. CRUMPACKER] who constantly reiterated "Wait a while, wait a while, wait a while." I just want to point out to the gentleman that we are living in a very critical and chaotic world where we might be catapulted suddenly into an emergency and we will then wish that we had this carrier and many more of them. So I feel that the carrier should be built and built as soon as we can build it.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Pennsylvania is exactly right. You cannot build these carriers overnight. It takes years to construct them. It is for that reason that Congress annually for the past 5 years has placed its stamp of approval on the carrier program. As the gentleman from Pennsylvania pointed out the day could come when we wished we had these carriers. Mr. Chairman, I hope this amendment will be defeated.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. CRUMPACKER].

The amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 2. Tonnage required for the construction of 2 escort vessels, a total of 2,800 tons, is hereby authorized. Tonnage adequate to construct the other vessels listed in the first section of this act has been previously authorized by law and these vessels shall be charged against previously authorized and unobligated tonnage.

SEC. 3. The President is further authorized to convert, from existing vessels of the United States, the following naval vessels:

One aircraft carrier of about 54,000 tons.

Two aircraft carriers, each of about 36,000 tons.

One aircraft carrier of about 37,000 tons.

Five guided missile light cruisers, each of about 12,000 tons.

One guided missile submarine of about 1,700 tons.

One amphibious assault ship of about 13,000 tons.

One attack transport of about 10,000 tons.

One seaplane tender of about 10,000 tons.

Six radar picket escort vessels, each of about 1,500 tons.

Four ocean radar station ships, each of about 4,000 tons.

SEC. 4. The President is further authorized to commence design and advance procurement for a nuclear-powered aircraft carrier.

SEC. 5. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such sums as may be necessary for the construction, acquisition, or conversion of the foregoing vessels.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the bill may be dispensed with, that it be printed in the RECORD in its entirety, and open to amendment at any point.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There is no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. If there are no further amendments, under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. DELANEY, 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. 7993) to authorize the construction and conversion of certain naval vessels, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 392, he reported the 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.

The amendment 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.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, on that I ask for a division.

The question was taken; and there were—ayes 57, noes 1.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently, a quorum is not present.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 360, nays 3, answered "present" 1, not voting 68, as follows:

[Roll No. 5]

YEAS—360

Abbitt
Abernethy
Adair
Addonizio
Albert
Alexander
Alger
Allen, Calif.
Allen, Ill.
Andersen, H. Carl
Andresen, August H.
Andrews
Anfuso
Arends
Ashley
Ashmore
Aspinall
Ayres
Bailey
Baker
Baldwin
Barden
Bass, N. H.
Bass, Tenn.
Bates
Baumhart
Beamer
Becker
Belcher
Bell
Bennett, Fla.
Bennett, Mich.
Bentley
Berry
Betts
Blatnik
Blitch
Boggs
Boland
Bolling
Bolton, Frances P.
Bolton, Oliver P.
Bonner
Bosch
Bow
Bowler
Boykin
Boyle
Bray
Brooks, Tex.
Brown, Ga.
Brown, Ohio
Brownson
Broyhill
Budge
Burdick
Burnside
Byrd
Byrnes, Wis.
Canfield
Cannon
Carlyle
Carnahan
Carrigg
Cederberg
Celler
Chase
Chelf
Chenoweth
Chiperfield
Christopher
Church
Clark
Clevenger
Colmer
Coon
Cooper
Corbett
Coudert
Cramer
Cretella
Cunningham
Curtis, Mass.
Curtis, Mo.
Dague
Davidson
Davis, Ga.
Davis, Tenn.
Davis, Wis.
Dawson, Ill.
Dawson, Utah
Deane
Delaney
Dempsey
Denton
Derounian
Devereux
Dies
Diggs
Dingell
Dixon
Dodd
Dolliver
Dondero
Donohue
Donovan
Dorn, N. Y.
Dowdy
Edmondson
Elliott
Ellsworth
Engle
Evins
Fascell
Feighan
Fernandez
Fino
Fisher
Fjare
Flynt
Fogarty
Forand
Ford
Forrester
Frazier
Frelinghuysen
Fulton
Garmatz
Gary
Gathings
Gavin
Gentry
George
Gordon
Grant
Gray
Green, Oreg.
Gregory
Griffiths
Gross
Gubser
Gwinn
Hagen
Hale
Haley
Hand
Harden
Hardy
Harris
Harrison, Nebr.
Harrison, Va.
Harvey
Hays, Ark.
Hayworth
Hébert
Henderson
Herlong
Heselton
Hess
Hiestand
Hill
Hillings
Hoeven
Hoffman, Mich.
Holmes
Holt
Holtzman
Horan
Hosmer
Huddleston
Hull
Hyde
Ikard
Jackson
James
Jarman
Jenkins
Jennings
Johansen
Johnson, Calif.
Johnson, Wis.
Jonas
Jones, Ala.
Jones, Mo.
Jones, N. C.
Karsten
Kean
Kearney
Kearns
Keating
Kee
Kelly, N. Y.
Keogh
Kilday
Kilgore
King, Calif.
Kirwan
Klein
Kluczynski
Knox
Laird
Landrum
Lane
Lanham
Latham
LeCompte
Lesinski
Lipscomb
Long
Lovre
McCarthy
McConnell
McCormack
McCulloch
McDonough
McDowell
McGregor
McIntire
McVey
Macdonald
Madden
Magnuson
Mahon
Mailliard
Martin
Mason
Matthews
Meader
Merrow
Metcalf
Miller, Calif.
Miller, Md.
Miller, Nebr.
Miller, N. Y.
Mills
Minshall
Mollohan
Morano
Morgan
Morrison
Moss
Moulder
Multer
Murray, Ill.
Murray, Tenn.
Natcher
Nelson
Nicholson
Norblad
Norrell
O'Brien, Ill.
O'Hara, Ill.
O'Hara, Minn.
O'Konski
O'Neill
Ostertag
Passman
Patman
Pelly
Perkins
Philbin
Pilcher
Pillion
Poage
Poff
Polk
Powell
Preston
Priest
Prouty
Rabaut
Radwan
Rains
Ray
Rees, Kans.
Reuss
Rhodes, Ariz.
Rhodes, Pa.
Riehlman
Riley
Rivers
Roberts
Robeson, Va.
Robsion, Ky.
Rodino
Rogers, Colo.
Rogers, Fla.
Rogers, Tex.
Rooney
Roosevelt
Rutherford
Sadlak
St. George
Saylor
Schenck
Scherer
Schwengel
Scott
Scudder
Seely-Brown
Selden
Sheehan
Sheppard
Short
Shuford
Sieminski
Sikes
Siler
Simpson, Ill.
Sisk
Smith, Kans.
Smith, Miss.
Smith, Va.
Smith, Wis.
Springer
Staggers
Steed
Sullivan
Taber
Talle
Taylor
Teague, Calif.
Teague, Tex.
Thomas
Thompson, La.
Thompson, N. J.
Thompson, Tex.
Thomson, Wyo.
Thornberry
Tollefson
Trimble
Tuck
Tumulty
Udall
Utt
Vanik
Van Pelt
Van Zandt
Vinson
Wainwright
Westland
Wharton
Whitten
Wickersham
Widnall
Wier
Wigglesworth
Williams, N. J.
Williams, N. Y.
Willis
Wilson, Ind.
Winstead
Withrow
Wolcott
Wolverton
Wright
Yates
Young
Younger
Zelenko

NAYS—3

Crumpacker
Dorn, S. C.
Marshall

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Scrivner

NOT VOTING—68

Auchincloss
Avery
Barrett
Brooks, La.
Buckley
Burleson
Bush
Byrne, Pa.
Chatham
Chudoff
Cole
Cooley
Dollinger
Doyle
Durham
Eberharter
Fallon
Fenton
Flood
Fountain
Friedel
Gamble
Granahan
Green, Pa.
Halleck
Hays, Ohio
Hinshaw
Hoffman, Ill.
Holifield
Hope
Jensen
Judd
Kelley, Pa.
Kilburn
King, Pa.
Knutson
Krueger
Lankford
McMillan
Machrowicz
Mack, Ill.
Mack, Wash.
Mumma
O'Brien, N. Y.
Osmers
Patterson
Pfost
Phillips
Price
Quigley
Reece, Tenn.
Reed, Ill.
Reed, N. Y.
Richards
Rogers, Mass.
Shelley
Simpson, Pa.
Spence
Thompson, Mich.
Velde
Vorys
Vursell
Walter
Watts
Weaver
Williams, Miss.
Wilson, Calif.
Zablocki

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Fountain with Mr. Halleck.

Mr. Chatham with Mr. Simpson of Pennsylvania.

Mr. Durham with Mr. Auchincloss.

Mr. Shelley with Mrs. Rogers of Massachusetts.

Mrs. Pfost with Mr. Fenton.

Mr. Lankford with Mr. Osmers.

Mr. Barrett with Mr. Reece of Tennessee.

Mr. Walter with Mr. Hinshaw.

Mr. Eberharter with Mr. Hoffman of Illinois.

Mr. Price with Mr. Kilburn.

Mr. Granahan with Mr. Weaver.

Mr. Mack of Illinois with Mr. Vursell.

Mr. Buckley with Mr. Cole.

Mr. Friedel with Mr. Bush.

Mr. Burleson with Mr. Avery.

Mr. Hays of Ohio with Mr. Hope.

Mr. Fallon with Mr. Judd.

Mr. Dollinger with Mr. Wilson of California.

Mr. Chudoff with Miss Thompson of Michigan.

Mr. Byrne of Pennsylvania with Mr. Reed of New York.

Mr. Green of Pennsylvania with Mr. Mumma.

Mr. Machrowicz with Mr. Gamble.

Mr. Kelley of Pennsylvania with Mr. Jensen.

Mr. Holifield with Mr. Velde.

Mr. Doyle with Mr. Krueger.

Mr. O'Brien of New York with Mr. King of Pennsylvania.

Mr. Watts with Mr. Vorys.

Mr. Williams of Mississippi with Mr. Mack of Washington.

Mr. Quigley with Mr. Patterson.

Mr. Flood with Mr. Phillips.

Mrs. Knutson with Mr. Reed of Illinois.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

UNITED STATES MERCHANT MARINE ACADEMY

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication, which was read:

JANUARY 31, 1956.

The SPEAKER,
The House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to Public Law 301 of the 78th Congress, I have appointed the following members of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries

to serve as members of the Board of Visitors to the United States Merchant Marine Academy for the year 1956: Hon. JOHN C. KLUCZYNSKI, Hon. JOHN D. DINGELL, Hon. JOHN J. ALLEN, JR.

As chairman of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, I am authorized to serve as an ex officio member of the Board.

Sincerely,

HERBERT C. BONNER,
Chairman.

UNITED STATES COAST GUARD ACADEMY

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication, which was read:

JANUARY 31, 1956.

The SPEAKER,
The House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to section 194 of title 14 of the United States Code, I have appointed the following members of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries to serve as members of the Board of Visitors to the United States Coast Guard Academy for the year 1956: Hon. EDWARD J. ROBESON, JR.; Hon. FRANK M. CLARK; Hon. HORACE SEELY-BROWN, JR.

As chairman of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, I am authorized to serve as an ex officio member of the Board.

Sincerely,

HERBERT C. BONNER,
Chairman.

THE LATE GOV. PAUL A. PATTERSON

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. ELLSWORTH].

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, at 3 o'clock this morning I was awakened by my telephone and received the tragic news that Gov. Paul A. Patterson, of Oregon, died suddenly last evening in the city of Portland. Mr. Speaker, the passing of our governor is not only a tragedy for the State of Oregon but for our country as well. Governor Patterson was well known nationally through his work in the governors conference since he has been governor. He was highly respected by all who knew him. For myself, the passing of Paul Patterson leaves an especially deep void. I have known Paul all of my adult life. We were college classmates at the University of Oregon. His widow, Georgia Benson Patterson, also attended the University of Oregon at that time. They have been our friends through the years.

Mr. Speaker, Paul Patterson was a splendid, distinguished lawyer in the city of Hillsboro, Oreg. He was a member of the State legislature for several years. Prior to becoming governor, he was a member of the Oregon State Senate where he ascended to the position of president of the Senate. In line of succession, when the governor's chair was vacated by the appointment of the then Governor, Douglas McKay, as Secretary of the Interior, Paul Patterson, as president of the Senate, became governor. Subsequently he was elected by the people of Oregon for the regular 4-year term. Paul Patterson served the State as a wonderful governor. He was respected and revered by all who knew him. Mrs. Ellsworth and I have expressed our deepest sympathy to Mrs. Patterson and the family. We deeply mourn their great loss as do all of the people of Oregon.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. COON].

Mr. COON. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join my colleague from Oregon in expressing sympathy to Mrs. Patterson and the rest of the family on the untimely passing of our Governor, Paul Patterson. I was deeply shocked to receive that news at 3 o'clock this morning.

Oregon has lost a great governor. The Patterson family have lost a dearly beloved member of their family. I have lost a real friend.

I served in the Oregon Senate with Paul Patterson when he was president of the senate. I know he was a very capable legislator. He was most honest and sincere in all of his activities and gave untiringly of his efforts for the best interests of Oregon. It is a great shock to our State to see the life of such a well loved man ended so suddenly at the height of his brilliant career.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members desiring to do so may extend their remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, "Paul Patterson, Governor of the State of Oregon is dead." One sentence, 10 words, but what a tremendous effect they have had on the people of my State and on people everywhere who knew and admired him.

Paul Patterson was one of God's kindly men. His life was dedicated to the principles of decency and humanity. It can truly be said of him that he looked upon public office as an obligation to serve his fellow man. He thought of government in the terms of people and how it would affect their daily lives, and from the depths of his generous soul, he strove mightily to make this world a better place in which to live. Somehow Paul Patterson the man was synonymous with the Far West and the State of Oregon for which he had a deep abiding love. He brought to the problems of that vast stretch of our Nation, leadership and ability that won for him an enduring place among his people. We will long remember this man of great intellectual stature who strode among us with his shock of unruly hair, his friendly smile, his sincere manner and a calm demeanor which inspired great confidence and loyal devotion.

During my many years in Oregon I had many opportunities to observe and to admire his splendid qualities and outstanding ability. The untimely death of Paul Patterson leaves a void in public life that will be difficult to fill. At this time of great sadness my heartfelt sympathies go out to his beloved wife, and my personal friend, Georgia Patterson.

Mr. NORBLAD. Mr. Speaker, I want to join in paying my tribute to Paul Patterson.

It had been my privilege to know Governor Patterson for many years both as a fellow attorney, as a State legislator and later as our chief executive.

He was an outstanding American and the highest type of citizen.

In his home town of Hillsboro he was held in high esteem by his fellow townsmen who had known him so many years.

I have never heard an ill word spoken against him nor any one doubt his complete sincerity, honesty, and decency.

The State of Oregon suffered a great loss when he passed away last night.

ESTABLISHMENT OF IMPORT QUOTAS BY THE UNITED STATES TARIFF COMMISSION

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD at this point.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I have today joined a number of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle and introduced a bill authorizing the establishment of import quotas by the United States Tariff Commission under conditions set forth in the bill.

This import quota bill, previously introduced by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. LANHAM], appeals to me for several reasons and I am therefore ready and happy to cosponsor it.

Mr. Speaker, American industry and those working in the manufacturing establishments, on the farms, in the fisheries and mines of this country do need protection against products imported from abroad for one very simple and obvious reason. That is the lower wages paid in other countries. There may be other reasons but it must be clear to anyone that with modern machinery operating in other countries, our industries can no longer outproduce their foreign competitors sufficiently to offset the wide wage differential.

This being the case many Members of Congress have sought the necessary protection in recent years by strengthening the escape clause of the Trade Agreements Act, hoping to make of it a proper remedy against injury from imports.

Unfortunately these hopes have been doomed to failure. The fault has not been with the Congress. The congressional intent was spelled out clearly enough. The failure of the escape clause to provide a practical remedy to date may fairly be laid at the doors of the State Department.

The time has now come for Congress to legislate in such a manner that its intent cannot be nullified by an executive department. The present bill would represent just such legislation.

However, the authorization of import quotas by legislation is fully justified on its own merits. All who are familiar with import competition have become aware of certain weaknesses of the tariff in providing protection under individual circumstances. This is particularly true when tariff rates have been bound

against any increase in an international agreement, as many rates have been bound under the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade, better known as GATT.

Import quotas have three outstanding merits, if the conditions of their use are properly drawn.

One is that, by setting aside a given share of the market to be supplied by imports, the uncertainty and fear that grip domestic producers faced with an unlimited flow of imports, are eliminated. The disruption and depression of the market attributable to the fear of imports can be prevented. The planning of production and expansion of plants or renewal of machinery can be carried out with greater confidence and with full assurance that imports will not skim the cream of the market or push the domestic product to the side. We have seen such things happen in New England as elsewhere.

In New England we have but to take a look at the watch industry, the bicycle industry and the fisheries to be aware of what unimpeded import competition can do. Now the textile industry is similarly exposed.

The second point of superiority lies in the greater flexibility of import quotas compared to the tariff, provided that the conditions controlling the modification and adjustment of quotas are made clear in the legislation covering the subject. The present bill does just that. It would not require an act of Congress to adjust a quota because the law would furnish the guidelines for action by the Tariff Commission. If a surplus should develop in any product protected by a quota the Tariff Commission could cut back imports temporarily to help the domestic industry work off the surplus. This flexibility would be extremely helpful in preventing a recession from backing into a depression.

Third, the import quota can be used to carry out a liberal trade plan. A reasonable share of the market could be left to imports. Expansion of the market would open the way for a larger volume of imports without raising their share of the market. Even the latter, that is, increasing the share of imports in supplying the market, is provided for in the bill where the need can be established and where additional imports would not seriously injure domestic producers.

The quota system, however, would not replace the tariff but would supplement it. Instances could no doubt be found where the tariff could be removed entirely and replaced by a quota but the bill does not now provide such a system of substitution.

An impressive feature of the bill is the incentive it gives to other countries to raise their wage standards if they want to increase their exports to the United States. This is something new and meets the objection to high tariffs. The bill provides that the quota on any product shipped to us from any country will be increased by 10 percent if the wages in the industry shipping the goods to us increase by as much as 5 percent in their relation to our own wages. Such an increase could be repeated as the wage-gap was narrowed. The door is therefore opened to the improvement of wage standards in other countries. This is an important feature of the bill.

There are other features of the bill that recommend it to me, but one of the most cogent is the final power bestowed on the Tariff Commission. The delegated power is carefully confined by the bill, as all delegated power should be, and it would recapture for Congress its constitutional authority to legislate toward the regulation of foreign commerce and to lay and collect duties. This power has so far passed out of the hands of this body that unless Congress reasserts its legislative power in this field it will progressively underwrite its own abdication.

This is a most serious matter. I urge early hearings on the bill so that the legislation may be considered in this session.

PLANTING OF TREES ON SURPLUS CROPLANDS

Mr. OSTERTAG. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. OSTERTAG. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a bill designed to make a virtue of necessity and convert a liability into an asset. It is a bill to encourage and stimulate the planting of trees on surplus croplands. The bill is geared to complement the administration's soil-bank proposals, by providing incentives in the form of Federal aid and technical assistance to farmers who convert their surplus croplands to woodlots.

Under the terms of this measure, tree seedlings would be made available, free of charge, for planting on farmlands earmarked for the so-called conservation-reserve program, and a strengthened and expanded Federal-State program of guidance and assistance in forest management would be provided to cooperating farmers.

Mr. Speaker, this is no pie-in-the-sky proposal, and it is not submitted as such. It is a program that will get land into the production of a crop which is in short supply today, and which will be in shorter supply in the future, unless we plan and plant now to take care of tomorrow's needs. It is a sound, workable program, based on solid experience rather than wishful thinking, and if it is approved, it can add as many as 5 billion trees to our productive timberlands in the next 5 years.

This program has numerous things to commend it. It will take land out of production on a long-range basis, thus providing a real breathing spell in which to whittle down our price-depressing surpluses.

It will put the land into a soil-building, rather than soil-depleting crop, thus providing a double harvest for future generations. At the same time, if there is a real emergency, land planted to trees can be quickly cleared with today's bulldozers, so that it is not permanently locked up against other uses, if it is really needed.

Such a program as is contemplated in this bill, Mr. Speaker, has been successfully operated in the State of New York for the past 10 years. As one who had a part in launching that program in my home State, during the period when I served as a State legislator, I can say that what is here proposed has been tried, and it works. More than 1.3 million acres of private land are now planted to trees, in New York State, under the so-called Forest Management program, and many a farmer in my State for the first time has a realizable resource in his woodlot.

I therefore trust that this measure will get careful consideration and win the approval of this Congress.

PERSONAL STATEMENT

Mr. DOLLINGER. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained on official business and away from the Chamber at the time the vote was taken on the naval construction bill. Had I been present, I would have voted in the affirmative.

PRINCIPAL PRODUCERS OF NATURAL GAS

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include certain tables and other statistical information.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Speaker, it seems more than probable that this House will have another opportunity to exercise its judgment on the proposal to exempt producers of natural gas from Federal regulation. In fact, it seems quite unlikely that the proposal can become law unless this House acts again.

Therefore, I believe it will be material to any such further consideration of the proposal for us to have readily accessible and before us certain information bearing upon the major issue of exemption.

Before presenting that information, I want to summarize briefly the most significant votes in committees and on this floor as to this proposal.

On June 7, 1955, a tie vote in the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce killed the bill temporarily.

On June 8, 1955, this vote was reconsidered and the bill was approved by a vote of 16 to 15.

The bill was reported on June 28.

It was not until July 26 that the Rules Committee granted a rule for the consideration of the bill. The vote was 6 to 5. One member of that committee did not vote.

The bill was debated and passed on July 28. A motion to recommit the bill lost by a vote of 203 to 210.

The vote on final passage was 209 to 203. This vote was on July 28. Congress adjourned the following Tuesday, August 2.

During the debate here references were made to the producers who would be benefited by the exemption proposal. It was stated that it had been estimated that 5,000 to 6,000 independent natural gas producers were involved.

I believe that in considering this proposal it is most important that we should have as a basis as firm knowledge as is available as to the size and scope of the operations of those who seek such an exemption by congressional action.

Therefore, I requested the Legislative Reference Service to compile some of the data available to the public as to several points in such sources as Moody's and Standard and Poor's. Unfortunately, it is not complete. I know of no sources through which it could be completed except from the companies involved. I hope that they will provide the full information, as well as any corrections they believe should be made, before this proposal comes before us again.

In any event, I submit the tables as they have been prepared by a competent, impartial and objective source. I believe they will be of assistance to us.

Table I is the list of companies which the following tables will treat in detail. That table is based upon certain data I inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 101, part 8, page 10869 as the most accurate I could obtain at that time. The first figure represents that data. The second figure is the latest data available to me.

It will be noted that the total estimated gas reserves in column 1 is 134,300,000,000,000 cubic feet; while the total in column 2 is 149,100,000,000,000 cubic feet.

According to the 1555 issue of Gas Facts, a statistical publication of the American Gas Association, the total proven recoverable reserves of natural gas in this country at the end of 1954 was 211,710,732,000 cubic feet—table 5, page 13.

TABLE I.—*Estimated gas reserves of principal producers*

[Trillions of cubic feet]

	Former	Latest
1. Humble Oil & Refining	18.0	16.0
2. Phillips Petroleum	17.9	17.9
3. The Texas Co	10.5	11.1
4. Standard Oil of Indiana	9.9	11.4
5. Socony Mobil Oil	7.5	7.8
6. Shell Oil	7.0	7.0
7. Cities Service	6.3	6.3
8. El Paso Natural Gas	4.5	4.5
9. Standard Oil of California	4.0	4.5
10. Gulf Oil	4.0	4.0
11. Continental Oil	3.8	2.2
12. Sun Oil	3.8	3.9
13. Pure Oil	3.7	3.7
14. Panhandle Eastern Pipe Line	3.5	11.5
15. Colorado Interstate Gas	3.3	5.6
16. Chicago Corp	2.5	1.5
17. Skelly Oil	2.4	2.3
18. Atlantic Refining	2.2	2.2
19. Ohio Oil	2.1	2.0
20. Republic Natural Gas	2.1	2.1
21. Cities Service Gas	2.0	2.0
22. Tidewater Associated Oil	1.8	2.2
23. Sinclair Oil	1.7	1.7
24. Union Oil of California	1.6	2.4
25. Superior Oil	1.5	1.5
26. Sunray Midcontinent Oil	1.5	1.9
27. Natural Gas Pipeline	1.5	4.2
28. Southern Production	1.3	1.2
29. Pan American Petroleum	1.3	1.3
30. Arkansas-Louisiana Gas	1.1	3.2

Table II contains brief notes about each of these companies to identify their legal status, including nature of incorporation:

TABLE II

NOTES ON MAJOR HOLDERS OF NATURAL GAS RESERVES

1. Humble Oil & Refining Co.: The majority of stock is owned by the Standard Oil Co. (New Jersey), amounting on December 31, 1954 to 87 percent of the voting stock. This is a Texas corporation.

2. Phillips Petroleum Co.: This is both a holding and an operating company, incorporated in Delaware on June 13, 1917.

3. The Texas Co.: This is both a holding and an operating company, incorporated in Delaware on August 26, 1926.

4. Standard Oil Company of Indiana: This is both a holding and an operating company, incorporated in Indiana on June 18, 1889.

5. Socony Mobil Oil Co.: This is both a holding and an operating company. It was incorporated in New York on August 10, 1882 as the Standard Oil Company of New York. In 1931, it changed its name to Socony-Vacuum Corp., and in May 1955, it became the Socony Mobil Oil Co., Inc.

6. The Shell Oil Co.: This is both a holding and an operating company. Some 65.44 percent of its stock is owned by the Shell Caribbean Petroleum Co. which in turn is a subsidiary of the Royal Dutch Petroleum Co. The American company was incorporated in Delaware on February 8, 1922.

7. Cities Service Co.: This is a holding company incorporated in Delaware. Because of the requirements of the Public Utility Holding Company Act of 1935, all its public utility subsidiaries have been disposed of except the Dominion Natural Gas Co., Ltd., of Canada, and there is pending an application for exemption of this subsidiary from the provisions of the 1935 act. In 1954, Cities Service sold 40 percent of its output to transportation companies at field delivery points, 34 percent to distribution companies at town border delivery points, 21 percent direct to industrial companies, and the remainder to other customers.

8. El Paso Natural Gas Co.: This is both a holding and an operating company. It was incorporated in Delaware on November 28, 1928. It owns and operates a pipeline system for the transportation and sale at wholesale of natural gas supplying customers in Texas, New Mexico, and Arizona, with further delivery to companies distributing in California and Nevada.

9. Standard Oil Company of California: This is primarily an operating company although it is also a holding company. It was incorporated in Delaware on January 27, 1926.

10. Gulf Oil Co.: This is both a holding and an operating company. It was incorporated in Pennsylvania on August 9, 1922. Its supplies of natural gas are used or processed for the extraction of natural gasoline or other such products, and gas is sold to other companies for the production of lampblack. Other sales are made in the area of production. The rest is used to repressure oilfields.

11. Continental Oil Co.: This is both a holding and an operating company. It was incorporated in Delaware on October 8, 1920. It does not present operating statistics in the standard reference books.

12. Sun Oil Co.: This is both a holding and an operating company. It was incorporated in New Jersey on May 2, 1901.

13. Pure Oil Co.: This is primarily an operating company but is also a holding company. It was incorporated in Ohio on April 9, 1914.

14. Panhandle Eastern Pipe Line Co.: This is both a holding company and an operating company. It was incorporated in Delaware on December 23, 1929. It is affiliated with the Missouri-Kansas Pipe Line Co., which owned on December 31, 1954 some 447,943 shares of the 4 million total.

This company is engaged in the production, purchase, transmission, and sale of natural gas. Most of the sales are to gas distributing companies for resale. It produces about 23 percent of its requirements, and has to purchase the rest.

15. Colorado Interstate Gas Co.: This is both a holding and an operating company. It was incorporated in Delaware on June 8, 1927.

16. Chicago Corp.: This is both a holding and an operating company. It was incorporated in Delaware on September 11, 1929.

17. Skelly Oil Co.: This is an operating company. It was incorporated in Delaware on August 20, 1919. On December 31, 1954, 59.38 percent of the company's common stock was owned by the Mission Corp., which in turn is a subsidiary of the Pacific Western Oil Corp. Pacific Western owned 46.98 percent of the voting stock of Mission. Mr. J. Paul Getty individually and as trustee owned 81.94 percent of the voting control of Pacific Western.

18. Atlantic Refining Co.: This is both a holding and an operating company. It was incorporated in Pennsylvania on April 29, 1870.

19. The Ohio Oil Co.: This is primarily an operating company, but is also a holding company. It was incorporated in Ohio on July 30, 1887. This company owns 8.9 percent of the capital stock of the Mountain Fuel Supply Co. which owns and controls large gas reserves in Colorado and Wyoming, and complete transportation and distribution systems to market gas in Salt Lake City, Provo, and other towns of that area.

20. Republic Natural Gas Co.: This is an operating company. It was incorporated in Delaware in November 1934. It sells its natural gas principally to the Cities Service Gas Co. and the Northern Natural Gas Co. Minimum gas prices fixed by regulations in Oklahoma and in Kansas in turn affect the prices charged the two customer companies named above.

21. Cities Service Gas Co.: This is an operating company which is owned 100 percent by the Cities Service Co. It is incorporated in Delaware. Producing in Texas, Oklahoma, and Kansas, it transmits and sells to gas distribution companies and industrial customers in Texas, Missouri, Oklahoma, and Kansas. Statistics of its operations are covered in this report on Cities Service Co. (No. 7).

22. Tidewater Associated Oil Co.: This is primarily an operating company although it is also a holding company. It was incorporated in Delaware on March 5, 1926. On December 31, 1954, 47.37 percent of the voting control was owned by the Mission Development Co., and 14.27 percent of voting control by the Pacific Western Oil Corp. Mr. J. Paul Getty, as owner and trustee, controlled the Pacific Western Oil Corp.

23. Sinclair Oil Corp.: This is exclusively a holding company. It was incorporated in New York on September 23, 1919. Its subsidiary is the Sinclair Oil & Gas Co., which is incorporated in Maine.

24. Union Oil Company of California: This is primarily an operating company, but is also a holding company. It was incorporated in California on October 17, 1890. It has gas reserves of 2.4 trillion cubic feet.

24. (Alternate) Union Oil & Gas Corporation of Louisiana: This is a company incorporated in Delaware. It has gas reserves of 1.5 trillion cubic feet.

25. The Superior Oil Co.: This is primarily an operating company, but is also a holding company. It was incorporated in California on October 31, 1936. It has a wholly owned subsidiary engaged in exploratory work in

Venezuela and a 51.7-percent interest in Canadian Superior Oil of California, Ltd.

26. Sunray Midcontinent Oil Co.: This is both a holding company and an operating company. It was incorporated in Delaware on February 15, 1929. The Sunray Oil Corp. merged on May 16, 1955, with the Mid Continent Petroleum Corp.

27. Natural Gas Pipeline Company of America: This is both a holding and an operating company. It was incorporated in Delaware on April 25, 1930. All of its stock is owned by the Peoples Gas Light & Coke Co. It is associated with the Texas Illinois Natural Gas Pipeline Co. It produces 30 percent of its gas supply, purchasing the rest of its supply from other gas producers in the Panhandle area. The gas it purchases or produces is processed, transported, and sold at wholesale to the Peoples Gas Light & Coke Co., the Northern Illinois Gas Co., and the Northern Indiana Public Service Co. for distribution in the Chicago metropolitan area, and to about 14 other utilities for resale in 110 communities in Kansas, Nebraska, Illinois, and Wisconsin.

28. Southern Production Co., Inc.: This is primarily a production company. It was incorporated in Delaware on August 8, 1942. This company produces oil, natural gas, and gas distillates. In 1954 gas sales produced 24 percent of gross revenues.

29. Pan American Petroleum & Transport Co.: This company was formerly a Delaware corporation, a subsidiary of the Standard Oil of Indiana, which held a 78.7-percent interest. However, on August 17, 1954, it was merged with Standard Oil of Indiana, so no separate statistics are available now.

30. Arkansas-Louisiana Gas Co.: This is an operating company. It was incorporated in Delaware on March 9, 1928. As of December 31, 1954, 52.7 percent of the common stock was owned by the W. R. Stephens Investment Co.

Table III presents summary information on the acreage of oil and gas lands owned as of December 31, 1954, by these same companies, insofar as information is available. The figures refer to domestic holdings only, unless noted otherwise. Where possible, there is division of information between developed and undeveloped reserves, and the States in which these reserves are located also are shown.

TABLE III

ACREAGE OF GAS AND OIL LANDS HELD BY CERTAIN MAJOR PRODUCERS (AS OF DECEMBER 31, 1954)

Humble Oil and Refining:

Developed: 2,647,827—Texas, Louisiana, New Mexico, Mississippi, Florida, Alabama, California.

Undeveloped: 13,555,000—Same plus Georgia, Arizona, Arkansas, Oregon.

Phillips Petroleum:

Developed (gross): 1,206,745—Arkansas, Colorado, Illinois, Kansas, Kentucky, Louisiana, Mississippi, Montana, Nebraska, New Mexico, Oklahoma, Texas, Utah, Wyoming.

Undeveloped (gross): 8,929,868. Same plus Alabama, Arizona, Idaho, Indiana, Oregon, South Dakota, Alaska.

Also has 755,464 gross acres in Venezuela, and Canada, and exploratory rights in Canada on 1,876,817 gross acres, and leases and operating rights on 1,065,894 gross acres in Canada.

Texas Co.:

Total domestic: 10,969,571.

Total foreign: 7,892,933.

Standard Oil of Indiana:

Producing (net): 1,361,000. Principal: Kansas, Oklahoma, Texas, New Mexico, Wyoming, Louisiana, Colorado.

Undeveloped: 13,820,000. other: Montana, Arkansas, Nebraska, Utah, Mississippi, Georgia, Alabama, Florida, Kentucky, Illinois, Idaho, North Dakota, and Alberta.

Socony Mobil Oil Co.:

Proven: 307,652—Texas, California, Oklahoma, Louisiana, New Mexico, Kansas, Wyoming, Illinois, Mississippi, Nebraska, Arkansas, Kentucky, Michigan, Indiana, Alabama, Montana.

Undeveloped: 13,190,576. Above States plus West Virginia, Florida, Tennessee, Colorado, Utah, Missouri, Ohio, Arizona, Nevada, North Dakota, South Dakota.

Other holdings: A subsidiary has 22.66 percent interest in a nonprofit corporation which takes over certain producing properties. Royalty interests in 8,000 producing acres and in 46,766 nonproducing acres. Foreign interests located in: India, Pakistan, British Somaliland, Sumatra, New Guinea, Australia, Saskatchewan, Venezuela, Columbia, Egypt, Alberta, Germany, Austria, Iraq.

Cities Service Co.:

Developed and prospective: 7,585,000. Principal: Texas, Kansas, Oklahoma, Louisiana, New Mexico; other: Arkansas, Illinois, Michigan, Mississippi, Pennsylvania, Ohio, Kentucky.

One million one hundred and sixty-three thousand acres of leaseholds and reservations in Canada.

Two hundred and thirty thousand acres of royalties and mineral rights in fee in United States.

Foreign activities located in Saudi Arabia, Egypt, Canada, and Peru.

Shell Oil Co.:

Producing: 388,461—Texas, Louisiana, Oklahoma, California, Kansas, Colorado, New Mexico, Illinois, Montana, Canada, South Dakota, Wyoming, Nebraska, and others.

Nonproducing: 21,712,990. Above States, plus North Dakota and Alaska.

El Paso Natural Gas Co.:

Held gas rights (gross): 1,931,852.

Held gas rights (net): 1,500,742—New Mexico, Texas, Colorado, Utah, Arizona, Louisiana, Nevada, Wyoming, and Oregon.

Standard Oil of California:

Total United States (net): 7,034,076. Principal: Louisiana, Mississippi, Colorado, Wyoming.

Total Canada (net): 10,187,256.

Total (gross): 34,295,435.

Gulf Oil Co.:

Producing (net): 945,192—Texas, Louisiana, Mississippi, New Mexico, Oklahoma, Kansas, Illinois, Wyoming, California, Michigan, Kentucky, Arkansas and others.

Nonproducing: 13,976,314. Above plus offshore Texas and Louisiana.

Continental Oil Co.:

Producing (net): 348,128. Principal: Texas, Louisiana (offshore), Wyoming, Kansas, New Mexico, Oklahoma. Other: Colorado, Indiana, Montana, California, Illinois, Utah, Mississippi, Washington, Nebraska, Arkansas.

Nonproducing (net): 8,655,311. Above States, plus Florida, Nevada, North Dakota.

Sun Oil Co.: Producing and nonproducing: 12,100,000—Oklahoma, Kansas, Texas, Louisiana, New Mexico, Michigan, Illinois, Mississippi, Indiana, Kentucky, Alabama, Montana, Utah, Wyoming, Colorado.

Pure Oil Co.:

Developed (net): 259,000. Principal: West Virginia, Texas, Louisiana, Oklahoma, Wyoming, Mississippi, Colorado, Illinois, Michigan, and offshore Louisiana. Other: also, Indiana, Kentucky, Kansas, New Mexico.

Undeveloped (net): 3,349,000.

Panhandle Eastern:

Proven: 880,747. Principal: Texas, Kansas, Oklahoma.

Total: 1,522,179.

Colorado Interstate:

Proven: 244,046—Texas, Oklahoma.

Total: 306,219.

Chicago Corp.:

Producing (net): 167,660—Arkansas, Colorado, Kansas Louisiana, Mississippi, Montana, Nebraska, New Mexico, North Dakota, Oklahoma, South Dakota, Texas.

Nonproducing (net): 1,340,000.

Skelly Oil Co.:

Producing (net): 424,408—Arkansas, Colorado, Illinois, Kansas, Louisiana, Mississippi, Montana, Nebraska, New Mexico, North Dakota, Oklahoma, Texas, Utah, Wyoming.

Undeveloped (net): 3,560,842. Above States, plus others.

Atlantic Refining Co.:

Total domestic: 3,851,000—Alabama, Arkansas, Colorado, Kansas, Louisiana, New Mexico, Mississippi, Montana, North Dakota, South Dakota, Oklahoma, Texas, Wyoming, Canada.

Total foreign: 1,017,000.

The Ohio Oil Co.:

Total: 3,358,517—Ohio, Indiana, Illinois, Kentucky, New Mexico, Arkansas, Louisiana, Kansas, Oklahoma, California, Texas, Montana, Wyoming, Colorado, Michigan, West Virginia, Nebraska, Mississippi.

Republic Natural Gas Co.:

Total: 900,000—Texas, Oklahoma, Kansas, Colorado, Nebraska.

Canada: 300,000—Saskatchewan.

Tide Water Associated Oil Co.:

Producing: 200,368—Pennsylvania, Illinois, Indiana, Kansas, Arkansas, Oklahoma, Texas, Louisiana, Mississippi, New Mexico, Colorado, California, Wyoming, West Virginia, and Canada.

Undeveloped: 2,115,895—California, New Mexico, Texas, Oklahoma, Arkansas, Louisiana, Kansas, Illinois, Indiana, Mississippi, North Dakota, South Dakota, Alabama, Florida, Montana, Utah, Colorado, New York, Pennsylvania, West Virginia, Wyoming, Ohio, Nevada, and Canada.

Sinclair Oil Corp.:

Producing (net): 373,630—Texas, Louisiana, Oklahoma, Kansas, New Mexico, Wyoming, Mississippi, Kentucky, Montana, Indiana, Colorado, and Illinois.

Undeveloped: 10,113,354. Forty-four percent in Texas, 9 percent in Oklahoma, remainder in other States.

Union Oil of California:

Proved (net): 59,000. Principal: California, Louisiana, Texas, Montana, Wyoming, New Mexico, Oklahoma.

Unproved (net): 2,980,000.

Superior Oil Co.: Not stated. Principal: California, Texas, Louisiana, Oklahoma, Illinois. Other: Indiana, Arkansas, New Mexico, Colorado, Kansas, Kentucky, Michigan, Mississippi, Nebraska, Wyoming.

Sunray Mid-Continent:

Sunray properties producing (net): 206,844—Arkansas, California, Colorado, Illinois, Kansas, Louisiana, Mississippi, New Mexico, Oklahoma, Pennsylvania, Texas.

Sunray properties nonproducing (net): 2,885,064.

Mid-Continent properties producing (net): 82,319—Arkansas, Kansas, Louisiana, Nebraska, New Mexico, Oklahoma, Texas, Utah.

Mid-Continent properties nonproducing (net): 1,522,583.

Natural Gas Pipeline: Total: 130,000—Texas.

Southern Production Co.:

Producing (net): 69,189. Principal: Texas, Louisiana.

Nonproducing (net): 634,927. Other: Colorado, Louisiana, Mississippi, Oklahoma.

Arkansas Louisiana Gas:

Producing: 42,035. Principal: Arkansas, Texas, Louisiana.

Unproven: 127,821.

Table IV presents summary operating data on as many of these same companies as is available. Not all data are strictly comparable, but at least an idea of relative size of operations may be obtained, and the trends within particular companies measured in most cases.

TABLE IV.—*Operating statistics of certain major producers of natural gas*

[All gas volume data in millions of cubic feet unless marked otherwise]

	1955	1954	1953	1952	1951	1950	1949	1948
Humble Oil & Refining: Gas sales		335,100	316,653	241,877	214,766	169,441	136,559	126,947
Phillips Petroleum Co.:								
Gas sales per day		1,710	1,554	1,551	1,587	1,382	1,146	1,069
Average price per thousand cubic feet (cents)		8.29	8.09	6.56	5.86	5.15	4.87	4.43
Net gas produced		(1)	(1)	375,000	365,000	362,000	282,000	276,000
Gas purchased		(1)	(1)	384,000	392,000	280,000	276,000	268,000
The Texas Co.: Gas sales		244,020	209,028	181,405	162,943	138,620	140,055	118,256
Standard Oil of Indiana:								
Net gas daily production		990	919	774	669	528	446	380
Gas sales per day		1,078	1,007	863	725	570	445	339
Gas sales		393,400	367,500	315,800	264,700	208,092	162,561	123,750
Consolidated sales and operating revenue (dollars per thousand)		36,668	29,182	21,798	17,261	12,468	8,978	5,862
Socony Mobile Oil Co.: Gas production		290,188	289,582	263,657	253,000	209,000	157,539	113,165
Shell Oil Co.:								
Gas production		340,040	316,362	266,515	229,391	156,116	142,981	128,119
Gas sales		285,928	222,822	176,613	146,160	121,678	90,431	73,693
Cities Service Co.:								
Gas production		[2] 236,597	262,086	252,135	242,110	210,826	189,227	171,368
Gas sales		[2] 456,149	619,417	591,111	559,132	501,041	429,480	371,835
Number of customers		(1)	750,155	745,158	705,543	668,879	633,088	599,097
Miles of pipelines and mains		[2] 7,783	18,893	19,076	18,353	17,716	16,818	16,360
El Paso Natural Gas:								
Gas production and from storage		[3] 75,965	58,112	57,404	17,009	580	446	2,628
Gas received in exchange		49,966	435					
Gas purchased		[4] 731,114	589,442	487,460	412,834	295,586	208,490	141,556
Gas sales and delivery		645,356	515,909	437,512	379,416	264,219	185,117	130,014
Gas used in system		53,760	50,419	40,450	30,455	21,103	16,508	12,321
Gas stored		55,957	8,909	5,570	1,115	8,066	6,021	998
Gas unaccounted		8,286	7,606	3,927	1,848	2,197	853	1,776
Gas delivered in exchange		(5)	6,599					
Total gas utilization		[4] 731,114	589,442	487,460	412,834	295,586	208,499	141,556
Total gas sales (dollars per thousand)		132,895	105,639	74,682	61,135	39,674	28,708	21,529
Standard Oil of California:								
Gas production		147,917	143,188	141,711	148,482	162,221	159,655	168,649
Gas sales		98,858	83,859	81,491	87,403	113,834	117,119	113,138
Gulf Oil Co.:								
Net gas production		236,656	245,979	234,152	215,148	167,217	143,342	145,523
Net gas sales		195,998	201,595	182,815	163,341	124,284	110,564	117,411
Continental Oil Co. (No data available.)								
Sun Oil Co.: Gas sales		159,000	149,000	136,000	110,000			
Pure Oil Co.: Gas production		80,595	64,174	62,904	42,231	26,291	21,998	25,702
Panhandle Eastern Pipe Line Co.: [6]								
Gas production		79,335	72,400	74,660	75,406	65,428	60,163	51,591
Gas purchases		263,877	267,100	228,681	170,821	138,186	125,565	120,022
Gas sales [7]		318,737	315,008	320,773	251,272 / [8] 219,008	204,711 / [8] 195,828	186,104 / [9] 177,564	170,132
Gross gas sales (dollars per thousand)		85,301	92,993	89,499	[8] 42,207	[8] 36,936	[9] 32,954	
Population served (thousands):								
Directly		4.5	4.1	3.8	3.4	3.0	2.5	2.0
Indirectly		12,300	11,850	9,700	8,700	6,980	6,440	6,380
Colorado Interstate:								
Gas production		127,933	141,584	143,464				
Gas purchased and exchanged		76,299	42,343	25,052				
Gas total supply		204,232	183,927	168,516				
Gas total sales		191,245	174,656	163,634	159,476	136,281	104,124	108,686
Chicago Corp.:								
Gas production		Not stated	209,369	211,098	201,299	185,992		
Gas sales		116,460	113,055	118,743	107,001	74,050	65,252	55,114
Skelly Oil Co.:								
Gas production		116,786	113,433	106,204	103,313	88,919		
Gas processed		95,697	105,912	98,953	87,872	81,061	73,842	65,716
Atlantic Refining Co. (No data available)								
The Ohio Oil Co. (No data available)								
Republic Natural Gas: [10]								
Gas sales	64,946	64,586	71,418	70,721	63,555	65,661	70,426	[11] 58,862
Gas sales (dollars per thousand)	6,630	6,253	6,317	5,984	4,947	3,111	3,269	3,094
Cities Service Gas. (See No. 7 above.)								
Tide Water Associated Oil Co.: Gas production		85,863	74,385	68,651	58,003	46,277	40,963	40,736
Sinclair Oil Corp. (No data available.)								
Union Oil of California: Net gas production		60,701	64,308	52,597	45,208	25,649	25,259	22,951
Superior Oil Co.: Gas production [12]		65,000	70,300	[13] 189	44,000	41,000	33,000	34,000
Sunray Mid-Continent:								
Gas production		80,557	80,663	66,601	57,501	44,740	39,994	
Do		21,920	19,141	18,350	17,736	17,025		
Natural Gas Pipeline Co.:								
Gas production		76,317	90,582	95,235	109,323			
Gas purchases		162,310	142,835	130,482	104,340			
Gas sales		218,298	211,664	204,558	191,432			
Gas sales (dollars per thousand)		39,752						
Average price per thousand cubic feet (cents)		10.07	7.49	6.38	5.55	5.23		
Southern Production: Net gas sales		57,082	49,864	45,294	33,469	30,683	27,974	22,989
Pan-American Petroleum. (Merged with Standard Oil of Indiana; no separate data available.)								
Arkansas Louisiana:								
Gas production		37,361	35,470	35,875	38,670	34,464	25,805	30,605
Gas purchases		164,313	144,684	142,116	142,625	115,954	98,787	88,014
Gas sales		181,115	165,344	158,498	158,670	138,346	114,070	108,136
Gas sales (dollars per thousand)		32,567						

[1] Not stated.
[2] Reflects reductions resulting from sale of 2 natural-gas utilities in 1954.
[3] Only produced: withdrawn from storage included in received in exchange.
[4] As of Sept. 30, 1954.
[5] Included in storage for future use.
[6] Moody's and Standard & Poor's disagree on figures for 1952–54. These figures are from Standard and Poor's, p. 7285.
[7] Total volume produced and purchased differs from volume of sales, due to use of different measurement basis.
[8] 12 months ended as of June 30.
[9] 12 months ended as of July 31.
[10] Fiscal years ending June 30, 1955, and corresponding dates.
[11] Pressure base 16.4 pounds. Subsequent years 14.65 pounds.
[12] Fiscal years ending Aug. 31.
[13] Average daily.

Table V presents data on the consolidated earnings of these same selected companies. They are reflections of gross operating income and net income for comparable parts of 1955 and 1954, plus totals for the years 1954 and 1953. In a few cases, other qualifying footnotes have been added. It is most important to note that these data represent combined figures covering all operations which in some cases may only incidentally include natural-gas income. Only in one case has it been possible to quote separate data on income from gas operations.

TABLE V.—*Consolidated earnings of selected major producers of natural gas*

[Data in thousands of dollars]

Company	January-June		January-September		January-December	
	1955	1954	1955	1954	1954	1953
Humble Oil & Refining:						
Gross operating income	532,426	497,924			984,577	1,026,491
Net income	88,284	74,743			146,303	164,258
Phillips Petroleum Co.:						
Gross operating income	430,016	392,007	660,405	586,779	794,559	762,307
Net income	42,576	37,919	65,189	55,615	76,235	76,760
The Texas Co.:						
Gross operating income [1]	830,212	753,380	1,280,620	1,155,634	1,574,370	1,558,814
Net income [1]	[2] 124,834	97,481	[2] 189,767	151,880	226,141	192,600
Standard Oil of Indiana:						
Gross operating income	857,551	821,211			1,660,343	1,709,511
Net income	64,965	53,043			117,157	124,826
Socony Mobil Oil Co.:						
Gross operating income	832,569	803,890			1,608,708	1,606,572
Net income	97,056	87,808	145,000	128,000	183,806	187,250
Shell Oil Co.:						
Gross operating income	713,466	655,610			1,312,060	1,269,551
Net income	54,497	63,436			121,127	115,407
Cities Service Co.:						
Gross operating income	453,701	405,634	666,410	589,353	[3] 813,174	892,198
Gross operating income, natural gas					[3] 68,171	117,744
Net income	23,541	19,456	32,518	[3] 26,646	43,724	50,721
El Paso Natural Gas:						
Gross operating income	84,847	68,873			143,842	111,144
Net income	9,126	6,512			12,317	18,369
Standard Oil of California:						
Gross operating income [4]	603,468	549,567	939,098	[4] 825,490	1,113,343	1,080,425
Net income	109,343	104,044	166,272	154,921	211,872	189,453
Gulf Oil Co.:						
Gross operating income	917,196	836,327			[5] 1,705,329	1,640,872
Net income	91,871	80,797	145,287	121,867	182,813	175,036
Continental Oil Co.:						
Gross operating income	256,566	249,144			500,125	476,842
Net income	22,172	21,859			41,683	40,875
Sun Oil Co.:						
Gross operating income	321,573	328,343			659,532	670,787
Net income	24,407	20,407			40,344	45,154
Pure Oil Co.:						
Gross operating income	238,053	184,639	356,329	279,674	388,278	368,027
Net income	16,081	14,016	24,650	20,829	31,163	27,105
Panhandle Eastern Pipe Line Co.:						
Gross operating income	50,266				87,161	95,138
Net income	9,259				14,892	17,170
Colorado Interstate:						
Gross operating income	21,700	14,513			29,940	17,948
Net income	4,844	2,458			4,102	2,480
Chicago Corp.:						
Gross operating income (net sales)	31,289					
Net income	3,603	[6] 3,397				
Skelly Oil Co.:						
Gross operating income	110,266	104,634	167,353	156,312	211,081	215,317
Net income	14,823	14,184	22,815	20,933	29,455	31,277
Atlantic Refining Co.:						
Gross operating income	259,005	242,390	372,937	351,370	596,168	606,977
Net income	[7] 18,883	[7] 19,851	24,407	26,372	41,384	49,809
The Ohio Oil Co.:						
Gross operating income	126,684	127,355	190,975	187,219	248,484	241,705
Net income	19,551	19,493	29,193	28,281	38,224	43,539
Republic Natural Gas:						
Gross operating income [8]				[9] 16,240	15,962	15,238
Net income (includes net gain on sale of perperty: 1953, $557; 1954, $146) [8]				4,065	5,198	4,943
Cities Service Gas. (See No. 7 above.)						
Tide Water Associated Oil Co.:						
Gross operating income	239,284	229,297	354,292	338,289	459,030	473,437
Net income	18,022	18,167	27,256	26,967	34,547	36,952
Sinclair Oil Corp.:						
Gross operating income	535,591	499,072	799,720	741,539	1,021,461	935,465
Net income	37,801	36,515	56,138	[10] 52,896	[11] 91,580	68,061
Union Oil of California:						
Gross operating income	175,863	178,296	272,915	265,149	349,667	324,487
Net income	16,309	17,688	25,094	27,151	35,888	38,100
Superior Oil Co.:						
Gross operating income [12]	[13] 58,859	[13] 57,464			[14] 76,137	[14] 72,307
Net income [12]	[13] 4,063	[13] 8,343			[14] 10,360	[14] 12,000
Sunray Mid-Continent:						
Sunray Oil Corp. prior to merger:						
Gross operating income					125,239	133,169
Net income					23,200	27,573
Mid-Continent prior to merger:						
Gross operating income					164,250	174,455
Net income					13,468	14,394
Combined earnings:						
Gross operating income	147,510		221,000		294,838	313,232
Net income	17,629		27,535		36,669	41,967
Natural Gas Pipeline Co.:						
Gross operating income					41,994	32,316
Net income					2,753	2,225
Southern Production Co.:						
Gross operating income	8,580	8,717	12,835	12,880	22,847	19,961
Net income	2,239	2,536	3,275	3,247	4,174	3,601
Pan-American Petroleum. (Merged with Standard Oil of Indiana; no separate data available)						
Arkansas-Louisiana Gas:						
Gross operating income	25,573	21,917	35,571	30,805	42,421	[16] 37,096
Net income	1,992	[17] 1,606	2,316	[16] 1,397	[16] 1,950	[16] 2,194

[1] Brazilian subsidiaries excluded.
[2] Including $8,185 profit on sale of capital assets.
[3] Reflects reductions resulting from sale of 2 natural-gas utilities in 1954.
[4] After deducting State sales and gasoline taxes and Federal gasoline and lubricating-oil taxes.
[5] After deducting State sales and gasoline taxes and Federal gasoline and lubricating oil taxes.
[6] Includes $812 profit from sale of securities.
[7] Reflects special changes in organization.
[8] Fiscal years.
[9] 1955.
[10] Does not include profit figure.
[11] Includes $16,957 profit on sale of Pioneer Natural Gas Co. stock.
[12] After deducting royalties, other purchases, etc.
[13] 9 months ending May 31.
[14] Year ending August 31.
[15] After providing for losses of subsidiaries.
[16] Adjusted.
[17] Including special credits of $193.
[18] See Standard & Poor's, p. 2804.

Table VI, the final one of this series, reports both the current assets and the total assets of the same group of selected companies. The reminder is repeated that although all of these companies have extensive interests in natural gas, these figures represent their combined operations in all fields, not just in gas. Data for each year are given as of December 31, unless marked otherwise.

TABLE VI.—*Asset position of selected major firms engaged in the production of natural gas*

[In thousands of dollars]

[Data are as of Dec. 31, except when marked otherwise, and cover total operations, not gas alone]

Company	1954	1953	1950	1948
Humble Oil & Refining:				
Current assets	215,869	259,940	251,096	297,315
Total assets	1,245,054	1,186,306	935,527	861,268
Phillips Petroleum Co.:				
Current assets	261,635	257,290	176,879	151,349
Total assets	1,092,745	1,039,226	667,232	579,274
The Texas Co.: [1]				
Current assets	642,110	631,749	469,429	481,203
Total assets	1,945,509	1,805,481	1,448,712	1,277,094
Standard Oil of Indiana:				
Current assets	611,648	604,524	478,616	395,836
Total assets	2,187,358	2,036,101	1,640,075	1,500,049
Socony Mobil Oil Co.:				
Current assets	709,577	763,649	513,808	454,814
Total assets	2,256,691	2,154,456	1,609,872	1,443,034
Shell Oil Co.:				
Current assets	342,492	361,825	330,381	269,504
Total assets	1,041,886	984,589	723,102	640,569
Cities Service Co.:				
Current assets	411,682	367,332	314,316	286,116
Total assets	1,053,527	1,102,786	935,697	991,851
El Paso Natural Gas:				
Current assets	40,545	31,835	13,252	7,526
Total assets	675,439	612,958	274,847	170,013
Standard Oil of California:				
Current assets	474,131	448,551	334,429	285,642
Total assets	1,677,849	1,535,185	1,232,953	1,074,526
Gulf Oil Co.:				
Current assets	744,054	734,646	461,287	393,348
Total assets	1,969,052	1,765,748	1,344,358	1,191,004
Continental Oil Co.:				
Current assets	173,851	129,933	112,958	108,025
Total assets	480,199	409,423	291,585	261,950
Sun Oil Co.:				
Current assets	144,518	140,317	124,999	110,573
Total assets	494,870	468,817	329,174	278,583
Pure Oil Co.:				
Current assets	132,031	121,720	93,227	81,625
Total assets	410,764	383,103	308,725	270,968
Panhandle Eastern:				
Current assets	24,456	34,144	26,300	30,101
Total assets	328,709	294,445	227,250	178,219
Colorado Interstate: [2]				
Current assets	14,973	6,042	----------	----------
Total assets	124,985	104,858	----------	----------
Chicago Corp.:				
Current assets	31,734	13,095	----------	----------
Total assets	100,689	46,920	----------	----------
Skelly Oil Co.:				
Current assets	72,481	71,143	53,197	57,784
Total assets	291,843	274,528	210,916	169,015
Atlantic Refining Co.:				
Current assets	146,202	155,482	138,459	119,830
Total assets	611,682	570,839	432,545	382,558
The Ohio Oil Co.:				
Current assets	99,138	101,546	86,478	73,433
Total assets	324,949	313,298	241,191	203,389
Republic Natural Gas Co.: [3]				
Current assets	7,869	4,606	----------	----------
Total assets	42,844	37,370	----------	----------
Tide Water Associated Oil Co.:				
Current assets	146,401	137,550	106,328	101,903
Total assets	395,869	362,424	296,583	287,730
Sinclair Oil Corp.:				
Current assets	382,965	385,148	302,335	296,157
Total assets	1,186,771	1,140,665	799,051	710,125
Union Oil of California:				
Current assets	128,912	132,355	90,867	86,743
Total assets	511,238	476,047	358,292	298,416
Superior Oil Co.: [4]				
Current assets	34,156	34,315	----------	----------
Total assets	142,435	135,804	----------	----------
Sunray Mid-Continent:				
Sunray Oil Corp.:				
Current assets	65,494	57,637	----------	----------
Total assets	300,040	292,339	----------	----------
Mid-Continent:				
Current assets	88,373	88,032	----------	----------
Total assets	186,332	181,776	----------	----------
Consolidated balance sheet reflecting merger:				
Current assets	129,315	----------	----------	----------
Total assets	461,805	----------	----------	----------
Natural Gas Pipeline:				
Current assets	11,364	7,284	----------	----------
Total assets	150,305	142,636	----------	----------
Southern Production:				
Current assets	14,142	13,563	----------	----------
Total assets	79,230	71,573	----------	----------
Arkansas-Louisiana:				
Current assets	16,435	12,153	10,154	9,125
Total assets	93,062	82,636	61,695	51,851

[1] Excludes Brazilian subsidiaries, 1953 and thereafter.
[2] Prior to 1951, was merged with Canadian River Gas Co. No separate data.
[3] Fiscal years.
[4] Year ending Aug. 31.

VISIT OF THE PRIME MINISTER OF GREAT BRITAIN

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, I merely desire to refresh the memory of the Members to the fact that tomorrow, the Prime Minister of Great Britain, Hon. Sir Anthony Eden, will be the guest of the House. It is expected that he will arrive here about 1 o'clock. I make this statement so that Members may anticipate the visit and, if possible, be present.

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

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. MARTIN. I understand there are no tickets for tomorrow, is that correct?

Mr. McCORMACK. That is correct. I desire also to say that there will be a quorum call before Mr. Eden's visit.

POLITICAL EXPEDIENCY MAY CHANGE, BUT PRINCIPLES NEVER DO

The SPEAKER. Under previous orders of the House, the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. BYRD] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. Speaker, talks are under way between Prime Minister Anthony Eden and President Eisenhower here in Washington. Mr. Eden will probably press the President and the State Department to give Communist China the offshore islands of Matsu and Quemoy and to be ready to advance United Nations membership for Red China as soon as American public opinion permits. He is probably hopeful, too, that the administration will be willing to launch a massive propaganda drive to shape American public opinion to the desired mold.

When Mr. Eden comes to us pleading the cause of Red China, he upholds the bloody hands which tortured and killed thousands of our American boys in Korea. He fronts for the men who wantonly have broken their armistice agreement with us and who are holding our people as captives, and he asks us to be guilty of dishonorable desertion of our loyal ally, the Nationalist Chinese Government, a step which would ultimately force them to give up Formosa. This would be an ideal time for the President and the State Department to tell Mr. Eden that, if the Chinese Nationalists are ever forced to yield the offshore islands to Red China, it would merely whet the appetite of the Reds to press the claim they now make to Formosa. Moreover, it would further encourage them to take the British Crown Colony of Hong Kong, which the English acquired from the Chinese in 1842, under the Treaty of Nanking. Russia would, of course, support Red China in this just as she now supports Chou En-lai's blatant and brazen claim to Formosa. If for 1 minute Mr. Eden thinks that the taking of Hong Kong is not on the timetable of Red China, or that it can be avoided by appeasement, he is completely blind to the Communist technique.

The American people are a religious people who believe in moral laws and who believe in a Creator who governs the destinies of men and nations. The people of America will never stoop to

low as to yield on basic principles of righteousness and justice, nor will they succumb to either the blandishments or the threats of the atheistic cutthroats and murderers who constitute the communistic government of Red China, and who openly and defiantly deny the existence of God and of any moral law.

American public opinion will never approve Mr. Eden's policy. If it should ever do so, that very day would mark the beginning of the decline of the American Republic, a decline which would be as precipitous as its cause was shameful.

THE DEATH OF A PATRIOT

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CARNAHAN). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FEIGHAN] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, our daily press of yesterday carried the story of the tragic death of Maj. Gen. Kim Chang Young, who was struck down by the bullets of assassins on the very streets of Seoul, Korea. General Kim was the Commanding General of the Counter Intelligence Corps of the Republic of Korea Army. To all who knew him, he was a dedicated patriot. He was possessed of a fierce determination to keep his country free and independent. General Kim was equally dedicated to the hope that all Korea would soon be united under a government clearly representative of the will of the people. He was loved by all who stood for human freedom, individual liberty, and equal justice. He was feared equally by all who engage in the conspiratorial advancement of communism in Korea.

General Kim was no theorist, though he was one who fought for the highest ideals and noblest aims of free men and free nations. He could never be a theorist on the subject of communism because he knew the evils of that tyranny from first-hand experience. General Kim suffered at the hands of the Communists. During the war of Communist aggression in Korea, General Kim was a field commander. In the course of battle, he was taken prisoner by the Communist legions of China, operating out of North Korea. As a prisoner of war, he was subjected to the worst kind of torture and carried with him to his death the scars of brutality on his face. That is one of the reasons why General Kim was so determined that the inhumanities and cruelties which go hand in hand with Communist occupation of all non-Russian nations should not befall his fellow countrymen in the Republic of Korea. These facts also explain, in large degree, why General Kim was so dedicated to uniting Korea under a free and democratic government—thus ending the cruel Communist division of his homeland.

It has been my honor and privilege to know personally the late General Kim. Only last November, I had several important and most useful meetings with him while I was in Korea on an official mission for the Committee on the Judiciary. I recall that on Armistice Day which was properly celebrated as a holiday by all United States missions in Korea, I spent 6 hours with General Kim and members of his staff in the headquarters office of Counter Intelligence Corps which he commanded. Those were six unforgettable hours in which I had presented to me almost unbelievable evidence that General Kim and his staff had collected on the operation of the Communist conspiracy in the Republic of Korea.

I believe that the greatest tribute I could pay to General Kim would be to tell you, my colleagues, about some of the evidence of the Communist conspiracy which General Kim uncovered which has a special bearing on the future security and well-being of the United States and all free countries.

It is obvious that the Communist forces which now occupy the northern area of Korea have made a determined effort to infiltrate free Korea and to cause confusion among the Allied Powers and disruption of the democratic Government of the Republic of Korea. General Kim uncovered and exposed the entire plan of the Communists to infiltrate and subvert free Korea. He showed me a map which pinpointed literally hundreds of training centers maintained by the Communists in the occupied part of Korea from which thousands of agents have been sent into South Korea. These agents were prepared to infiltrate, infect, disrupt, and disorganize every element and phase of civilized life in free Korea. General Kim's staff was most effective in apprehending these agents and in breaking up their underground network. So effective were his operations that the original system of enemy-agent infiltration was completely destroyed. That system was based upon a cell comprised of six agents who operated as a unit. As a consequence of General Kim's actions, the Communists now train only one agent at a time for a given task, and that agent is not aware of the identity of any other agents who might be assigned to a similar task. In addition, these agents attempt to slip into the Republic of Korea as individuals rather than as operating units. I personally saw positive evidence of the effectiveness of General Kim and his staff in breaking up these latest efforts of the Communists to infiltrate and subvert free Korea. In fact, during my stay in Korea this past November, General Kim permitted me to interrogate two Communist agents who had been apprehended only a matter of hours before I saw them. During the course of my interrogation these two people voluntarily admitted that they were Communist agents, that they had been specially trained in North Korea, and that they had been indoctrinated with the Communist big lie about the United States and its intentions toward all the people of the world. These two agents unwittingly paid tribute to the effectiveness of General Kim and his corps by relating how difficult it was for a Communist agent to enter free Korea, or to carry out the mission assigned to them by the conspirators who now occupy North Korea. I well recall General Kim's statement to the effect that the price of internal security for free Korea depended upon eternal vigilance against infiltration of Communist agents.

Another part of the Communist conspiracy uncovered by General Kim was the manner in which commercial trade is used by them to carry out their espionage missions. General Kim uncovered an abundance of documentary evidence to clearly demonstrate that Red China is using trade with the free world as a means to infiltrate its agents into key spots in the free world as well as to secure currencies of the victim countries to pay for Communist activities which these same countries are trying to stamp out. For example, he uncovered evidence to show that commercial trading ventures in the Far East manipulated out of Red China, comprised the main lines to facilitate agent infiltration, information transmission, and the supply of operational funds for agents of all types. He expressed amazement that any intelligent person would suggest that it was possible to trade with Red China without accepting the consequences of agent infiltration, granting the enemy communication facilities, and other destroying effects that come from such activities. This was no idle theory propounded by General Kim, but rather a hard cold fact of life which he was able to support with volumes of documentary evidence and sworn statements. Those who today are so naive as to urge any trade with Red China, even in what they erroneously call nonstrategic materials, could well learn the lesson set forth by the late General Kim that you cannot do business of any kind with the Communists without accepting the concomitant of agent infiltration and all the other subversive activities that eventually do destroy the independence and dignity of a people.

Anyone who harbors even the slightest hope that recognition by the United States of Red China could lessen world tensions, would do well to reflect upon the warnings of General Kim with respect to trade with Red China, which is now being used as a prelude to softening our resistance to any form of recognition of the Communist regime which occupies the Chinese mainland.

General Kim was also an expert on the manner in which the Chinese Communists and their bosses, the Russian Communists, have taken over North Korea and the ruthless manner by which they maintain their control over the people in that area. He opened up his files and records to me to point out that there were still over 60,000 battle ready Chinese Communist soldiers stationed in North Korea, that over 100 air strips had been built in North Korea since the so-called armistice, which as you and I know, is in cold and clear violation of the basic terms of that armistice. He also revealed to me the amount of Russian-made equipment that is now available in North Korea in addition to the Russian MIG jet fighter which is known to everyone who reads the newspaper. General Kim had uncovered evidence to prove beyond any doubt, that those behind aggression and war in Korea were the Russian Communists who, in fact, control every

affair of importance done in Communist occupied Korea or directed at the free world from that area.

Members of the Korean Counter Intelligence Corps Staff put before me actual weapons then being issued to the Communist troops in North Korea which were stamped "Made in the U. S. S. R." In this connection, I was also shown Russian-made radios and Russian-made-sabotage equipment which had been confiscated from Communist agents attempting to operate in South Korea. General Kim hesitated to give me an exact figure of the number of Russian Communists stationed in North Korea, but he assured me that the number was considerable and that there was no doubt but that they were the ones who masterminded everything that was done in the name of the North Korean Communists. It is to the everlasting credit of General Kim that he understood the Russian question and that he did not under estimate the superior role played by the Russians in the international Communist conspiracy.

While in Korea, I heard a great deal of talk about the neutral nations supervisory commission which was provided for in the so-called armistice arranged during the Communist war of aggression in Korea. As you know, that neutral nations supervisory commission is supposed to inspect and report on the armed truce which now hangs so heavily over the people of Korea. This commission is in no sense, a neutral nations commission because it includes in its membership representation of Communist occupied Poland and Communist occupied Czechoslovakia. It will be recalled that India agreed to accept the chair of this commission when it was set up. But soon after when the deal proved to be phony, the Indian general acting as chairman could no longer stomach the tragic farce which involved his nation and he accordingly resigned the chairmanship and took the Indian troops back to India. Consequently, there remain four member nations on this so-called supervisory commission in addition to the Communist Czechs and Poles, there are the Swedes and the Swiss. Because of all the talk I heard about this so-called neutral nations supervisory commission, I asked General Kim for his opinion on the matter. He hesitated to answer me, and he told me that he did not want to embarrass any of the governments of the free world by expressing his opinion on this matter. I assured him that truth could never be a matter of embarrassment to the American people.

It was at this point that General Kim took me to a set of files and exhibits relating to the activities of the so-called Neutral Nations Supervisory Commission. In those files was an abundance of evidence of a documentary character together with pictures showing that the Communist Poles and Communist Czechs serving as members of this mission engaged in both espionage and propaganda activities. From the evidence collected by General Kim and his staff, I have no doubt whatever but that the Communist world conspiracy regards the so-called Neutral Nations Supervisory Commission in Korea as nothing more than an instrument through which they can carry out espionage and propaganda. I need not add that our own military security officers were not in disagreement with the evaluation given to me by General Kim on this all-important question. It is to be regretted that the representatives of Switzerland and Sweden have continued to lend themselves to this tragic farce which only makes more difficult the task of enforcing the peace and bringing about eventual unity of Korea under one government, representative of the will of the people.

General Kim came to see me as I departed Korea. He then presented me with this documentary album having to do with the Communist efforts to infiltrate, subvert, and destroy the Republic of Korea. This album depicts by pictures and narrative the destroying processes carried on by the Communists in Korea and in some measure throughout all of the Far East. I invite you, my colleagues, and all Members of Congress, to examine this documentary album because I am sure you will be greatly impressed by the information it contains. I regard it as a demonstration of the role that the late General Kim played in defending the freedom and independence of Free Korea.

As of this moment, to the best of my knowledge, the assassins of General Kim have been neither apprehended nor identified. General Kim was a great friend of the United States because he knew about us from firsthand experience. Only last December General Kim was here in the United States for a short visit. I know that all those who met him while he was here, were impressed with his vigor and his determination in the cause of human freedom and that they too will mourn his untimely passing.

It is not my purpose to pass judgment or to speculate on who could be responsible for such a terrible crime as this, but I will say that after all the dust has been cleared away, there shall be no doubt but that General Kim was the victim of those who feared the patriot and those who carried out the orders of the alien tyranny of Russian communism. All lovers of freedom will mourn the passing of General Kim. The people of Free Korea who today live under the shadow of an armed truce with the alien Communists, will miss the dedicated and determined efforts of General Kim to maintain their freedom and independence. I, like all those who came to know him, will cherish his memory as one who loved his homeland and who was prepared to give his life in the cause of human freedom.

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

Mr. FEIGHAN. I am very happy to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BENTLEY. I commend the gentleman from Ohio for his interesting and informative statement regarding the late General Kim, another martyr in the fight against communism. I was particularly impressed with what the gentleman from Ohio had to say regarding the fallacy of trade with Communist China, especially in view of the fact that the Members of the House are going to be privileged to listen tomorrow afternoon to the Prime Minister of the United Kingdom who is apparently one of the outstanding advocates of increased trade with China in addition to recognition of Communist China itself. Would the gentleman care to comment on Mr. Eden's views in that respect?

Mr. FEIGHAN. I am diametrically opposed to Mr. Eden's views on the subject of trade with the Communists because it is known that he is even now advocating expanding trade with Red China. I am against trading with the U. S. S. R. or with any Communist-dominated country, and I mean trade in any form whatsoever. I do not recognize any difference between so-called strategic and nonstrategic materials because, in my opinion, there is no difference. As an example, food itself may be considered by some to be a nonstrategic material; however, food is used as a weapon of war by the Russian Communists. I certainly hope we will sever our trade relations with the presently Russian occupied countries. As far as having any trade with Red China is concerned, I am unalterably opposed to that. As General Kim explained and as this album depicts, the Chinese Communists and the Russian Communists have set up trade establishments in Shingisu in North Korea and they also have other commercial offices in Hong Kong, Osaka, and Tokyo, Japan, using those offices to infiltrate and to subvert and as a means of communication for their espionage activities, also to obtain operating funds for Communist activities in South Korea. That same thing would apply in any nation of the world where there is trade with Red China or any Communist-occupied country, including U. S. S. R.

Mr. BENTLEY. If the gentleman will yield further, I wonder if the gentleman could tell the House if either the diplomatic recognition of Red China or the amount of trade that has been carried on between Red China and Great Britain have been of any benefit as far as the British people or the British economy is concerned.

Mr. FEIGHAN. I do not feel adequately prepared at this time to express an opinion as to how the British fared economically with trade in Red China.

Mr. BENTLEY. I can tell the gentleman that as far as I know neither the recognition nor the little trade that has been carried on has been of any assistance to the United Kingdom. I certainly commend the gentleman for his statement and I hope the House will remember his remarks when we listen to Her Majesty's Prime Minister tomorrow.

Mr. FEIGHAN. I am sure the gentleman is correct in his estimate that the people of Great Britain have not benefited in any way by trade with Red China. I am equally certain that the prestige of Great Britain in the arena of world affairs suffered a crippling blow by its diplomatic recognition of Red China. As an example of my point, that once great nation, Great Britain, sent its Ambassador to Peking as the first step in establishing diplomatic relations with the Red commissars of China. That Ambassador was required to lay around in Peking for

almost 2 years before the Red commissars even took note of the fact of his presence. During this period when the British Ambassador was given the silent treatment, the Chinese Reds continued to abuse Great Britain for everything it did to support the cause of human dignity and freedom. In my considered judgment, the British Ambassador was made victim of the ancient practice of kow-tow made famous by the court of the Manchus, who used these methods against the Russians centuries before. I say it is quite unfortunate that the fine people of a once proud nation, Great Britain, would be subjected to such degradation and abuse of their national honor.

Mr. BENTLEY. Is the gentleman familiar with the fact that the Red Chinese have been prepared to and are using narcotics in this economic warfare?

Mr. FEIGHAN. Indeed I am. In this album which I hold here in my hand, are pictures showing contraband narcotics which were taken off the person of North Korean Communist agents who had infiltrated into free Korea. These agents were, of course, dispatched by the Chinese Communists in North Korea and their Russian Communist masters who instigate and supervise all such nefarious practices. One of these pictures shows a series of bottles containing 955 grams of morphine taken from a commercial firm operating in South Korea which was later disclosed to be a covert subsidiary of the Communist intelligence network. Another picture shows a captured agent and a large quantity of narcotics which were taken from his person when he was apprehended. The mission of this particular agent was to bring about the narcotic addiction of our own GI's fighting in Korea and thus to cause the demoralization of our fighting force. Still another picture shows a series of boxes containing morphine injections confiscated from the quarters of a Communist agent who had been sent into free Korea to raise funds to cover the operational costs of other Communist agents operating in free Korea. Here again the sly and cunning Communists seek to accomplish a dual objective—that of securing funds for their conspiratorial works, and at the same time demoralizing the victim state by bringing about the narcotic addiction of large numbers of its citizens. Still another picture shows a huge quantity of raw opium, well over 10 pounds, which was confiscated from still another Communist agent who was apprehended in the process of cutting and selling this raw opium in South Korea in order to secure operational funds for the Communist conspiracy in South Korea. I was assured by General Kim that every single bit of these narcotics which I have described were supplied by the Chinese Communists who have made a major industry out of narcotic production. I say to the distinguished gentleman from Michigan that based on the evidence which I have here in my possession, I am convinced that anyone who commits the foolish error of attempting to carry on trade with Red China will lay themselves open to the diabolical plan used by the Red Chinese to bring about the narcotic addiction of vast numbers of the people of a victim state, a process which will certainly break down the moral fibre and integrity of any nation and in the end will make such nations easy prey to the coup d'etat which the Russian Communists are always ready to administer.

Mr. BENTLEY. Would not the gentleman from Ohio think it extremely likely that if we did have any amount of commercial relations with Red China we might find various narcotics flooding this country?

Mr. FEIGHAN. I do not hesitate to say that if the United States should ever be led into the fatal error of trade with Red China we will lay our loved ones, our children, and the flower of our youth open to this diabolical menace.

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

Mr. FEIGHAN. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I want highly to compliment the able, distinguished gentleman from Ohio for his splendid, eloquent tribute to General Kim, and for his most penetrating comments on these great international issues which are of such great concern to all of us at this time. I think the gentleman's penetrating speech has thrown a great deal of light upon many facets of these problems that will likely increasingly attract the attention of the Congress. I want to commend the gentleman for his excellent address.

Mr. FEIGHAN. I thank the gentleman.

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

Mr. FEIGHAN. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I rise to join my colleague from Massachusetts to compliment the distinguished gentleman from Ohio for his very able statement. I know him as one of the active and energetic members of the Committee on the Judiciary and one who in our recesses in the Congress here has taken advantage of the time to go abroad to study and to further educate himself on international programs and especially the functioning of our immigration system. I feel that he, as one of my colleagues on the committee, is to be complimented for the amount of time and work and effort that he has put in especially on all of those matters pertaining to the Committee on Immigration. Although he has traveled extensively, he has found the time to give us the benefit and value of his study and his thought and his recommendations and his suggestions, and he is to be congratulated for bringing back to us all of this valuable information as the result of his travels to these many countries that he has visited for the Congress of the United States.

Mr. FEIGHAN. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FEIGHAN. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I, too, wish to join with my colleagues in commending the distinguished gentleman from Ohio for his tribute to the martyred General Kim and for his report to us here in the Congress of his conversations with General Kim visited only a few months ago by the gentleman from Ohio who is now bringing to us here in the Congress a report of those conversations. I feel the gentleman from Ohio has made a great contribution to this subject and to the matters that we will be considering within the next days and the next weeks. I thank the gentleman from Ohio for his contribution to my own understanding and knowledge of the subject.

Mr. FEIGHAN. I thank the gentleman.

DISASTER INSURANCE

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, today I appeared before the House Committee on Banking and Currency in behalf of the principles of my bill, H. R. 7944, and other similar bills to provide a national system of disaster insurance. My own bill which is based on the principles of the War Damage Corporation which functioned so successfully during the war, recognizes our free enterprise and in general designates the insurance companies to place and service all the policies and establishes a revolving fund out of which losses can be paid upon a given contingency.

I appreciate the fact that there are far more sweeping proposals presented by Senator Lehman and others which cover manmade, as well as natural, disasters, and, frankly, I have no objections to them, because I think they all move in the right direction, namely, of providing for our fellow citizens, individuals, bodies corporate and public, appropriate insurance against disaster of whatever kind wherever it may strike.

Admittedly, this is a very broad question and I think that Congress in providing this type of insurance, as now appears inevitable and imperative, will have to establish appropriate limitations to make such a program actuarily and fiscally sound and confine any inflationary effects that might otherwise appear. Members of Congress can all take judicial notice, I think, of the tremendous, horrible potentialities of nuclear and thermo-nuclear damage to the Nation in case of war or attack. And it can be demonstrated beyond question, based on our experiences over a long period of time and particularly of recent date, that natural disasters can inflict tremendous damage which should be recognized and anticipated by enacting indemnity legislation embracing the principles of insurance.

I first introduced my bill on this subject following the Worcester, Mass., tornado of 1953 which created such great havoc and dreadful loss of life in one of our great American cities represented in the Congress by our able and distinguished friend the gentleman from Massachusetts, Congressman DONOHUE, and

when the ravaging floods of August 1955, and since that time, struck my district, State, and the Northeast and, later the great State of California with such terrific impact and huge damage, my interest has naturally become all the more intensified. There can be no doubt, I think, that the time has come for action in this field, if we are to be prepared to cope with future disasters whether they emanate from war or nature.

There are many kinds of natural disasters which would and should be covered by this legislation—floods, tornadoes, earthquakes, forest fires, hurricanes, droughts, and other similar visitations of nature. It is estimated by a very eminent economist, Prof. Seymour E. Harris, head of the economic department at Harvard College and prominent public figure, that over 25 years the average cost of floods has been about $160 million per year and other qualified economists have estimated that these costs might be as high as $300 million per year or more. Actually, the latest available figures of the Army engineers appraise the damage done in New England prior to August 26, 1955, was $1.7 billion, or about 10 percent of the region's income for the year. And that does not include, of course, the severe damage of later floods which ravaged our area and caused untold damage.

Clearly, action by Congress is imperative and it must be on a broad front, it must embrace adequate relief, rehabilitation measures, effective protection, and insurance. While to some extent these remedies are mutually inclusive, and again they may not be, for example, if a widespread, efficient system of flood control is speedily inaugurated and completed that would, in the opinion of engineering experts, insure against the repetition and reoccurrence of periodic floods in given areas. However, nature's caprice is unpredictable and future floods could conceivably overcome or bypass technical protective projects and strike even at areas that have not been heretofore hit. This is one strong and sound reason for insurance against floods and other disasters because not even the wisest and most accomplished scientist can forecast with certainty when one or the other of these terrible natural disasters which visit us from time to time, will descend.

Most of us will agree, I think, that disaster-insurance coverage or even flood coverage cannot be provided by the private insurance companies. Admittedly, the rates would be prohibitive without Government support. This principle was recognized in the war-damage-insurance legislation and by President Truman in 1951 after the Missouri River floods when he proposed a Federal underwriting program of disaster policies up to a billion and a half dollars. This measure was not adopted at the time and, as an alternative, the Bureau of the Budget suggested that Congress enact a measure authorizing the Government to pay out $22 billion for disaster insurance, an amount that would involve about 2 percent of the current wealth of the Nation.

There are many broad pending proposals relating to risks and the apportionment of rates, incentive plans, rate differentials between and within States, and the like.

Of all these proposals it seems to me that in principle at least the one I have suggested affords a ready answer to the problem, namely, a Federal reinsurance program with Government backing, limiting the total coverage to perhaps twenty or twenty-five billion dollars, entailing about an average rate of $1 per $10,000 value. This insurance would be cheap and attractive and would, most experts agree, result in wide coverage. If the States were permitted to participate as suggested by Professor Harris, by committing the property tax to a certain limited amount of the rate, it is believed that each homeowner would be charged something like 50 cents to $1.50 per year. Personally, I am of the opinion that the Federal Government should underwrite and support this program by itself, because I think the general property tax is already very heavily burdened in most States and communities. These damages are national in character and effect even though they strike at localities and areas and they greatly affect the national economy and I, therefore, believe the solution lies in the national field by enactments of this Congress.

It is undeniable that once the costs of disasters could be distributed over broad enough an area it would not only be general participation because of low rates and the need for coverage but also a more realistic contribution by the Federal Government from tax revenues collected from the States.

Of course, it does not seem to me that it should make any difference whether we call this protective legislation indemnity or insurance. It also seems to me that it wil be desirable for us in the first instance to experiment with this new type of program in order to acquire sufficient experience to enable us in the long run to provide a mechanism that will be actuarily and financially sound. I do not believe that this program should entail matching contributions from the States at this time.

There will also be a problem of reconciling the new program with other types of personal-property insurance and the crop insurance. It will be more beneficial in the long run, I think, to start with a broad support program excluding Government competition with private companies and preserving the principle of our free-enterprise system.

I also agree that whatever form this legislation takes it should provide, insofar as it is practicable, for the ultimate elimination of subsidies and for a self-sustaining program, although we can all envision situations involving manmade disasters when no program of this character which the Congress might adopt, could possibly carry itself and stupendous Federal payments would be necessary. In fact, in that event, doubtless the entire taxing power of the Federal Government would have to be thrown into the breach. I agree with Professor Harris that the fund should be limited to about twenty billion dollars or so, in order to cope with possible inflation.

I would suggest that the maximum coverage under any bill for any one corporation, individual, State or municipality should not be limited to $250,000, as proposed by the administration bill, but extended to cover every possible loss. To illustrate the need for this provision, I may say that in my own district in the recent floods, one company sustained an actual loss of well over a million dollars and several companies sustained losses well over $250,000.

The principle of re-insurance of private companies underwriting disaster risks is a sound one, and I think it should be incorporated into any legislation, but here again I feel that the matter of limiting the amount of authorized reinsurance ought to be carefully studied so as to provide adequate funds to cover all contingencies.

Under the situation now confronting us, I believe that the Government and the Government only, can feasibly inaugurate disaster insurance. I hope that in considering this legislation that the Congress will consider the principles of my bill, H. R. 7944.

I may add that under my bill payments for damages incurred would be made only upon a declaration by the President of a disaster area.

In my judgment the idea of disaster insurance is not only sound but economically feasible and imperatively demanded by existing conditions in order to safeguard our economy and spare many of our fellow citizens from ruin or great economic loss.

There are elements in the problem that are extremely challenging, I know, there are great complexities to be sure, but I have confidence the Congress will not only give the matter painstaking and thorough attention, but also be able to come up with effective solutions that will square with our free-enterprise system, protect the public interest and save large numbers of our fellow citizens from virtually irreparable economic loss.

As chairman of the Massachusetts Congressional Delegation Committee on Flood Prevention and Relief, a body composed of several very able Members of the House, in behalf of my own constituents, our State and area which suffered so greatly from past and recent floods and in the name of the very many people and communities throughout the Nation which have been and will be in the future confronted with the horrible conditions that arise from natural disasters I respectfully urge the Congress to continue careful, and expeditious study and prompt action upon disaster-insurance legislation.

The foregoing is the substance of my remarks today before the Committee on Banking and Currency of the House, which is holding hearings on disaster-insurance legislation.

ARMY RESERVE TRAINING CENTER, MONTCLAIR, N. J.

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Speaker, I wonder how many times a week each Member of the House of Representatives uses the word of an officer of the United States Army as the sole basis of a commitment to a constituent.

If the volume of mail in the offices of other Representatives dealing with soldiers' problems, construction of Army installations, Army spending and so forth, is as great as it is in mine, the average Member of this body makes promises daily to constituents based on the word of Army officers.

It is because of this part of our everyday life that I wish to relate to the membership of this body an experience I am now having with the Department of the Army. But before doing so, I wish to emphasize that I strongly favor the Army Reserve program. I believe that it was the Reserves who won both World War I and World War II, and made it possible for us to do as well as we did in Korea. The Reserve program is all-important to insure our strength for any possible future war. I favor location of a Reserve armory somewhere in the vicinity. However, in my opinion, the location chosen by the Army was an unfortunate one.

Here is the story:

On October 5, 1955, I received eight telegrams from residents of Montclair protesting the erection of an Army Reserve training center on Orange Road, Montclair, N. J., "because of its detrimental effect upon our neighborhood."

This was the first that I had ever heard of the project.

I immediately asked my administrative assistant in Washington, as Congress was in recess and I was in New Jersey at the time, to find out what it all was about. He discussed the matter with the Army and sent me a memorandum which I received on October 7.

I looked into the situation and found that the area suggested was one which was building up into a very respectable single-family dwelling neighborhood for colored homeowners.

A meeting was arranged with the Army to discuss the matter which was held in Montclair on October 24. Present besides myself were: Mayor Dill, of Montclair, 2 of the Montclair town commissioners, and a committee of 3 representing the local citizens group, and representatives of the Army.

The meeting was a friendly one. All present realized the need for a Reserve armory somewhere in the vicinity, but representatives of Montclair emphasized that the choice of location was unfortunate.

Mayor Dill, who, by the way, is a Democrat, stated that he would try to suggest some alternate sites in Montclair.

At the close of the meeting Col. Lowell S. Love, representing the chief of the Army Reserves, turned to me and stated that he was authorized by his superiors to say that as long as the Congressman and the citizens living in that area did not wish the armory there, they would not press the proposal.

He had stated earlier in the meeting that the Army had moved pretty far toward acquiring the property and that they would now have to take steps to get out of the contract.

The matter seemed to be settled satisfactorily and the next move the Army was to make was to consider the suitability of the sites suggested by Mayor Dill.

There were, of course, newspaper items published stating that the Army officials had promised to relocate the project, and a short time later I sent out letters to several hundred of those living in the neighborhood telling them of the Army's decision.

On November 30 I received a letter from Dr. W. Lincoln Hawkins, one of the local committee, enclosing copy of a letter he received from Col. John S. Roosma, Headquarters, First Army, Governors Island, N. Y., dated November 25, in which he stated:

> There is a difference of opinion on the agreement reached at the meeting held in Montclair.

He further stated:

> We cannot abandon the Orange Road project until such time as a suitable alternate location is offered us and the Army had not heard from Mayor Dill.

This was true. Mayor Dill's mother had died shortly after the meeting and it was not until November 25 that the mayor wrote to the Army suggesting the three alternate sites in Montclair.

I wrote to the colonel on November 30, in part, as follows:

> I must, however, call your attention to the fact that the statement made by you with reference to our understanding as to the meeting was incorrect. Colonel Love stated categorically that if I felt that the site proposed was not a suitable one, the Army would not place the armory there. I naturally rely on his word as an officer and a gentleman. This fact was in no way modified by any statement that the alternate sites which the Montclair authorities volunteered they would suggest to you must be suitable.

A few days later, Mayor Dill wrote to Brig. Gen. Philip F. Lindeman, Chief of Army Reserve and ROTC Affairs, as follows:

> I have your letter of December 5, which is both disappointing and surprising. At the meeting on October 24, Colonel Love stated to me, to two of my fellow commissioners, to Congressman KEAN, and to a committee representing the residents of the neighborhood of the proposed center, that he had been authorized by you to state that in view of the expression of disapproval of the location of the Army Reserve Training Center on the Kramer property that the Army would not locate the center in Montclair. That was a categorical, unequivocal, and unconditional assurance.

I talked to Colonel Love on the telephone and he suggested that it might be a good idea to have the mayor and representatives of the town meet with the Assistant Secretary of the Army, Chester Davis, as the matter was now at the Secretarial level.

I arranged the meeting for the afternoon of December 22. Mayor Dill, a committee of three from Montclair, A. B. Hermann representing Senator H. ALEXANDER SMITH, of New Jersey, and I were present.

The meeting was not satisfactory. Secretary Davis gave no indication that he would even consider relocating the proposed armory. The statement was made that Mr. Kramer, the owner of the property, had refused to cancel the proposed condemnation and that the Army was thus stuck with the property, and I gather this was the reason why they seemed adamant.

Now although I can sympathize with the Army's feelings, they made two very serious mistakes in their handling of the matter.

In the first place, they never notified me, the Representative of the District, that the armory was contemplated and they took their first steps with reference to condemnation without ever notifying me.

In the second place, the Army made a definite promise at the meeting in Montclair that the installation would not be placed there as is attested by myself, Mayor Dill, and the three representatives of the community who were present.

Colonel Love agrees that he made the statement but said it was modified by his discussion before, that the Army had to be able to get out of the contract.

However, neither I, nor anyone else present, will agree that there was such a modification.

I read from a letter written to the Honorable Chester R. Davis, Assistant Secretary of the Army, on January 18, 1956, by Mayor Dill, of Montclair:

> DEAR MR. DAVIS: At at meeting of all the members of the town commission last evening I was directed to write you that the Montclair town government has neither changed nor modified the views which have been heretofore expressed to you in opposition to the location of the proposed training center on Orange Road in Montclair. We again wish to direct your attention to the numerous other locations available in this general area, and if Montclair is believed to be especially desirable, to the other sites in town suggested for consideration.
>
> We are aware of the necessity for the center in the advancement of the Army's expanded reserve program. We do hope, however, that in selecting sites you will not be unmindful of the feelings of the community and particularly of the reasonable and understandable views of the residents in the area of the proposed location.
>
> Sincerely yours,
>
> WILLIAM L. DILL, Jr.

These, gentlemen, are the facts.

I think the implication of what it can mean to each and every one of us if the Army is allowed to break its word to a Member of Congress is clear.

A COMBINED FARM CONSERVATION-CIVIL DEFENSE PROGRAM

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and include extraneous matter.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, I have this week introduced H. R. 8914, entitled the "Farm Conservation Civil Defense Act of

1956." The bill seeks to join together what are too often considered as compartmentalized and isolated goals—maintaining the income of the family-sized farmer, revitalizing the conservation program, and a foresighted civil defense program. The bill would enlist the farmers' efforts in support of these goals.

Plainly, our farm program, our conservation program, and our civil defense program are in trouble.

THREE PROGRAMS IN TROUBLE

The American family farmer is faced with a lowering of his income which threatens his very survival. The farmers' net income is now running at the rate of $10.5 billion a year, as compared to $16.7 billion in 1948. Surpluses in storage are at an all-time high.

Second, our natural resources of soil, water, vegetation, and wildlife are being depleted at an alarming rate. The depletion is being accelerated by the farm crisis, which is forcing farmers to mine their resources to expand production in order to maintain their income. The process of draining wetlands, cultivating up to the fence line to the destruction of wildlife, allowing cattle to graze in the woodlot, and slighting soil-building practices goes on and on. And as our resources diminish, the demand for them grows. The number of city dwellers who yearn for outdoor recreation increases, and so does the leisure time available to them. Urbanization and automation mean that the demand for woods and streams and wildlife endlessly expands.

Third, an essential element in any civil defense plan—the evacuation of city people to the countryside—is being very largely ignored. If there is an operational plan in existence in the hinterland of any American city whereby specific farm families have agreed to house specific numbers of city evacuees, I am unaware of it. The plain fact is that, if a civil defense emergency comes, we are unprepared for it.

Under H. R. 8914, the Secretary of Agriculture would determine annually how many acres, on a National, State, county, and individual farm basis, should be retired from current production in order to bring production into line with the current needs of domestic and foreign consumers and of a reasonable food and fiber reserve. A farmer who voluntarily participates in the conservation-civil defense acreage program would be paid the parity price for the commodities that would otherwise be produced on these nonproducing acres, in return for his dedicating this acreage, to the extent applicable to his farm, to the following conservation-civil defense precepts:

TEN CONSERVATION-CIVIL DEFENSE PRECEPTS

First. Grassland: Establishing or maintaining grass or legume-grass cover for soil or watershed protection.

Second. Flood and erosion-control structures: Establishing or maintaining sod waterways, diversion ditches, or farm ponds to dispose of excess surface water without causing erosion and so as to reduce flood hazards.

Third. Terracing: Establishing or maintaining terraces to slow the flow of water on sloping land.

Fourth. Contour stripcropping: Establishing or maintaining contour stripcropping to prevent water erosion.

Fifth. Wind stripcropping: Establishing or maintaining wind stripcropping to prevent wind erosion.

Sixth. Vegetation: Establishing or maintaining tree or shrub plantations for windbreaks, shelter belts, fence rows, streambanks, wildlife cover and feed, or farm woodlots—for such purposes as erosion control, watershed and water-table protection, production of timber and pulpwood on a sustained yield basis, and fish and wildlife improvement.

Seventh. Fencing livestock: Establishing and maintaining fences to prevent livestock from trampling down streambanks, from damaging natural springs and from grazing in woodlots.

Eighth. Wetlands: Flooding, reflooding, or refraining from draining low areas which are suitable for nesting and resting for waterfowl and for supporting fur-bearing animals.

Ninth. Public access: Giving limited access to the public, under reasonable regulations, for hunting, fishing, bird-watching, camping, and picnicking.

Tenth. Civil defense: Providing civil defense standby facilities for housing and feeding evacuees from the cities.

THE FAMILY-SIZED FARMER

The Secretary of Agriculture may specify additional conservation and civil defense practices to be incorporated in the annual agreement. The Secretary is responsible for insuring that the operator refrain from using the diverted acreage for grazing or for the production of any agricultural commodity. There is a provision for cost-sharing of the materials and labor required to establish approved conservation or civil defense practices. In order to restrict benefits of the program to the family-sized farmer, the maximum amount payable in any 1 year to any 1 farmer, as compensation for dedicating his land to a conservation-civil defense purpose, is $2,000. In addition, the Government may share in the cost of establishing specific practices, such as fences and tree-planting, up to a maximum of $1,000.

In practice, administration of H. R. 8914 would be in the hands of local committees, like the existing soil-conservation committees, familiar with local farming and with local conservation and civil-defense needs.

The proposed farm-conservation-civil defense program is not, of course, a substitute for other farm legislation. It is designed to supplement farm legislation aimed at supporting farmers' income—whether by price supports or production payments—and at expanding markets by some type of food-stamp plan and by a vigorous export drive.

"THE HIGHEST USE"

H. R. 8914 is intended not as a package solution to the farm problem but as an effort to recognize that the farm problem, the conservation problem, and the civil-defense problem, are at heart the problem of finding the highest use of our natural resources. H. R. 8914 recognizes that the highest land use is not the continued overproduction of unneeded farm commodities, but the provision of values needed by all Americans. Conservation, recreation, and civil defense are important to the sound multiple use of our countryside. Providing them is a national responsibility that should not be charged solely to the farmer.

Unlike the present agricultural conservation program, and various soil-bank proposals, H. R. 8914 starts with a concept of conservation that includes all our resources—soil, water, woods, and wildlife—as of interest to all Americans, rather than as something having to do principally with just soil and affecting mainly farmers.

The operation of the farm-conservation–civil-defense program can best be envisaged by applying it to a specific farmer. Specifics, of course, will vary with the region. What will be applicable to the plains of the West will not suit the hills of New England. But let me take, just as an example, what might be a farm in my own State of Wisconsin.

A TYPICAL EXAMPLE

Farmer Brown has a 160-acre family dairy farm, of which 90 acres are in corn and small grains, 40 in pasture, 10 in woodlot, and 20 in marsh. Farmer Brown's attempt to maintain his income in the face of falling milk prices has caused him to plow steep-sloping land across the contour, to let his cows trample down the bank of the trout stream that runs through the south forty and graze in his woodlot, and to cultivate right up to his fence line. He is planning to drain the marsh for additional pastureland. Having heard the Secretary of Agriculture make speeches recently blaming the farm problem on city workingmen, Farmer Brown has lately taken to shooing off hunters and picnickers from the city, whom he used to welcome as long as they respected his property. Although he realizes that the countryside is the only place to which city people could be evacuated in case of a national emergency, he feels out of touch with the civil-defense program.

If Farmer Brown decides to participate in the farm conservation-civil defense program, he will be eligible for payments based on the number of acres he devotes to the program. Let us suppose his maximum allotment is 35 acres, and that he takes that maximum—15 in marshland (that portion which might profitably have been drained), 10 in woodlot, 9 in land diverted from corn production to grasslands, stripcropping, wildlife cover and feed, and one-half acre each devoted to civil-defense housing facilities, and to a picnic and camping place. For this diversion, Farmer Brown will be paid a sum computed by taking the parity price, less adjustments, for the milk or livestock or corn or whatever that could have been produced on that acreage, with a maximum in any case of $2,000, plus cost-sharing on any specific conservation practices that are established, such as building a fence around the woodlot and the stream, planting trees and game food, and stockpiling food for evacuees.

The acres diverted from grain into grass can furnish nesting sites for prairie chicken. Tree planting will encourage deer by giving cover. Ducks can nest in the marsh. Rabbits can find cover in

the brush along the fence line. Fencing the stream banks will prevent their being trampled down.

I have discussed the kind of program envisaged by the farm conservation-civil defense bill with a number of conservation, civil defense, and farm leaders.

COMMENTS FROM CONSERVATIONISTS

Among comments received from leading conservationists are the following:

Lou Klewer, Toledo, Ohio, president of the Outdoor Writers Association of America, writes on November 2, 1955:

The conservation practices you outline in your program can only meet with the heartfelt approval of outdoor writers throughout the Nation, all of whom are vitally interested in seeing that we have a better out-of-doors, less soil erosion, restoration of more of our wetlands, more planting of game cover and feed, and more accessibility to the nonfarm dwellers for hunting, fishing, bird watching, nature hikes, and general outdoors recreation.

Urging the farmer to help restore soil, water, forests, and vegetation and wildlife, along with a civil-defense program as well as an aid in solving the farm problem, should get your program a lot of support. I feel sure that all members of this organization will support intensely the conservation features of your program.

C. R. Gutermuth, Washington, D. C., secretary of the North American Wildlife Foundation, writes on October 25, 1955:

We have been delighted to observe that you have taken a keen interest in conservation, and it is hoped that you will call upon us whenever we can be of assistance.

While we do not feel competent to judge the farm and civil defense phases of your combined program, we wish to commend the conservation aspects of the proposal. The members of the foundation wish to compliment you on the four segments of your conservation program and can assure you that those measures would have widespread public support.

Les Woerpel, Stevens Point, executive secretary of the Wisconsin Federation of Conservation Clubs, writes, on October 31, 1955:

Personally, I think you are on the right track. The subsidy-payment program is actually the biggest steal from both the farmer and the public that could be devised. It takes the farmer's farm away from him by encouraging mining the soil, and it not only charges the public twice for farm commodities, but deprives it of the benefits of recreation in the out of doors by destruction of such areas as might be suitable to carry wildlife and be available for other recreational purposes.

If such a program could be worked out we would back it a hundred percent. It is a bold step at a time when many farmers are crying for more rigid supports and more help. Unless the problem is solved we stand the chance of not only bankrupting our lands, but possibly bankrupting our farmers as well as our middle-class workingman.

Ralph H. Musser, Washington, D. C., Southeast field representative for the United States Department of Agriculture Soil Conservation Service, writes, on November 10, 1955:

Personally, I am pleased to see the stress placed on the conservation of our natural resources, particularly soil, water, forestry, and wildlife.

H. Wayne Pritchard, Des Moines, Iowa, executive secretary of the Soil Conservation Society of America, writes, on November 23, 1955:

Your proposal to combine conservation and a farm program with a civil defense program is a new approach to the total problem that needs to be accomplished. I was very much interested in reviewing it and will follow with interest the reception it receives in the Department of Agriculture, the Department of the Interior, and from the Administrator of Civil Defense.

As you know, the problem of conservation is a complicated one, and one in which we need to use many incentives because the urban citizen is dependent upon those who manage the agricultural land. This dependency will increase as our population grows.

Ira N. Gabrielson, Washington, D. C., president of Wildlife Institute, writes on November 23, 1955:

Being a conservationist, rather than an agriculturalist, I approve most heartily of your idea of utilizing land that is taken out of agricultural production for conservation purposes, either to protect soil and water resources or to provide forestry or wildlife restoration programs, or a combination of all three.

Many years ago, when the old Agricultural Adjustment Administration was first established, provision was made for paying farmers for planting and maintaining woodlots, including keeping cattle out of the enclosures, and for planting certain wildlife food plants in areas that needed to be put in permanent vegetation. Unfortunately, too few farmers took advantage of this, and the plan had one defect in that a farmer could get the subsidy payments for planting such material and then plow them up the next year, since the payments for maintaining the plantings were entirely too low.

If we must subsidize farmers, I certainly would favor subsidizing them in some way that would improve the building of the soils and the conserving of the resources of soil and water and their products, rather than paying them, as we are now doing, to deplete the soils by overproducing crops for which there are no markets. I certainly hope the Congress in considering any bill for changing the agricultural program will come up with something along the line of your suggestions.

John M. Olin, East Alton, Ill., chairman of the board of Olin Mathieson Chemical Co., writes on November 18, 1955:

I certainly agree with you that any program to conserve the soil, water, forestry and vegetation, and wildlife of this country is essential to the future welfare of our Nation.

With this part of your proposal, with which I am personally familiar, I most certainly agree in principle. When all farmers become conservation conscious, we will have accomplished an important step in preserving the birthright of future generations of Americans.

Charles H. Stoddard, Minneapolis, Minn., executive director of Independent Timber Farmers of America, writes on November 17, 1955:

I have read over your farm-conservation plan and impressed by the breadth and practical soundness which it seems to have. As in all ideas the filling in of the painful details becomes quite a task. Nevertheless it seems to have a definite practicability at this time now that the administration is giving consideration to the soil-rent proposal. The danger in this plan is that it will simply take acres out of cash crop production but will fail to provide for conservation practices other than those now under the agricultural conservation program.

It would seem to me that the real opportunity for your program would be to urge an amendment to whatever basic new legislation develops to provide for specific payments for specific practices such as you outline giving extra credits over and above the straight soil-rent program for such practices.

CIVIL DEFENSE COMMENTS

Among comments received from civil defense authorities, George W. Carnachan, Milwaukee County civil defense coordinator, writes on October 24, 1955:

I believe that your program has many interesting possibilities. In working with the counties which are substantially rural outside of the County of Milwaukee, I find that there is considerable apathy on the part of the rural population, chiefly because of the fact that they do not realize that their economy, their social life, and their very existence is so solidly tied in with that of the cities, that they are inclined to look on the necessity for a civil defense organization as a rather abstract and remote thing. What they do not realize is that if the cities were bombed their markets would immediately be gone, their power would probably be shut off, their sources of supply, which are chiefly located within the cities, would be completely negated, and that they would, after their present stock of supplies and equipment was exhausted, be back on a stone-age economy. It has been well put "that if the cities were bombed and would die as a result of such bombing, the rural districts would die also—they would just die slower."

I would like, at this time, to suggest that you could perform a genuine service to the country as a whole if you could find some practical means of bringing the farm program into the civil defense program. After studying your program I would like to suggest that each farmer could execute a commitment to the effect that he would participate in a civil-defense organization on an active basis; that he would engage to shelter a certain number of persons up to his optimum capacity, and further that he would agree to increase his reserve of supplies, food, and equipment to the point necessary to support these people on a subsistence basis for an intermediate period of time. In return for this, he could be brought under a subsidy basis on a parity agreement for whatever his farm produced. This would, in effect, operate to create a multitude of small reserve stocks of food, supplies and equipment and might be termed a decentralized stockpiling program. I think this would be a practical thing, very much in line with your program and would have the happy effect of bringing the farm economy in line with that of industry, and at the same time creating a necessary backlog of food and shelter. While there are undoubtedly many differences which would arise in the development of such a program, I think that your basic idea is sound, practicable, and workable.

Brig. Gen. Don E. Carleton, director of Milwaukee Civil Defense Administration, writes on December 13, 1955:

I have long been at a loss to understand why some such plan as the one you propose has not been worked out as an answer to the very difficult farm support problem. It has been so obvious for these many years that our price-support program has failed to accomplish its mission and has cost the taxpayer double in money and the Government in grief to what out-and-out conservation programs would have cost.

Obviously it has never been understood by our people that the ownership of real estate is a privilege and not a right and that man has an obligation to posterity to pass along the good earth in the same or better condition than that in which he found it. We

seemed to have reached a glimmer of understanding of this in our reforestation projects but as far as land in general is concerned, the theory of the maximum exploitation for the greatest benefit now, with no responsibility for the future, still persists. It is certainly true that had the billions of dollars spent in price supports, been paid as outright grants for conservation practices, a very noticeable and delightful change in our entire countryside would have resulted by this time. I am thinking of the countryside in Bavaria where I spent some time following the war. Here they have carefully tended forests and streams, and the banks of every little brook and stream are revetted with rock to prevent erosion. Now every stream abounds with fish of carefully selected varieties and the forests with game. We certainly have a lot to learn about the care and development of God's good earth which has been given into our charge for such a short time.

Of course, man has a right to make a living and there is no question but that the living he makes should be kept in some sort of economic balance in relation to his production efficiency. However, there is an element that has never been considered as far as our farmers are concerned, which is, how much does he contribute to the lasting good of the area. This is an element in the success of an individual in urban areas, industry, politics, or professions but it does not seem to have affected the farmer. Civil defensewise the farmer of the future will have to shoulder a tremendous responsibility and one that will perhaps be very distasteful to him. However, if he is willing to accept this and willing to carry out civil defense work that needs to be done, there is no reason why he should not receive compensation for his efforts. Certainly it is preferable to pay him for doing these things, than to pay him for raising food and other commodities that are not needed and then to pay again for the storage of these commodities.

We are starting a survey here in a very short time under the auspices of the Federal Civil Defense Administration which will include at least 11 countries and probably more surrounding Milwaukee. This survey will include such subjects as the capabilities of the area to provide for the reception and care of evacuees from the metropolitan area, the resources now existent, possibility of shelter, and the education and training necessary to make such a program possible. I sincerely believe that there is a definite tie-in of all this with the suggestions you have made in your proposal. In the field of public relations alone the situation has been allowed to drift to the point where at present the attitude of the farm population in Wisconsin borders on hostility toward the city dweller. This is most noticeable in articles written in their local papers, as well as in the general attitude of the State legislature which is predominantly rural. I have worried about this for some time and hoped that some means could be found to solve the problem. Certainly the urban population is dependent on the farm and the farm areas are also dependent on the city, in more ways than either of them have ever realized.

Be assured that I agree with your idea 100 percent and I sincerely hope and pray that we will be able to find some means of implementing it.

On the other hand, Federal Civil Defense Administrator Val Peterson writes on January 13, 1956:

May I say at once that I agree on the necessity for a sound, long-term solution to the farm problem. However, I am reluctantly brought to the conclusion that it is not to be found in the device of making incentive payments for participation in civil defense. The reasons leading to this conclusion are:

A long-range solution to the problem of farm income maintenance must necessarily depend upon an economic base. The necessity for civil defense depends on a base of the possibility and likelihood of military attack. That is to say, the needs for farm income maintenance, on the one hand, and for civil defense on the other, do not have a common base. Consequently, it is possible that these needs may vary independently of each other—leaving the Government the dilemma, at a future time, of choosing whether to continue payments no longer needed for the economic situation, but needed for civil defense—or the opposite.

In a broader frame, the sense of the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950 (Public Law 920, 81st Cong.) is that service is primarily on a volunteer basis. We would have no basis to resist demands from other sections or elements of the community, such as organized labor, professional people such as doctors, or the teachers in our schools, for similar payment for essentially identical service, were we to start making incentive payments to farmers for participation in civil defense. I hope that you will agree with this thinking.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. FOUNTAIN (at the request of Mr. ALEXANDER), for today, on account of official business.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. SHEEHAN, for 15 minutes on Monday next.

Mr. HESELTON, for 30 minutes today.

Mr. MULTER, for 1 hour on Wednesday next.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to vacate the special order granted me for today and that on Monday next I may address the House for 60 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

SPECIAL ORDER VACATED

Mr. PERKINS asked and was given permission to vacate the special order granted him for today.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. FRIEDEL.

Mr. GORDON and to include articles.

Mr. BYRD.

Mr. BEAMER in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. PELLY in six instances and in two to include extraneous matter.

Mr. CANFIELD (at the request of Mr. MARTIN) and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. WILLIS and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. ASHLEY.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. DONOHUE and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. GWINN and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. PHILBIN in three instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. BOLAND in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. WOLVERTON.

BILL PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 7871. An act to amend the Small Business Act of 1953.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 5 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, February 2, 1956, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1455. A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, transmitting the annual report on administration of functions for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1955, pursuant to the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended; to the Committee on Government Operations.

1456. A letter from the Chairman, Interstate Commerce Commission, transmitting copies of final valuations of properties of certain carriers, pursuant to section 19a of the Interstate Commerce Act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1457. A letter from the Chairman, Interstate Commerce Commission, transmitting the 69th Annual Report of the Interstate Commerce Commission; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1458. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a report submitted by the Postmaster General, reviewing major activities of the Post Office Department and offering proposals for modernization and improvement of operations and the postal rate structure; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

1459. A letter from the Director, Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President, relative to reporting that the administrative expense authorization of the Commodity Credit Corporation for the fiscal year 1956 has been reapportioned on a basis which indicates a necessity for a supplemental estimate of administrative expense authorization, pursuant to paragraph 2 of subsection (e) of section 3679 of the Revised Statutes, as amended; to the Committee on Appropriations.

1460. A letter from the Director, Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President, transmitting a report on the operations of Bureau of the Budget Circular No. A-45 upon departments, agencies, and corporations of the Government, pursuant to section 208 of the General Government Matters Appropriation Act, 1956; to the Committee on Appropriations.

1461. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to con-

tract with the Middle Rio Grande Conservancy District of New Mexico for the payment of operation and maintenance charges on certain Pueblo Indian lands"; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

1462. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to authorize the County of Custer, State of Montana, to convey certain lands to the United States"; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

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. TRIMBLE: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 394. Resolution for consideration of S. 926, an act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Ventura River reclamation project, California; without amendment (Rept. No. 1737). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. DELANEY: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 395. Resolution for consideration of H. R. 8704, a bill to extend through June 30, 1957, the duration of the Poliomyelitis Vaccination Assistance Act of 1955; without amendment (Rept. No. 1738). Referred to the House Calendar.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. FEIGHAN: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 97. An act for the relief of Barbara D. Colthurst; with amendment (Rept. No. 1734). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FEIGHAN: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 213. An act for the relief of Mrs. Ingeborg C. Karde; with amendment (Rept. No. 1735). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FEIGHAN: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 315. An act for the relief of Asher Ezrachi; with amendment (Rept. No. 1736). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WILLIS: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 6421. A bill for the relief of certain individuals whose land was flooded by action of the Federal Government; with amendment (Rept. No. 1739). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BUCKLEY:

H. R. 8979. A bill to establish within the Department of Defense a civilian department to be known as the Department of Civil Defense, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. R. 8980. A bill to establish within the Department of Defense a civilian department to be known as the Department of Civil Defense, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. DOLLINGER:

H. R. 8981. A bill to establish within the Department of Defense a civilian department to be known as the Department of Civil Defense, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. KEOGH:

H. R. 8982. A bill to establish within the Department of Defense a civilian department to be known as the Department of Civil Defense, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. KLEIN:

H. R. 8983. A bill to establish within the Department of Defense a civilian department to be known as the Department of Civil Defense, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. POWELL:

H. R. 8984. A bill to establish within the Department of Defense a civilian department to be known as the Department of Civil Defense, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. ZELENKO:

H. R. 8985. A bill to establish within the Department of Defense a civilian department to be known as the Department of Civil Defense, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BAILEY:

H. R. 8986. A bill to assist areas to develop and maintain stable and diversified economies by a program of financial and technical assistance and otherwise, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee:

H. R. 8987. A bill declaring September 17 a legal public holiday to be known as Constitution Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DAVIS of Georgia:

H. R. 8988. A bill to clarify the authority of the Commissioners of the District of Columbia with respect to the discipline of officers and members of the Metropolitan Police force and the Fire Department of the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. DINGELL:

H. R. 8989. A bill to protect the right of individuals to be free from discrimination or segregation by reason of race, color, religion, or national origin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 8990. A bill to declare certain rights of all persons within the jurisdiction of the United States, and for the protection of such persons from lynching, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 8991. A bill making unlawful the requirement for the payment of a poll tax as a prerequisite to voting in a primary or other election for national officers; to the Committee on House Administration.

H. R. 8992. A bill to prohibit discrimination in employment because of race, color, religion, national origin, or ancestry; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. HIESTAND:

H. R. 8993. A bill to establish an immediate program to aid in reducing the public debt by providing that certain receipts from the sale of capital assets of the Government shall be used for such purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KEARNEY:

H. R. 8994. A bill to assist areas to develop and maintain stable and diversified economies by a program of financial and technical assistance and otherwise, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. McDONOUGH:

H. R. 8995. A bill to amend the act of September 1, 1954, to correct certain inequities with respect to the compensation of prevailing wage-rate employees, to provide longevity compensation for such employees, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. MINSHALL:

H. R. 8996. A bill to encourage construction and maintenance of modern Great Lakes bulk cargo vessels in the interest of peacetime commerce and the national defense; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. PELLY:

H. R. 8997. A bill to amend the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, to provide for the transportation of all waterborne cargoes in United States-flag vessels in connection with foreign assistance programs; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. ROOSEVELT:

H. R. 8998. A bill to provide for loans to enable needy and scholastically qualified students to continue posthigh school education; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. THOMPSON of Louisiana:

H. R. 8999. A bill authorizing a comprehensive project for control and progressive eradication of obnoxious acquatic plant growths from navigable waters; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. WEAVER:

H. R. 9000. A bill to partially recompense farmers for the harm they sustain by reason of increases in the cost of supplies, services, and equipment they must buy which have not been accompanied by corresponding increases in the prices of the agricultural commodities they sell; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WILLIS:

H. R. 9001. A bill authorizing a comprehensive project for control and progressive eradication of obnoxious aquatic plant growths from navigable waters; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. BARTLETT:

H. R. 9002. A bill to amend section 1 of the act of March 12, 1914, as amended; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BOLAND:

H. R. 9003. A bill to provide for national disaster insurance; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. ELLIOTT:

H. R. 9004. A bill to amend section 610 of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938 to prohibit the serving of alcoholic beverages to airline passengers while in flight; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mrs. GRIFFITHS:

H. R. 9005. A bill to authorize the Public Housing Commissioner to enter into agreements with local public housing authorities for the admission of elderly persons to federally assisted low-rent housing projects; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. HAYWORTH:

H. R. 9006. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, so as to prohibit the movement in interstate or foreign commerce of unsound, unhealthful, diseased, unwholesome or adulterated poultry or poultry products; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HOLTZMAN:

H. R. 9007. A bill to establish within the Department of Defense a civilian department to be known as the Department of Civil Defense, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. KEARNS:

H. R. 9008. A bill to encourage construction and maintenance of modern Great Lakes bulk cargo vessels in the interest of peacetime commerce and the national defense; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. LANE:

H. R. 9009. A bill to regulate the foreign commerce of the United States by establishing import quotas under specified conditions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LANHAM:

H. R. 9010. A bill to amend the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, and the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. OSTERTAG:

H. R. 9011. A bill to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 to exempt certain wheat producers from liability under the act where all the wheat crop is fed or used for seed on the farm, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 9012. A bill to amend the Cooperative Forest Management Act; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. PRIEST (by request):

H. R. 9013. A bill to provide a 5-year program of Federal construction grants for the purpose of assisting medical and dental schools to expand and improve their research and teaching facilities, and of assisting other public and nonprofit institutions engaged in medical or dental research to expand and improve their research facilities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. WOLVERTON:

H. R. 9014. A bill to provide a 5-year program of Federal construction grants for the purpose of assisting medical and dental schools to expand and improve their research and teaching facilities, and of assisting other public and nonprofit institutions engaged in medical or dental research to expand and improve their research facilities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. RABAUT:

H. R. 9015. A bill to establish an effective program to alleviate conditions of excessive unemployment in certain economically depressed areas; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WOLVERTON:

H. R. 9016. A bill to provide for a continuing survey and special studies of sickness and disability in the United States, and for periodic reports of the results thereof, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 9017. A bill to extend for 2 years the duration of the hospital and medical facilities survey and construction provisions (title VI) of the Public Health Service Act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BAILEY:

H. J. Res. 504. Joint Resolution to provide for the observance and commemoration of the 50th anniversary of the official founding and launching of the conservation movement for the protection, in the public interest, of the natural resources of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey:

H. J. Res. 505. Joint resolution granting the consent of Congress to the States of New York, New Jersey, and Connecticut to confer certain additional powers upon the Interstate Sanitation Commission, established by said States pursuant to Public Resolution 62, 74th Congress, August 27, 1935; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ELLIOTT:

H. J. Res. 506. Joint resolution to provide for the observance and commemoration of the 50th anniversary of the founding and launching of the conservation movement for the preservation of the natural resources of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JENNINGS:

H. J. Res. 507. Joint resolution relating to burley tobacco acreage allotments and marketing quotas; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. YATES:

H. Res. 396. Resolution disapproving the sale of the Institute, W. Va., Copolymer Plant, Plancor 980; to the Committee on Armed Services.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of West Virginia, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to reject the disapproval resolution on the sale of the Institute plant, now pending before it, etc.; to the Committee on Armed Services.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ADDONIZIO:

H. R. 9018. A bill for the relief of Charles Blasi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BALDWIN:

H. R. 9019. A bill for the relief of Andoquio B. Bunayog; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BLATNIK:

H. R. 9020. A bill for the relief of Toini Margareta Heino; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DAVIDSON:

H. R. 9021. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Feiga Altmann Rock; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 9022. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Pierrette Marie-Rose Valery Chiarelli; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania:

H. R. 9023. A bill for the relief of Aleksander Dabrowski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. GRIFFITHS:

H. R. 9024. A bill for the relief of Panayota Persantzis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 9025. A bill for the relief of Giuseppa Zinna; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KLEIN:

H. R. 9026. A bill for the relief of Nora Lyons; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PROUTY:

H. R. 9027. A bill for the relief of Sok Nam Ko; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RABAUT:

H. R. 9028. A bill for the relief of Fred G. Nagle Co.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SMITH of Kansas:

H. R. 9029. A bill for the relief of John L. Hughes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

469. By Mr. BRAY: Petition of 23 persons of Greene County, Ind., in support of H. R. 4627, a bill to prohibit the transportation in interstate commerce of alcoholic beverage advertising; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

470. Also, petition of 123 persons of Greene County, Ind., in support of H. R. 4627, a bill to prohibit the transportation in interstate commerce of alcoholic beverage advertising; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

471. Also, petition of 197 persons of Daviess County, Ind., in support of H. R. 4627, a bill to prohibit the transportation in interstate commerce of alcoholic beverage advertising; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

472. By Mr. NORBLAD: Petition of Ada E. Cummings, and 13 other citizens, of Corvallis, Oreg., urging enactment of legislation to prohibit the transportation of alcoholic beverage advertising in interstate commerce; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

473. By Mr. SHORT: Petition of Fred King, and other citizens, from Barry County, Mo., urging the adoption of H. R. 4471 as an amendment to the Social Security Act in place of the present program of old-age and survivors insurance and old-age assistance; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

474. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the deputy clerk of the Board of Supervisors of Erie County, Buffalo, N. Y., requesting that the Congress oppose the Harris-Fulbright natural-gas bill, which would ultimately cause an undue burden upon the taxpayer; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Ukrainian Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 1, 1956

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, this year marks the 38th anniversary of the declaration of the independence of the Ukraine and I wish to join my distinguished colleagues in the House in their recent salutation to the gallant people of the Ukraine.

The Iron Curtain is drawn across the afflicted Ukrainian nation. Its people are shut off from the rest of the free world, but let us work and pray for the day when tyranny, oppression and persecution will be banished from the Ukraine and the other enslaved nations still in Red bondage.

The glorious history of the Ukraine is one of struggle and sacrifice to maintain its precious freedom from the old Ukrainian Kievan state of the ninth century to the Ukrainian National republic of 1917. It was in 1920 that the Ukraine became one of the first victims of Soviet imperialism, but despite the destruction of its national church, famine, mass murder, purges and banishment of its citizens, the ruthless extermination of its natural resources, the Ukraine has remained a symbol of the hope and burning fervor of a people destined to be free and independent.

The Ukrainian people have fought and died to preserve their freedom. The fight goes on today to regain their independence and free way of life. While oppression again stalks this nation of more than 40 million people, the largest non-Russian nation behind the Iron Curtain, the lamp of freedom still burns in the hearts of its people. It will not be extinguished and will blaze again, proudly and fiercely, when the great goal of liberation has been won.