

adjourned until 11 o'clock a. m., tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock and 24 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned, the adjournment being, under the order previously entered, until tomorrow, Wednesday, February 8, 1956, at 11 o'clock a. m.

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 7, 1956

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

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

O Thou whom we worship and adore as the God of infallible wisdom, invincible strength and infinite love, show us how we may lay hold of those spiritual resources and reserves which will make us equal to all our needs and demands.

We humbly confess that we find it difficult to discern and know Thy will because of the blurrings and refractions of our poor human vision.

Grant that in the great business of statecraft, with its many arduous tasks and heavy responsibilities, we may be inspired with those sterling qualities of character which will keep us strong and steadfast.

May we be men and women of high resolve, noble aspirations, sound judgment, and bold initiative as we daily set our minds and hearts to the lofty vocation of serving our generation faithfully and effectively.

Hear us in Christ's name. Amen.

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

### MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Carrell, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 6645. An act to amend the Natural Gas Act, as amended.

### CHANGING THE DATE FOR THE COUNTING OF THE ELECTORAL VOTES IN 1957

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. J. Res. 517) and ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

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

There being no objection, the Clerk read the joint resolution, as follows:

Whereas January 6, 1957, is a Sunday; and

Whereas Public Law 771, 80th Congress (62 Stat. 672, 675), provides that "Congress shall be in session on the 6th day of January succeeding every meeting of the (Presidential) electors" for the purpose of counting the electoral votes: Therefore be it

Resolved, etc., That the two Houses of Congress shall meet in the Hall of the House of Representatives on Monday the 7th day of January 1957, at 1 o'clock postmeridian,

pursuant to the requirements of the Constitution and laws relating to the election of President and Vice President of the United States, and the President of the Senate shall be their presiding officer; that 2 tellers shall be previously appointed by the President of the Senate on the part of the Senate and 2 by the Speaker on the part of the House of Representatives, to whom shall be handed, as they are opened by the President of the Senate, all the certificates and papers purporting to be certificates of the electoral votes, which certificates and papers shall be opened, presented, and acted upon in the alphabetical order of the States, beginning with the letter A; and said tellers, having then read the same in the presence and hearing of the two Houses, shall make a list of the votes as they shall appear from the said certificates; and the votes having been ascertained and counted in the manner and according to the rules by law provided, the result of the same shall be delivered to the President of the Senate, who shall thereupon announce the state of the vote, which announcement shall be deemed a sufficient declaration of the persons, if any, elected President and Vice President of the United States, and, together with a list of the votes, be entered upon the Journals of the two Houses.

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

### ARRANGEMENTS FOR THE INAUGURATION OF THE PRESIDENT-ELECT AND VICE PRESIDENT-ELECT ON THE 20TH DAY OF JANUARY 1957

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I offer a concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 64) and ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the concurrent resolution, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That a joint committee consisting of 3 Senators and 3 Representatives, to be appointed by the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives, respectively, is authorized to make the necessary arrangements for the inauguration of the President-elect and Vice President-elect of the United States on the 20th day of January 1957.

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

There was no objection.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. McCORMACK: Page 1, line 7, strike out "twentieth" and insert "twenty-first."

The amendment was agreed to.

The Senate concurrent resolution was concurred in, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

### JOINT MEETING TO RECEIVE THE PRESIDENT OF THE REPUBLIC OF ITALY

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that it may be in order at any time on Wednesday, February 29, 1956, for the Speaker to declare a recess subject to the call of the Chair

for the purpose of receiving in joint meeting the President of the Republic of Italy.

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

There was no objection.

### READING OF WASHINGTON'S FAREWELL ADDRESS

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Wednesday, February 22, 1956, Washington's Farewell Address may be read by a Member to be designated by the Speaker.

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

There was no objection.

### ANNA K. MCQUILKIN

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 6790) for the relief of Anna K. McQuilkin, with Senate amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 1, line 6, after "McQuilkin", insert, "of Chicago, Ill."

Page 1, line 9, after "World War I", insert "In the event judgment is entered for Anna McQuilkin any award payable thereunder shall be reduced by the amount received by the father of Elmer K. Kersey, under the provisions of section 401 of the act of October 6, 1917 (40 Stat. 409), as amended."

Page 2, after line 6, insert:

"Sec. 3. Nothing contained in this act shall be construed as an inference of liability on the part of the United States."

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

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

### COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs may have until midnight February 14, 1956, to file a supplemental report on H. R. 3383.

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

There was no objection.

### PRIVATE CALENDAR

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

### ESTATE OF GRADY WARD

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2472) for the relief of the estate of Grady Ward.

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

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to

pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of \$10,000 to the estate of Grady Ward, who was killed on October 2, 1943, when the truck in which he was a passenger was in collision with a United States Army truck near Bushnell, Fla. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims against the United States on account of such accident: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 5, strike out "\$10,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$2,500."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

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

#### PHILIP COOPERMAN AND OTHERS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4773) for the relief of Philip Cooperman, Aron Shriro, and Samuel Stackman.

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

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That, for the purpose of determining the individual liability for income taxes for the taxable year 1951 of Philip Cooperman, Aron Shriro, and Samuel Stackman, the elections of said Philip Cooperman, Aron Shriro, and Samuel Stackman, sole stockholders of Queens Syndicate, Inc., which was liquidated pursuant to a plan of complete liquidation adopted on the 1st day of September 1951, to have the benefits of section 112 (b) (7) (A) of the Internal Revenue Code shall be considered to have been filed within 30 days after the date of adoption of such plan, such benefits having been denied because the mailing of such election was delayed, without negligence or fault on the part of such stockholders, until after the 30th day following the adoption of such plan.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 2, line 1, after "Code", insert "of 1939."

Page 2, line 3, strike out "election" and insert "elections."

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.

#### DR. LU HO TUNG AND HIS WIFE, CHING-HSI (NEE TSAO) TUNG

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1892) for the relief of Dr. Lu Ho Tung and his wife, Ching-hsi (nee Tsao) Tung.

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

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Dr. Lu Ho Tung and his wife, Ching-hsi (nee Tsao) Tung, shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to

the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fees. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such aliens as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct two numbers from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

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

#### CERTAIN RELATIVES OF UNITED STATES CITIZENS

The Clerk called the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 457) for the relief of certain relatives of United States citizens.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the joint resolution, as follows:

*Resolved, etc.*, That, notwithstanding the provisions of section 212 (a) (6) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, the aliens hereinafter named may be admitted to the United States for permanent residence if they are found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of that act under such conditions and controls which the Attorney General, after consultation with the Surgeon General of the United States Public Health Service, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, may deem necessary to impose: *Provided*, That a suitable and proper bond or undertaking, approved by the Attorney General, be deposited as prescribed by section 213 of the said act: Viviana T. Alfano, Maria A. M. Almeida, Joan W. Arrant, Elizabeth C. D. Ashe, Helene S. Banyal, Siroun Bazikian, Iole B. Biddle, Olive Byers, Makaria Chamberis, Alfonsina F. Corra, Christiane Donahue, Mavis M. Dunn, Helmut W. Engelhardt, Luisa V. Falcone, Antonio Formichelli, Germaine M. P. Foscolos, Enrica S. Garra, Petros A. Gasparatos, Jean D. Gibson, Sofia Hawley, Maria do R. Henriques, Christa E. Holder, Rose D. Israel, Regina H. Kikel, Michele Labellarte, Anna M. Larson, Edith R. Levy.

Chrysoula V. Lewis, Paul Louizos, Andromachi Loukatos, Elfriede Luker, James McGrath, Maria McWalters, Nicholas I. Manolios, Rosario Maniscalco, John N. Manos, Nicolaos Mavromatis, Elizabeth S. Meinhardt, Demetrios A. Metropoulos, Marina Michialis, Nicolaos Mikedis, Patricia E. M. Miller, Michail Miloradowitsch, Zambeta J. P. Moraitis, Carmen O. Morales, Maria C. M. Navarra, Barbara D. Oakley, Lubomyr Ortynsky, Johanna Overkamp, Giulia P. Pacini, Camille Pagacki, Bruno Pantera, Maria S. Riley, Ingeborg A. G. Ruschak, Katherine P. Skalkotas, Charlotte B. Snow, Angele L. M. B. Sorayama, Mary Stine, Alexandra Tsagkouris, Lorenzo Tuccori, Aspasia Vourliotis, Giangiacomo Vuxani, Hedwig S. Whitney, David M. Wilkins, Lydia H. Willard, Anna L. M. Wilson, Jadwiga Wozniak, Rene Wyss, Michele Zappitelli, and Karola C. Z. Zmijewski.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 2, line 4, strike out the name "Olive Byers."

Page 2, line 10, strike out the name "Christa E. Holder."

Page 2, line 14, after the name "Manos," insert the name "Rudolfo Marmaloli."

Page 2, line 20, after the name "Ruschak," insert the name "Settina F. Serra."

Page 3, at the end of the bill, add new sections 2 and 3, to read as follows:

"Sec. 2. For the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Christa E. Holder shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the

required visa fee, under such conditions and controls which the Attorney General, after consultation with the Surgeon General of the United States Public Health Service, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, may deem necessary to impose: *Provided*, That a suitable and proper bond or undertaking, approved by the Attorney General, be deposited as prescribed by section 213 of the said act. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

SEC. 3. For the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Olive Byers shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act upon payment of the required visa fee, under such conditions and controls which the Attorney General, after consultation with the Surgeon General of the United States Public Health Service, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, may deem necessary to impose: *Provided*, That a suitable and proper bond or undertaking, approved by the Attorney General, be deposited as prescribed by section 213 of the said act."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

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

#### PERMANENT RESIDENCE STATUS FOR ALIENS JOSEPH HAYIM ABRAHAM AND OTHERS

The Clerk called the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 201) approving the granting of the status of permanent residence to certain aliens.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the concurrent resolution, as follows:

*Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring)*, That the Congress approves the granting of the status of permanent residence in the case of each alien hereinafter named, in which case the Attorney General has determined that such alien is qualified under the provisions of section 6 of the Refugee Relief Act of 1953, as amended (67 Stat. 403; 68 Stat. 1044):

0300-324377, Abraham, Joseph Hayim.  
0300-324378, Abraham, Liza.  
E-118803, Belich, John.  
0300-322190, Chen, Ellin.  
A-6848424, Chen, Suez.  
A-6143086, Chen, Ping, or Ping Sun.  
A-6709315, Chen, Tsung, Hsien.  
A-6877776, Chou, Shelley Nien-Chun.  
A-6967717, Chow, Christopher Hsin-Ren, formerly Hsin-Ren Chow.  
0300-133483, Do, Qual.  
A-8031885, Fabry, Paul Andrew.  
T-2019796, Fang, Jencho.  
A-7480746, Hoffman, Eugene.  
0300-340214, Hsu, Kwangtze W.  
A-7491747, Hsu, Lee Hwei.  
A-7491745, Hsu, Ling Nyl Chang.  
A-7491746, Hsu, Wung Hwei.  
A-7296209, Hsu, Mary (Pseng-I).  
A-7263685, Kahan, Alfred.  
0300-458490, Kao, Chien Chai.  
A-6958625, Lee, Cheng-Lee.  
A-6497276, Lee, Shu-Chin (nee Shen).  
A-6967495, Li, Pei-Chao.  
A-7424894, Ling, Huo Won, also known as Loretta Fok.  
A-6527763, Liu, David Kung-Chan, formerly Kung-Chan Liu.



A-6527762, Liu, John Kung-Fu, formerly Kung-Fu Liu.  
 A-6527760, Liu, Mary Man-Li, formerly Man-Li Liu.  
 A-6527759, Liu, Robert Kung-Shan, formerly Kung Shan Liu.  
 0300-459048, Liu, Gseling Lee.  
 0300-459047, Liu, Ming Chao.  
 0300-459058, Lu, Chen Yenan.  
 0300-459057, Lu, Hwa Chang, also known as Flora Lu.  
 0300-362127, Nieh, Candia Kwangtee.  
 A-7913547, Pih, Hao, Hwei.  
 A-7985647, Poy, Wong Wah.  
 A-6973676, Shen, Yu-Fu, or Angela Yu-Fu Shen.  
 A-7292437, Szeto, Edward.  
 A-8001025, Tao, Ling Hsiao Chen.  
 A-8057493, Tao, Shih-Yu.  
 A-3104066, Vucetic, Peter Paul.  
 A-7930524, Wang, Ernest Tseng-Chuan.  
 A-7930525, Wang, Minta Chi-Hsien Chou.  
 A-6967535, Wen, Tao Yung.  
 0300-459344, Wong, Chen Ta.  
 V-189653, Wu, Grace Ka-Ho.  
 0300-367910, Wu, Sek Chang.  
 0200-86981, Yes, Chin-Ho Yu.  
 0200-86883, Yen, Peter Kai-Jen.  
 A-7174394, Yin, Chi Peng.  
 A-7174395, Yin, Chi Tien.  
 A-7185010, Yin, Hua Nien Chien.  
 A-7174393, Yin, Yi Ming.  
 A-8057007, Appel, Berta Szalel.  
 A-7807024, Appel, Isaac, or Isaac Marcu Appel.  
 A-7952526, Apter, Joshua.  
 A-6819170, Brull, Gitta, formerly Gitta Moskowitiz.  
 A-7293132, Chan, Hak Chill.  
 A-7376694, Chang, Diana Yueh-Ming (nee Yueh-Ming Tan).  
 0200/130572, Chang, Te Wen, or Te-Wen Chang.  
 A-2590672, Chang, Yick Sun.  
 0300-463563, Chang, Yuck Gee.  
 A-6196856, Chang, Yun Lang Susan.  
 A-3061510, Chao, Grace Chi-Chen.  
 A-6967550, Chen, Alice Lee.  
 A-7830621, Chen, Jean Chun, also known as Chun Chen.  
 A-8021573, Chen, Minjen, also known as Homer Minjen Chen.  
 A-7174728, Cheng, Fa-Wu.  
 A-7350823, Cheng, Yi-Ren, also known as Luke Louh Cheng.  
 A-7859931, Chi, Ho Yu, also known as Hsu King-Ling.  
 A-6195282, Chiang, Franklin Chuin.  
 0300-462366, Chraime, Chabetaye.  
 A-7910594, Chuan, Kao Bie, also known as Ling Quee, alias Ting Hing Quee.  
 A-9765172, Deak, Julius Leslie, or Julius Leslie Emerick Deak.  
 A-6450820, Fan, Shih Kuei.  
 A-9559245, Fen, Chong.  
 A-6967560, Fong, Chen Chiang, now Michael Chen-Chiang Fong.  
 A-7913558, Gluckman, Eva.  
 A-7992598, Grunbaum, Imre.  
 A-6848544, Ho, Catherine Lu.  
 A-6143092, Ho, Hui-Chen.  
 A-9694641, Ho, Loo.  
 A-7399272, Ho, Theodore Wei-Yung.  
 A-7228330, I-Lieh, Huang, or Henry I-Lieh Huang.  
 V-1189017, Katani, Simentob Cholomo (Salman).  
 V-1487850, Katani, Wizeh.  
 0300-464315, Kaung, Hui Ming Shen.  
 0300-464327, Kaung, Stephan.  
 A-7244877, Koprak, Joseph.  
 A-7952709, Krieger, Moisze.  
 0300-462066, Krieger, Perl (nee Magerowitz).  
 A-6994578, Kuang, Hsiang.  
 A-6967660, Kuang, Janet Lauphit (nee Lofee, Ming-Chi).  
 T-1143768, Kuo, Franklin Fa-Kun, formerly Fa-Kun Kuo.  
 V-1505924, Kwei, Chung Shu, alias Tao Chien or C. S. Kwei.

V-1505925, Kwei, Linda Lee (nee Linda Lee), alias Lin Dee Lee.  
 A-6847927, Kwok, Gloria Joyce.  
 A-7821107, Lee, Joy Mary, or Joy Mei-Jui Lee.  
 A-6970896, Lepak, Harry, or Henryk Lepak or Hersz Lepak.  
 0300-455919, Li, Chang Fu.  
 A-7444638, Li, Jul Lan.  
 A-7444636, Li, Meng Shu.  
 V-952238, Li, Ta Wei, or David Henry Lee.  
 A-6980350, Li, Rose Shao Chiang.  
 A-7056924, Liang, William Wei-Liang.  
 A-6983524, Lin, Ying-Ngho Tang.  
 A-6847863, Ling, Frederick Fongsun.  
 A-7809747, Liu, Zang Sun.  
 A-7436599, Loe, Mary Jean, formerly Hsiao Piao Loe.  
 A-7210312, Lommatsch, Ernest E.  
 A-7210313, Lommatsch, Olga.  
 A-7133236, Ma, Evelyn, formerly Ma Hwun Ing.  
 0300-448219, Nicis, Liliya Cukurs.  
 0300-448218, Nicis, Zanis.  
 A-7845330, Nindel, Pinkas.  
 A-7282983, Ong, Anna Marie Bernadette.  
 0300-325763, Peng, Shu-Fang.  
 A-7897528, Rott, Joseph.  
 0300-332133, Shashoua, Menashi Alfred.  
 A-7241495, Spinrad, Jakos.  
 A-7865106, Streicher, George.  
 A-7865107, Streicher, Kalman.  
 A-7286227, Tan, Daisy (nee Daisy Chan Tu).  
 A-6815632, Tan, Yueh-Han, also known as John Tan.  
 V-372657, Tang, Betty, formerly Betty Fong.  
 A-7626358, Tang, Yun-Teh.  
 A-6851457, Teng, Hsi Huan.  
 A-7274543, Tsao, Maak-Sang.  
 0300-320945, Tsuel-Ju-Shien, Sister Josephine Frances, also known as Maria Francesca Tseul-Ju-Shien.  
 0300-386518, Vala, Rosario.  
 A-7967252, Wang, Funghin Lieu.  
 A-6567123, Wang, Ju-Chien Tseng.  
 A-7129794, Wang, Ting-Ming.  
 0300-431055, Wang, Leon Li-Jen.  
 0300-367007, Way, Shirley L., also known as Shiu-Lan Liang.  
 0300-367008, Way, Theodore L., also known as Ling Wei.  
 0300-406302, Weinreb, Sara.  
 0300-331156, Weinreb, Wolf.  
 A-7805993, Weintraub, Saul.  
 0300-360795, Wong, Yuen Su.  
 0300-466652, Yeh, Shu Tze.  
 A-6159686, Yeh, Wan Yuan.  
 A-7118743, Yeh, Victoria Shuan.  
 0300-458486, Yuan, Hu Lung.  
 A-7983493, Yurman, Joseph, or Joseph Jurman, also known as Giuseppe Yurman, or Giuseppe Gemini.  
 A-7930592, Zawiszynski, Binem.  
 A-7196409, Zia, Lucy Ai Chu, or Lucy Ai Chu Henson, or Mrs. Nolan Henson.  
 A-7962598, Berger, Nora.  
 A-9922560, Chang, Chin Hsiang.  
 E-057572, Chang, Lee Kong.  
 A-6589868, Chang, Hung-Chi.  
 V-550063, Chang, Ping Yuen (Mary).  
 V-550064, Chang, Yuen Yu Mei (Margaret).  
 A-6848009, Chen, Ching-Tao.  
 A-7436766, Chen, Shih Chen.  
 A-7368976, Chen, Yung Chiung.  
 A-6851598, Cheng, Hung Sheng or David H. S. Cheng.  
 A-6847821, Lee, Chu Shan.  
 A-6967247, Cheng, Mou-Ta.  
 V-550362, Ching, Kam Shee (nee Kum Yee Kam).  
 A-7357784, Chiu, Han-Hsiang.  
 0800-9906, Liu, San-Teh.  
 A-6986578, Chu, Ting Li.  
 0900-65392, Da Costa, Frank Richards.  
 0900-65393, Da Costa, Dorothy Graham (nee Bacelar).  
 0900-65394, Da Costa, Carol Ann Richards.  
 A-7296247, Gyorki, Ladislav.  
 A-6848514, Han, Lit-Sien.

A-7118647, Han, Tsung-Men Shen.  
 0800-113002, Huang, Ray.  
 0501-20451, Hwang, Ying-Chen.  
 A-5057004, Hwang, Lois, formerly Hsueh-Hsia Lois Lee.  
 A-6017688, Hsu, Cheng-Teh.  
 A-7274364, Hsu, Chih Hsiang.  
 A-6953088, Hsu, Eu-Phang Tsao (nee Eu-Phang Tsao).  
 0501-20461, Huang, Kwe Pau.  
 T-103125, JIJJ, Latif Menashl.  
 A-6958634, Ku, Benedict Hsing-Yun.  
 0900-77628, Ku, Agnes Pei-Chaun nee Ho.  
 A-6848572, Kuang, Huan-Pao.  
 T-2760295, Kung, Lilly Meng-en.  
 A-9801108, Kwok, Choon.  
 A-7392522, Kwong, Kong Nin.  
 V-1184786, Lee, Lucy Hsien Ping.  
 A-8039640, Lei, Chih Tseng.  
 A-8039641, Lei, Pao-Ying Wu.  
 A-7546050, Liang, Theresa Shih-ying.  
 0300-443846, Lillemagi, Adela (nee Koppel).  
 A-6451318, Lin, Chi-Chiang.  
 A-8110448, Ling, Chi Chang (Frances).  
 A-6451319, Lin, Jun-Ching.  
 A-7299351, Ma, John Yoh-Han.  
 A-7267394, Ma, Christina Tsi-Ching (nee Liu).  
 A-9579072, Mak, Koon Sing.  
 T-669332, Mar, Timothy Tientseh.  
 T-669333, Mar, Shuhyin Lu.  
 T-669336, Mar, Florence Hsu-Yung.  
 T-669337, Mar, Michael Yuan-Kai.  
 A-8021421, Mei, Ginsiang.  
 A-8258365, Pan, Edwin Shih-Chuin.  
 A-6855647, Pan, Te-Tai.  
 A-8001932, Pu, Pin Hsiu.  
 A-10187012, Pu, Lillian or Lai-Ling.  
 A-7415302, Yao, Ting Siu.  
 V-550144, Shen, Suzy Yu San.  
 A-7436763, Shen, Theresa (Fang-Ching) (nee Chow).  
 A-8065318, Shen, Walter Yuen-When.  
 A-8065319, Shen, Gen Wun (nee Chen).  
 A-8065320, Shen, Pearl Yui-Tai.  
 A-8065321, Shen, Lyon Yin-Liang.  
 A-7292405, Su, Chin Fan.  
 A-7389501, Szu-Tu, Huang I-Ping.  
 A-7438763, Tang, Anna.  
 A-6396667, Tang, Tze-Tung.  
 E-0518036, Tse, Chek-Sau.  
 E-057489, Sze, Ching Ah.  
 A-7952393, Vong, Sandy Ting-Shung.  
 A-6967683, Wang, Cheh-Chang.  
 A-6848684, Wang, Isabel Deh-Yu (nee Isabel Deh-Yu Sueh).  
 A-6962973, Wang, Phyllis Chiu-Chu.  
 A-7299371, Wei, Peter En-Tien.  
 A-8211313, Wu, Carlton Chung-Chieh.  
 0804-5290, Yao, Hao (Wm. H. Yao).  
 A-6033461, Yu, Cheng-Tseng.  
 A-7985246, Angielowicz, Fania.  
 A-7985245, Angielowicz, Michel.  
 A-7370990, Au, Lewis Li Tang.  
 A-7274568, Blum, Fajga.  
 A-7274597, Blum, Ide Lejb.  
 A-7952703, Borgenicht, Chaim.  
 A-7399268, Chang, Julia Chu-Hua (nee Young).  
 A-6877737, Chang, Richard Chi-Cheng.  
 A-7805891, Chao, Man alias Hilda Man Chao.  
 A-6712051, Cheang (Cheng), Katharine Hui-Chin.  
 0300-463428, Chen, Ethel Ihming.  
 0300-447082, Chen, Tai Jai also known as Ah Seng or Ah Sing.  
 V-184756, Chin, Jin Gew.  
 A-4831369, Ching, Ming Tseng.  
 0300-372213, Ching, Gong Sze.  
 A-1209297, Chong, Yon or Chong Yon.  
 E-085421, Chow, Ling Lai.  
 A-6877745, Chow, Woo Fong.  
 A-5928207, Choy, Moo.  
 0300-460537, Chu, Chang Wei or John Wang Chu.  
 A-6847753, Chun-Jo, Liu or Chun-Jo Liu also known as Yolanda Liu.  
 0300-455955, Chung, Tsang Kwang.  
 A-8102803, David, Reuben Isaac Solomon.

A-7966373, Feng, Yen-Tsai.  
 0300-462354, Folger, Efraim.  
 A-7209172, Frank, Abraham.  
 A-7209173, Frank, Edit.  
 A-7863599, Frank, Judit.  
 0300-463691, Guth, Dresel (nee Klapholz).  
 0300-465382, Guth, Elias.  
 0300-463692, Guth, Wigdor.  
 E-084376, Hallman, Herman.  
 0300-297505, Herskovitz, Moses.  
 0300-297506, Herskovitz, Rosalia.  
 0300-321913, Ho, Gwei Hsin Wang.  
 A-7395426, Ho, William Wei-Lan.  
 A-6844338, Hou, Chi Ming.  
 A-6619131, Hsia, Tao-Ching.  
 A-4373792, Hsu, Marjory Louise Hsi-Yen.  
 A-7241235, Hsu, Martin Shao-Min.  
 A-7028985, Hsu, Ming-Yen.  
 A-7424867, Huang, Pak Cio.  
 A-6017053, Ilie, Ivan.  
 A-7251805, Jeremias, Elizabeth Mindszent.  
 A-7251806, Jeremias, Imre.  
 0300-320857, Kaminer, Cecylia.  
 A-7988128, Klein, Nicolas.  
 0300-462006, Klein, Rozalia (nee Berger).  
 0300-460274, Kong, Bao Tse.  
 A-7118698, Kong, Louise.  
 A-7841163, Kortus, Praskovia.  
 0300-442009, Koscica, Ante also known as Ante Pavle Koscica.  
 A-6703362, Kwang, Lillian Ya Chieh Lo (nee Lo).  
 0300-291809, Lai, Kong Kuen.  
 0300-459397, Lau, Mee Kee.  
 0300-459398, Liu, Ying Yuen.  
 0300-294022, Lee, Fook Sang.  
 A-7367997, Lee, Paul Chin Yuan.  
 A-7384797, Lerner, Izak.  
 A-6962847, Liang, Dehwei David also known as David Liang.  
 A-1020258, Lieu, Rio Lien Wha or Rio Lieu Chiang.  
 V-371658, Lin, James Min.  
 0300-397683, Liu You-Chao.  
 E-082523, Michael, Heskell Saleh.  
 A-6691425, Nee, Paul Chen-I.  
 0300-346429, Pan, Kuo-Fong.  
 0300-346199, Pan, Wai-Sing.  
 0300-346200, Pan, Yeu Yeu.  
 0300-346201, Pan, Pien Hwa.  
 A-6917987, Polak, Samuel.  
 A-7480747, Raices, Josef.  
 0300-457032, Rubin, Rachel or Rachel Neuhaus.  
 A-8198430, Rubin, Samuel or Shmuel Rubin.  
 A-7296245, Ryniewicz-Wisniewski, Henryk Stanislaw.  
 A-6931513, Schischa, Erno Ernest.  
 A-8267919, Schwartz, Solomon.  
 0300-416245, Schwartz, Chaja.  
 A-7290227, Steiner, Bertalen.  
 A-7819651, Stern, Jindrich.  
 A-7133262, Sun, Clara V. G. Shu-Yi.  
 0300-461732, Sun, Woo Kin.  
 A-9765798, Tang, Shing Wha, also known as Sheng Hul Tang.  
 A-7802716, Tchen, Hoshien.  
 V-885365, Tchen, Lin Sie Chao.  
 0900-74128, Tchen, Victoria Kuo Hua.  
 E-094625, Tsao, Yuet Yung.  
 A-7476105, Tse, Helen Yung-Feng.  
 A-6991761, Tseng, Margaret Ting-Yi Shang (nee Margaret Ting-Yi Shang).  
 A-6381290, Tso, Yung Sze.  
 E-085484, Twanmoh, Mary Vivian, or Tsai-Wei Fu or Mary Vivian Fu.  
 E-085482, Twanmoh, Thomas, or Chun-Ming Twanmoh.  
 A-6470331, Wang, Chai Shih.  
 T-359245, Wang, George Chung.  
 A-6851664, Wang, Joseph Ch'eng-Tung.  
 A-6847945, Wang, Liance.  
 A-6772193, Wang, Sue Ming.  
 0300-360173, Wang, Shangee.  
 1610-8899, Wong, Fee Ting.  
 A-7364798, Woo, Tung Ting.  
 A-6142243, Yeh, Chok Ming or Yeh Chok Ming.  
 A-7121731, Yih, Mae or Chih Feng Dunne.  
 0300-381997, Yin Ng.

0300-456582, Yue, David.  
 0300-460249, Yue, Mai-Tchi Chang.  
 0300-460243, Yue, Shyh Jong.  
 A-6432549, Yung, Kway Sung.  
 0300-463831, Zbigniew, Joseph Birtus.  
 0300-461463, Zimmerman, Frieda.  
 0300-444754, Zimmerman, Rozelle.  
 A-7837168, Zimmerman, Samuel.  
 A-7197709, Chen, Katherine Michiu.  
 A-8065821, Cheng, Tsung O.  
 A-7056914, Chiang, Chieh Yue.  
 T-404087, Chu, Yeh Ta Kung.  
 V-865191, Chuang, Ching-Chi Claude.  
 A-6858251, Djao, Er Hung.  
 A-6527765, Dju, Mei Yu.  
 A-6851468, Hsu, Kuo-Liang.  
 A-7118751, Huang, Bertha Hsiao-Yun.  
 A-6982890, Hung, Chin-Tsai also known as Hung Chin-Tsai.  
 A-7134534, Jen, Young Ming.  
 A-7079587, King, Tieh-Sun Conrad.  
 A-6985595, Ling, Huang.  
 A-6552709, Lum, Kum Nown known as Sister Mary Francene Lum.  
 V-550145, Shen, Yu-Chuan known as Jenny Shen.  
 A-7805898, Shu, Jia, or Jimmy Chong.  
 V-026472, Tsao, William Shen.  
 A-6589959, Tu, Hung, Yeu-an.  
 A-6877760, Tu, Tai-Chen Chang.  
 A-6735290, Wang, Carter Chia-Ta.  
 A-7282067, Wang, James or Yung-An Wang.  
 A-7415179, Wang, Ting-Hsien.  
 A-6526170, Wang, Frances Dzo formerly Frances Yu-Lin Dzo.  
 A-6973670, Wong, Helen Wen-Chuan.  
 A-7952444, Wu, Chen Yang.  
 A-6975566, Wu, Rodney Ta-Chuan.  
 A-80-0612, Yang, James C. S.  
 A-8125590, Yew, Ming-Chih.  
 0200-86483, Chang, Chung Mou.  
 0200-86544, Chang, Feng Ye Chen.  
 0300-457462, Chen, Liang Fu.  
 0300-45463, Chen, Rena.  
 0300-457464, Chen, John.  
 0300-457465, Chen, Mary.  
 A-7285818, Cheng, Kaiser, Kai-Shih.  
 A-6522849, Cheng, Kwei Fang.  
 A-6221003, Chih, Yu-Ju alias Jimmy Chih.  
 0300-368618, Chin, Shao-Fen.  
 0300-368617, Chin, Ke-Sien.  
 0300-368619, Chin, Ya-Tung.  
 A-7985789, Chin, Nina.  
 A-7286199, Cukier, Mordko.  
 0300-313410, Cukier, Chana.  
 A-5961419, Darida, Zoltan Sandor.  
 0300-340142, Dong, Suey Yuen.  
 0300-340375, Dong, Sin Tsan Tsai.  
 A-7975021, Kao, Morgan M. T. or Mong-Tsang Kao.  
 A-7975003, Kao, Dorothy H. or Ming-Wei Hsiung or King-Wei Hsiung.  
 0300-460655, Kaufman, Peps (nee Sch-witzer).  
 A-7913542, Kiffel, Jacob.  
 A-7399688, Korf, Gedale.  
 A-6545335, Kwan, Tsun-Yee.  
 0300-465468, Fried, Ignacy.  
 0300-459065, Friedman, Abraham.  
 0300-331806, Goldmann, Zsigmond.  
 A-6702141, Hsiung, Gueh-Djen alias Edith Hsiung.  
 A-6027124, Hsu, Pao-Tan.  
 A-6008443, Hsu, Kwei Fang.  
 0300-256956, Hsu, Shu Kuan.  
 A-7383189, Hsu, Lillian Lee-Yee.  
 A-7383190, Hsu, Stephen Sui-Dah.  
 A-7383191, Hsu, Peter Ping-Dah.  
 A-8307995, Hung, Teh-Lung (Sister M. Theresa Hung).  
 A-7436605, Lampart, Lazar or Lejzor Lampart.  
 0300-331003, Lampart, Rachela (nee Praw-da).  
 E-088758, Lampart, Enoch.  
 0300-420127, Lee, You or Lee Yow or Li Yau.  
 A-8307994, Li, Mo-Hsien (Sister M. Gloria Li).  
 0501-20527, Li, Pao-Ming Tien.  
 0501-20529, Li, Si-Chi.  
 0501-20528, Li, Si-Ju.

A-6703350, Li, Sue Loong or Sue Loong.  
 A-7285833, Lieou, Yves, also known as Liu Yen Tsu.  
 A-6967606, Lo, Yuen Tze.  
 A-10035236, Low, Henry Bel-Chung alias Bel or Pei-Chung Low (Lu).  
 A-10035285, Low, Betty Bel-Chen (nee Betty Bel-Chen Yang) alias Betty Pei Chen Yang.  
 0300-365723, Lowinger, Lajos.  
 0300-365724, Lowinger, Livia.  
 0300-366369, Lowinger, Peter.  
 0300-366368, Lowinger, Marietta.  
 A-7436622, Mendlovic, Herman.  
 0300-373167, Mozes, Lola Rewitz.  
 A-8036391, Mozes, Menachem.  
 0300-390488, Ng, Tin You.  
 A-5372318, Purgvee, Arnold.  
 0300-324151, Radulo, Riho.  
 0300-324152, Radulo, Helmi Adele (nee Veera).  
 0300-420922, Rymland, Mordechai.  
 0300-42923, Rymland, Miriam.  
 A-7298065, She, Berlin.  
 A-7125266, Sheng, Sheng Pao.  
 A-6690602, Sheng, Fang Shao.  
 A-6967484, Sun, Veronica Hui Lan.  
 0300-364811, Sung, Jesse I-Hsin.  
 A-8039859, Sung, Susan (nee Chiang).  
 A-6699887, Tan, Chun-Lin or Chester Chun-Lin Tan.  
 0300-357533, Tien, Li Soo.  
 0300-459372, Tom, Yet Pang.  
 0300-445373, Tom, Cung May Ngo.  
 0300-444070, Tom, Cherry also known as Wang Chi Tom.  
 A-6967705, Tsuan, Tai Hsun.  
 A-9682627, Wah, Wong Sei.  
 A-7297286, Weiss, Joseph or Joseph Weisz or Jozsef Weisz.  
 A-7297283, Weiss, Machla or Machla Weisz (nee Kahan).  
 A-7297280, Mendlowitz, Olga known as Olga Mendlovic (nee Weisz).  
 A-7910441, Weiss, Edity or Edity Weisz.  
 0300-354448, Wen, Lian-Tong.  
 0501-20253, Yan, Shung Ching.  
 A-10035256, Yang, Martin Mao-Chun alias Mao-Chun Yang, Tien Sze or Mien Chai.  
 A-10035257, Yang, Lucy Ching-Yuan (nee Lucy Ching-Yuan Wang) alias Mei Wang.  
 A-10035258, Yang, Jefferson Yuan-Sheng alias Yuan-Sheng Yang.  
 A-10035255, Yang, Peterson Pu-Sheng alias Pu-Sheng Yang.  
 A-10035259, Yang, Jackson Chai-Sheng alias Chai-Sheng Yang.  
 A-7418228, Yeh, Yuen Kung.  
 A-6849357, Chang, Fu Wen.  
 A-7078172, Chang, Robert Wen-Hua.  
 A-6588667, Chang, Tony H. also known as Tan Hsueh Chang.  
 A-6877749, Chen, Paul Shih Kan.  
 A-7118660, Cheng, Ting Chuan known as Sister Alfonsine Ting.  
 A-6847884, Chiao, Lin Sung.  
 A-6916542, Chieh, Chang Shieh known as Sister Mary Louise Chang.  
 A-6916541, Chieh, Chen Mel known as Sister Margaret Mary Chen.  
 A-6589915, Chin, Te Ning.  
 A-6967472, Chow, Fu Ho Chen.  
 A-5671024, Chow, Iong Lien.  
 A-5529100, Chow, Martha Chen (nee Mai-Chia Chen) also known as Martha C. Chen.  
 A-6324935, Chow, Kao Liang.  
 A-6916543, Fang, Chao Wen known as Sister Collette Chao.  
 A-7118750, Fu, Elizabeth Pai-Ying Huang.  
 A-6848164, Fu, Peter Wenyung.  
 A-6967697, Fu, Helena Da-Cheu (nee Suen).  
 A-7299556, Fu, Richard Ko-Liang.  
 V-1505572, Gin, Tew Gan Yee also known as Yee Gin Tew Gan.  
 A-8967106, Han, Daniel Cheng Sin.  
 A-7118703, Hsia, Chu Kuang known as Sister Theodora Chu.  
 A-6916529, Hsin, Cheng Fu known as Sister Paschal Cheng.  
 A-6967381, Hu, Patrick Pei Chwen.



- A-7267074, Han, Grace Hsiu Hua.  
V-1598804, Hung, Fu, or Frederick Hung.  
A-7269688, Jong, Serena Sit-Yee.  
A-7295486, Klang, Chien Kuen.  
A-6916547, Kuen, Hu Cheng, known as Sister Gabriells Hu.  
A-6916546, Kuo, Chuang Cheng, known as Sister Fransis Kuo.  
A-6171336, Lee, Han Yuan, or Chao Neim Lee.  
A-6849845, Lee, Henry Kuang-Chen.  
A-6916544, Li, Cheng Chieueh, known as Sister Clara Li.  
A-6851414, Ling, Cheng.  
A-7354777, Ling, Cho-Hsin.  
A-4076136, Liu, Ang-Tsung.  
A-4076135, Liu, Helen Tso-Zue Zau.  
A-6916545, Liu, Chao Min, known as Sister Elizabeth Liu.  
A-6916661, Liu, Din Lung, known as Sister Isidor Liu.  
A-7286739, Liu, Samuel Lieng-Chu.  
T-1896835, Liu, Young King.  
A-6936467, Lu, Wen Lung, known as Sister St. Michael Lu.  
A-6916549, Mei, Chiang Ching, known as Sister Peter Damian Chiang.  
A-6916539, Min, Chang Shih, known as Sister Marie Chang.  
A-7118704, Pao-Lung, Hu, known as Sister Claudine Hu.  
A-6958552, Pih, Hui.  
A-6916548, Ping, Fang, known as Sister Therese Fang.  
1209-8437, Shao, Yung Shen.  
A-6916557, Shaw, Horace Kao.  
A-7286659, Sim, Alfred Yang-Ping.  
A-8871714, Sim, Willie Yuk Sum.  
A-7436667, Soong, Wan Chen.  
A-8153737, Sul, Kuang-Chi (nee Fong).  
V-574882, Sui, Francois Siao.  
A-7961380, Sul, Wai Kong.  
A-6564142, Sun, Raydong.  
A-6959856, Szu, Chung Yao.  
A-6405951, Tan, Hai-Chuen, also known as Sterling Tan.  
A-8057464, Tom, Pak-Tsai.  
0900-76578, Tsui, Li Fen.  
A-1841383, Tsang, Chi Mou.  
A-7424845, Tsang, Chin-Nien Chow.  
T-356924, Wang, Yi Chu.  
T-1794218, Wang, Kay Tom.  
0900-74033, Wang, Hung.  
0900-74032, Wang, Hui.  
0900-74034, Wang, Cheng.  
A-6923186, Wang, Hang Chia.  
A-6916524, Wang, Hsing Ting known as Sister Magdalene Wang.  
A-6855618, Wang, Hui (Helen) Chi.  
A-7491389, Wang, Thomas T. S.  
A-6851312, Wang, Yun-Shen.  
A-7118719, Wei, Shu Cheng known as Sister Emilie Wei.  
A-7390063, Wu, Robert Kung-Hsien.  
A-7248492, Yang, Yun-Jui nee Sung Yun-Jui, now known as Rachel Yun-Jui Yang.  
A-7882619, Yeh, Ling-Chuan.  
A-6916682, Ying, Bao Yuan known as Sister Pacis Bao.  
A-7285805, Yu, Kwok Leung.  
V-383272, Yuen, Yue Lucille.  
A-7358511, Zwack, Peter.  
0300-407030, Bang, Lee Yung.  
A-7993997, Butt, Carlos Joseph Rickman.  
A-7457273, Carleton, Mary Sing Gieu.  
A-6457510, Chai, Chen Kang.  
A-6959726, Chang, Katherine Feng-Yi.  
A-7788070, Chang, Yuan-Feng Eugene also known as Chang Yuan-Feng.  
0300-419146, Chao, Ah-Ling.  
A-8829315, Chen, Belle Pei-Li.  
A-6967573, Chen, Rose or Miao Young-Cheng.  
0300-260171, Cheng, Stephen Chuntao also known as Chuntao Cheng.  
A-6967249, Cheng, Tao.  
A-6712047, Chin, Yung Kang.  
A-10141621, Chou, Chi-Ye.  
A-9653210, Chu, Lee Ah also known as Ding Wah Chu.  
A-7436760, Citronenbaum, Pinkas Hirsh.  
E-096452, Cukurs, Gunnar.  
E-086802, Deutsch, Karoly.  
E-086804, Deutsch, Edith.  
E-086829, Deutsch, Eugen.  
E-086834, Deutsch, Marta.  
0300-459555, Ding, Hung Han.  
A-7046631, Doo, Sih Huan.  
0300-140547, Egerov, Nikolai.  
A-9559249, Fook, Pong Chan also known as Chan Fook or Chan Hong or Chan Hong Fook.  
A-6943497, Fu, Jack Jen-Kuei.  
0300-463774, Gragas, Bruno.  
A-8198402, Hsieh, Sherwood J. S., also known as Hsieh Jui Shang.  
A-7355246, Kan, Dora (Frances) or Dora Kan.  
0300-459345, Kee, Fong Tung also known as Fong Kirn Liam.  
0300-469694, Klausner, Tiberius.  
A-7357776, Kunda, Faiga Felicia also known as Faiga Kunda also known as Fay Kunda.  
A-6849437, Kuo, James also known as Tsing Hwan Kuo.  
A-7491708, Kuo, Wei.  
0300-304957, Kwok, Marguerite (Lien-Fong).  
T-2659481, Lee, Ming.  
0300-460544, Lee Yee Lung.  
A-8082054, Lin, Seng, Ma.  
A-6858247, Liu, David Chang-Tso.  
A-671973, Loo, Sin-Jez or Patsy (nee Pei).  
A-7274637, Ma, Henry Shing-Yi, also known as Henri Ma.  
0300-402501, Mans, Ilmar Leonhard.  
E-118816, Mielczarek, Mieczyslaw.  
A-8091348, Mon, Ching, also known as Mun Ching.  
0300-304630, Ow, Man Kong.  
0300-459374, Tong, Man Fong.  
0300-304632, Chaw, Hin or Chaw Hin.  
E-093938, Peras, Giuseppe.  
A-7365712, Rimpler, Ojzash or Szaya Rimpler.  
V-126051, Ryniewicz-Wisniewski, Alicja Joanna (nee Berger), also known as Modzelewska.  
A-7436673, Schanowicz, Azriel.  
A-7480732, Schweij, Boruch.  
0300-461121, Sepp, Aleksei.  
A-6739692, Shen, Amy I-Chin Sun (nee Sun).  
A-6886876, Shen, Teh-Ching, also known as John Teh-Ching Shen.  
0300-305730, Szoffer, Abraham.  
E-082732, To, Koot Bun.  
A-7282985, Tsai, William Wei-Ling alias Wei-Ling Tsai.  
0300-421200, Wah, Ng or Ching Wah Ng.  
A-6849388, Wang, Chi Hua.  
A-7247323, Wang, Nancy Yang.  
0300-396164, Wang, Shih Kun.  
A-9765244, Wong, Meng Kong.  
A-7202727, Yang, Chen Tek.  
A-6845072, Yang, Ching Huan.  
A-5829657, Yen, Ernest Chu also known as En Chu en.  
A-7640624, Yen, Louise Loo.  
A-7350772, Yen, Martha.  
A-7350773, Yen, Simone.  
A-7350774, Yen, Linda.  
A-7123420, Yen, Pei Ping.  
A-5119422, Yuan, (John) Chia-Chang.  
A-5119402, Yuan, Lu (Norma) Shih-Chu.  
A-7926272, Yung, Paul Tse Hwa.  
A-7135602, An, Chung or Chung Ting Shan, also known as Lillian Chung and Sister M. Anne.  
A-6930158, Beyda, Cohen Alfred.  
A-6930156, Beyda, Linda Yacoub.  
A-8015605, Chai, Martha May.  
A-7436614, Chang, Chih-Ming or Benjamin Chang.  
A-7354795, Chang, Leo I-Ho.  
A-8909618, Chang, Lih-Yong Ya-Go, now known as James Lih-Yong Chang.  
A-6847835, Chang, Lucy or Chang Ching Lui, also known as Sister M. Lily.  
V-305609, Chang, Yao Teh.  
A-713270, Chang, Lois Tsung-Ying.  
A-7399270, Chen, Ronald Ming-Teh.  
A-10135605, Chen, Tseh-Han.  
A-10135606, Chen, Tse-Ping.  
A-6855638, Chen, Vincent, alias Chao-Kuei Chen or Benedict Chao-Kuei Chen.  
A-6848432, Cheng, Hou Shyl.  
A-6271455, Cheng, Ruth Hsin Yueh Chang.  
A-7399663, Cheng, Shun.  
A-8036489, Cheng, Ya Yu Lung.  
A-7225901, Chi, Chou Fung or Sister M. Grace (Gloria Chou).  
A-7248471, Chih, Yin Choa also known as Sister M. George.  
A-10141572, Chow, Chien.  
A-10141573, Chow, Dorothy Wei.  
A-7819671, Chow, Tse-Sun.  
A-7828203, Chu, Kinman.  
A-6739697, Chu, Wei Lee.  
A-7286821, Chu, Yuen-Wen also known as Yun-Wen Yvonne Chu.  
A-6708411, Chung, Evangeline Chi-Ming.  
A-7480693, Cross, Evelyn Shu-Chu.  
A-7367960, Ding, Ai-Fang.  
A-6702151, Fan, Florence Ih-Chi.  
A-6527579, Gih, Ru-Chin now known as Marcus Gih.  
A-7436808, Gih, Wei-Ching (nee Hu) now known as Marian Gih.  
A-7374666, Heilmann, Jakob also known as Jacob Heiman.  
A-8909598, Ho, Chih Chin (nee Hsu) now known as Lucy Hsu Ho.  
A-8307993, Ho, Ki-Yu (Sister Mary Antonia Ho).  
A-6877750, Ho, Wan also known as Van H. Ho.  
A-6959725, Hsieh, Jui Sheng.  
A-6973661, Hsu, Anthony Kuo-Chi.  
A-6967379, Hsu, Ming Chen.  
A-6148161, Hu, Hsun also known as William Shun Hu.  
A-6363936, Huang, Alice Shih Hou.  
A-10141613, Hul, Peter Shui Pui.  
A-7524245, Jen, Rose (Sister M. Agnes) Jen I Yeh.  
A-6275292, Kan, Peter Tai Yuen.  
A-6973674, Kan, Juliana Lee-Chun.  
A-7835197, Kao, Shih-Chinn.  
A-7097851, Kentzer, Czelaw Pawel.  
A-6967657, Ku, Timothy Tao or Chao-Seng Ku.  
A-6967563, Ku, Victoria Feng or Keh-Hsui Feng Ku.  
A-10135611, Ku, Wei Shing.  
A-6847737, Kung, Kuo-Hao also known as Charles Kuo-Hao Kung.  
A-7142393, Lee, Laurence Chih-Liang.  
A-8829406, Lee, Maofang Linda Miriam.  
A-8055430, Lee, Stephen Shao-Chin.  
A-5855220, Lee, Tsung Ma or Lucia Tsung also known as Sister M. Mario.  
A-7288227, Lee, Virginia Chieh-Shou, also known as Chieh-Shou Lee.  
A-7396005, Li, Anthony Ching-Wen.  
A-6916657, Li, Kuang-Hua.  
A-6847940, Li, Chu-Tsing.  
A-6847738, Li, Yao-Wen Kwang.  
A-7941731, Ling, Chang Si also known as Pan Han Chang, Si Ling Tchang, Pan Han Tchang.  
V-754165, Ling, Tsai Cho-Zung.  
0301-17059, Ling, Chen Kuo.  
0801-17061, Ling, Lu Lu.  
A-7202734, Ling, Sung Ching.  
A-6527761, Liu, Margaret Kung-Ting.  
A-6967587, Liu, William Yung.  
A-7274548, Lo, Frances Romana.  
A-6847941, Lo, Robert Kai Tze.  
A-6982863, Lo, Helen Pei Yao Chao.  
A-8876902, Ng, Hop Tai.  
V-485911, Nowicka, Helena.  
V-485910, Nowicka, Irene.  
A-7282988, Oleen, Nachum.  
A-7295487, Sah, Chih-Han.  
A-7362934, Shen, Ku-Chen.  
A-6851333, Shiu, Yan Chang.  
A-7282965, Su, Kelvin.  
A-7483525, Sung, Mei-En now Mary Ann Chou.  
A-8106780, Szethofer, Leon de, also known as Leo Setoff.  
A-8106781, Szethofer, Blanche de, also known as Blanche Setoff.  
0900-77483, Tan, Humen.

A-7274386, Tao, Grace Hsu (nee Grace Kwang-Chueh Hsu).  
 A-6849412, Tao, Lu Chang.  
 A-6694211, Teng, Chang Li.  
 A-7118658, Tsao, Ching Chang.  
 V-371645, Tseng, Ching Yuen.  
 A-6534342, Tseng, Po Yee (Stella) Huang.  
 A-6847787, Tsui, Yaw Tsong.  
 0800-111750, Wang, Chun-Heng.  
 T-2080357, Wang, Huai Ming.  
 A-6551848, Wang, Tsu Hsiao.  
 A-6855599, Wu, Mei Chuan Chi.  
 A-6848057, Wu, Mien Tseng.  
 A-6624722, Yip, Su Zee known as Diana Yip.  
 0900-69922, Zak, Joseph.  
 0900-69923, Zak, Emilia.  
 A-6916639, Zee, King Tao.  
 E-6066, Li, Ann Teh Chu.  
 E-6067, Li, Nancy Teh Yu.  
 E-6761, Li, Ru Ping.  
 A-9708070, You, Soo.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 10, line 5, after the name "Pao-Ying", insert the name "Wu."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

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

#### FAVORING THE GRANTING OF THE STATUS OF PERMANENT RESIDENCE TO CERTAIN ALIENS

The Clerk read the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 202) favoring the granting of the status of permanent residence to certain aliens.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the concurrent resolution, as follows:

*Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the Congress favors the granting of the status of permanent residence in the case of each alien hereinafter named, in which case the Attorney General has determined that such alien is qualified under the provisions of section 4 of the Displaced Persons Act of 1948, as amended (62 Stat. 1011; 64 Stat. 219; 50 App. U. S. C. 1953):*

A-6954184, Horesovsky, Bohumil Rudolf.  
 A-7415111, Horesovsky, Jr., Bohumil Rudolf.  
 A-7415110, Horesovsky, Jan Josef.  
 A-6938802, Balaitis, Janis Alberts or John Alberts Balkits.  
 A-6848040, Chang, Victor Chao-Lung.  
 A-6620889, Chen, Pem Ching alias Robin Chen.  
 A-6361214, Dow, Tsung-I.  
 A-7086975, Hinko, Ladislav.  
 A-7439056, Hinko, Ladislav Gustav.  
 A-7439057, Hinko, Eva.  
 A-6442478, Javor, Pal or Paul.  
 A-6450409, Javor, Olga (nee Landesmann).  
 A-3153623, Peros, Peter Milan.  
 0300-442350, Ting, Ah Wong.  
 A-7044355, Vujosevic (Vujosevich), Nikola Mirko.  
 A-6819093, Chalme, Sara Moise (nee Sutton).  
 A-6472673, Ernst, Adolf.  
 A-6760795, Moncauskas, Julijonas.  
 A-6472150, Ravasz, Rudolf.  
 0300-416646, Shing, Sam, also known as Lem Shing.  
 A-6377623, Sneed, Myla, also known as Myla Szaladini.  
 A-6847792, Tung, Cheng-Kang.  
 A-6963306, Burger (Burgerova), Marie.  
 A-9643921, Ching, Leong.  
 A-6847975, Fang, Theresa Chihsun.  
 A-6851302, Fu, Chi-Hsiung.  
 A-6534357, Isakowitz, Robert Meier.  
 A-9559796, Lam, Yin or Yim Lam.

A-6173176, Li, Pa Chun, also known as Pat Li.

A-6703332, Li, Choi Chee Lou also known as Jennie Li.

A-8196502, Lung, Dong Ah.

A-6437027, Mitt, Rudolf.

A-6491926, Mitt, Olga (nee Ulenan).

A-6159696, Papp, Frank.

A-6159698, Papp, Valeria (nee Stritz).

A-6159697, Papp, Jr., Frank.

0300-408013, Roziskovich (Boziskovich), Josep or Joe.

A-6967286, Shen, Florence Tse-Yun Kao.

A-6609116, Tsang, Zue-Tze.

A-6971753, Uustalu, Juri, Arnold.

A-2797209, Ching, Chen Pak also known as Manuel Ching.

A-6776849, Choukanoff, Boyan Petkoff.

A-6776848, Choukanova, Ekaterina Boyanova.

A-5411126, Chu, Dai Poy also known as Dai Poy Chew; professional name, T. B. Chew, Jr.

A-6848515, Han Paul Shu Tung formerly Han Shu-Tung.

A-9771293, Lee, Chay Kun also known as Lee, Choy Kun.

A-6415037, Liu, Victor.

A-6847717, Loh, John Chu Fel.

1300-128711, Yuk, Lau also known as James Low.

A-7828457, Moy, Sun Show.

A-6923191, Rannala, Harry.

A-9825276, Tarabocchia, Martin.

A-7863005, Tipans, Ansis.

1300-74259, Wong, Gee Yiao.

A-6702180, Yen, Shee-Mang or Yen Shee Mang.

1300-74263, Yong, Wah Hing.

E-8394, Kroneroff, Geza.

A-8021280, Smits, Paul.

A-7941090, Barbarini, Antonio.

A-6848234, Bergman, Ibolya (nee Lebowitz).

A-7863011, Bondarenko, Vladimir Ivanovich or Vsevolod Ivanovich Abromov.

A-6438029, Cavrilovic, Mira.

E-086531, Cerineo, Branko.

A-8039898, Chan, Mong Chu.

A-68515114, Chang, Ching-Tung.

A-6652186, Cohen, Nadji Murad or Maji Murad Cohen.

0300-308450, Fat, Chang Han.

0300-363107, Fook, Cheong Chung.

A-6438028, Gavrilovich, Oscar.

A-6931603, Iwaniszyn, Helena.

A-6403580, Liang, Florence Kiang.

A-9765847, Lizzul, Giuseppe or Joseph Lizzul.

A-6894879, Philibosian, Emil Herant.

A-9767788, Randoja, Hannus.

A-6772096, Strupl, Milos.

A-6673276, Wung, Tam Bing.

A-6674085, Hung, Loo Shirt.

A-6250123, Zakkay, Victor Haron.

A-6960369, Filipescu, Aurelia.

A-6662152, Fulga, Alfred Dimitru also known as Alfred or Fred Fuuga.

A-8065669, Hong, Ng.

A-6960370, Istrate, Steliana.

A-7962159, Pauska, Aleksander.

A-6594757, Rejlek, Frantisek also known as Frank Rejlek, alias Raym.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 4, line 14, strike out the name "Cavrilovic" and substitute in lieu thereof the name "Gavrilovic."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

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

#### ETHA DORA JOHNSON

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6618) for the relief of Etha Dora Johnson.

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

*Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior is authorized and directed to issue, without consideration, to Etha Dora Johnson, of Taylorsville, Miss., a patent in fee, including all mineral rights, to the following-described tract of land:*

Lot 5 southwest quarter northwest quarter and lot 6 southeast quarter northwest quarter, section 8, township 10 north, range 14 west, Smith County, Miss.

Sec. 2. If any mineral deposits in such land have been leased by the United States, the patent authorized under the first section of this act shall be issued subject to such lease and all rights of the United States under such lease shall be transferred to the said Etha Dora Johnson.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1 line 4, strike out the words "without consideration," and insert in lieu thereof the words "upon the payment of not less than \$1.25 per acre."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

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

#### GRANTING STATUS OF PERMANENT RESIDENCE TO CERTAIN ALIENS

The Clerk called the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 472) for the relief of certain aliens.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the joint resolution, as follows:

*Resolved, etc., That, for the purpose of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Isak Hershig, Constantine George Kaitsoyannis, Milly Model, Erich Rahneberg, Margaretha Rath Rahneberg, Solomon Joseph Sadakne, Rosa Stangl, Rosy Juin Tseng, Irma Elina Vcela, and Jose Cristiano Vieira, shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fees. Upon the granting of permanent residence to each alien as provided for in this act, if such alien was classifiable as a quota immigrant at the time of the enactment of this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to reduce by one the quota for the quota area to which the alien is chargeable for the first year that such quota is available.*

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

#### AMENDING ACT RECOGNIZING PUBLIC SERVICE RENDERED BY MAJ. WALTER REED AND HIS ASSOCIATES

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5590) to amend the act entitled "An act to recognize the high public service rendered by Maj. Walter Reed and those associated with him in the discovery of the cause and means of transmission of yellow fever," approved February 28, 1929, by including therein the name of Gustaf E. Lambert.

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

*Be it enacted, etc., That the act entitled "An act to recognize the high public service*



rendered by Maj. Walter Reed and those associated with him in the discovery of the cause and means of transmission of yellow fever," approved February 28, 1929 (45 Stat. 1409), is hereby amended by inserting after the name of John J. Moran, wherever it appears in such act, the name of Gustaf E. Lambert.

With the following committee amendment:

Immediately following line 2, on page 2, add the following new section:

"Sec. 2. No benefits shall be paid by reason of the amendment made by this act for any period prior to the date an application therefor is filed after the date of enactment of this act."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

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

#### SALE OF CERTAIN LAND IN ALASKA

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6703) to authorize the sale of certain land in Alaska to Victor Power, of Juneau, Alaska.

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

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That Victor Power, of Juneau, Alaska, is hereby authorized, for a period of 1 year from and after the effective date of this act, to apply for the purchase of, and the Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized and directed to convey to Victor Power, for use in connection with his home-site, lot 7, United States survey No. 3269, Alaska, containing approximately seventy-three one-hundredths acre.

Sec. 2. The purchase price for the land shall be the reasonable value thereof without improvement, as determined by the Secretary of the Interior but not less than \$1.25 per acre: *Provided*, That the conveyance hereby authorized shall not include any land covered by a valid existing right initiated under the public land laws: *Provided further*, That the coal and other mineral deposits in the land shall be reserved to the United States, together with the right to prospect for, mine, and remove the same under applicable laws and regulations to be prescribed by the Secretary of the Interior.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, strike out lines 3 to 9, inclusive, and insert in lieu thereof the following: "That Victor Power, of Juneau, Alaska, shall have the right to purchase under the act of June 1, 1938, as amended (43 U. S. C., sec. 682a), lot 7, United States survey No. 3269, Alaska, within 1 year after the approval of this act."

Page 2, line 4, strike out the word "reasonable" and insert in lieu thereof the words "fair market."

Page 2, line 9, change the colon to a period and strike out the remainder of the bill.

The committee amendments were agreed to.

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

#### CONVEYANCE OF CERTAIN LANDS IN ALASKA TO MATANUSKA VALLEY LINES, INC., AND OTHERS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 7513) to authorize the conveyance of certain lands in Alaska to the Matanuska Valley

Lines, Inc., and to Russell Swank and Joe Blackard.

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

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That the Secretary of the Interior is authorized and directed to convey to the Matanuska Valley Lines, Inc., and to Russell Swank and Joe Blackard, without further compensation therefor, all the right, title, and interest of the United States to the following described lands purchased by the said grantees pursuant to the provisions of the Alaska Public Sale Act of August 30, 1949 (63 Stat. 679; 48 U. S. C. 364a-364e): Tracts 1, 2, 3, and 4 of block 27 of the east addition to the original townsite of Anchorage, Alaska, and tracts 6 and 7 of block 34 of the east addition to the original townsite of Anchorage, Alaska.

Sec. 2. The deed of conveyance authorized under the provisions of this act shall contain the terms, conditions, reservations, and restrictions included in patents granted under the Alaska Public Sale Act.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert the following language: "That the Secretary of the Interior shall grant the Matanuska Valley Lines, Inc., such additional period of time as he shall deem reasonable within which to comply with the requirements of its certificate of conditional purchase, issued on August 20, 1951, pursuant to the provisions of the Alaska Public Sale Act of August 30, 1949 (63 Stat. 679; 48 U. S. C., secs 364a-364e), for tracts 1, 2, 3, and 4 of block 27 of the east addition to the original townsite of Anchorage, Alaska, and tract 7 of block 34 of the east addition to the original townsite of Anchorage, Alaska."

"Sec. 2. The Secretary of the Interior shall grant Joe Blackard and Russell Swank, operating a joint venture as Blackard & Swank, such additional period of time as he shall deem reasonable within which to comply with the requirements of their certificate of conditional purchase, issued on August 20, 1951, pursuant to the provisions of the Alaska Public Sale Act of August 30, 1949 (63 Stat. 679; 48 U. S. C., secs. 364a-364e), for tract 6 of block 34 of the east addition to the original townsite of Anchorage, Alaska."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

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

The title was amended so as to read: "To direct the Secretary of the Interior to grant an extension of time to the Matanuska Valley Lines, Inc., and to Russell Swank and Joe Blackard within which to apply for patent to certain lands in Alaska."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### A. J. CROZAT, JR.

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1352) for the relief of A. J. Crozat, Jr.

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

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to A. J. Crozat, Jr., New Orleans, La., the sum of \$10,000. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said A. J. Crozat, Jr., against the United States on account of permanent physical disability resulting from the withdrawal of blood, to be used in the treatment of members of the Armed Forces of the United States, at a Red Cross blood donor center in New Orleans, La., on December 13,

1943: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

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

#### RAYMOND D. BECKNER AND LULU STANLEY BECKNER

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1584) for the relief of Raymond D. Beckner and Lulu Stanley Beckner.

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

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Raymond D. Beckner and Lulu Stanley Beckner, Fairmont, W. Va., the sum of \$4,953.50. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said Raymond D. Beckner and his wife, Lulu Stanley Beckner, against the United States arising out of a paralytic stroke suffered by said Lulu Stanley Beckner on November 5, 1943, as the result of furnishing blood to a blood bank operated in Fairmont under the wartime blood donor program which was conducted for the armed services by the American National Red Cross: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

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

#### WILLIAM J. ROBERTSON

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1471) for the relief of William J. Robertson.

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

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to William J. Robertson, the sum of \$1,590.82. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of such person against the United States for payment for damages to his personal effects, alleged to have been sustained while being shipped on the steamship *Alaska* at Government expense, as an employee of the Department of the Interior, on February 2, 1947, on which date said ship was wrecked: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

On page 2, lines 2 and 3, strike out the words "in excess of 10 per centum thereof."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

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

#### MARTIN M. SORENSEN

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1876) for the relief of Martin M. Sorensen.

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

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Martin M. Sorensen, New Orleans, La., the sum of \$697.35. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said Martin M. Sorensen against the United States for pay and allowances for 45 days terminal leave which he should have received as an incident to his service as a commissioned officer in the United States Coast Guard Reserve: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

On page 1, line 6, strike out "\$697.35" and insert in lieu thereof "\$592.50".

The committee amendment was agreed to.

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

#### MRS. BLANCHE HOUSER

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3343) for the relief of Mrs. Blanche Houser.

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

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That sections 15 and 20, inclusive, of the Federal Employees' Compensation Act are hereby waived in favor of Mrs. Blanche Houser, Kenton, Ohio, and her claim for compensation for the death of her husband, John Houser, a former employee of the Civil Works Administration who died on June 19, 1947, shall be acted upon under the remaining provisions of such act if she files such claim with the Bureau of Employees' Compensation, Department of Labor, within 6 months after the date of the enactment of this act. No benefits shall accrue by reason of the enactment of this act for any period prior to the date of its enactment.

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.

#### HERMAN F. GIERKE, JR.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3725) for the relief of Herman F. Gierke, Jr.

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

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Herman F. Gierke, Jr., of Watford City, N. Dak., the sum of \$3,550. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of Herman F. Gierke, Jr., against the United States for damages resulting from the failure of the Corps of Engineers to replace certain fences, for their failure to construct containment for livestock, and for their failure to construct certain road approaches which they agreed to do in return for an easement granted by Herman F. Gierke, Jr., to the United States. No part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "\$3,550" and insert "\$2,500."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: Page 2, line 4, strike out "in excess of 10 percent thereof."

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Speaker, in reference to the committee amendment which has just been read by the Clerk, that has to do with the attorney clause in the bill. The committee originally thought that no attorney was involved in this particular matter and for that reason this committee amendment is before us. We now find, however, that an attorney has been working on this case and, therefore, we are hopeful that the amendment will be voted down.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was rejected.

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.

#### CHARLES A. BARRON

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3733) for the relief of Charles A. Barron.

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

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That Charles A. Barron, Rising Sun, Md., is hereby relieved of all liability to refund to the United States the sum of \$864.96. Such sums represents the amount of overpayment of basic compensation received in good faith by him from the United States as a result in his indefinite appointment on December 10, 1951, in contravention of existing law and regulations, to the position of ordnance inspector (general), grade GS-7, Office of the Naval Inspector of Ordnance, Philadelphia, Pa. In the audit and settlement of the accounts of any disbursing officer of the United States, full credit shall be given for the amount of such overpayment. The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise ap-

propriated, to the said Charles A. Barron a sum equal to the aggregate of any amounts which may have been paid by him, or withheld from amounts otherwise due him, in complete or partial satisfaction of the claim of the United States for the refund of such overpayment.

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

#### HARRY V. SHOOP, ET AL.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3980) for the relief of Harry V. Shoop, Frederick J. Richardson, and Junior K. Schoolcraft.

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

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That Harry V. Shoop, Frederick J. Richardson, and Junior K. Schoolcraft are hereby relieved of all liability to refund to the United States the sums of \$1,190.20, \$410.40, and \$1,176.80, respectively. Such sums represent the respective amounts of overpayment of compensation made to the above-specified individuals and received by them in good faith covering periods from and after November 9, 1952, through February 14, 1953, during which such individuals were absent from duty as employees of the Department of the Air Force by reason of service which they were performing with the Ohio National Guard. In the audit and settlement of the accounts of any disbursing officer of the United States, full credit shall be given for such respective amounts of overpayment. The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to each of the above-specified individuals a sum equal to the aggregate of any amounts which may have been paid by him, or which may have been withheld from amounts otherwise due him, in complete or partial satisfaction of the claim of the United States for refund of such overpayment.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 3, after the name Richardson, insert "Joseph D. Rosenlieb, Joseph E. P. McCann."

Page 1, line 5, after "\$410.40", insert "\$636.11, \$904.80."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

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

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill for the relief of Harry V. Shoop, Frederick J. Richardson, Joseph D. Rosenlieb, Joseph E. P. McCann, and Junior K. Schoolcraft."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### CROSSE & BLACKWELL CO.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4633) for the relief of Crosse & Blackwell Co.

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

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of \$1,620.09 to the Crosse & Blackwell Co., of Baltimore, Md., in full settlement of all claims against the United States. Such sum represents the tax refund on four overseas shipments of alcoholic products on



which the taxes were paid at the time of bottling, but on which drawback claims were rejected: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 2 line 1, after the word "Act" strike out "in excess of 10 percent thereof."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

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

#### CLARENCE MAXWELL

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4759) for the relief of Clarence Maxwell.

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

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That the Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Clarence Maxwell, Sterling, Ill., the sum of \$318.37. Such sum represents reimbursement to the said Clarence Maxwell for paying out of his own funds a judgment, together with court costs, arising out of an accident occurring on January 30, 1951, when the said Clarence Maxwell was operating a United States mail truck: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

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

#### MRS. ELLA MADDEN

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5237) for the relief of Mrs. Ella Madden.

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

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Mrs. Ella Madden, of Lawton, Okla., the sum of \$25,000. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said Mrs. Ella Madden on account of the death of her two sons, Robert and Jackson C. Annis, resulting from the explosion of a rifle grenade which had been found by these boys and which undoubtedly had been brought into the town by some member of the United States Army stationed at nearby Fort Sill, Okla.: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection

with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 3, strike out all after the enacting clause and insert "That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, (1) to Mrs. Ella Madden, of Lawton, Okla., the sum of \$15,000, in full settlement of all claims of the said Mrs. Ella Madden against the United States on account of the death of her two sons, Robert and Jackson C. Annis, resulting from the explosion of a rifle grenade which had been found by these boys and which undoubtedly had come from nearby Fort Sill, Okla., and (2) to Clarence E. Madden, of Lawton, Okla., the stepfather of Robert and Jackson C. Annis, the sum of \$1,950.21, in full settlement of his claim against the United States for reimbursement of hospital, funeral, burial, and other expenses incurred by him on account of the injuries and death of the said Robert and Jackson C. Annis: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

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

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill for the relief of Mrs. Ella Madden and Clarence E. Madden."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### KEITH A. BOTTERUD

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5284) for the relief of Keith A. Botterud.

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

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of \$1,649.94 to Keith A. Botterud, 10140 Dallas Avenue, Silver Spring, Md., in full settlement of all claims against the United States as reimbursement for travel and transportation expense of his immediate family, household goods, and personal effects, while a civilian employee of the Post Office Department carrying out his duties under official travel orders dated June 2, 1954, which specified that such travel and transportation expenses would be paid by the Government: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid, delivered to, or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered by any agent or attorney in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

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

#### ARTHUR H. HOMEYER

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5495) for the relief of Arthur H. Homeyer.

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

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That Arthur H. Homeyer, Cheverly, Md., is hereby relieved of liability to repay to the United States the sum of \$1,415.33, representing the amounts of payments made on voucher numbered 2-266799 (in the amount of \$951.99, dated October 1947) and voucher numbered 415764 (in the amount of \$463.32, dated December 1947), certified by him, to which the General Accounting Office has made exception. The said Arthur H. Homeyer certified such vouchers for payment in good faith but he cannot properly defend himself against any action by the United States to require him to pay such sums to the United States because of the loss by the Public Housing Administration of records relating to the transactions covered by the vouchers.

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

#### MRS. KATHRYN M. BAKER

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5526) for the relief of Mrs. Kathryn M. Baker.

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

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Mrs. Kathryn M. Baker, of Bethel Island, Calif., the sum of \$691.20. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said Kathryn M. Baker against the United States on account of the death of her former husband, Staff Sgt. James C. Sipes (serial No. 37232567), who was killed in action on June 10, 1944: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 2, line 1, after the word "Act", strike out "in excess of 10 percent thereof."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

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

#### JUNE SMITH

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5778) for the relief of June Smith.

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

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to

pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of \$3,500 to June Smith whose leg was injured when struck by United States Navy vehicle No. 18970 while crossing the street on August 1, 1945, at Burton Station, Princess Anne County, Va. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims against the United States on account of such accident (this claim is not cognizable under the Federal Tort Claims Act): *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 5, strike out "\$3,500" and insert "\$2,400."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

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

#### MR. AND MRS. HERMAN FLOYD WILLIAMS AND MR. AND MRS. W. C. SEGARS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6137) for the relief of Herman Floyd Williams, Bettie J. Williams, Alma G. Segars, and W. C. Segars.

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

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Herman Floyd Williams the sum of \$12,500, to Bettie J. Williams the sum of \$12,500, to Alma G. Segars the sum of \$2,500, and to W. C. Segars the sum of \$2,500. The payment of such sums shall be in full settlement of all claims of such persons against the United States on account of personal injuries, death, and property damage caused by the crash of a United States Air Force aircraft in the city of Marianna, Fla., on July 22, 1952, it having been determined that these claims are not cognizable under the Federal tort claims procedure: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act for the payment of any one claim in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with such claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 5, after the word "to" insert "Mr. and Mrs."

Page 1, line 6, strike out "\$12,500, to Bettie J. Williams the sum of \$12,500, to Alma G. Segars the sum of \$2,500, and."

Page 1, line 7, after the word "to" insert "Mr. and Mrs." and change "Segars" to "Segers."

Page 1, line 8, strike out the figures "2,500", and insert in lieu thereof "5,000."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

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

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Herman Floyd Williams and Mr. and Mrs. W. C. Segers."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### MANUEL MELLO

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6673) for the relief of Manuel Mello.

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

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That the Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Manuel Mello, New Bedford, Mass., the sum of \$158.21. Such sum represents reimbursement to the said Manuel Mello for paying out of his own funds a judgment rendered against him in the courts in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, arising out of an accident occurring in January 1954, when the said Manuel Mello was operating a Government vehicle in the course of his duties as an employee of the Post Office Department: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 2, line 3, after the word "Act" strike out "in excess of 10 percent thereof."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

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

#### EUGENE G. ARETZ

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 7373) for the relief of Eugene G. Aretz.

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

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That Eugene G. Aretz, employee in the Naval Ordnance Plant at Indianapolis, Ind., is relieved of all liability to refund to the United States the sum of \$410.40 which he received as excess compensation as a result of his promotion approved on June 24, 1951, before the expiration of a waiting period of 52 calendar weeks of service required by section 701 (a) of the Classification Act of 1949 (63 Stat. 967).

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

#### MARY VIOLA JONES

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 7583) for the relief of Mary Viola Jones.

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

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the

Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Mary Viola Jones, 909 Keener Avenue, Atlantic City, N. J., the sum of \$2,000 in full satisfaction and final settlement of her claim against the United States arising out of the lapse of insurance policy No. 4901, issued by the International Fidelity Insurance Co., Houston, Tex., on the life of her son, Sgt. Donald Jones, RA13266376, which policy lapsed prior to the death of the said Sgt. Donald Jones which occurred on April 28, 1951, while he was a prisoner of war in North Korea: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or agents, or attorney or attorneys, on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

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

#### WRIGHT H. HUNTLEY

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 8187) for the relief of Wright H. Huntley.

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

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Wright H. Huntley, Bishop, Calif., a sum consisting of \$20,147.27, representing the amount reported by the United States Court of Claims to the Congress in response to House Resolution 255, 83d Congress (congressional No. 2-53, decided November 8, 1955), to be the amount agreed to by the United States and the said Wright H. Huntley of losses of the said Wright H. Huntley against the United States as a result of mining operation restrictions by the Government, during the period beginning June 10, 1944, and ending February 21, 1946, in the operation of the Huntley Talc Mine, Saline Valley, Inyo County, Calif., as a result of the establishment by the United States of the Saline Valley Aerial Gunnery Range which included such mine and certain roads leading thereto: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

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

#### WESTFELDT BROS.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 8298) for the relief of Westfeldt Bros.

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

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That Westfeldt Bros., of New Orleans, La., is hereby relieved of liability to pay to the United States the amount of \$540,540.00 erroneously levied as increased customs duty on account of merchandise imported by them, because of a clerical error in the entry of such merchandise (New Orleans warehouse entry No. 676



of October 3, 1945), such error being perpetuated by an appraisal based thereon which became conclusive with respect to all parties upon the lapse of 60 days after the date of such appraisal.

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.

**EUGENE GARDNER, BYRON M. BARBEAU, JOHN R. REAVES, AND JACKSON L. HARDY**

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 8306) for the relief of Eugene Gardner, Byron M. Barbeau, John R. Reaves, and Jackson L. Hardy.

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

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Eugene Gardner, 427 East Main Street, Xenia, Ohio, the sum of \$1,479.40; to Byron M. Barbeau, Fourth and Main Streets, Batavia, Ohio, the sum of \$463.68; to John R. Reaves, 41 Wood Street, Rutherford, N. J., the sum of \$4,944.39; and to Jackson L. Hardy, 903 Third Avenue South, Box 629, Seattle, Wash., the sum of \$1,548.54. The payment of these amounts shall be in full settlement of all claims against the United States for the losses sustained by the said Eugene Gardner, Byron M. Barbeau, John R. Reaves, and Jackson L. Hardy, as a result of damage to and destruction of their personal property in a fire that occurred in the warehouse of the Ferguson Moving & Storage Co., 1220 Harrison Avenue, Cincinnati, Ohio, on September 10, 1952: *Provided*, That nothing in this act does or shall affect the right, title, and interest in and to any claim which the Government of the United States has as a result of this fire: *Provided further*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating any of the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

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

**NATHAN A. KAHN**

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 8307) for the relief of Nathan A. Kahn.

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

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to 1st Lt. Nathan A. Kahn, United States Army Reserve, 2915 Blackshear Avenue, Pensacola, Fla., the sum of \$1,568.40 in full settlement of all claims against the United States for the damages sustained by him as a result of the destruction of his household goods and personal effects in a fire that occurred in the warehouse of the Washburn Storage Co., Atlanta, Ga., on April 30, 1954: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be un-

lawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating any of the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

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

**ARTHUR E. WEEDEN, JR.**

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 8308) for the relief of Arthur E. Weeden, Jr.

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

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Arthur E. Weeden, Jr., 523 Janesville Street, Oregon, Wis., the sum of \$572.80, in full settlement of all claims against the United States for the loss sustained by him as a result of damage to and destruction of his personal property in a fire that occurred in the warehouse of the Buckner Transfer & Storage Co., 2301 Mills Street, El Paso, Tex., on June 3, 1953: *Provided*, That nothing in this act does or shall affect the right, title and interest in and to any claim which the Government of the United States has as a result of this fire: *Provided further*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating any of the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

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

**COL. HENRY M. ZELLER**

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 8309) for the relief of Col. Henry M. Zeller.

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

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Col. Henry M. Zeller, O-16843, Fort Benning, Ga., the sum of \$1,871.43, in full satisfaction and final settlement of his claim against the United States for destruction of his household goods by fire while in the custody of the Government en route from Fort McPherson, Ga., to Fort Richardson, Anchorage, Alaska, incident to his change of station in March 1953, such amount being in addition to the amount of \$2,500 already administratively paid to him under the provisions of the Military Personnel Claims Act of 1945, as amended (31 U. S. C. 222c): *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

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

**C. W. O. GEORGE C. CARTER**

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 8310) for the relief of C. W. O. George C. Carter.

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

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to C. W. O. George C. Carter, 537 Meadow Lane, Collinsville, Ill., the sum of \$1,432.35, in full satisfaction and final settlement of his claim against the United States for the destruction of his household goods and personal property by a fire which occurred on December 27, 1954, in the building in which Chief Warrant Officer Carter and his family were residing pursuant to a private rental agreement at the time when he was on duty with the United States Army in France. The amount of \$1,432.35 is in addition to the amount of \$2,500 already administratively paid to him under the provisions of the Military Personnel Claims Act of 1945, as amended (31 U. S. C. 222c): *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

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

**DANIEL O. HULSE, JR.**

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 8311) for the relief of Daniel O. Hulse, Jr.

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

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated to Daniel O. Hulse, Jr., 10233 Sylvia Drive, Dallas 28, Tex., the sum of \$256.20, in full satisfaction and final settlement of his claim against the United States for the destruction of his household goods and personal property by fire on July 15, 1954, while in the custody of an agent of the Government at the warehouse of the Sunset Motor Lines, Dallas, Tex. The shipment was picked up by Army authorities in Fort Bliss, Tex., where Sergeant Hulse was stationed prior to his release from the military service, and had been transported to Dallas, Tex. The amount of \$256.20 is in addition to the amount of \$2,500 already administratively paid to him under the provisions of the Military Personnel Claims Act of 1945, as amended (31 U. S. C. 222c): *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

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

## BARBARA D. COLTHURST

The Clerk called the bill (S. 97) for the relief of Barbara D. Colthurst.

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

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That, notwithstanding the provisions of the Immigration and Nationality Act, the periods of time Barbara D. Colthurst has resided or was physically present in the United States or any State since July 2, 1947, shall be held and considered as compliance with the residence or physical presence requirements of section 316 of the said act.

With the following committee amendment:

After line 8, on page 1, add sections 2 and 3, to read as follows:

"Sec. 2. For the purposes of section 316 (a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Pedro P. Dagamac shall be held and considered to have been physically present in, and a continuous permanent resident of, the United States during the period from February 1946 until November 7, 1952, while temporarily absent from the United States in the employment of the United States Government.

"Sec. 3. Notwithstanding the provisions of the Immigration and Nationality Act, the periods of time Edith Kahler has resided or was physically present in the United States or any State since December 11, 1947, shall be held and considered as compliance with the residence or physical presence requirements of section 316 of the said act."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

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

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill for the relief of Barbara D. Colthurst, Pedro P. Dagamac, and Edith Kahler."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

## MRS. INGEBORG C. KARDE

The Clerk called the bill (S. 213) for the relief of Mrs. Ingeborg C. Karde.

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

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Mrs. Ingeborg C. Karde shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee under such conditions and controls which the Attorney General, after consultation with the Surgeon General of the United States Public Health Service, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, may deem necessary to impose: *Provided*, That a suitable and proper bond or undertaking, approved by the Attorney General, be deposited as prescribed by section 213 of the said act. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following: "That for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act Ingeborg C. Karde, Shigeo Nakamura, and Valdis Mikelsons shall be

held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fees under such conditions and controls which the Attorney General, after consultation with the Surgeon General of the United States Public Health Service, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, may deem necessary to impose: *Provided*, That a suitable and proper bond or undertaking, approved by the Attorney General, be deposited as prescribed by section 213 of the said act. Upon the granting of permanent residence to each alien as provided for in this section of this act, if such alien was classifiable as a quota immigrant at the time of the enactment of this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to reduce by one the quota for the quota area to which the alien is chargeable for the first year that such quota is available.

"Sec. 2. The Attorney General is authorized and directed to discontinue any deportation proceedings and to cancel any outstanding orders and warrants of deportation, warrants of arrest, and bonds, which may have been issued in the cases of Georges Demetelin, Athena Demetelin, Stanley William Wheatland, Mareanthe Baicou, and Peter Skole. From and after the date of enactment of this act, the said persons shall not again be subject to deportation by reason of the same facts upon which such deportation proceedings were commenced or any such warrants and orders have issued.

"Sec. 3. For the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act Domenico Bompiani, Beri Denovi, Mervin Walter Ball, Gordon Thompson Brown, Edward White, Lily Elsie White, Dr. Klaus Hergt, and Stephen Fodo, shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fees."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

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

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to grant the status of permanent residence in the United States to certain aliens and to cancel deportation proceedings in the cases of certain aliens."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

## ASHER EZRACHI

The Clerk called the bill (S. 315) for the relief of Asher Ezrachi.

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

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That notwithstanding the provisions of section 212 (a) (9) and section 212 (a) (19) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Asher Ezrachi may be admitted to the United States for permanent residence if he is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of such Act: *Provided*, That these exemptions shall apply only to grounds for exclusion of which the Department of State or the Department of Justice has knowledge prior to the enactment of this act.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following: "That notwithstanding the provisions of section 212 (a) (9) and (19) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Asher Ezrachi and Ralph Piccolo (Raffaele Piccolo), may be admitted

to the United States for permanent residence if they are found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of such Act: *Provided*, That these exemptions shall apply only to grounds for exclusion of which the Department of State or the Department of Justice had knowledge prior to the enactment of this Act.

"Sec. 2. Notwithstanding the provisions of section 212 (a) (1) and (4) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Bart Krijger may be admitted to the United States for permanent residence if he is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of such act: *Provided*, That this exemption shall apply only to a ground for exclusion of which the Department of State or the Department of Justice had knowledge prior to the enactment of this act: *Provided further*, That a suitable and proper bond or undertaking, approved by the Attorney General, be deposited as prescribed by section 213 of the said act.

"Sec. 3. Notwithstanding the provisions of section 212 (a) (9) and (12) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Anna Jerman Bonito and Esteni Rodriguez Estopinan de Witlicki may be admitted to the United States for permanent residence if they are found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of that act: *Provided*, That these exemptions shall apply only to grounds for exclusions of which the Department of State or the Department of Justice had knowledge prior to the enactment of this act.

"Sec. 4. Notwithstanding the provision of section (6) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Ivan Gerasko may be admitted to the United States for permanent residence, if he is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of such act, under such conditions and controls which the Attorney General, after consultation with the Surgeon General of the United States Public Health Service, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, may deem necessary to impose: *Provided*, That a suitable and proper bond or undertaking, approved by the Attorney General, be deposited as prescribed by section 213 of the said act.

"Sec. 5. Notwithstanding the provision of section 212 (a) (9) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Jose Alvarez, Hildegard Kropfisch Pelloski, George Roland Lavoie, Katharine Lajimodiere (nee Schneeberger), Luigi Cardone, Ingeborg Edith Stallings (nee Nitzki), and Hilde Schiller, may be admitted to the United States for permanent residence if they are found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of such act: *Provided*, That this exemption shall apply only to a ground for exclusion of which the Department of State or the Department of Justice had knowledge prior to the enactment of this act."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

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

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to waive certain provisions of section 212 (a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act in behalf of certain aliens."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RELIEF OF CERTAIN INDIVIDUALS  
WHOSE LAND WAS FLOODED BY  
ACTION OF THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6421) for the relief of certain individuals whose land was flooded by the Federal Government.



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

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That the Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the persons listed in section 2 the sums set forth after their names. The payment of such sums shall be in full settlement of all claims of the persons so named against the United States arising by reason of the flooding of land in the vicinity of Lake Alice, N. Dak., as a result of the activities of the Fish and Wildlife Service in connection with the establishment and maintenance of a migratory wildlife refuge.

Sec. 2. The names of the persons referred to in the first section and the amount claimed by each are as follows: Roy Cowan, \$9,750; Dorothy Gessner, \$1,800; Norris Larson, \$10,300; L. A. Anderson, \$13,650; Albert and Evelyn Moen, \$25,400; Allan Overland and Reuben Overland, \$2,100; Reuben Overland, \$4,000; C. N. Barrett, as agent of certain landowners, \$4,000; Joseph Hartl, \$4,200; Annie Elspenger, \$38,990; John F. Elspenger and Kathleen Elspenger, his wife, \$31,180; Robert M. Elspenger, \$288; Roman F. Elspenger, \$12,100; Bernard F. Lange, \$3,850; Roy A. Noltmiller, \$23,870; Donald Noltmiller and Agatha Noltmiller, his wife, \$29,590; Henry Noltmiller, \$700; Maude Wright Webster, \$8,650; Ewald Henke, \$2,900; Harry L. Overland and Bella Overland, \$25,000; John Magnuson, \$13,750; Roy G. Sylvester and Walter E. Sylvester, \$10,500.

Sec. 3. No part of the amount appropriated in this act for the payment of any one claim in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with such claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

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

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill for the relief of Roy Cowan and others."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### TREASURY, POST OFFICE, TAX COURT APPROPRIATION BILL, 1957

Mr. GARY. 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. 9064) making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments, and the Tax Court of the United States, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes; and pending that motion I ask unanimous consent that general debate on the bill be limited to 3 hours, one-half the time to be controlled by the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. CANFIELD] and one-half by myself.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House

on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 9064, with Mr. COOPER in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may use.

Mr. Chairman, I am happy to report to the House at this time that, although there has been some talk about this session of the Congress being late in getting down to business, this bill is being reported to the House earlier than any regular annual appropriation bill has been reported since the 1933 amendment to the Constitution changing the date of the meeting of the Congress.

I assure my colleagues, however, that this does not mean the bill has been rushed through the committee. Our committee is exceedingly fortunate in that we have as members experienced men who have handled this particular bill for a number of years. Most of you know that my very distinguished colleague the gentleman from New Jersey and I have had the honor of alternating as chairman of this committee for the past 6 or 8 years. When his party is in control of the Congress he serves as chairman of the committee, and when my party has been in control I have had that honor. The gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. CANFIELD] has served on this committee for a number of years and has rendered very outstanding service. In addition, the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. PASSMAN], the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SIEMINSKI], the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. WILSON], and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. JAMES] have served for more than one Congress. They, therefore, are thoroughly familiar with the workings of the two Departments. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MURRAY] is the latest addition to our committee, and he has the benefit of the experience of last year.

Mr. Chairman, may I say that the members of this committee work the year around on this bill. We do not hold hearings and then forget about it. The committee has visited the installations of the Treasury and the Post Office Departments in various parts of the world. We have visited post offices in various parts of the United States, we have visited Coast Guard installations which are scattered far out into the Pacific and into the Atlantic.

In addition to these visitations which offered the committee an opportunity to get firsthand information of the needs of the departments, we had, during the past recess of the Congress, five staff investigations, and the committee had the benefit of the recommendations of those staff reports. We also had one General Accounting Office report dealing with certain phases of the work of the departments. We commenced our hearings almost immediately after the Congress convened and we held sessions morning and afternoon during long, tedious hours. Therefore, I say to you that the bill has been given as thorough consideration as any bill that we have ever brought to the floor of the House; at the same time we are somewhat proud of the fact that we have established a record.

The total amount of budgeted funds covered in this bill is \$20.4 billion. In other words, this bill carries more money than any other appropriation bill that is presented to the House with the exception of the armed services bill. However, the larger part of that amount is moneys over which the committee has no control. For example, the permanent indefinite appropriations which are carried in the bill amount to \$7.8 billion. The largest item in the permanent indefinite appropriations is the interest on the public debt, which is estimated for the fiscal year 1957 at \$7 billion, an increase of \$200 million over 1956. That increase is due largely to the increase in the interest rate on the short-term notes.

The bill also carries \$8.9 billion of trust funds, and in that item there is an increase of \$238 million over 1956. The largest item in these trust funds is the Federal old-age and survivors insurance trust fund, the expenditures from which are estimated at \$7.3 billion for the fiscal year 1957. These are fixed expenditures that our committee cannot revise either up or down.

When these items are eliminated, it leaves estimated expenditures of \$3,649,872,000 for 1957 over which the committee does have jurisdiction. These are the estimated expenditures for the Treasury and Post Office Departments and the Tax Court of the United States. The appropriation for these departments for fiscal 1956 was \$3,332,501,500. The request for 1957 represents an increase over 1956 of \$317,370,500. Our committee recommends \$3,618,699,000, which is a decrease of \$31,173,000 in the estimates presented to us by the departments.

Of the \$286,197,500 increase allowed by our committee over 1956 appropriations, however, I might point out that \$197 million is due to the pay increases which this Congress approved during the last session. That appropriation is broken down into three subtitles, and we will consider first the appropriations for the Treasury Department.

The Congress appropriated for the Treasury for the fiscal year 1956 \$609,611,000. If any of you desire to follow these figures, you can find them tabulated at the end of the committee report beginning on page 17.

The Treasury Department requested \$648,507,000 for the fiscal year 1957. Our committee recommends \$643,434,000. That is an increase of \$33,823,000 over the appropriation for 1956, and a decrease of \$5,073,000 from the 1957 estimates; \$25 million of the increase is due to the pay raise legislation of last year.

I will not discuss each item in the Treasury bill unless there are some questions about them, but I shall discuss briefly the items in which we have granted the largest increases. Let us take up first the Division of Disbursements. Last year we appropriated \$15,475,000 for the Division of Disbursements. They requested \$16,240,000 this year. Our committee recommends \$16,100,000, which is an increase of \$625,000 over 1956 and a decrease of \$140,000 from the 1957 estimate, \$355,000 of the increase is due to the pay increase legis-



lation. The balance is due largely to the increased number of Social Security checks which that division will have to prepare and distribute during the next year. The increase in the number of checks is due to the changes that have been made in the Social Security law by the Congress of the United States.

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

Mr. GARY. I gladly yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. On the subject of the Bureau of the Public Debt I notice that the committee recommends \$45,500,000. Can the gentleman tell me briefly how that money is spent? Is it spent upon advertising, for radio time for the sale of bonds, and so forth?

Mr. GARY. The Public Debt handles all of the transactions relating to the public debt. They have to keep a record of the public debt. They have to keep a record of the holders of bonds. They have to provide for the sale of bonds. A part of the money is spent for the preparation of advertising programs. But I might say to the gentleman, and it is a very remarkable fact, that the Bureau of the Public Debt secures millions of dollars worth of advertising for which it does not pay a single penny.

Mr. GROSS. I understand that, but \$45,500,000 is a pretty substantial sum. The number of employees in this Bureau is not large, is it?

Mr. GARY. Yes. They handle all transactions relating to the public debt. They have a large organization. Our committee has visited their facilities. They have an extensive setup because they have to keep records of all United States bonds. It is a tremendous task when you think of the millions of bonds that are held by individual bond holders in the United States and the records that have to be kept of those individual bond holders.

Mr. GROSS. Is the personnel to be paid in the terms of hundreds or thousands or what?

Mr. GARY. Five million one hundred twenty-four thousand seven hundred dollars is used for the promotion of bond sales. That is the total amount for that item. Practically all of the advertising is free. The television and radio stations donate the time for the programs and the performers donate their time. It is a great and patriotic contribution to the Nation.

Mr. GROSS. Then the other \$40 million goes for the compensation of employees?

Mr. GARY. The other \$40 million goes for the handling of the public debt. There are 3,957 employees in the Bureau. They are required for the handling of the public debt. As a matter of fact, that Bureau asked for only \$1 million increase over last year. Our committee granted them that increase for this reason: The Treasury Department has made very great strides in modernizing the Department, installing electronic machines and various other modern appliances so as to reduce the cost of operation. Very frankly, our committee thought that the Bureau of the Public Debt has not been as active in the modernization program

as some of the other bureaus. We therefore allowed them this additional \$1 million with the understanding that they apply a large part of it next year to the study and the improvement of their methods. I do not want to intimate that the Bureau has not made any progress, but we hope that it will make greater progress next year because of this additional allowance.

The next item is the Bureau of Customs. The appropriation for the Bureau of Customs for 1956 was \$41,200,000. They requested for 1957 \$44,500,000. Our committee recommended \$44,250,000, which is an increase of \$3,050,000 over 1956, and a decrease of \$250,000 from their request. Two million nine hundred thousand dollars of the increase is due to pay-raise legislation. The additional increase recommended by the committee is allowed to permit the examination of more foreign mail packages, that is, the examination of packages coming into this country from abroad. Previous experience convinces the committee that the revenue gain from the examination of this foreign mail will more than offset the cost of the examination.

The next item is the Internal Revenue Service, and this is, of course, one of the larger divisions of the Treasury Department and one of the most important, because that is the division that collects the taxes that are so necessary to operate the Government.

The appropriation for the Internal Revenue Service for 1956 was \$282,250,000. The estimates for 1957 are \$307,850,000.

Our committee recommends \$305 million, which is an increase of \$22,750,000 over 1956 and a decrease in the estimates of \$2,850,000. The pay raise legislation accounts for \$19 million of the increase.

The increase allowed over and above the pay increase is due largely to the addition to the legal staff to permit the preparation and issuance of ruling pertaining to the Internal Revenue Code of 1954. That code, as you all know, made very great changes in the law and a larger staff is required to prepare and issue rulings carrying the new law into effect.

Moreover, additional staff members are required in the unit responsible for the collection of taxes from United States citizens residing overseas.

Several discussions which arose in the Internal Revenue Service hearings were very interesting. One has gained considerable publicity throughout the United States and relates to the fact that certain professional boxers in the United States are delinquent in the payment of their income taxes. Apparently there is no provision in the present law for withholding taxes on amounts they receive from the boxing matches in which they engage because they are not employees. They are considered to be independent contractors and consequently at least 1 or 2 boxers have gotten way behind in their income tax payments. When the Treasury Department attempted to collect the tax, their earning capacity had so seriously diminished that it has been difficult, if not impossible, to collect the taxes due. Our committee insisted that the Treasury Department give this mat-

ter very serious study and attempt to work out a method of handling these cases which will avoid recurrences in the future.

Another situation arose in one of our principal cities where a very outstanding citizen died and it was found on his death that he had not reported his income tax for a number of years. His estate was then assessed a million or more dollars in back taxes.

This incident resulted in an investigation which disclosed that there were a number of other people in that community who had failed to file returns. Our committee feels that the Internal Revenue Service should have exercised greater diligence in these cases, and we have so expressed ourselves. Every effort should be made to collect taxes at the time they are due and when the taxpayer has the money with which to pay them.

We also had some discussion with reference to the new training school. You will remember that 2 years ago the Congress authorized a training school for the revenue employees. Our staff interviewed a number of those attending the school last year. They reported to us that the employees attending the school, were of the opinion that the courses were too academic and not enough related to the duties of a tax assessor. The new Commissioner of Internal Revenue assured us that he would give this matter immediate attention. We trust that this will result in more practical courses in the future.

The next item is the Bureau of Narcotics. This is a very important bureau of the Treasury Department, particularly at the present time when the use of narcotics is becoming such a blight in the United States. That bureau was allowed for 1956 \$2,990,000. For 1957, they asked for \$3,250,000 which is an increase of \$260,000. Our committee recommended the full amount. We did not feel that in face of the problems which the Bureau has before it we should attempt to cut down on the appropriation at this time. The \$260,000 increase which they have requested will provide additional pay of \$155,000, and 15 additional agents for enforcement of the narcotic laws in the troubled areas of the United States.

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

Mr. GARY. I yield.

Mr. HIESTAND. May we have just a brief statement from the gentleman on the testimony of Narcotics Bureau in asking additional amounts and only 15 additional agents? This is the most serious problem of the Nation, and I am wondering what we can do with only 15 additional agents.

Mr. GARY. Our committee felt, and so does the Bureau of Narcotics, that the prime duty of enforcing the narcotics law should be left with the States and the localities. The moment we intimate to the localities or the States that we are going to step into this field and take over, we are going to lose the benefit of thousands of enforcement officers throughout the United States who are now engaged in enforcing this law. What the Bureau of Narcotics attempts



to do is to handle the interstate and foreign aspects of the matter. For example, we allowed them several agents a few years ago to operate abroad. We cannot do anything abroad except pick up information, and work in collaboration with the foreign governments. But those agents have been instrumental in breaking up large international narcotic rings. There are certain areas in the United States where the situation is particularly acute at this time and Dr. Anslinger, who I think is one of the ablest administrators in the Government, says if we give him these 15 agents he believes he can handle the problem from the Federal standpoint at the present time. But, we are never going to get to the point where the Federal Government can take over this narcotics-enforcement program. We must have the cooperation of the States and the localities, and it is the policy of the Bureau, to cooperate with the State and local officers in enforcing the law locally.

Mr. HESTAND. I thank the gentleman. However, I am sure we are all agreed in the soundness of the fundamental policy of having the enforcement local; there is no argument there. I am sure we all agree in commending the excellent work of the Commissioner and the Bureau in the good things it has done. However, this is interstate traffic, and I still cannot see how it is with an additional 15 men that it will make any appreciable difference in choking off this interstate traffic which the local enforcement officers are not privileged to enforce or capable of enforcing.

Mr. GARY. Our committee allowed them the full amount requested. We never cut their request a single penny. We allowed the Bureau what it said was necessary. Two reports on this subject have been released within the last few days. One by a Senate committee which has been investigating this matter. The other, by a Cabinet committee which made a study at the request of the President. If the Congress, after a study of these reports, considers additional agents justified, they can be added later. However, we have given the Bureau everything it asked for.

The next item is the United States Secret Service, which we have given an increase over 1956 of \$456,000, of which \$261,000 represents pay increase. The additional amount will provide five new agents to take care of the backlog of work which has piled up in the Department.

United States Coast Guard: This appropriation was \$195,053,000 in 1956. The request for 1957 was \$202 million. The committee recommends \$200,250,000, an increase of \$5,197,000 over 1956 and a decrease of \$1,750,000 on the request; \$690,000 of the increase is for pay raise and the balance provides for the operation of 10 additional loran stations, a modification of the radar installations on certain ships, and the modification of aircraft, including helicopters. The loran stations are part of the national defense program.

We come now to the Post Office Department.

In 1956 for the Post Office Department we appropriated \$2,721,720,500. They

requested for 1957 an even \$3 billion. The committee recommends \$2,973,900,000, which is an increase of \$252,179,500 over the 1956 appropriations.

Of that amount, \$172 million is due to pay raise; the balance is due to an estimated increase in the volume of mail.

Last year the House, at the recommendation of our committee, cut the Post Office Department \$69,117,000. The Senate restored practically every bit of it; they restored \$68,404,000. Then we went to conference, and the final cut was \$33,096,500. This year, I want to say to you very frankly, the Post Office sent over a very much closer estimate than in 1956. Therefore, instead of recommending to you a cut of \$69 million this year, we are recommending a cut of only \$26,100,000. We feel that the Post Office can stand that without any difficulty. They told us last year when we cut them \$33 million that they could not operate on that figure. They have operated on that figure, and they say they believe they are going to be able to finish the year without asking for any additional money. I compliment them for it, because we did cut them heavily last year. I believe, however, that this year they will be able to operate on the amount the committee recommends without any difficulty.

I want to call attention to one other item, and that is the postal deficit.

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

Mr. GARY. I shall be glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. JENNINGS. A newspaper circulated in my district published an editorial commending the Postmaster General and attributed the decrease of about \$364 million in the postal deficit from the fiscal year 1952 to the fiscal year 1955 to the use of better business methods by the Post Office Department. Is that editorial observation correct?

Mr. GARY. No; I was just getting ready to discuss that. The editorial is not correct in two respects. In the first place, they misquoted the Postmaster General. He never claimed the reduction in the deficit was due to better business methods and more efficient operation as the newspaper alleged. In the second place, the reduction was not due to those causes.

It is true that the deficit was \$727 million in 1952 and that it had dropped to \$363 million in 1955.

In the \$727 million deficit of 1952, however, we had an item for franked mail of \$1,700,000. That is the mail that we Members of Congress send out during the year. We now appropriate to the Congress money for the franked mail and that money is paid to the Post Office Department. In my judgment that is proper as there is no reason why the Post Office Department should be charged with the mail of the Congress. The same is true with the penalty mail for the various departments. There is no reason why the Post Office Department should be charged with the mail that they handle free for other departments. Now we appropriate the money to the various departments for them to pay to the Post Office Department. That

amounted to \$54,200,000. Then we had in the accounts of the Post Office Department the airmail subsidies which should never have been in there. That item which amounted to \$67 million has been transferred to the Civil Aeronautics Administration. This makes a total of \$122,900,000 that was transferred from the Post Office Department by book-keeping entries to various other departments.

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

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

Mr. MASON. Would the gentleman not say that was due to better business management on the part of the Congress?

Mr. GARY. I would, and I am glad to say that I was one of those who advocated those changes. They were very proper changes, and I am not criticizing them. I am merely trying to answer the gentleman's question.

In addition to these changes, we have had one increase in parcel post rates which was instituted by the previous administration and carried through by this administration, which brings in \$151 million in additional revenue. So that \$273,900,000 of the deficit is due to changes made by the Congress in the laws. However, that leaves a balance of approximately \$90 million unaccounted for. The Post Office Department has put in some innovations and may with good reason claim that this \$90 million is due largely to improved methods adopted by the Department.

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

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

Mr. SPRINGER. During the last several years the committee of which I am a member has traveled in various countries of the world. One of the things that has come to my attention, which has nothing to do with my committee, is important. That is that practically every mail system in existence, except ours, pays its own way. Can the gentleman comment on that?

Mr. GARY. I was going to comment on that.

The situation is as follows and this is what I particularly call attention to. The deficit decreased from \$727 million to \$363 million in 1955. In 1956 it is estimated it will go back up to \$420 million, and in 1957 that it will go up to \$470 million. This is due largely to the increase in postal salaries. I am not criticizing this increase. I thought it was justified and voted for it. But you cannot increase the salaries of postal employees and the other operating expenses of the Department without increasing the deficit. When the costs of handling the mail increase and the postal rates remain fixed, a deficit is bound to result. The only answer to getting rid of the deficit is to increase the mail rates and I am happy to say that our committee has recommended such an increase over a long period of time.

Mr. SPRINGER. Would the gentleman tell me in connection with what classifications his committee has recommended increases?

Mr. GARY. We have not recommended increases in any particular classification. We do not feel that is within the province of our committee. Postal rate legislation is handled by the Committee on the Post Office and Civil Service. We have never tried to take over the functions of any other committee of the Congress. However, we do say that the Post Office Department should be more nearly self-sustaining than it is now, and that there should not be a deficit of a half-billion dollars a year. We have, therefore, recommended that the Congress give serious consideration to the question of increased postal rates without making recommendations as to any particular classification.

Mr. SPRINGER. Is that the gentleman's recommendation now, for this year?

Mr. GARY. Yes.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARY. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. I have read with much satisfaction and am in complete agreement with the following section of the report appearing on page 9 under title II, Post Office Department:

The postal deficit having reached the estimated figure of \$470 million, the committee cannot avoid again expressing concern that some action must be taken to get postal rates more appropriate to the costs of the service. Many items previously charged to the postal service, but not properly a part of operating costs (airline subsidies, etc.) have now either been eliminated or transferred to a more proper place in the Federal fiscal structure. There remain in these appropriation items but the costs of handling the mails, and it is obvious that the presently established rates are woefully inadequate to compensate for such necessary expenditures.

I would like to ask the gentleman first, was that part of the report completely approved by your committee?

Mr. GARY. Yes.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Was it also approved by the entire Committee on Appropriations?

Mr. GARY. So far as I know.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. As the gentleman knows, for the past 10 years there has been a deficit amounting to \$10 billion in the Post Office Department. Does the gentleman also realize that if this deficit is to be reduced appreciably or curtailed, there must be an increase in the first-class mail rates?

Mr. GARY. I stated that our committee has not taken any position whatever as to the classes of mail that should be increased. The gentleman from Tennessee is the chairman of the committee whose duty it is to consider measures of that kind. It is not our desire to encroach upon your prerogatives, Mr. Chairman. We are perfectly willing to leave that matter to the tender graces of your committee.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. I will ask the gentleman if he read the letter of the Postmaster General proposing an increase in postal rates which was sent to the Congress just a few days ago by the President of the United States.

Mr. GARY. Yes.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Now, the Postmaster General is proposing an

increase of a little less than \$400 million in the postal rates. Of that amount \$295 must come from raising the first-class rate from 3 to 4 cents. You can raise the second-class mail rate 30 percent, as the Postmaster General proposes, but it will only raise \$17 million. You can raise your third-class mail rate 30 percent, practically one-third, and it would only amount to \$77 million. What I would like to know from the gentleman is if the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service reports out a bill increasing adequately the first-, second-, and third-class rates, does that signify that our Committee on Post Office and Civil Service can depend upon the enthusiastic support of every member of the Committee on Appropriations?

Mr. GARY. I cannot speak for the members of the Committee on Appropriations other than what we have said in this report. I believe if your committee comes out with a bill which will fairly increase the various classifications of mail, that our committee will support it. I can give the gentleman my assurance that I will support it.

Mr. SIEMINSKI. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a correction?

Mr. GARY. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. SIEMINSKI. The gentleman from Tennessee stated that the deficit was \$10 billion in 10 years. It was \$5 billion.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Five billion dollars. That is correct.

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

Mr. GARY. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. CANFIELD. Speaking for the minority on this subcommittee, I am sure I concur in the statement of the chairman. It is about time we were realistic and faced the facts of life and took care of this situation.

Mr. MURRAY of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. MURRAY of Illinois. I would like to call the attention of the House on this question of rates to this. One of the reasons I expect it is so different to determine what class of mail the rate of increase should go on is disclosed by testimony given in our committee when I questioned the officials of the Post Office Department in connection with the allocation of cost on an experimental airmail basis by which a 3-cent letter is sent by air, and the cost of that experimental air transportation, although one would think that it would be allocated to the 3-cent letter, is actually allocated to the cost of air transportation.

I think, though, that I concur that there is a need of an increase in postal rates and that before we decide on which classification of mail should bear those increases, we should make a very close inquiry into cost allocations.

Mr. GARY. I thank the gentleman.

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

Mr. GARY. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GROSS. Last year Congress passed a bill increasing the salaries of some 2 million classified workers. Can

the gentleman tell me how the revenue was increased to take care of the deficit incurred by those salary increases?

Mr. GARY. So far as I know, the revenue was not increased in any way.

Mr. GROSS. All those salary increases are charged up to the general tax revenues, are they not?

Mr. GARY. That is right.

Mr. GROSS. I do not understand what the shooting is all about in attempting to put rates upon the public for service commensurate with expenditures of the department which provides that service.

Mr. GARY. The Post Office Department renders special service to particular people. It renders a special service to those who use the mails. Our committee has felt that the users of the mails should pay for that service. There is no reason why the taxpayers of the Nation should be called upon to pay for that service. The taxpayers of the Nation should not be required to pay the cost of the junk mail which is sent to them against their wishes and which they promptly throw into the trash basket.

Why should not that class of mail pay its own way? Why should not all classes of mail pay their own way? Let the user of the post office pay for the service that is rendered him.

Mr. GROSS. But the gentleman very well knows that if there is to be any balancing of the post-office budget it will have to come through an increase in the first class mail rate. There are no special users of the first class letter rate. Every man, woman, and child in this country who can write may use and does use first-class mail.

Mr. GARY. Personally I have never advocated that the Post Office Department must absolutely pay its way because I can see that there are some publications which might be given some preference in the handling of the mail. I am convinced, however, that this Government should not operate a Post Office Department at an annual deficit of half a billion dollars a year. In determining which classifications should be increased I think we should see what classes of users are being subsidized and we should put them on a self-paying basis. If first class mail is not paying its own way I say by all means first-class rates should be increased. But if first-class mail is paying its own way I see no reason for increasing the rate on first class mail and permitting other users of mail to enjoy large subsidies.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman well knows that first class mail is the only service showing a profit.

Mr. GARY. I am not certain of that.

Mr. GROSS. Of more than \$100 million a year. The Department admits that.

Mr. GARY. It was at one time more than paying its way. Since the recent increases I am not certain. Maybe local first-class mail pays its own way. But certainly the gentleman would not say that when one pays 3 cents to carry a letter from Washington to California that the 3 cents covers the cost of handling that mail.



Mr. GROSS. Especially if it goes by air as many of them do. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SPRINGER] raised the question of the foreign postal services' paying their own way. The gentleman will agree, will he not, that our dishing out of a good many billions of dollars has helped them to maintain their postal services, in some instances at a higher level than the service given the people of the United States? Only a few days ago we learned that every civil servant in Italy, a million of them, in a country with a population of some 40 million people, had an increase. The Government frankly admits that they have no money with which to pay the increase. One of the top officials in the Government, I believe the Finance Minister, has resigned because the increase has been authorized. Where do you suppose they are going to get the money to pay the increase to the civil servants in Italy? It is through the appropriations bill for the foreign giveaway program in this House.

Mr. GARY. That is not involved in this bill.

Mr. GROSS. It is by way of comparison.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARY. I yield.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. First-class mail is not paying its way. The crying need is for an increase in first-class mail outside of the local mail from 3 to 4 cents. Statistics show that from 75 to 80 percent of all first-class mail is being used by those who are using the mail for profit. Why should not those who are using first-class mail pay more? And why should we continue to subsidize the second- and third-class mail users?

Mr. GARY. The last item in our bill is the Tax Court of the United States. We have made no change in their request.

They are requesting slightly more funds, but their increase is due entirely to the salary increases and the fact that they will have a couple of extra retired judges next year.

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

Mr. Chairman, I, too, am very proud of this subcommittee handling this bill here today. I am very proud of its product.

I want to say a special word about the distinguished gentleman from Virginia who chairs our committee. I do not know of any person serving in the Congress of the United States in either body who is more sincere, more dedicated, and who works harder than he.

I, too, want to discuss these perennial problems of the Post Office Department, problems that we must solve if we are to continue to give the American public efficient postal service. First, of course, is that of the postal deficit just discussed by the chairman. In the past 10 years the costs of the Post Office Department have exceeded its revenues by almost \$5 billion. This huge sum is now costing the American taxpayers more than \$100 million a year in interest alone. We cannot in good conscience keep on dodging the cost of our own postal bill and passing it on to our children and their children to pay.

During the past 3 years, Mr. Chairman, major postal improvements and savings have been made. Despite this, the yearly postal deficit now approximates one-half billion dollars of which \$200 million is for pay raises and other employee benefits enacted by the Congress during the previous session.

The Post Office Department is losing money in such huge amounts for one primary reason. It is still charging 1932 rates but paying 1956 costs. Letter rates are the same today as they were in 1932. Second-class mail rates on magazines and newspapers have increased only by 3 percent net since 1932.

The distinguished gentleman from Iowa who discussed this matter briefly a moment ago may not subscribe to some of the major magazines and periodicals printed in the United States of America, but even though he does not subscribe he has to pay part of the freight through general taxation. He has to pay part of the postage on magazines and periodicals which editorially, week after week, and month after month, speak out against Federal subsidies—yes, Federal subsidies—all except their own.

Third class rates for advertising matter and small parcels have increased only one-third since 1932. Yet, all postal operating costs are up 107 percent since 1932. The pay of postal clerks is up 103 percent. City carriers' pay is up 106 percent. Rural carriers' pay is up 118 percent. Railroad costs are up 90 percent. Postal transportation service wages are up 102 percent. Cost of trucks, and that is a big cost, is up 206 percent.

During this period when this country is so prosperous and yet so heavily in debt, continuing to run our postal operations at a loss encourages fiscal irresponsibility throughout the whole Government. As you know, we are the only major Nation in the world that does not operate its Post Office Department on break even or better basis. Our neighbor Canada has shown a surplus in its postal operations for 17 of the past 20 years. The excess of income over outgo of the Canadian postal system during these two decades approximates \$100 million. As far as I can determine, there is only one other major nation operating its postal system on a deficit basis as we do, and that country is Argentina. In keeping with this administration's insistence on fiscal integrity in Government, Postmaster General Summerfield is urging an increase in postage rates so that actual users of the mail will assume the costs that they are now passing on to the general public. Any sizable cut in the postal deficit is dependent on an increase in first-class mail postage, the mail postage that gets all the preferential treatment. The Department has, therefore, recommended an increase of 1 cent per ounce for first-class mail, which would yield about \$295 million each year in new revenue as pointed out by the distinguished gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. MURRAY] who heads the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

For second class mail, mainly newspapers and magazines, the Postmaster General proposes two successive annual

increases of approximately 15 percent each. This, in effect, will bring in about \$17 million more a year. For such mail, the Department now receives about 2½ cents per pound in postage but spends about 11½ cents to handle each pound, without including the recent pay increases.

On third-class mail, mainly advertising matter, the Department proposes a rate increase averaging 30 percent, which would produce approximately \$77 million in new revenue.

The second serious problem facing the Post Office Department is the inadequacy of its postal plant.

For nearly 20 years the physical plant of the Post Office Department has lagged behind the Nation's growth during a time when mail volume was doubling. Since 1938 no money has been appropriated by the Congress for the construction of postal buildings.

Most of the 25,000 postal units in rented, leased, or Federal buildings now used by the Department are badly in need of modernization or enlargement.

Many present buildings need replacement. In fact the Postmaster General estimates that 3,500 new postal buildings distributed throughout the country are needed now.

Much of the work today in our post offices is done with outmoded equipment, in congested buildings, built 50 or more years ago.

A badly needed large scale new building and modernization program, extending over a minimum of 5 years time, and costing approximately \$780 million is urgently needed now. It should be accomplished simultaneously with the postage rate increases I have already discussed.

Only when our postage rates are increased, and our postal buildings and equipment modernized can we expect the Post Office Department and its one-half million splendid employees to meet properly the ever growing postal requirements of this great Nation.

I earnestly hope this Congress will meet this responsibility and take steps to assure the American people with a continuously improving mail service.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANFIELD. I yield.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. I would like to commend the gentleman for this very fine presentation. He has brought out the great necessity of increasing postal rates. I do not think anyone can deny it, unless we want to say that the Post Office Department is purely a service department, in which case we should all be given franked envelopes and allowed to send anything we want at the taxpayers' expense.

Mr. CANFIELD. Most certainly we would be unique in saying that, because no other major country in the world says that.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. The gentleman is absolutely right. When we try to say that on account of our so-called giveaway programs those nations are able to make their postal departments pay, I can tell the gentleman that is not correct. I was in Europe all summer studying this question, and they told me,

everywhere I went, that it would be an unheard-of thing to allow the postal department to operate at a deficit; that their own people would not stand for it and have never stood for it. I think if this was put up to our people, the gentleman would find that they are definitely in favor of an adequate postal rate.

Mr. CANFIELD. May I say that from time to time national polls have been conducted on the willingness of the American postal patrons to meet this issue. Those polls indicated that far more than 80 percent of the patrons want this operation to be conducted on a businesslike basis and that they are willing to pay the freight. So are the New York Times and the Scripps-Howard newspapers and many others interested in this problem.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. I might say to the gentleman that I spoke to one of our biggest magazine publishers, and he said to me it would be quite proper for them to pay a higher cost, and he added that "we would still make plenty of money." I said, "I have long suspected that."

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

Mr. CANFIELD. I yield.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman would not deny the fact that the billions of dollars that we have handed out to governments overseas has helped them with their economies and the maintenance of the services of those governments? The gentleman would not deny that?

Mr. CANFIELD. That may be so, but that is not any reason why we should not meet this issue face to face. I am willing to do it, and I hope the gentleman from Iowa is willing to do it also.

Mr. GROSS. I will say to the gentleman that I take issue with this beautiful prosperity picture that he paints, that everything is lovely and the goose hangs high. It does not work out that way in my country. A day or two ago legislation was passed giving the farmers a refund on gasoline consumed on the farms. Now, to pass a bill increasing the first-class postage rates would take some of that money away from them again.

Mr. CANFIELD. I want to say to the gentleman that I have not discussed nor do I propose to discuss geese. I am discussing this issue right here before us.

Mr. GROSS. I will say to the gentleman that we do not have the prosperity in the Middle West that he speaks about.

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

Mr. CANFIELD. I yield to my friend from Illinois.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I am told that in Chicago they now have stamp vending machines which when you put in your nickel or dime not only delivers your stamps, but then a sweet voice says, "Thank you." My constituents write saying they understand that the Post Office Department paid a good deal of money for these machines. May I ask the gentleman is this intended to soften up the opposition to a 4-cent stamp? Does it hold out the prospect that when and if the 4-cent stamp is forced on the people the dose will be

made more palatable by having the sweet little voice in the vending machines sing out: "Thank you so much; come lick me some more."

Mr. CANFIELD. I shall be glad to discuss that item for my good friend and colleague from Illinois.

The procurement of seven experimental models of the patron-operated changemaking stamp-vending machines—these machines are called the Stampmaster—for streamlined installations is only one item in our overall streamlined self-service project. The practical objective of this project is to reduce the man-hours required to provide necessary window service and to provide after-hours self-service facilities for postal patrons in the major offices. It will be a 24-hour around-the-clock operation.

The Department purchased and installed 1,500 patron-operated stamp-vending machines manufactured by the Commercial Controls Corp. more than 50 years ago. In addition the Department procured and installed 70 metered postage Mail-o-Mats from the Pitney-Bowes Co.; also, the Department is now considering proposals for vending machines to sell stamped paper, stamped envelopes and post cards.

The use of these vending machines will permit the consolidation or closing of numerous stamp windows and help cut these long stamp window lines at holiday times and in rush hours.

The Department did not have a developmental contract on these latest machines but the manufacturer developed and built the new Stampmaster at their own expense. The prototype of the Stampmaster, like any other equipment, is much more costly than the production model, since the prototype is hand-made.

The talking feature of the new Stampmaster is a relatively inexpensive item. It is planned to experiment with this type of announcer for educational purposes; for example—this is what concerns the gentleman—the public can be advised to use the new certified mail service, to complete carefully the new money order forms, to remind patrons of early holiday and overseas mailing, and to announce new postal services as they are provided.

Comment regarding this that you have heard over TV and radio and in newspaper columns does not tell the whole story by any means.

The talking tape, may I say to my friend from Illinois, was not in the specifications for which the Post Office Department contracted; it was added by the contractor without charge to the first seven models as an experiment to test whether the Department would want to purchase it on future orders for stamp vending machines.

I know a lot about the gentleman from Illinois, and all that I know is good. I know he is the kind of fellow who, when somebody renders him a service, is quick to say, "Thank you."

I do not know whether he drives his own car, but if he does he is the kind of fellow who now and then yields to the other person. For the life of me I can-

not see why there is all the to-do about this experimental purchase which really is not costing the United States Government a cent.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. May I say to the gentleman that the reason I addressed the question to him is because of my great regard for the gentleman and my great affection for him. In my esteem there is not a finer gentleman or a statesman of higher caliber in this body than the distinguished and beloved statesman from New Jersey.

Mr. CANFIELD. And I reciprocate those sentiments.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. I appreciate the gentleman informing me of the facts as he finds and believes them. I was relieved to learn that the sweet voice of seduction in the vending machines is not really 15 years old. It is a new voice and, as the gentleman explains, the circumstances of its maturity, it all seems to be along a certain pattern, recently set by another Cabinet member who pinned the blame for his self-confessed boner onto a little woman who earns her daily bread as secretary to a press agent. I am grateful for the information that in the present instance the Postmaster General disclaims having anything to do with this vending machine voice. As a matter of gallantry I would say it is much preferable to pin the blame on a man contractor instead of a little woman secretary. The contractor thought it would be a good thing to put the "We thank you" into the apparatus.

Mr. CANFIELD. Yes; and may I say to the gentleman I think it is a good thing, too. It is wholesome; it follows the best American tradition.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. I agree with the gentleman that courtesy and gentleness give a richness to life that we all could spare, but let us not charge the little American people 1 cent more on their letters to pay for a metallic voice saying "We thank you."

#### BUREAU OF NARCOTICS

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I desire now to say a few words about a small bureau in the Treasury Department currently operating under an annual appropriation of about \$3 million and doing a heroic job to prevent the flow into our country of illicit narcotics and to stamp out with the cooperation of State and local authorities drug addiction in the United States which unfortunately is now increasing monthly.

The Federal Bureau of Narcotics has approximately 250 enforcement agents. A report recently filed by Senator DANIEL on behalf of a Senate committee states that New York City alone has more full-time narcotics agents than the Federal Government. This report holds that a minimum of 50 additional agents should be provided at the earliest possible moment.

Two years ago I called to my office here on Capitol Hill, Mr. Chapman Rose, Assistant Secretary of the Treasury, having jurisdiction over this Bureau, for a discussion of the national narcotics problem and I then suggested that he take up with the President the formation of an interdepartmental committee to review all phases. This was done.



While our committee has allowed in this bill all the funds requested by the Bureau of Narcotics for the new fiscal year, we did not have before us during the hearings or at the time of our markup, the first report of this interdepartmental committee. This report was publicized only yesterday.

The committee, consisting of members of the President's Cabinet, recommends stiffer prison terms, more enforcement agents, and a greater coordination of Federal-State drives to combat illicit traffic in narcotics. In releasing the report, President Eisenhower urged early and effective action on all fronts to stamp out this awful menace.

Commissioner Harry Anslinger, who heads the Federal Bureau of Narcotics and who, all students of the problem agree, is the world's greatest authority on narcotics addiction, has oftentimes told our committee, and he did so again this year, that there are too many courts prone to mete out low sentences. He emphasizes that where stiff sentences are imposed the traffic usually moves to areas generally those where sentences are not so severe. The Commissioner feels that it is definitely the responsibility of the Federal Bureau of Narcotics to help foreign police break up international gangs sending this stuff to our shores and to do everything possible to prevent its entry, also to get the interstate trafficker, leaving local enforcement to State and municipal authorities. Our committee has said repeatedly in its reports that unless there is real honest-to-goodness enforcement on the State and local level, we are never going to win this important battle.

In the 32 years I have been living and working in the Nation's Capitol City, I have never been shocked more than when it was developed about 2 years ago that the officer in charge of the Metropolitan Police Department's narcotics squad was charged with being part and parcel of a dope racket. It pleases me now to hear of the dedication of the present Chief of Police and his officers and men to meet this challenge and do a good job. It pleases me also that the courts of the District of Columbia have in recent years taken a more realistic approach and are handing out stiffer sentences.

It is my hope that on the basis of the recommendations made by the President's Interdepartmental Committee and the Daniel's committee in the Senate the Treasury Department will without delay make recommendations to the Congress for stiffer prison terms for violators of the narcotics laws and will come before our committee with a request for funds for an increased number of enforcement agents. Meanwhile, more Federal authorities should exercise the proper leadership in obtaining stronger Federal-State and local cooperation. Commissioner Anslinger tells us that he is receiving reports of 1,000 additional addicts each month. That is 1,000 too many and the Congress must do its part in meeting this challenge.

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

Mr. CANFIELD. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HIESTAND. I am happy to comment on the opinion of a great many people that the enforcement of the laws and the stiffening of the sentences in the State represented by the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. CANFIELD] who is now addressing us, has very, very largely reduced the problem in that State.

Mr. CANFIELD. May I say to my friend right here that I am so happy that the Commissioner of Narcotics told our committee not only this year but he told us last year that my State and Mr. SIEMSKI's State of New Jersey stands out as No. 1; No. 1 in the Nation in enforcement and No. 1 in the type of stiff sentences handed out by the courts in New Jersey. And, I am so proud of that.

Mr. HIESTAND. I think the Congress and the Nation certainly can well congratulate the great State of New Jersey. However, the problem as I see it is one of interstate law enforcement. The chairman remarked that your committee had recommended or requested enlargement of the enforcement officer staff. Am I to understand that your committee will approve or recommend to the Congress any additional staff that the Commissioner shall subsequently recommend?

Mr. CANFIELD. Knowing our committee's concern about this problem, knowing something about its dedication to meet this awful challenge, I feel quite ready and free to say now that if the Treasury Department comes down to us tomorrow with a request for additional agents, be it 50 or be it some other reasonable number, our committee will accord that request immediate consideration and unanimous support.

Mr. HIESTAND. I thank the gentleman.

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

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

Mr. SADLAK. I want to commend the gentleman for the vigorous presentation he is making. It is perhaps unfortunate that the subcommittee of the Committee on Ways and Means on narcotics has not as yet presented its report of its findings of hearings that have been held down at Lexington, New York City, San Francisco, Seattle, and Chicago, in addition to hearings that have been held here in Washington. I am sure, when the report and recommendations by our committee are presented, we will have the full help and cooperation of the gentleman and of his committee. The pushers of narcotics must be dealt with severely when presented to the courts on their first offense. A severe mandatory sentence will have a salutary effect in this vicious trade.

Mr. CANFIELD. There is no question about that. I thank my friend from Connecticut.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANFIELD. I am happy to yield to the distinguished gentleman from Kansas, former chairman of the House Committee on Civil Service and Post Office, who knows so much concerning post office matters.

Mr. REES of Kansas. I thank the gentleman. I want to commend the gen-

tleman from New Jersey who presently has the floor. I also want to pay tribute to the chairman of this subcommittee the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. GARY], for the careful study you have made in respect to the problems involved in the legislation you have submitted today. Explanations on both sides of the aisle have been unusually clear. I see no reason why anyone in the House today should leave the floor and say that he did not understand the bill as presented here. Both leaders have done a good job in their presentation.

There is one comment I should like to make, which relates to the matter of postal rates. It is unfortunate, I think, that the people across the country have been imbued with the idea that 3-cent postage pays its own way. Unfortunately, so many think this to be a fact, and therefore feel there ought not be an increase in that rate. Of course, if the public are not in favor of sufficient postage to pay its own way, that is something else. But, as the gentleman has well explained and as the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. GARY] has well stated—and I think both gentlemen have done an exceptionally good job in getting this information across to the people of this country—we do have a postal deficit not only in third-class and in second-class mail, but also in first-class mail. But it is for the people to decide whether to support an increase in these rates or let all of the deficiency be charged against the Federal Treasury.

Permit me, also, to join with the gentleman from New Jersey in paying tribute to the Postmaster General and his associates in their efforts to provide this country with an efficient postal system.

Mr. CANFIELD. The gentleman is correct. I am very sorry now, before I close, to have to make this statement. I have come to the conclusion that the Congress of the United States is not ready, is not equipped, to meet this problem. It may be that until the time comes when we can set up an independent agency to treat the issue realistically and squarely, we will not be able to run the Post Office Department of the United States on a business basis.

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

Mr. CANFIELD. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. TEAGUE of California. I should like to make this observation, if I may, as a freshmen, perhaps a naive Member of this body. But I believe we underestimate the good sense and judgment of the American voter. Recently I sent out a questionnaire through my district and 75 percent of the voters of both parties, a cross-section, indicated that they felt an increase of all classes of postal rates was justified and would not in any way oppose that.

Mr. CANFIELD. I thank the gentleman; I want to say to him I have never known anybody in the House who thought the gentleman was naive in any sense of the word. We all appreciate the wonderful contribution he is making and his dedication to his assignment.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. PASSMAN].

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Chairman, it is always a pleasure to pay tribute to the very able chairman of this subcommittee, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. GARY], for his determination to report a good bill to the floor for consideration. Mr. GARY is fair, impartial, courteous, and efficient, and incidentally, my regard is equally as high for the former chairman of this Subcommittee on Appropriations, Mr. CANFIELD, of New Jersey.

Now, Mr. Chairman, while we are passing out bouquets, I think it would be proper to again bring to the attention of the subcommittee that Postmaster General Arthur E. Summerfield and Assistant Postmaster General Norman R. Abrams are doing an outstanding job in handling the affairs of the Post Office Department.

General Summerfield has brought to the Post Office Department as his assistants some of the finest businessmen in the Nation. He, too, is one of America's outstanding and highly successful businessmen.

The appropriation bill before the Committee at this time is indeed of the atomic-jet type in an atomic-jet age. Yet, it is to a large extent being supported financially by horse-and-buggy postal rates.

On yesterday I received an airmail letter from a constituent which read in part as follows:

DEAR MR. PASSMAN: I have been keeping up with your work in Congress and I think a majority of the people feel that you are doing a good job. I observed your great courage and the courage of the Congress in voting well deserved salary increases for postal employees. I wonder if you and other Members of Congress would display as much courage and vote for an increase in postal rates and stop subsidizing newspapers, magazines, other periodicals and big business.

Yours very truly,

PAUL MCKENZIE,  
601 Victoria Street, Monroe, La.

Mr. Chairman, the American people are now aware that the operating deficit of the Post Office Department is made up largely of subsidies to business which includes newspapers, magazines and periodicals which are in business primarily to make a profit on their investment.

It has been pointed out that in the past 10 years the cost of operating the Post Office Department has exceeded its revenues by almost \$5 billion. Of course, this \$5 billion had to be paid with borrowed money and increases the public debt by \$5 billion.

I have no apologies to offer for praising General Summerfield and General Abrams and other officials of the Post Office Department. They have done a good job and are continuing to improve the postal service, but notwithstanding these facts, the operating loss of the postal establishment for the current fiscal year will approach \$500 million. Why is this true? Simply because we are charging 1932 postal rates but paying 1956 costs. May I remind you that letter rates are the same today as they were in 1932. Can you imagine such gross neglect as to permit this condition to exist?

Second-class rates on magazines and newspapers are the same as in 1932 or,

that is, within 2 or 3 percent of the 1932 rates.

Third-class rates, which cover advertising matter and small parcels, could be better identified as junk mail and are up only about 33 percent since 1932.

Mr. Chairman, there are arguments for and against an increase in postal rates but from a standpoint of equity, fairness, and good business, the arguments for a postal rate increase are sound.

I should like to put it this way, that it costs a certain amount of money to handle the mails and when the revenue from postal receipts is inadequate to pay the cost of the postal service, then it is necessary to ask the taxpayers to make up the difference. It is just that simple. Would it not be better, safer and more sound to let the actual users of the mail pay the costs rather than to ask the nonusers who, as a usual thing, are the masses and poor people, to make a contribution through a subsidy to business, and magazine and newspaper publishers.

I can see no reason for the poorer people of this Nation to continue through their Government to subsidize tens of thousands of businesses, newspaper publishers and magazine publishers who operate their businesses mainly for a profit and who are presently accepting a subsidy from the Government to enhance their own profits.

I shall consider voting for an increase of 1 cent per ounce for first class mail as well as an increase of 1 cent per ounce for air mail. But I should like also to vote to remove the subsidy from 2d and 3d class mails. It certainly would not be hard for me to vote for an increase in first class and air mail if the President and the Postmaster General would ask for legislation that would remove the subsidy from 2d and 3d class mails. I should like to see legislation that would remove the subsidy in 4 years, increasing the rates sufficiently to erase 25 percent of the subsidy each year for 4 years. This way it would give those accustomed to this large subsidy an opportunity to make the necessary adjustment.

I do not know what my position will be on the postal rate increase bill if the President and the Postmaster General ask for only a 15-percent increase in second-class mail for 2 consecutive years and an increase of 30-percent in third class mail. To my way of thinking there is a sleeper in this recommendation. For instance, on second-class mail as it is now being handled, if the publisher is paying 20 percent of the cost of handling, and the taxpayer through the Government the other 80-percent, and the rates are increased by 30-percent, then the user or publisher would be paying only 26 percent of the cost of handling the mail and the taxpayer through his Government, 74 percent. I repeat, this is a sleeper and would remove very, very little of the subsidy now going to business and magazine and newspaper publishers.

If there are those among you who feel that the large publishers of newspapers and magazines and businesses who are in business for the main purpose of earn-

ing a profit need a subsidy, then I suggest that you secure a financial statement on a few of those receiving an unwarranted and unneeded subsidy.

You may find that many of them are earning substantial profits out of the operation of their businesses.

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. JAMES].

Mr. JAMES. Mr. Chairman, just about everything that can be discussed concerning this bill has already been discussed by the very able chairman of our committee and our ranking minority member, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. CANFIELD], who has just finished a remarkably fine statement on this bill. I, however, want a few minutes to express my admiration for and confidence in the leadership of this committee which, as the chairman has said, rotates. The gentleman from Virginia, the present chairman, will no doubt, therefore, in view of that regular rotation, in the next session of the Congress be the ranking minority member, and the gentleman from New Jersey will be the chairman.

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

Mr. JAMES. I yield.

Mr. PASSMAN. I wonder if the gentleman is going to change his party affiliation—that is news to me.

Mr. JAMES. I will not change my party affiliation, I have some inside information that the statement I have just made is a sound prediction.

Mr. Chairman, this is the only committee of the House, of which I am aware, that actually appropriates a deficit. In the present bill, the deficit amounts to \$470 million. It is written in the bill. It says right here, "together with an amount equal to the difference between such revenues and the total of appropriations hereafter specified, and the sum needed may be advanced to the Post Office Department upon requisition of the Postmaster General for the following purposes."

That is very unique in the business of appropriating money for the operation of Government agencies. As has been pointed out here today very amply, that situation comes about solely because the postal rates, be they first, second, third, or fourth class, are not accurately adjusted to the cost of handling those classifications of mail. I want simply today to point out that the fiction of first-class postage paying for itself has finally and amply been exploded in the testimony before our committee in the hearings we have just concluded.

I want to read just that part of the hearings. But first I want to say that if all the charges which should properly be made against the Post Office Department were made against that Department, the deficit would be very much greater than the deficit estimated in this year. In the first place the Post Office Department is not charged with the pensions paid to its employees who have retired. Nor is the workmen's compensation claims arising out of the operation of the Post Office Department paid by the Post Office Department. Those sums are paid elsewhere in the Government. Of



course, since they are related to the employment of over a half million people, those expenditures are very, very great indeed, and would probably add a huge sum to the already heavy estimated deficit, if they were a part of the Post Office Department accounting, which they are not.

Now I am going to read a part of what was said concerning the first-class postage rate. Just about the time that the statement I am going to read was made, an editorial in the Philadelphia Inquirer carried a statement that it has never been denied that the first-class postage rate pays a profit. Now listen to this statement by the Deputy Postmaster General Mr. Stans, in response to a question by Mr. CANFIELD:

On that basis, Mr. CANFIELD, first-class mail shows a loss across the board.

That is the first real testimony that has come out of the Post Office Department, as far as I know, that first-class postage does not pay its way. Of course it is unfair to take out of the context a statement of that kind, so there must be something further said.

Mr. Stans, in response to a question by Mr. CANFIELD, said:

I quote:

On the basis of our cost ascertainment report which merely allocates our cost according to the use of the facilities and personnel, we show that the revenues derived from the 3-cent letter that is sent out locally exceeds the cost. On the other hand, the revenues from the 3-cent letter that is sent out of town no longer covers the cost of that letter.

Now beyond that I want to point out, as I have done in my testimony before the Post Office Committee, that those computations do not take into account the preferred service that first-class mail receives. It is the position of the Department that first-class mail should pay a premium above its present allocated costs so that the deferred service—that is, the mail which does not receive as good attention as the first-class mail—would pay less than its allocated costs.

Now, that is the philosophy of the Post Office Department. There is a frank and complete confession that first-class mail no longer pays its way.

Now, what is this cost allocation program that the Post Office Department uses? It is not a cost-finding program. It is not a program in which the cost of handling any class of mail is actually established, but it is merely a cost allocation and it is handled in this way, because this was adduced at the hearings. It is a statement again by Mr. Stans, no less a person than the Deputy Postmaster General, and he is speaking about cost ascertainment.

I quote:

All it purports to do is allocate the postal revenues in toto over the classes of mail since there is no separate accounting at the source for the use of the stamp:

It also allocates the cost to the Department of the classes of mail in accordance with the class of mail requiring the uses and facilities of the Department.

That simply says that they take the total sum appropriated for operations and they say because we have so many billion first-class letters that is a percentage of the total number of pieces of mail, so we allocate that much of the percentage of the appropriation to first-

class mail. And so on down through the other classes of mail. That, I submit, is not intended as a method of finding the actual cost of operations in any of the postal classes.

But it is very certain now that from their experiences and from other means of testing the values in first-class mail and its preferred handling that they are willing to come forward now with the frank statement that first-class mail does not pay its way, much less yield a profit; and I, as a member of this subcommittee, am willing to stand today with any who are ready to vote for an increase in first-class postage and also for an increase that is adequate and substantial in the rates for other classifications of the postal service.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SIEMINSKI].

Mr. SIEMINSKI. Mr. Chairman, I think in passing on the merits of the bill one could derive greater confidence if he were to ask three questions and give himself satisfactory answers to each question:

First. What is the value of the postal service to the United States? If the postal service were closed down for 1 year, what would the effect be on our economy? Would that help us determine its value?

Second. What are the three lines of approach that the Department must continuously take in trying to meet and whip its problems? Will efforts at cost reduction, rate adjustment and user accommodation as our Nation grows insure effective and economic service?

Third. What is the status of cash in the pockets of our citizens now and in the estimated future? If there is enough, after taxes, then obviously our citizens will not mind the estimated deficit of \$470 million which this bill carries. If there is not enough cash going into the pockets of our citizens in the foreseeable future then, of course, we are going to have a mild, to say the least, tax and stamp act reaction in the country against this measure and all similar deficit bills.

What creates the wealth of America? In my opinion, it seems that among other factors are the speedy transmittal and prompt use of goods, services, and information be it by letterbox, phone, wire, printed page, package, and screen via air, ground, water, boat, train, plane, truck, car, horse, mule, word of mouth, and hand to hand.

If you start from scratch and eliminate the postal service what would you, Mr. and Mrs. Citizen, care to restore and at what cost, of the service you now use and enjoy? How much would you pay to get back the right to receive your Government check, your pension, your veterans' benefits, your social-security funds, and so forth?

What value to you is it to make contracts by mail, to shop and to pay your bills and insurance premiums, as well as to receive them if you are in business or commerce? Those are just a few of the factors we must consider in the question of how worthwhile moneywise is our postal service, not to mention the intense value beyond measure of person to person contact at home and abroad.

When this bill passes I think the country and the Congress should know, as they no doubt do, that there will be three lines of effort put out by the postal service in meeting the problems it faces each year on appropriations.

First. Intense application to cost-reduction factors will continue in order to eliminate or reduce unnecessary motions to get the mails through quicker and at less cost. Perhaps we could save for the Treasury of Uncle Sam as much as a billion dollars a year if our check disbursements were made at local levels instead of from Washington. Some 50 million Government checks, I am advised, now go through the mails monthly sent by Uncle Sam which could be disbursed on local levels and thus take out of the mails some 500 million mailings a year. For this information I am indebted to one Mr. Baber, a Government employee.

Second. In addition to efforts at cost reduction we face the continuing problem of rate adjustments which, as the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. GARY] said, does not come directly before our committee, rather is it a problem facing our legislative committee on the postal service. I trust they will resolve it.

The third item is, Will the Post Office Department be on guard to direct its efforts at user accommodation as suburbia grows? As we know, there are some 18 to 23 great clusters of ever growing population in the United States. As we grow, the Post Office must be most flexible to accommodate itself to the swift and efficient service the people expect of it. This is going to cost money. At the same time, it will increase postal user benefits.

This is a great bill, Mr. Chairman. The Treasury, Post Office, and Tax Court are great institutions. They are called upon to service the prime needs of our people in keeping their Government and the economy operating. Adequate funds and swift information for the ready dispatch of goods and the immediate use of services seems the mission of this measure.

In or out of deficits, our job here, it seems, is to keep attuned to the cash in the pockets of our citizens. If they have adequate cash in the pocket to pay the taxes levied to overcome deficits, then postal service must be rendered as inexpensively as possible. If not, the deficit must be erased by rates adjusted to do so.

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. HIESTAND].

Mr. HIESTAND. Mr. Chairman, you may have gathered from my previous questions that I am concerned about this matter of narcotics. There are a few very brief remarks that might well be made.

Testimony before the Boggs committee as well as the committee of the other body confirmed generally that 50 percent of the crime in the larger cities is directly traceable to the narcotics traffic.

Mr. Chairman, this is an interstate traffic. It is an international traffic. We cannot possibly shut off all of the imports due to our very, very long and wide open boundary and the fact that



there is such a tremendous profit wrapped up in such tiny physical parcels. It is practically impossible to stop the importing. Therefore, we have got to stop the interstate traffic. It becomes a national problem because it is an interstate problem.

I have no criticism of the achievements of the Bureau of Narcotics, one of those fine old bureaus which has not asked for wild billions of dollars but has tried to do its job conscientiously and well, except that this is our major crime problem, and, in my judgment, they are not asking for enough money. They are not enlarging their staff anywhere near enough.

I have introduced a bill, as has been suggested, for heavily stiffening the penalties, but that is not going to do the job entirely. My bill also provides for no suspensions and no probations after the first offense. That will help some, of course. But the major thing is this: Because of the fact that the Bureau of Narcotics has not seen fit to ask for adequate funds for enforcement, supplementing the local enforcement, the remedy, in my judgment, is to transfer the Bureau of Narcotics from the Treasury Department to the Department of Justice and the FBI, the strongest interstate law-enforcement agency. I propose to introduce that at a later time.

Presently, however, I concur absolutely with the recommendation of the committee as expressed by the chairman that the major enforcement must be local. It should be local and it must be. That is quite all right. We in southern California are getting probably a greater total of arrests and apprehensions than anywhere else but we are getting few convictions. Partly that is due to the inadequate evidence gathered by the local law-enforcement agencies. This can be greatly helped if we add to it the power of the Department of Justice and the FBI. We all recognize what happened to the kidnapping racket when that became a Federal offense and was turned over to the Department of Justice and the FBI. It is my opinion that will happen if we make this transfer. The very fear of law-enforcement power of the Department of Justice and the FBI will prove a major deterrent to would-be peddlers of narcotics.

However, for the moment, I support the bill. I do not believe that part of it is adequate. I do believe it should have been much larger. I cannot criticize the committee. Their job is to control appropriations rather than add to them, and it is hard to add more money than is requested. However, I feel that we should support the bill but also concur in the committee's expressed desire to add to the staff if and when the Treasury Department so requests.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MURRAY].

Mr. MURRAY of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, after the excellent presentation and discussion by our able chairman, the distinguished ranking minority member of the committee and the other members of the committee there is very little, if anything, that I, the newest member of the committee, can add to the pres-

entation. I would like, however, to express my appreciation to the able chairman of the committee and the ranking minority member of the committee, the other members of the committee, and the staff members, particularly our staff assistant, for the tremendous consideration they have shown me.

Mr. Chairman, I observed, as the newest member of the committee, that the consideration of this bill was not hasty, although the bill was expeditiously handled. Every cut in the requested appropriations made was supported by documentary evidence. Much of the testimony was devoted to evidence that disclosed that the services that these departments ought to give the public would, in fact, be rendered. Like the gentleman from California, I am not at all satisfied with the type of protection we are getting on the Federal level as far as the narcotics situation is concerned. I think we do not sufficiently appreciate the interstate character of this problem. In Cook County, through our able State's attorney, we have had particular emphasis on the narcotics situation. We have some 80 police officers assigned to narcotics. We increased our local penalties to provide for life imprisonment in case of a repeated offense. Although this local enforcement showed improvement, particularly in the case of juvenile addiction—as a matter of fact, last year I believe we did not have a single juvenile case—the evidence before our committee disclosed that despite this increased local enforcement, the interstate movement of narcotics shifted from other areas to the city of Chicago. Obviously, the clearing up of this situation is a Federal and not a local responsibility. I am happy to see that the very capable head of the Bureau of Narcotics, Dr. Anslinger, probably the outstanding man in this field in the country, has stated that he intends to place an emphasis in the Chicago area this year and hopes that we can clean up that situation. I am not at all convinced, after I heard the testimony of the Bureau of Customs, that due to their procedure in spot checking vessels and spot checking baggage we are given adequate policing through our customs laws and our narcotics laws.

However, it would be legislatively presumptuous in a high degree, in my opinion, if we were to attempt to tell the administrative officials how to administer the law. Obviously that is their responsibility. But we did in this bill approve every dime to the Bureau of Narcotics that they requested and we gave to the Bureau of Customs funds which their methods of enforcement disclosed were required. That is all that it is possible for an Appropriations Committee to recommend, in my opinion. I think in this matter of the enforcement of our penal laws with respect to narcotics, we might be a little penny-wise and pound-foolish; we might be like the department-store owner who decided to attempt to secure economy by not buying sufficient electricity as a result of which his customers could not see his merchandise. I will support legislation designed to strengthen narcotic law enforcement at the Federal level.

I was disappointed that the committee did not see fit to appropriate funds so that icebreaking service could be maintained in the Illinois waterway. In 1947, and until this past winter, the Coast Guard sought and received sufficient funds to keep the Illinois River clear of ice. Last winter it was administratively decided to discontinue this most important activity. I requested the subcommittee and the full committee to include funds in this bill to insure that this activity be continued. However, after deep consideration, the committee rejected my suggestion. I do not intend to offer my amendment to the present bill for icebreaking activity, largely because the able chairman of our committee, after the matter had been brought to his attention, made inquiry of the Coast Guard and the Commandant of the Coast Guard sent a letter to the chairman of our committee, making a statement therein in connection with any emergency that might arise in the city of Chicago or State of Illinois with regard to a bad ice condition. In his letter, the Commandant of the Coast Guard stated, under date February 2, 1956:

MY DEAR MR. GARY: This is in compliance with your recent request for information on Coast Guard icebreaking operations.

Under 14 United States Code 2 and Executive Order 7521, the Coast Guard conducts icebreaking operations to the extent of available and suitable Coast Guard facilities, consistent with the reasonable demands of commerce, the requirements of the national defense, and emergency duties imposed on the Coast Guard by law.

However, not every Coast Guard vessel is suited to icebreaking or continuously available to such purpose. Moreover, in any severe ice year, those that are suitable and available are quite unequal to the task of keeping all navigable harbors and channels open to navigation. Thus, the Coast Guard cannot guarantee to keep all channels and harbors clear, and in fact the cited laws do not appear to impose on the Coast Guard such a responsibility. However, the Coast Guard makes every effort to use its equipment to the best practicable benefit in breaking ice, consistent with the other variables and urgent responsibilities outlined above.

The situation on the Illinois Waterway deserves mention as a special case. Icebreaking operations on this waterway were initiated by the Coast Guard in World War II to insure expeditious passage of Great Lakes-built naval vessels to the sea. The Chief of Naval Operations in August 1945 withdrew this national defense requirement for icebreaking on the waterway, and such operations were not carried on during the winters of 1945-46 and 1946-47.

During an acute oil shortage in the Midwest in the ice season 1947-48, the Coast Guard was provided with special funds for contractual icebreaking on the waterway as an urgent humanitarian service. About the time need for this activity would have terminated, the Defense Transportation Administration stated a national defense requirement (incident to hostilities in Korea) for keeping the waterway open to fuel barge traffic during the winter of 1951-52. Based on the national defense requirement, the Coast Guard thereafter was furnished funds by the Congress annually for this express purpose through the winter of 1954-55. Subsequently, there being no apparent national defense requirement for such special icebreaking service, funds for this purpose have not been appropriated.

In the event of a serious emergency which could cause serious hardship to a community



the President is authorized by the act of September 30, 1950 (42 U. S. C. 1855), to take such necessary action as he deems advisable to alleviate the situation.

Very truly yours,

A. C. RICHMOND,  
Vice Admiral, United States Coast  
Guard Commandant.

I think that our community owes a debt of gratitude to the chairman of our subcommittee for his interest in this matter and for obtaining an assurance from the Coast Guard that funds would be available if an emergency arose.

Because the subcommittee and the full Committee on Appropriations rejected my request for additional appropriations for icebreaking activity in the Illinois River, and because our chairman has secured from the Commandant of the Coast Guard the assurance that in the event the city of Chicago or other communities of Illinois were to suffer from a bad ice condition on the Illinois River funds would be available to alleviate the situation, I do not intend to submit an amendment to this appropriation bill to provide legislatively for such service. I do feel that as a matter in the public interest such funds ought to have been made available and ought to continue to be made available.

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Chairman, we have no further requests for time on this side.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of our time to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON], the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, we are discussing a subject here which more nearly touches and more nearly interests every man, woman, and child in the United States than any other of the appropriation bills or any other bill which could be introduced or considered in the House. The postman makes his appointed round 6 days a week to the remotest corner of the Nation and the smallest school child writes and receives letters and counts out the pennies for postage.

I regret that the bill is so liberal. Frankly, it is a surprise. We were promised retrenchment and decreased Federal expenditures, and for years we have listened to criticisms of profligacy on this floor every time an appropriation bill was reported. And yet the Budget Bureau sends up this bill with estimates and recommendations for the largest amount ever spent for the purpose in the history of the Nation. And no one over there on the other side of the aisle uses the old time-worn phrase we used to hear so often, that "it is ridiculous."

Speaking very seriously, Mr. Chairman—and it is a time for serious speaking—the bill is too large. It is swollen in every section—almost in every paragraph, and the aggregate is the largest ever before estimated or spent for this purpose by any administration. Surely if there ever was a time when the assurances that have been given us so often of reducing expenditures in the Department should have been carried into effect, this is the time.

The bill is too large. Many items instead of being increased should have been reduced below those of the current

year. But I want to correct an impression which seems to be abroad to the effect that the increase in the bill is due to increases in the pay of the employees of the Department.

The bill itself disproves any such idea. The increase in this bill over last year is in excess of \$317 million. But the total budget estimate for statutory pay increase is only \$170 million—and even at that it should not have been more than \$150 million as the Department in a bill of that size should have absorbed \$20 million or more.

So it is evident on the face of the bill that the increase is not chargeable to warranted adjustment of postal salaries already too long delayed. But that is one of the stock arguments always advanced when they want to raise the rate of postage on any class of mail.

And they also want to hold the postal employees responsible for the recent order requiring a complete name and address on circular mail which they want us to believe is junk mail. There is no such thing as junk mail. That is merely a smear word used as a term of opprobrium in an effort to create prejudice. It is propaganda, pure, and simple. And again they try to hide behind the mailman.

Postmaster General Sumnerfield is a practical businessman and saw the absurdity of requiring individual addresses on this class of mail, and directed its discontinuance. The results obtained justified his good judgment. Without knowing very much about it here in the House we suggested its resumption last year and now it is costing the businessmen of the country an aggregate of millions of dollars a year without any compensating advantage to anybody and rendering vastly reduced service.

Let us drag this thing out into the open and take a look at it. If a street address is not required—if it is addressed to Boxholder, Occupant, or to any other impersonal addressee, the carrier does not have to sort it before leaving the office. All he has to do is put in one copy for each patron. And when he reaches the point of delivery he does not have to scrutinize it to be certain it is the proper address. He merely drops one copy—any copy—in the slot. And when he finds the patron has moved or died or the address is imperfect he does not have to follow up and redirect or redeliver. Such mail requires less time and attention than any other class of mail.

And what about the service rendered the sender? Let us not overlook the fact that the Post Office Department is a service department and is intended to render the most efficient service at the lowest possible legitimate cost. When mail must be individually addressed the cost of securing lists and of addressing each piece is heavy and then the sender misses anywhere from 10 to 25 percent of the patrons along the line. He is subjected to a heavy expense and then gets less service. And the mailman works harder and with less efficiency. Everybody concerned is penalized and nobody is benefited. And the Department does a 10 percent to 25 percent poorer job.

But they claim the recipient is burdened with a plethora of unwanted mail.

"The patron doesn't want it." That statement belongs under the classification of "interesting if true." This mail is welcome everywhere except in the Congressman's office and requiring an address would not protect the Congressman. His wastebasket is always full anyway. Out on the delivery line—and especially on rural delivery—many patrons receive less than a letter a week. They like to have the mailman stop—even with a circular—rather than pass them by. I can say positively that in the rural mailbox the circular is welcome. And the proof of that is the fact that even when an address is required this class of mail is heavier this year than last. The Wall Street Journal this week called attention to the increasing use of this class of mail. And the senders of such mail find that the patrons read it and answer it and both find it profitable or it would not be on the increase. So the last argument against "junk" mail goes glimmering.

If the Congressman does not like it, a push of his elbows drops it into the wastebasket. And if it costs too much to deliver it, just add the cost of service. But the patron wants it and answers it and will pay cost of delivery. Permit me to say again that the Post Office Department is a service department and both the sender and the patron want this service and are willing and glad to pay for it.

But Mr. Chairman, when it comes to this pious tongue-in-cheek sob story about first-class mail not paying its way, and an attempt to add another cent to the cost of delivery, that is another matter. Charging 4 cents for delivering a 3-cent letter would be an outrageous imposition on every family in the country. Never before has it been claimed that first-class mail did not pay its way and I do not believe it now. If any such claim is seriously made it is due either to inefficiency in administration or to faulty bookkeeping.

During the war it was decided—merely as a war revenue measure—to increase the cost of letter postage from 2 cents to 3 cents. And we were promised that as soon as the war was over the cost of postage would go from 3 cents back to 2 cents. That promise has never been kept. And now they propose to further mulct the public by charging 4 cents.

Somewhere between 3 cents and 4 cents the law of diminishing returns will clamp down. And you will get less profitable revenue at 4 cents than you would get if you went back to 2 cents. And the Post Office Department is no longer a service department.

I am opposed to it. My constituents are opposed to it. The American people are opposed to it.

Mr. Chairman, the Post Office Department is the one department of government in which a deficit is not an un-mixed misfortune.

When the Constitution of the United States was adopted in 1789 there were many, including Patrick Henry, who seriously doubted its success. And the criticism most frequently made was that the average citizen was not sufficiently informed to vote intelligently on issues with many of which he naturally lacked familiarity. The Founding Fathers, ap-

preciating the logic of this objection, early adopted two measures to meet it. They organized a public school system with a little red schoolhouse on every hill. And they provided free postage at Government expense of newspapers in local and adjacent counties in order that news, information, and official opinion might be disseminated as widely and as cheaply as possible. So successful have these two measures justified the expectations of the founders, that they are continued to this day. And in addition congressional speeches are mailed free of postage in order that the voters may know what the issues are and may understand the position of their representative on the questions of the day and have opportunity to judge whether he represents their views.

No money spent by the Federal Government is so well and so wisely spent as that expended by the Post Office Department for the diffusion of knowledge for these purposes.

And when any one proposes to lay profane and impious hands on the delivery of first-class mail under a 3-cent stamp, let us again remember that the Post Office Department is a service department. Let us not lose sight of the high ideal of service envisioned by Woodrow Wilson when he indited the inscription for the facade of the post-office building here in Washington:

"Messenger of sympathy and love,  
Servant of parted friends,  
Consoler of the lonely,  
Bond of the scattered family,  
Enlarger of the common life.

"Carrier of news and knowledge,  
Instrument of trade and industry,  
Promoter of mutual acquaintance,  
Of peace and of good will,  
Among men and nations."

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

The CHAIRMAN. If there are no further requests, the Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read the bill.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Chairman, I move the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with the recommendation that the bill do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. COOPER, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill H. R. 9064, directed him to report the bill back to the House with the recommendation that the bill do pass.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill to final passage.

The previous question was ordered.

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. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I do not think any general appropriation bill ought to pass this House without a yeand-nay vote. I shall demand a yeand-nay vote, and ask unanimous consent that further proceedings on this bill may go over until tomorrow.

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

There was no objection.

#### URGENT DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATION BILL, 1956

Mr. RABAUT. 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. 9063) making appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, and for other purposes; and pending that motion I ask unanimous consent that general debate thereon be limited to 2 hours. Is that satisfactory to the gentleman from New York?

Mr. TABER. How about 1 hour?

Mr. RABAUT. Let us compromise and say not to exceed an hour and a half, the time to be equally divided and controlled by the gentleman from New York and myself.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Michigan asks unanimous consent that general debate on the bill be limited to 1 hour and a half, the time to be equally divided and controlled by himself and the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 9063, with Mr. KEOGH in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 25 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON], chairman of the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, this is election year. On November 6 the American people will determine at the polls what administration will be entrusted with control of the Government for the next 4 years.

Since 1789, 34 Presidents have been elected and the 35th will be elected this year. In that respect it is a routine election. But this year there is a new note. This year—for the first time—there is the possibility that this may be the last Presidential election ever to be held under our form of government, and that the President elected this year may be the last President in the history of the United States.

Our people and our form of government are in greater danger today than they have been since the administration of President Washington. The sinister shadow of communism is engulfing the world and the United States is the last bulwark of free government around the globe.

Twenty-five years ago in Moscow the secretary of the executive committee of the Comintern declared:

War to the hilt between communism and capitalism is inevitable. Today, of course, we are not strong enough to attack. Our

time will come in 20 or 30 years. To win we shall need the element of surprise. The bourgeoisie will have to be put to sleep. So we shall begin by launching the most spectacular peace movement on record. There will be electrifying overtures and unheard-of concessions. The capitalist countries, stupid and decadent, will rejoice to cooperate in their own destruction. They will leap at another chance to be friends. As soon as the guard is down we shall smash them with our clenched fist.

The current peace offensives of the Communist world may herald the beginning of the "electrifying overtures and unheard-of concessions."

There are left in the world today only the two major military powers. Both are arming desperately for the last and final conflict. Our Secretary of State reports that already the two have been repeatedly on the brink of war.

Such a conflict would be unlike any war ever waged. It would be fought with new and terrible weapons of incredible destructive power that conceivably may destroy a part of the globe itself. And undoubtedly it would be fought under circumstances unlike any in which the United States has ever participated.

We are not a war-minded people. Our Nation is not a military power by choice. We have never initiated a war. In every conflict in which we have been engaged we have accepted war only when it was forced upon us and when there was no alternative.

We had not expected to fight in the First World War—or the Second. We did not want to fight. We were not prepared to fight. But in each instance, when it became inevitable our allies held the line while we armed.

This time there will be no one to hold the line. The attack will come suddenly and aimed directly at the heart of America. And no ally can delay it 1 day or 1 hour. And ready or unready, with such armament as we happen to have at the time, we must fight without help and without quarter. If we are not ready when the zero hour comes we will never be ready. Ever since the close of the world war in 1945 we have striven earnestly for peace. We are a peace-loving people and have humbled ourselves and accepted insults without protest and shut our eyes to violations of our rights of sovereignty. We pleaded for peace and accepted eagerly every suggestion for a peace conference from whatever source. But without avail. Communism is insatiable and implacable. Always talking peace, they have made peace impossible. From the first they announced to the world that communism and what they chose to call capitalism could not live in the same world. They have never for an instant deviated from that policy and their war factories have roared day and night in three 8-hour shifts for 7 days a week continuously—and are in heavier production today than ever before—even in time of war.

At the close of the last world war we were invincible. Our Armed Forces excelled the combined forces of the world in every branch of military service. We had the greatest Army, the greatest Navy, and the greatest Air Force in history. We had annihilated the Hitler armies so completely as to



leave no one with authority to sign terms of capitulation. On the deck of the battleship *Missouri* we submitted terms, without consultation with the enemy and demanded that they sign on the dotted line. And they signed.

Today we are outarmed and outmanned in practically every branch of the service. Russia has the greatest army in the world. China has the second largest. And the United States is a poor third. Both Russia and China have commanding armies in the field and in reserve, and monolithic manpower which we can never hope to equal.

If the issue were left to the foot soldier, Russia could sweep the allied forces from the Continent and into the English Channel in a matter of 30 to 60 days.

So far as naval power is concerned, Russia has over 400 modern snorkle submarines and is building more at the rate of 75 a year. Our production is barely 5 per annum.

If Hitler with less than 100 old style submarines could drive our commerce from the Atlantic, as they did in the last World War, when they had to come to the surface to recharge their batteries, what could more than 400 snorkles, staying submerged indefinitely, do with allied commerce today?

But Russia is devoting comparatively little attention to our Army or Navy. They are concentrating on long-range bombers and ballistic missiles. They will fly over any army and any navy.

If Russia had ten times the navy they have today—if they had 1,000 divisions of infantry—they could not seriously disturb us in our homeland. But one long-range bomber with one nuclear bomb could destroy Washington and all in it. The French learned that lesson at the gates of Paris. As the German troops advanced the French would rally and drive a spearhead through the German line. And at that crucial instant a German plane would drift down and drop a bomb at the head of the French column. Frantically they telephoned back to French headquarters. "Send us a plane—just one plane." But France had made the same mistake we are making. They had none to send. All they had was blueprints. We have blueprints too.

There will be no Maginot lines, no trenches, no no-man's land—no first line of defense on land or sea. All such anachronisms are a part of the dead, buried and forgotten past. The A-bomb, the H-bomb and the cobalt-bomb have seen to that.

A decade ago an airplane flew over Hiroshima and dropped a single bomb. The city with a population of 343,000 was all but obliterated. More than 220,000 of its people were killed, maimed and subjected to radiation. We had expected to have to take the homeland step by step at a cost of thousands of lives and immeasurable treasure. But when the bomb dropped the war was over and complete surrender followed. That bomb was merely experimental and was as a T-model Ford compared with a modern automobile.

Today a single H-bomb can blanket an area of 100,000 square miles with deadly radioactive fallout. Such a bomb would kill 85 percent of all people liv-

ing in ordinary houses within 12 miles of the explosion point and would seriously injure the other 15 percent.

The world has shrunk. There is no place on the globe that cannot be reached by airplane within a few hours. We ourselves have developed a jet fighter which flies faster than 1,100 miles per hour. At that rate it could fly from Chicago to St. Louis in less than 15 minutes. Every city in the Nation is now subject to attack and in event of a nuclear war every major city in the United States would be attacked simultaneously.

And there is no defense once the bomber has left the Russian base. The only defense is evacuation. But complete evacuation of a major American city requires 6 hours. The longest notice mentioned is 3 hours and no assurances can be given that it will be more than 15 minutes. As you enter the express highway leaving Washington you may have noticed a sign: "In event of enemy attack, this highway will be closed to all except military traffic." That sign is the result of experience in the last world war. When the German armies approached Paris, the terrified inhabitants jammed the highways out of the city until the French cavalry could not maneuver and sat completely immobilized.

But, if you will not be permitted to use the highways, how can you evacuate the city. And what will you do with a million people suddenly without homes or shelter?

The situation is worse in Washington. The Washington Post said editorially a month or two ago:

#### ABANDONING WASHINGTON

The White House decision that Washington must be evacuated in the event of a threatened air attack has the great virtue of definiteness. It resolves for all the people of this Capital city a pervasive uncertainty as to what they ought to do in case of a "probable attack" warning should be sounded. Other cities may postpone evacuation of the civilian population until the destination of enemy bombers approaching the United States can be determined; and pending this determination civilians may have to face a most difficult decision as to the best way to take care of themselves and their families. But Washingtonians now know they have no choice if hostile planes should approach anywhere along the eastern seaboard.

The decision seems a sound one. Behind it is the consideration that the White House staff and key Government agency personnel must be evacuated immediately in case of a bombing threat to the Capital. Obviously, the President and his aides would run the risk of being hopelessly entangled in "panic and disorganized flight" if the residents of the city were left free to stay or go as they thought best. It follows from this, as Commander Beach, the President's naval aide, pointed out in revealing the White House decision, that the city must develop a "workable, tested evacuation plan" in cooperation with Maryland and Virginia. Mass evacuation is an extremely complicated and difficult undertaking. It can be accomplished only if people know clearly where they are to go and what is expected of them. The next step, therefore, is a comprehensive, concise plan by civil defense authorities. There should be no uncertainties.

The Russians not only have more planes than we have, but they may have

better planes than we have. Russia led in the development and production of jet planes. It was stated on the floor of the Senate last week that as early as 1954 Russia had jet planes more advanced than our own. When we could get them up but were having difficulty getting them down, Russia was already producing the Bison, the Russian counterpart of our B-52, in quantity. The Russians moved 2 years faster than we did in the mass production of long-range bombers. And last May Day the Soviets flew large numbers of a new fighter plane equipped with an engine with a thrust estimated by our experts to be twice that of any airplane engine we have flying.

And the Kremlin is going back to the fundamentals and training increasing numbers of scientists and engineers. The National Science Foundation estimates that in the decade from 1950 to 1960 Russia will educate and train 1,200,000 students while we are graduating only 900,000.

We turn now to perhaps the greatest and most immediate menace—the ICBM, the intercontinental ballistic missile. I shall not discuss the missile in detail as Senator Jackson, of Washington, discussed it exhaustively in the Senate last week.

Suffice to say that immediately on the conclusion of the war in 1945 Russia seized the laboratories, factories and most of the German scientists engaged in the production of the V-2 rocket with which Hitler had been bombarding London and which had it been left undisturbed would shortly have ended the war disastrously for the Allies.

The United States took over a few of the German staff at work on the rocket but convinced that there would never be another war, gave the project only cursory attention. As a result, while General Electric was producing casually one model, the Russians were producing 1,000 improved machines and extending research industriously. Realizing belatedly the importance of the missile we are now engaged in a deadly race to develop range and accuracy but the Russians have had the lead from the start.

We are in much the same situation we were with the atomic bomb when the Committee on Appropriations refused to provide the money—\$800 million in the first request unless we knew how the money was to be used. The Department told us they could not divulge the purpose of the appropriation but they would tell us that Germany and the United States were engaged in a race for the project and if Germany first solved the problem, Germany would win the war and nothing could stop her. If the United States first found the solution the United States would win the war and nothing would stop us. Confronted by that alternative we appropriated the money sight unseen. It is high time additional effort was applied to this race—just as important and perhaps just as decisive.

Ballistic missiles are automatic and carry no operator—only a warhead. They travel at a speed many times that of sound and no defense has been found which can be used against them. It is claimed that unless we can meet this

threat our allies will eventually have no choice but to abandon NATO. Strategic materials will be denied us. And our defeat will be merely a matter of time.

But the maximum range of the ICBM is tentatively set at 1,500 miles so the final attack, if it comes, will be by long-range bombers, Bisons or their equivalent. Just how effective such an attack could be is indicated vividly by the recent Operation Sagebrush, carried out November 15 last, over 12 Southern States, the largest military maneuver since the World War, in which actual war conditions were simulated as nearly as possible. The result was startling. The enemy bombers were in contact within 17 minutes after the first warning signal and in the next 23 minutes had knocked out half the United States striking force in the area and destroyed 80 percent of our known air bases. In 40 minutes the battle was over.

Our military authorities have been relying on a policy of massive retaliation. We cannot strike first. Our plan of battle has been to give the enemy the first blow and then strike back. But in the light of recent developments we are beginning to wonder if we would have anything with which to strike back after the first blow. We are now keeping our planes aloft, day and night, to prevent enemy surprise or infiltration at our bases. Such bombers would follow up with a retaliatory attack on Russia. But back at home with our centers of population, centers of production, centers of communication, centers of military mobilization destroyed, what would there be to come back to?

It is significant that Russia is drilling troops to operate on paved highways. There are no paved highways in Russia—only dirt roads. So it is possible that Russia is preparing to follow up such a colossal simultaneous attack by bombers with paratroopers who protected by victorious bombers overhead could quickly dispose of such American troops as retained mobilization.

What would follow would be a familiar pattern. As Russia took over her satellites her firing squads exterminated all official and professional classes—all who might attempt to organize what was left of the population for resistance. Bank vaults were broken open and the contents appropriated. Livestock and other food was allotted to armies and all factories were dismantled and shipped to Russia. Germany was denuded of factory equipment even where Russian use could not be found for it and it remained rusting on the sidetracks.

What adequate provisions are we making? In the supreme minute when the sirens are screaming, when panic-stricken mobs rush through the streets seeking shelter, when the drone of Russian planes mingles with the crash of rending explosions, and blinding flashes, and all-consuming heat and the debris blots out the sun—it will be too late.

Remember, the battle will be won or lost in the air. And it will be largely over in one afternoon.

And if we lose, we lose forever. There will be no second chance. It will avail nothing to go down on our knees and beg for mercy. The last ounce of gold

and the last drop of blood will be exacted. The looting of Anglo-Saxon England by the Normans will not be a circumstance. And if there is still any doubt about it, take another look at Czechoslovakia, Poland, Lithuania, Estonia, and the rest of the once-proud and independent nations which have been "liberated" by Russia.

Mr. Chairman, we are engaged in the happy and delectable chore of spending money out of the United States Treasury here this afternoon. May I venture to suggest that we leave at least a small amount for long-range planes and guided missiles.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I have been especially interested this year in appropriations for and in the work connected with the Defense Department. I think the country should know that as of November 30 we had \$262,262,000 unobligated in the appropriation in the Army for research and development; that they are going ahead just as fast as they can with the Nike development, which is designed to protect us from airplanes on a long-range basis. That is the main item along that line, and they are giving everything they have to it.

In the Navy, where they are developing antisubmarine operations, and doing it to the very best of their capacity, they had \$320,947,000 unobligated on the 30th of last November for research and development.

The Air Force which is doing a tremendous job of development had \$428,357,000 available and had obligated \$132 million up to the 30th of November. I felt that the House ought to know those things.

In the bill before us are a few small items for disaster relief, \$25 million.

In Independent Offices we have a small item of \$750,000 for the service-disabled veterans' insurance fund under the Veterans' Administration.

The overall total of the bill is \$61,504,000.

For public works we have a total of \$31 million.

We have also provided \$2,600,000 for use out of unobligated funds which the Corps of Engineers told us would be at least \$60 million on the 30th of next June for use in the New England, Pennsylvania, and New York area.

Every recommendation for construction was allowed in full.

The only items which were cut were items which would not in the slightest delay any forward-looking work.

I think that tells the story of most of what is in the bill.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Is any of the amount for flood-control work reimbursable?

Mr. TABER. No.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Does it draw interest? Or is it matched by the communities?

Mr. TABER. In every case, as in other parts of the country, certain local con-

tributions are expected, including rights-of-way over lands and a great many other things that are necessary to bring the matter to a head.

Thirty-one million dollars is provided to reimburse the Engineers' funds for items they were obliged to pay out in fighting the temporary disaster that followed the flood in New England. That was under a new bill passed about 2 years ago, I think.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. If my memory serves me right, about \$5,800,000,000 has been spent on flood-control projects in the last 20 years, approximately that much.

Mr. TABER. I have not those figures available. I do not know whether anyone else has or not, but I do not have them.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. No part of it is returned to the Federal Government?

Mr. TABER. There is no provision for any part of items that are spent for navigation or for flood control that is returnable. That is correct.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. The thought I wanted to bring out is the fact that reclamation projects which are designed to put water on the land and not keep it off have had about one-fifth as much money and the funds that are advanced for reclamation projects will be returned by the local districts that borrow the money.

Mr. TABER. They are paid in to what they call the reclamation fund, but they are not returned to the Treasury as such.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. The reclamation fund is a part of the Treasury.

Mr. TABER. It is set up in the Treasury, but it is not available for the general use of the Treasury. It is only available for other new reclamation projects.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I understand that there is a cut of some \$300,000 for surveys recommended by the Engineers for New England for future flood control work. That is very vital to us there. My district has suffered great damage and it would have been even more if the wind had hit in a little different direction.

Mr. TABER. It was not that much. There is a situation where something in the neighborhood of \$3 million was turned over to the Engineers for a survey. That item resulted in a complete survey and an analysis of every stream in the New England-New York territory. That item involved, as I remember it, 48 volumes. The reports have just been received within the week. Those volumes are about 3 inches thick and they are as big on the flat surface as the sheet of paper I hold in my hand.

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

Mr. TABER. The gentleman from Minnesota has in his hand one of those little volumes. They only filled up two



great big shelves in the subcommittee's room, is that correct?

Mr. MARSHALL. Five and a half feet by measurement.

Mr. TABER. 48 volumes, as I remember it.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. They may not have all of the information that is available.

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

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. CANNON. As the gentleman will recall this survey cost approximately \$5 million and took 5 years to complete.

Mr. TABER. That is correct, and it has just arrived. It is not something that was made year before last. It was just finished up this year.

Mr. CANNON. The last volume was received this week.

Mr. MARSHALL. The cost for these volumes was \$4½ million extending over a 6-year period and 2 agencies of the Federal Government.

Mr. CANNON. And that does not include the amount the States put into it, which makes a total of approximately \$5 million.

Mr. MARSHALL. That is correct.

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

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

Mr. BOLAND. Whether or not this report of New England and New York included a survey of the flood of 1955, I would like to know. Does this report have any reference at all to the floods of 1955 that occurred in August and in October?

Mr. TABER. I do not know as it did, but the efforts of almost every agency of the Army engineers have been devoted almost exclusively to rehabilitation work and the work of getting out the things that they absolutely needed to do to protect the people in New England and going into these streams and analyzing the things that had happened to them since they made that survey. Now, I believe, taking those things as a base and following the thing through, that they have covered the whole picture. I do not like to see these people doing nothing at all except putting on a survey to do over and over again the same thing that they did yesterday.

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

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. RABAUT. Well, now, when we talk about floods, we make a study of the terrain. The terrain is no different just because you had a flood in 1956 or 1954 or 1888. It is a matter of the terrain, and it is a matter of where the water comes from and it is a matter of where the water should be retained, and it is a matter of where the flowoff should be. That is what a study is, and this talk about what they got in 1955 and they got a 5½-foot shelf of study is quite a different thing.

Mr. TABER. I think I ought to say at this point that when we had the Engineers up before us—and I would like to have the attention of the gentleman from Minnesota on this because I want to be sure that I am right—were we not

told that they had pulled in from all over the country every engineer that could possibly be spared from the projects that were involved at other places?

Mr. MARSHALL. The gentleman is absolutely correct. That is what they told us.

Mr. TABER. So that they had an enormous force there, many times what they would have under ordinary circumstances.

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

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

Mr. MORANO. Is it not true that the Army Engineers recommended this money to the Bureau of the Budget and that the Bureau of the Budget and the President approved it and made the request of the Committee on Appropriations?

Mr. TABER. Well, that is correct. There is no question about that. They came up and asked for the money.

Mr. MORANO. If that is so, then would it not be accurate to say that the money is needed on the expert advice and recommendation of the Engineers and the President?

Mr. TABER. Well, I would say that the Engineers said it was needed and they wanted something in the neighborhood of \$150,000.

Mr. MORANO. Three hundred and thirty thousand dollars.

Mr. TABER. No. Let me see what they wanted for New England.

Mr. MORANO. Two million six hundred thousand dollars.

Mr. TABER. No. They wanted in the neighborhood of \$150,000.

Mr. MORANO. Well, I thought the figure was \$330,000.

Mr. TABER. No. That was for New York and down the coast as far as the Potomac.

Mr. MORANO. All we are trying to do is to protect the people of New England and particularly of Connecticut, in my case, from a recurrence of the disasters that struck the area last year.

Mr. TABER. I have the figure right now in front of me. It is \$130,000 for New England, \$169,000 for streams south of the New England territory to and including the Potomac, and then there is \$31,000 to initiate a comprehensive resource investigation of the Delaware River Basin. That is the way it was divided.

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

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

Mr. PHILBIN. I think the item that the gentleman has just referred to was an item for \$330,000 to—

Mr. TABER. Well, the overall item was that. The New England item was \$130,000.

Mr. PHILBIN. Let me finish my question.

The item originally was for \$330,000 to cover a comprehensive study and survey from the Potomac to the New England States, including all of the New England States. Now, of that, \$130,000, I think, was allocated to New England. Now, is it not true that this study that the gentleman has referred to, the so-called interoffice agency report, a sample

of which has been exhibited by the distinguished gentleman from Minnesota, was finished and concluded prior to the devastating flood of August 19?

Mr. TABER. Yes.

Mr. PHILBIN. And those which followed it.

Mr. TABER. And after that they had in that territory an enormous number of engineers. They probably had as many engineers in that territory as they had in all the rest of the country put together during all that fall period.

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

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

Mr. MARSHALL. I would think that the proof of the pudding was in the request that came from the President's Bureau of the Budget, inasmuch as he asked for construction items which this committee allowed, and he asked for planning projects which this committee allowed. They certainly did not indicate that they needed any further study, or certainly they would have presented that to the committee.

Mr. TABER. That is the impression that I got.

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

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. PATTERSON. I want to say to the gentleman that I represent the congressional district that was completely devastated.

Mr. TABER. I appreciate that.

Mr. PATTERSON. Further I want to state, not only to the gentleman, but to the entire House, that when the Engineers were in my district, they were working. There were not any studies being made. They were doing things to help the people in the area. The gentleman would have to only witness one of those terribly devastating floods to realize that it is a very small thing to ask the Congress of the United States for an extra \$330,000 or even \$2 million.

Mr. Chairman, last week the House Appropriations Committee astonished hundreds of thousands of persons who were victims of the tragic floods that struck the New England area last August and October when the committee rejected President Eisenhower's budget request for flood control in the New England States.

In my particular district—the Naugatuck Valley of Connecticut which was the worst hit of all areas—the only beacon of hope that my constituents have looked forward to since the floods of last August and October has been the wholly understandable expectation that the Congress would act at once on flood control measures to prevent future disasters similar to those from which we suffered last year.

Indeed, I was both surprised and shocked when I learned that the House Appropriations Committee did not see fit either in the subcommittee or in the whole committee to come to the aid of our good people in New England. Of course, there are times here in Congress when appropriations should be slashed, but never when the welfare and security of our people and their property are at stake.

I can readily imagine what would happen to the economy of our Nation if its New England industrial heart should be washed away by muddy waters while Members of Congress quibbled over a few extra dollars. When we take into consideration the vast investment the Nation has in New England both from a financial point of view and from the standpoint of national defense, we must take no further chances on jeopardizing the lives and property of millions in New England and the national defense of the United States.

It is now a well-known fact that if measures such as those recommended by President Eisenhower had been taken just 5 years ago the tragic loss of life and property in New England would have been avoided—or at least reduced to a negligible degree.

The question before Congress today is are we going to once again let history repeat itself? It has been said before the Appropriations Committee that floods similar to these that struck New England last August occur only once in every hundred years. But look what actually happened. Instead of waiting 100 years for another disaster, we had to wait only 2 months for another one which struck with devastating force in October. Are we to let tragic history repeat itself when we can take steps to prevent this disastrous recurrence?

Therefore, I once again appeal to my colleagues in the House of Representatives to restore the essential funds for flood control that were recklessly cut from the appropriation bill last week by the House Appropriations Committee. I urgently appeal to you to restore all of the flood-control funds cut from President Eisenhower's very modest budget requests for this high essential work. Let us not be penny wise and pound foolish when the very lives of our citizens are at stake in the crucial flood hazard areas like my own Fifth Congressional District of Connecticut.

Mr. TABER. Let me get down to earth on that. I shall try not to be too long-winded, but I should really like to call attention to page 6 of the committee report. There are in New England for advance planning 4 projects that the committee has recommended. They must have taken some of their attention, with this enormous force that they had up there, to recommend those projects. On top of that there are in New England 5 projects involving total costs in the long run of something like \$50 million for which provision was made for construction. In other words, they got these plans out.

Let me say this further, that one of those that they recommend for planning was the Thomaston Reservoir in Connecticut which is on the Naugatuck, and which is the main reservoir that is being recommended by them. The total cost of that item, when they get through, is said to be \$16 million, indicating that the Engineers must have paid considerable attention to the future activities expected in that territory.

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. PATTERSON. This Thomaston Reservoir is the main part of our flood

control in the entire industrial Naugatuck Valley.

Mr. TABER. That is what I understand. We have done everything we could to speed that through. We went ahead and held hearings just as soon as we possibly could. I was not running the committee, but I am making that statement. Maybe it is not good politics to compliment the other guy, but they went to work and they put us to work. The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MARSHALL] was in charge of the operation and he kept us grinding right straight through until we got it done. I do not know that I have seen any more prompt or expeditious handling of anything than there was on that. I think I ought to say that.

Mr. MARSHALL. I wish to thank the gentleman from New York for his kind remarks. I would say that all members of the committee worked long hours and faithfully and neglected some of their other committee work, which they did not like to do, in order to give prompt consideration to this matter which we thought was of paramount importance. We did it for the reason that we understood it was necessary to get some of the construction started early up there so that it could be done this season. We did that, and that is why we have put in here these construction projects.

I call the attention of the Congress to the fact that on some of these projects to which we granted construction funds there are considerable unobligated funds. Regardless of that, and knowing that this is the year that it is, we put those in our request to the Congress. In addition, we went outside the flood area, based upon what the Army engineers defined to us as the flood area, to put in two construction projects that we felt ought to be in there.

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

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

Mr. EDMONDSON. May I say at the outset that I am one of those from an area not affected by the storms which struck New England but who nevertheless deeply appreciate the attention the committee did give to the problem of flood control, even though it is many miles away from our own Oklahoma problems. I appreciate also the discussion the gentleman has been addressing to the particular points of this bill, and specifically to page 6 of the report by the committee, to which the distinguished former chairman has just made reference. In the middle of that page appears this language:

In view of the fact that the Corps of Engineers is accumulating large unobligated balances during this fiscal year, the committee directs that the foregoing construction program be financed out of previously appropriated and now unobligated funds.

In view of the concern which we in the Arkansas River Basin have over certain funds appropriated by Congress for dams in that basin, I would appreciate an explanation by the distinguished former chairman as to that particular language, "previously appropriated and now unobligated funds."

Mr. TABER. I looked at the budget and I saw that the budget prophesied \$35

million of unobligated funds on the 30th of June next, so when I got to talking to the Assistant Chief of Engineers, General Itschner, I said, "General, it looks to me like you would have instead of \$35 million unobligated on the 30th of June the sum of \$55 or \$60 million." General Itschner said, "At least that."

What is the Congress going to do? We have always deducted unobligated balances that were going to be available after the end of the fiscal year from many appropriations we made for construction or surveys. That has always been the practice regardless of who was in power. I do not know anything about the status of the Arkansas projects or anything about what has been done about them. I cannot give the gentleman any report.

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

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. MCCORMACK. Bearing on that question, I received a letter from General Itschner this morning. The mail arrived yesterday. I arrived in Washington this morning. Among other things it says:

At the end of the fiscal year 1956, there will be obligated balances from the regular 1956 appropriations sufficient to cover the cost of the projects authorized for planning and construction in the committee report. I would like to stress, however, that these are not savings and most of these funds are programmed for obligation in the first quarter of the fiscal year 1957. If the projects which the committee recommends must be financed out of these funds, it will be necessary to obtain a like amount of additional fiscal year 1957 funds to complete the program covered in the regular 1956 appropriations.

Now that is information as of either yesterday or of today, which was received from the Corps of Engineers.

Mr. TABER. Of course, they always say that.

Mr. MCCORMACK. Oh, now, I do not think my dear friend ought to say that. The Corps of Engineers is one of the greatest organizations we have.

Mr. TABER. Yes, but you see when the budget came out a couple of weeks ago, there was to be \$35 million left over and when they got up to see us, it had grown to \$60 million.

Mr. MCCORMACK. It is nothing but robbing Peter to pay Paul.

Mr. TABER. Every year when we have these bills up, we find that same situation—that the unobligated balances are much greater than they have told us they would be and we find that same thing happening year after year. If you get the figures as of May 1 or June 1, you will find that your June 30 estimate will be way beyond what it has been before. I would like to ask the gentleman from Missouri if that statement is not correct?

Mr. CANNON. The gentleman has outlined a situation which has given the committee considerable concern over a number of years.

Mr. MCCORMACK. In other words, the position of my friend, the gentleman from New York—and I believe he is having a hard time trying to put his heart in the case he is trying to present because he is too good a fellow—what my friend says is that out of the funds we have already appropriated for the fiscal



year—projects in other Members' districts, they should take some of that money and apply it to this and then let them hope that they will get a reimbursable appropriation for the next fiscal year. My good friend would not want that to happen if it related to a project in his district, I am quite sure.

Mr. TABER. I would not object in the least because that has been the practice, for us to take the unobligated balances into consideration in making our appropriations for years and years.

Mr. McCORMACK. But there is a commitment.

Mr. TABER. I have never known the question to be raised before.

Mr. McCORMACK. But these unobligated funds are committed.

Mr. TABER. Oh, they say they are committed, but they never will use as much or obligate as much as they tell you they will. And that has been our experience over a period of years, and I can remember back at least 25 years.

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

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. MARSHALL. I would like to read from page 162 of our hearings:

Mr. TABER. You had available in the neighborhood of \$415 million when you started the fiscal year. You probably will have an unobligated balance of \$55 million or \$60 million this year, will you not, out of that?

General ITSCHNER. I think it will be at least that amount; yes, sir.

Mr. TABER. This particular item is about \$31.5 million to reimburse for straight out and out emergency flood items. There is about \$3 million for new flood construction or planning.

General ITSCHNER. That is right.

Mr. TABER. The amount involved for the construction and the planning one way or the other wouldn't make much difference to your overall picture as of the first of the year?

General ITSCHNER. No, sir.

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

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. EDMONDSON. I think the gentleman will concede that if we adopt the principle of taking funds that are set up for one purpose and using them for a new purpose before they have been spent for their originally intended purpose, if that were carried over into several other appropriation bills, as could possibly be done, we would wind up not having money on hand for its intended purpose; is that not correct?

Mr. TABER. No, it is not. That is not the way the thing works at all. They use the money for the things they have in front of them to work with and that is what the practice has been over at least 25 years to my personal knowledge and I imagine I could remember back even a little farther than that.

Mr. EDMONDSON. May we then conclude from the statement of the gentleman and from the statement of the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MARSHALL], that this does not involve any deferment on the part of the committee, or any shifting to the back of the shelf on the part of the committee of other projects?

Mr. TABER. Or any other project. I will say that. That is correct.

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

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Were these obligated funds obligated for work to be done in New England States?

Mr. TABER. They are not obligated at all. They have not been obligated. It is only out of unobligated funds that we set aside this money; the things that they had not contracted for. They had not gotten around to it, because their work had not progressed to the point where they could.

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

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. JENKINS. I would like to ask the gentleman one or two questions. Do I understand that all reference to the Department of Defense and the Army engineers only applies to work in New England?

Mr. TABER. What does the gentleman mean?

Mr. JENKINS. Well, whatever you are going to do in reference to civil defense functions, and so forth. Do you confine all of your appropriations in this bill to the catastrophes up in New England?

Mr. TABER. No.

Mr. JENKINS. Then I come to this point: I pointed out before the Army engineers at a meeting I attended, in which a matter on the Ohio River was a very important matter and the Army engineers agreed to it and recommended it. I do not find it in this bill.

Mr. TABER. Well, I do not know anything about that, but I do know that these were the things that they brought before us as a result of the flood situation in New England, and these are the items that we considered. I beg the gentleman's pardon. There were some other territories that were hit. There was a little corner of Pennsylvania, New Jersey, and a little bit up the Hudson River in New York. It was all of the lower part of New England that was hit in that terrible flood last fall. We have tried in this emergency bill to bring in something that would take care of that situation just as well as it could be cared for.

Mr. JENKINS. That being the case, I am going to assume that this bill covers those urgencies, and we will have another bill that will later cover things that are not so urgent?

Mr. TABER. We will have to have a regular river and harbor and general public works bill. Frankly, I do not think it can be brought in here before the 1st of May, in view of the fact that hearings will have to be held. If we can do so it will be done, but I do not see how we can at this time.

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

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. MARSHALL. Approximately 80 percent of the funds in this bill go into the New England area. There is one other thing that should be cleared up at this time and that is the reason why some of these funds are unobligated. One of them is that many times the local people have not met the assurances that are required by the Army engineers be-

fore they can contract for work. Another reason is because the Engineer Corps are having difficulty in getting engineers to do the work. This extra load came onto the Engineers because of the generosity of the House in passing a public works appropriation bill last year. That has affected some of the projects throughout the country, and the more projects we had throughout the country to conduct planning work, the longer some of this will be delayed.

Mr. TABER. That is correct.

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

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. McCORMACK. In answer to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JENKINS], I think the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] gave us a correct answer. This is for the remainder of this fiscal year. It involves areas in New England and Pennsylvania. The regular budget with reference to fiscal year 1957, of course, will be considered later.

Mr. JENKINS. I have no objection to whatever is done for New England because they suffered terrifically and deserve to be helped.

Mr. McCORMACK. The importance of getting this through now so far as these projects in New England and Pennsylvania are concerned is that it will give them an advance construction year, whereas if it waits until the next fiscal year or until next June a whole construction year is lost. That is of vital importance.

Mr. TABER. Let me say to the Members that I expect the item we have here will be very small in comparison with what we will be expected to provide for the New England situation before the end of the session. I would not want to say what the time limit might be but we have quite a considerable job in covering this disaster.

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

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. PHILBIN. With regard to what the majority leader has just said, I think the testimony of the Engineers is that if we can appropriate for and commence these projects right now, or within the reasonably near future, they will save from 6 months to a year and a half in construction time; and that may be a very critical thing.

Mr. TABER. The money is provided in this bill as it stands to take care of those things that would expedite construction. That is the thought the committee had in mind in bringing the bill in here.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York has consumed 39 minutes.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BOLAND].

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Chairman, this recommendation is the Presidential recommendation for the fiscal year 1956, and it amounts to \$34,645,000. This request is occasioned, as everyone knows, by the tragic floods that hit New England and the Northeast last August and again in October.

The devastation that was wrought by the torrential hurricane winds and water of those months was, according to the Corps of Engineers, the worst in the history of the United States. Damages total as of this date \$680 million for the August flood alone.

But more important than that, more important than the actual dollar damage, is the tragic fact that a total of 205 lives were lost throughout the flooded area.

This House is thoroughly familiar with the pictorial and written facts of this catastrophe. Few phenomena have received such coverage by press, radio, and television. This great and good Nation joined with nations across the world in an expression of sympathy and concern to the people of the Northeast, and our people are grateful for the deep interest shown. They deeply appreciate the help that was so readily given by the President, by the Congress, by governmental agencies, by the Federal Civil Defense organization, by the Small Business Administration, by the air rescue teams of the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force. We are grateful not only to the Federal Government for the wonderful work done by the Corps of Army Engineers in such a short period of time to rehabilitate these people and their property, but also to the governors, the mayors and the selectmen of the area. They deserve much credit also. Without all this help so much rehabilitation could not have been accomplished.

This Committee on Public Works, the subcommittee, the eastern panel upon which I serve with the distinguished gentleman from Minnesota as my chairman, deserves a great deal of credit for the manner in which it handled this request.

I deeply regret the statements from some people, who ought to know better, that it was callous and indifferent to the needs of New England. There are few men in this Congress who are more cooperative than Mr. MARSHALL, the distinguished chairman, and Mr. TABER, the ranking minority member. Of course, it is not so. This does not involve any partisan issue at all. Republicans and Democrats alike are united in the program that is recommended and that we hope will give adequate protection to New England.

There are few committees in this Congress that work harder than the House Committee on Appropriations and specifically the House Subcommittee on Appropriations for Public Works. So I want to let the chairman of this committee know that my people are grateful for what you have done in speeding up the hearings on this matter. This request from the President came to the Congress on January 12, as I recall, and the chairman set down hearings for the very next week. The only reason why we did not have hearings sooner was because General Sturgis was unable to be present.

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

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

Mr. MARTIN. The gentleman, I understand, served on the subcommittee that handled this project?

Mr. BOLAND. That is true.

Mr. MARTIN. Do I understand he is going to offer an amendment to restore these funds?

Mr. BOLAND. That is true.

Mr. MARTIN. He thinks that the New England condition demands that the money be returned?

Mr. BOLAND. That is right.

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

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

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. I want to congratulate the gentleman for the statement he is making.

Mr. Chairman, I assure him of my support of amendments which will restore to the urgent deficiency appropriation bill for 1956 the sums requested by the President for the purpose of accelerating flood-control works in New England and the North Atlantic States. I believe this work is necessary because of the occurrence of last year's disastrous floods.

As you know, the House Appropriations Committee has recommended the appropriation of only the portion of this supplemental budget intended to reimburse the Corps of Engineers for the disaster relief expenditures. The committee has also authorized the initiation of planning on some of the recommended projects with unobligated funds available to the Corps of Engineers. It also authorized initiation of construction on the six projects recommended, using the same method of financing. The committee further recommended the elimination of planning funds for local protection works at Allentown, Pa.; Bethlehem, Pa.; Rutland, Vt.; flood-control reservoirs at North Hartland, North Springfield, and Townshend, Vt.; and modification of existing dams at East Barre, Waterbury, and Writtsville, Vt.

It is my understanding that the first two referred to above were eliminated because the committee felt that their planning should be deferred until the Bear Creek Reservoir, a unit in the same system, was further along. The other projects, I understand, were eliminated from the planning because the committee apparently felt they involved no emergency action since they are not in the immediate area affected by the hurricane storms of last year. In addition, the committee also by its action has eliminated the item of \$330,000 requested by President Eisenhower for investigations, general, with the statement that the recently completed New England-New York Inter-Agency Committee Report had already resulted in sufficient study data.

It is my understanding, Mr. Chairman, that at the end of fiscal 1956 there will be unobligated balances from the regular 1956 appropriation sufficient to cover the cost of the projects authorized for planning and construction in the committee's report. I think, however, it is only fair to stress at this time that these are not bona fide savings. Most of these funds are programed for obligation in the first quarter of the fiscal year 1957. I think it is apparent to all of us that if the projects which the committee recommends must be financed out of these funds, it will then be necessary to obtain

a like amount of additional fiscal year 1957 funds to complete the program covered in the regular 1956 appropriation.

Mr. Chairman, we do not know where the next disaster may strike. It is possible that in the future we may be spared the terrible consequences of the elements or of any other natural manifestations. But we of New England know that in the order of things past we may expect catastrophes in the future.

I believe that the elimination of the money requested for surveys, covered under the topic "General investigations," is particularly harmful. I recognize that it is perfectly true that the New England-New York Inter-Agency Committee Report is now available, and I also realize that most of the basic data for the flood-control studies is contained in this report. However, I must rise and insist that this report does not purport to provide an answer to the complete flood-control problems of the area.

I am advised that while the Chief of Engineers is authorized within limitations to transfer planning funds between projects authorized for planning, and construction funds between projects authorized for construction, he cannot under law transfer either planning or construction funds to meet survey requirements. The survey funds available now to the Chief of Engineers are completely committed. Unless an appropriation is made available for this survey, this program, which we in New England are united in believing to be of the utmost importance, cannot be funded.

Mr. Chairman, when President Eisenhower submitted this supplemental budget it was based on a potential danger to the Northeast States and not solely to the area affected by the August and October storm patterns.

Without meaning to sound as an alarmist, I must report that the frequency of disaster storms in the Northeast seems to be increasing. I believe it would be unwise to delay action on certain projects solely on the ground that these projects were not in the August or October patterns of last year.

New England has a lower degree of flood protection now than any other section of the country. The projects at North Hartland, North Springfield, and Townshend are units in the comprehensive plan for control of the Connecticut River. This river basin has been flooded disastrously 5 times in the last 28 years.

Had there been a slight shift in the storm patterns in either August or October, the downstream industrial area would have been devastated.

We in Connecticut are keenly aware of the day, the hour, and the minute that Hurricane Diane brought death and destruction to our peaceful and homeloving communities. This terrifying experience will never be forgotten by me or by any of the citizens whom I am honored to represent. The floods which descended on us brought unbelievable destruction and resulted in the loss of jobs for many of those working in my area.

During our period of need, every agency of State, local, and Federal Government provided prompt aid and assistance. The Red Cross brought instantaneous help and stayed on to aid in



restoration and rehabilitation. We are truly grateful for that assistance and will never forget it.

However, one of our greatest problems remains—and that is the problem of employment. Our factories and places of business were destroyed and our people were deprived of their ordinary means of livelihood. A great many of our people not only lost their jobs but also their homes and all of their possessions.

During this period of emergency and the difficult days that followed, the spirit of our people has been a constant inspiration to all. By providing the funds requested by President Eisenhower, we will assure those people that here in Washington we are doing everything that we can to protect them at home so that they may rebuild their homes and regain their jobs and work together in the building of a better and stronger America.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Chairman, I am concerned, too, about the manner in which moneys are appropriated by the Congress. I am concerned as a member of this committee, and I am concerned because I think there is a great danger that when people legislate at the height of the storm there will be a great waste of public funds. That is not being done in this instance, and it is not being done because General Sturgis and the Corps of Engineers have given to this problem a great deal of study. This is not a crash program. The Corps of Engineers recommended the maximum program that could be accomplished with this particular amount of money. I think they have done a good job, just as this committee has done a good job all around. In the committee records it will be shown that I expressed my concern about appropriating money for projects that are outside of the flooded areas. I believed that should not be done. I do not believe any supplemental bill ought to be used as a vehicle to bring in projects outside the flooded area; but because of the explanation given by the Corps of Engineers that if the storm pattern of last August and October had shifted a few miles New England would have been completely devastated and the \$657-million damage could have amounted to billions and billions in damage, I have changed my position today. I do it with great respect for the committee on which I serve.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. DODD].

Mr. DODD. Mr. Chairman, I wish to commend my colleague from Massachusetts for the remarks he delivered here a few minutes ago. I shall not talk about the terrible damage which we suffered in Connecticut, and, indeed, in other parts of New England. I believe most of you have heard that terrible story. I do want to point out that the distinguished Governor of my State, Abraham Ribicoff, who served in this body with great honor for two sessions, has come to Washington today to represent all of the New England governors and, indeed, all of the people of New England, in urging those of us in the House from

that territory to restore the necessary funds for flood prevention and control in New England.

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

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

Mr. PATTERSON. I want to say to my distinguished colleague from Connecticut, that the distinguished governor did not have to come down here to urge his Members of Congress to do something about it.

Mr. DODD. Well, I do not know how you feel. All I know is that there are 6 governors in New England, 3 Republicans, and 3 Democrats, and they asked him to come down here. Those who have served with him in the House know that he is a man of great intelligence, fairness, and reasonableness, and I think he deserves a great deal of credit for taking time out from a busy job as Governor of Connecticut to come down here today and I am grateful to him for doing so. He has been of great help.

It seems to me that our problem is one of time. As I read the bill, and as I have heard the statements made here, the difference between us seems to be this: The chairman and the members of the committee say as to the \$333,000 for the special survey: "We will wait until we read all of those volumes of reports." There are two long shelves of these reports and they are as big as telephone books. Yet the committee says: "We are going to take all the time we need to read them and after we get through doing that we may do something." It looks to me like it will take 6 months to read them. They say, "Then we will decide whether the recommendation of the Army engineers that this special survey is necessary should be followed."

Now I say to the distinguished members of the committee that there is not that much time. Nature will not wait. A lot of people in this country thought after this disaster that we should have a special session of this Congress. That is how valuable time is with respect to this problem. The people in my State thought that surely this Congress would not say: "Give us more time." They want us to get down to business and do something now—not 6 months from now.

There is also an element of time with respect to these projects up in Vermont which have great bearing on the Connecticut River Basin. The committee says, "Let us wait" until we get around to all projects perhaps next summer.

Now, these floods and these tornadoes and these hurricanes and these disasters do not wait on the Committee on Appropriations and do not wait on the deliberations of this body. We may be hit again soon. Connecticut and all of New England has been subject to disasters recently that were never dreamed of 20 years ago. A hurricane in New England in 1938 was as likely as a glacier in Florida. But now we have hurricanes, we have dreadful floods, we have tornadoes, and the weathermen and the people who ought to know say "Look

out." That is why the Corps of Army Engineers say we need \$330,000 to conduct a special survey, because this latest disaster indicates to us that something new is in this pattern, and there is not enough or sufficient funds in this bill to cope with the situation, and a special study must be made right away. Now, that is all we are asking for in this item, and it is not very much money. The people of New England are not people begging with their hands out. On the other hand, we have tried to be helpful when other parts of the country were hit by flood and disaster. We need this help badly and we need it now. If the Connecticut River had been hit by these torrential rains in this area where these projects are provided for, the city of Hartford probably would have been devastated and her industry would have been ruined. We built great dikes there, but the Engineers say that is not enough. The Engineers say that if we are to prevent a future flood disaster, we need to start at once with this protection in the Connecticut Basin. Of the \$330,000, only \$130,000 goes into the New England area; \$200,000 goes elsewhere along the Atlantic area.

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

Mr. DODD. I yield to the gentleman from Rhode Island.

Mr. FORAND. Would the gentleman agree with me that the \$330,000 involved here is for a survey of the entire area because the surveys that were made in the past are now inadequate and made obsolete by last year's floods?

Mr. DODD. Yes. The majority leader read from a letter that he received from General Itschner, and I am sure he will agree with me that in another paragraph of this same letter General Itschner said of this \$330,000:

Elimination of the surveys covered under general investigations is particularly harmful.

That is what we need this money for. Here is the Chief of the Corps of Engineers telling in a letter that it is dangerous not to get at this thing right away. I hope that we will add these items to the bill.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. HESELTON].

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Chairman, I want to continue reading from the letter from which the gentleman from Connecticut just quoted. I think it is extremely important to all of us in New England. When we suffered from these 2 floods, 1 in August and 1 in October, this report which has been discussed had already been filed. This is the last of the paragraph of the letter:

While the Chief of Engineers is authorized within limitations to transfer planning funds between projects authorized for planning, and construction funds between projects authorized for construction, he cannot transfer either planning or construction funds to meet survey requirements.

That is what we are emphasizing. That is what has been eliminated.

The survey funds available now to the Chief of Engineers are completely committed, and unless an appropriation is made available for this survey, this program, which we consider of the utmost importance, cannot be funded.

The Chief of Engineers testified before the committee that—

The purpose of this review will be to determine in the light of the 1955 floods, and predicated upon sound basin planning, what additional projects and measures may be necessary and feasible to protect against or reduce the damages from flood occurrences.

I do not have the figures readily at hand, but it is my impression that only something like 20 percent of the funds authorized have been granted to all of New England. I am glad that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BOLAND] will ask to restore this \$330,000. Without it, as the majority leader has stated, New England will be stopped dead in its tracks. Remember, these were the worst two floods in New England history. We must have action now—not 6 months or a year from now.

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

Mr. HESELTON. I yield to my colleague from Massachusetts.

Mr. BATES. I want to commend the gentleman for his very fine statement. I am glad he stresses the urgency of this matter because time is of the essence. If we try to save a few pennies we are going to lose millions of dollars and many lives later on.

Mr. HESELTON. I appreciate the gentleman's point. It is an excellent one. Even though these two floods did not reach his district he has worked hard and effectively to bring about the comprehensive flood-control system New England needs so much and to which it is entitled. I know that the gentleman from Massachusetts, the chairman of our Massachusetts delegation subcommittee, agrees with us. I am certain that he shares our conviction that these funds are needed now.

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a unanimous consent request?

Mr. HESELTON. I yield.

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend the remarks I made during this debate.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

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

Mr. HESELTON. I yield.

Mr. CRETELLA. The gentleman has read from the letter of General Itschner, and parts of it have been read by others, but I think there is a very important sentence that has been left out up to this time. It is as follows:

The frequency of disaster storms in the Northeast seems to be increasing and we believe it would be unwise to delay action on certain projects because they were not in the August or October patterns. New England has a lower degree of flood protection now than any other section of the country.

I think that is very important.

Mr. HESELTON. That was stressed repeatedly in New England last year and it was presented forcefully by General Itschner. I do not believe anyone, considering the contributions New England has always made whenever disaster struck any other part of our country, would be unwilling to accept the responsibility of helping New England now to have the fair degree of flood protection to which it is entitled. I am certain that this House will approve that principle this afternoon.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. PHILBIN].

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

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

Mr. LANE. Mr. Chairman, I rise to compliment my colleague, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. PHILBIN] for his very energetic and able study of this entire flood situation as it affects Massachusetts. He was appointed chairman of a committee that worked not only hours but days on this subject matter up in Massachusetts and considered all these flood projects. I know that he knows whereof he speaks. I know he is familiar with the subject matter. He is to be congratulated and complimented for the time and effort that his committee put into studying the flood situation as it affected us in the New England States. I know that his statement will be of interest to the Congress. I join with him in hoping that this bill will be amended to increase the funds allowed to us in that area so that we may be able to do our best to combat these floods as they come from time to time.

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for his very fine contribution and especially for his generous compliments.

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

Mr. PHILBIN. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. PATTERSON. I just want to say to the gentleman that I, too, compliment him and thank him for the letters he sent me and for the help that he has given me and the people of my district.

Mr. PHILBIN. I very much appreciate the gentleman's remarks, and I shall try to be as brief as I can under the circumstances. I have enjoyed the pleasant interpolations and very generous compliments that have been paid me.

First let me say that I am thankful to the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee and the entire subcommittee for the courtesy extended me when I appeared before them and for the kind consideration they have given to the requests that I have made, some of which have been included in this bill. I realize that the problems confronting us are very great indeed and extremely complex. But I think it should be noted that the need is great, the need in New England and other flood-stricken areas is very great, for immediate relief. We cannot longer delay the commencement of these vital projects, and those which

are provided for by the amendment to be offered by my distinguished friend from Massachusetts [Mr. BOLAND]. We must have this relief I say at the earliest possible time if we are to avoid the prospects of the terrible visitations of nature which are so unpredictable in their arrival, which may come at any time.

The great district which I have the honor to represent, and other districts were torn by ravaging torrents of floodwaters. Never before was there a similar disaster. This is all inscribed on the records of the Army engineers, that great organization that rendered us so much help during our time of real disaster in New England and in the Northeast.

Never before in a similar disaster was there such suffering, privation, and damage over such a large area. Many lives were lost. Entire communities were paralyzed, torn, and tattered by the virtually unprecedented surge of raging waters. I have outlined these conditions many times before in various speeches here before the Members of the House and elsewhere, and I will not proceed further with this discussion of the conditions.

I should like to emphasize that the amendment to be offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BOLAND] is sound. It carries out the recommendations of the President and the Army engineers—it does not go beyond these recommendations—whose invaluable help has enabled us to recover from a great holocaust and restore many communities to normal economic activity.

I should prefer to see a larger and more extensive program, but I realize that this one will permit an early start to be made on vital flood-control projects. To that extent, I believe it is very essential and imperative that if possible we get favorable action on this amendment.

It will also, as you note, permit fresh engineering studies and planning to be made. Reference has been made to previous studies and reports. They were very extensive and very valuable. But since that time we have had this flood damage covering such a large area of our part of the country. To that extent, while much of the material in this study will be valuable, in other respects it has been completely outmoded. It is amply warranted that we have an appropriation in this bill for new studies and new surveys that will take into account the conditions produced by this terrible flood, with a view of rectifying them in every way possible within the purview of the Federal Government.

Let me repeat—this amendment is sound. It includes no projects that have not been authorized, studied by the Engineers and concurred in by the States and local communities. It is vitally needed to start the most important work of safeguarding the Northeast against the ravages of flood.

In expressing my thanks to the committee and many Members of the House who have manifested warm interest and willingness to help us in our present most unfortunate plight, I would like most



respectfully to urge each and every Member of the House to answer our humble plea for this desperately needed assistance and vote for this amendment and all others necessary to reinstate all of the flood-control program as originally presented.

I ask unanimous consent to include as part of my remarks a pertinent letter of Gen. E. C. Itschner, of the Army engineers.

The letter follows:

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY,  
OFFICE OF THE CHIEF OF ENGINEERS,  
Washington, D. C., February 6, 1956.

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN,  
House of Representatives,  
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. PHILBIN: In compliance with your request to General Fleming, the following information is furnished concerning the report of the House Appropriations Committee on the fiscal year 1956 deficiency bill which was submitted for the purpose of accelerating flood control works in New England and the North Atlantic States found necessary because of the occurrence of last year's disastrous floods.

The House Appropriations Committee recommends the appropriation of only the portion of this supplemental budget intended to reimburse the Corps of Engineers for the disaster relief expenditures. It authorizes the initiation of planning on some of the recommended projects with unobligated funds available to the Corps of Engineers. It also authorizes initiation of construction on the six projects recommended with the same method of financing. It eliminates planning funds for local protection works at Allentown, Pa., Bethlehem, Pa., Rutland, Vt.; flood-control reservoirs at North Hartland, North Springfield, and Townshend, Vt.; and modification of existing dams at East Barre, Waterbury, and Wrightsville, Vt.

The first two are eliminated because the committee felt that their planning should be deferred until the Bear Creek Reservoir, a unit in the same system, was further along. The other projects were eliminated from planning because the committee felt they involved no emergency since they are not in the immediate area affected by the hurricane storms of last year. The committee also eliminated the item of \$330,000 for "Investigations general" with the statement that the recently completed New England-New York Interagency Committee report had already resulted in sufficient study data.

At the end of fiscal year 1956 there will be unobligated balances from the regular 1956 appropriation sufficient to cover the cost of the projects authorized for planning and construction in the committee's report. I would like to stress, however, that these are not savings, and most of these funds are programmed for obligation in the first quarter of fiscal year 1957. If the projects which the committee recommends must be financed out of these funds, it will be necessary to obtain a like amount of additional fiscal year 1957 funds to complete the program covered in the regular 1956 appropriation.

Elimination of the surveys covered under General Investigations is particularly harmful. It is true that the New England-New York Interagency Committee report is now available, and that most basic data for the flood-control studies is contained therein. This report, however, does not purport to provide an answer to the complete flood-control problem of the area. While the Chief of Engineers is authorized within limitations to transfer planning funds between projects authorized for planning, and construction funds between projects authorized for construction, he cannot transfer either planning or construction funds to meet survey

requirements. The survey funds available now to the Chief of Engineers are completely committed, and unless an appropriation is made available for this survey, this program, which we consider of the utmost importance, cannot be funded.

The program submitted by the President's supplemental budget was based on a potential danger to the Northeast States and not solely to the area affected by the August and October storm patterns. The frequency of disaster storms in the Northeast seems to be increasing and we believe it would be unwise to delay action on certain projects because they were not in the August or October patterns. New England has a lower degree of flood protection now than any other section of the country. The projects at North Hartland, North Springfield, and Townshend are units in the comprehensive plan for control of the Connecticut River. This basin has been flooded disastrously five times in the last 28 years and had there been a slight shift in the storm patterns in either August or October, the downstream industrial area would have been devastated. The cities of Allentown and Bethlehem suffered damages of about \$12 million in the August 1955 flood. The schedules for these local protection projects were correlated with that for Bear Creek Reservoir so as to provide protection for the Lehigh River Basin early in fiscal year 1961, when Bear Creek Reservoir would be in operation. The Bethlehem project is scheduled for completion at that time. The Allentown project would be in effective operation in fiscal year 1960. Being primarily a channel improvement it will provide benefits immediately on completion. It is therefore considered that the funds requested for Allentown and Bethlehem should be allowed to provide effective flood protection as scheduled. The modification projects at East Barre, Waterbury, and Wrightsville are corrections of known deficiencies in projects constructed in the 1930's with relief funds. We believe they are dangerous in their present condition. Similarly action should not be delayed on the Rutland local protection works. Had either the August or October storms shifted to this area, this section of Vermont would have been disastrously affected.

Sincerely yours,

E. C. ITSCHNER,  
Major General, United States Army,  
Assistant Chief of Engineers for  
Civil Works.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. ST. GEORGE].

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Chairman, so that this debate will not go down in history as New England against the world, I should like to put in also my plea for the restoration of these funds so that the very necessary and vital surveys can be made in the State of New York.

I spoke with the Corps of Engineers as recently as Sunday morning and they assured me that it would be impossible to make the necessary studies and surveys around Port Jervis on the Delaware River, in my own district, where the devastation has been very, very great indeed, unless these funds are restored.

In looking over the bill I see no mention of any survey to be made in that part of the State of New York. This is vitally needed. It has to be done immediately. This is the second flood we have had in that area. While we hope we may not have any more, we never can be sure. As the gentleman from Massa-

chusetts has well said, time is of the essence. We here in the Congress have to see that this very small amount, because it is a small amount, \$330,000, is restored to this bill. That is all we ask. These surveys are vital. Without them nothing can be accomplished.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS].

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I am grateful to every single person who has helped us in our flood conditions in New England, New York, and throughout that area. I wanted a special session of Congress. I am grateful to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. PHILBIN]. I heard indirectly from the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MARSHALL] all the time on this matter.

I would like to speak of the plight of the Merrimack and Concord Rivers area. Those rivers are both in my district. The Merrimack was not very high. If it had been high, Lowell, Mass., would have been wiped out, because the Concord runs into that river.

I went over to look into the yellow book which contains the water resources report and asked about it, but there was no mention of the Merrimack in that book.

Having lived through a number of floods and tornadoes, I plead with you to grant this small amount. I assure you it will not be wasted. It will save many lives and much money.

Mr. BATES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. BATES. I am glad the gentlewoman mentioned the Merrimack River which is in my district as well as hers.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. And also in the district of Congressman LANE. The Merrimack River was high only a month ago and damage was done in Congressman LANE's district. We watched hourly for great damage in Lowell, Mass.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. STAGGERS].

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Chairman, I think it has been well stated here that this is not a local proposition for New England. We are legislators for all America. When problems come up affecting the west coast, we try to help. When problems come up affecting the affairs of the North, the South, the East, the West, we help. I think, too, that this appropriation should be restored. I have a personal feeling about this. I feel that the Engineers have done a good job and are doing a good job. I feel, as has been said, that time is of great importance. The heading of this bill reads, "Urgent Deficiency Appropriation Bill for the Remainder of 1956." It does not say for 1957. It does not say we can come here next year and get some money for this. It reads "Urgent Deficiency Bill for 1956." I would like to tell you

about that same storm and of my own personal experience. You will notice the survey says "down to and including the Potomac." That includes part of my district as well as my hometown of Keyser, W. Va., which lies along the Potomac River. I lived right close to the Potomac. When that hurricane and the flood came, the Potomac River broke through and came down through my hometown. I had never been in a flood before—my neighbors came to us and said, "You had better get out of this if you want to get out." I said, "All right." I sat down to eat the evening meal and somebody said, "You cannot get your car out now, but maybe you can get your family out." I got four of my children out of that flood. My wife and I came back to get the two youngest children. When we started out we could not get out; the water was too high. I tell you from my own personal experience that \$330,000 for this is nothing. I saw men and women after 2 or 3 days coming back to their homes from which they had been driven. Some of the homes were badly damaged. I had the Engineers there looking at that hometown of mine when the floods were over. I moved from there—I will tell you that—but there are thousands of people who cannot move. I say it would be a small amount. The Engineers want something now to make that survey and not next year. They want it this spring to start as soon as the money is appropriated. If one life is lost as a result of this Congress not appropriating this money, I would feel that I was a part of it, and I think every Member of this House would feel the same way. The engineers are men who have been appointed to their positions because of their specialized knowledge and they know their job. They come up here and recommend to the Congress of the United States things that they believe are urgent, and we say, "You do not know your job, but we, as Congressmen, who are here to legislate know better than you do." This is marked "Urgent"; that means now, not next year, and I hope the House will restore this money.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from West Virginia has expired.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself a half minute to tell the gentleman from West Virginia, who just addressed us, that a committee amendment is on the desk which restores the \$330,000 budget estimate. The committee amendment is at the Clerk's desk and it has been there all afternoon.

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

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. McCONNELL].

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. Chairman, I have asked for this time for two reasons. First of all, to say that I favor the restoration of these funds to the particular appropriation bill that we are considering. Secondly, to ask a question of either the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. RABAUT] or the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MARSHALL]. I understood there was an amount presented

and requested of the Committee on Appropriations which I favor for a survey in Pennsylvania for some projects around Allentown and Bethlehem. Is that correct?

Mr. MARSHALL. That is correct.

Mr. McCONNELL. And they were not allowed?

Mr. MARSHALL. The reason they were not allowed is because they found the building of the key Bear Creek Dam was necessary. The committee feels that that dam must be expedited as much as possible, and included \$300,000 in this bill in accordance with the accelerated date of the Army engineers it will be June 1961 before it is completed. Your committee does not feel that we ought to appropriate money for planning for projects that will be that far in advance of the construction date of this dam.

Mr. McCONNELL. In other words, the denial was not one of disapproval of the plan but rather the fact that we should wait a while. Is that correct?

Mr. MARSHALL. That is correct. The committee was very sympathetic to those two items.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. McCONNELL] has expired.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GAVIN].

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, I just want to say to the Members that I think the full amount recommended by the President should be restored to the budget. I call attention to an article which appeared in the magazine Wall Street. It is a very important statement:

The Water Resources Policy Commission reported in 1951 that the Connecticut River floods in 1927, 1936, and 1938 caused damages that totaled \$150 million. The damage in one 1955 flood was placed at an additional \$326 million, bringing property damages for the 4 floods to a total of \$476 million. The 1950 estimate of cost for all Connecticut Basin flood-control projects contemplated, authorized, or recommended, came to only \$154 million, or \$322 million less than the loss that might have been prevented.

Certainly the House recognizes that that these flood situations in the Connecticut Valley and Pennsylvania should be remedied.

The amount requested in this amendment to complete the surveys and studies is essential so the actual construction of the work can be expedited.

The people of the New England States and Pennsylvania are entitled to relief from these devastating, recurring floods which have been periodically visited upon these communities over the past many years.

And I know that a sympathetic House will pass this amendment without question.

Also, I want to call to your attention the amendment which will follow to be offered by my very good and able friend, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BOLAND].

The gentleman from Massachusetts should be complimented on the fine work he has done on the flood-control program for the protection of the New England States.

This amendment, and the one that is to follow, should be overwhelmingly adopted.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GAVIN] has expired. All time has expired.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

# CHAPTER II. DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE—CIVIL FUNCTIONS

## DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY

### Rivers and harbors and flood control

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which is at the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. RABAUT: Page 2, after line 17, insert:

### "General investigations

"For an additional amount for 'General investigations,' \$330,000, to remain available until expended."

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, this amendment provides for the inclusion of the budget estimate of \$330,000 for general investigations. It includes \$299,000 for flood-control studies for New England streams and streams south of the New England area down to and including the Potomac River Basin. It also includes \$31,000 for a special study of the Delaware River Basin. This money will only provide for the initiation of those studies.

The first study covers the area from the Potomac River north and is estimated to take about 5 years to complete. The total cost is estimated at \$1,581,000.

The study of the Delaware River Basin will cost approximately \$1 million in total to complete.

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

Mr. RABAUT. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TABER. The committee on this side of the aisle will accept the amendment.

Mr. SCUDDER. 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. SCUDDER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment to restore the \$330,000 for survey and general study of flood conditions in an area which, in my opinion, is entitled to every consideration.

I have viewed the results of the terrible flood in California and can vouch for the disaster that was wrought on the west coast. I know the conditions of the Northeast and the terrible loss of life and property resulting from the hurricane and flood damage. I believe that this item and other items that have been stricken from the proposal submitted by President Eisenhower should be restored.

I believe in times like this it is false economy to endeavor to save at the expense of distress. I trust that when the appropriation bill to relieve the destruction wrought in California is presented



to this body it will receive favorable action as it will alleviate, as far as money can help, the burden of people in my district.

I am happy to support this amendment and trust that the House, in its wisdom, gives an unanimous vote in support of the same and that these recommendations of the President for disaster relief are voted in full.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the committee amendment as well as the one that I understand will be offered a little later by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BOLAND].

Mr. Chairman, I want to call the attention of the membership to the fact that these items are here upon the recommendation of the President of the United States they are here as part of his program to relieve suffering and bind up the wounds of communities which suffered from a great disaster. This happens to be the item that chiefly affects New England, but it is only one of a series of legislation that will follow. The President recognizes the need of aid to all sections of the country which meet with disaster.

It is not an innovation for Congress to come to the assistance of people who have met disaster; it is commonly believed to be the right thing to do here in America. We have responded many, many times in the past.

If we do not restore this \$330,000 to the program it would mean that all efforts to promote further flood control in New England would be suspended for 1 year. I do not think the Congress wants that to happen. I do not believe we want to take that chance. We want to get on immediately with the task of security from the ravages of flood. Adequate protection is a good investment for a country.

This morning I was at the White House and discussed these particular items with the President and the Republican leadership. As it happened, Roland Hughes, who is Director of the Budget, was present and he, without being solicited, volunteered the information that these items are essential if we are to go ahead with the splendid flood program outlined by the President.

President Eisenhower believes not only in assistance for New England, but also for the people of California and other sections of the country that have been grievously hit by storm and flood.

I am surprised that there should be any opposition to this bill which is tagged in its title as an urgent bill and which is here at the request of the President of the United States. I repeat, this bill has been approved by the Bureau of the Budget and it is a bill which the Army engineers say is absolutely necessary if we are going to do our full duty in these disaster areas. Who is there in Congress in the face of these facts who would eliminate the appropriation, so I want to voice my appreciation to the committee for proposing the amendment. I hope it is accepted, and I hope also the gentleman from Michigan who is offering the amendment in recognition of its

desirability, will support the second amendment that is to follow. Both are essential if we are to expedite the flood protection measure.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARTIN. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. As one who comes from a section of the country that is devastated by floods from time to time, but who does not come from New England, I want to join in supporting this amendment. I will also support the amendment to be presented to give New England the aid it needs at this time to repair the damage done by the floods of last summer and fall. I have just read the Red Cross report of the effects of that flood. The disaster was terrific.

These amendments ought to be adopted.

Mr. MARTIN. I appreciate the gentleman's remarks. He has a great record of work for flood control and the building of the waterways of America. The Congress was full of appreciation and sympathy for the people of New England last year. At that time many words were spoken. Now is the time to show the sympathy in a practical way and in a way that will erect a barrier against further disaster.

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

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

Mr. SADLAK. I want to commend the gentleman from Massachusetts and associate myself with his remarks. I wish I could translate to this body what appears as a headline in a morning paper of Hartford, Conn. It states:

"State traffic slowed by storm from south."

There might not be much significance in reading the headline but I want to tell the Members of the House that all of those people who were affected by not one but two storms are greatly concerned because again they are threatened with floods tomorrow morning.

Mr. MARTIN. I thank the gentleman from Connecticut. He has worked zealously for this legislation.

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

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

Mr. FULTON. I believe we people who live along the rivers of the United States should be insistent that every river basin in the country be taken care of. Back in 1937 we had a very serious situation up in my district and if it were not for the Federal Government putting up funds at that time the situation would have been more serious and we would not have the condition up there that we have today.

Mr. MARTIN. I thank the gentleman. He has always supported every worthy appeal. May I say that this tremendous amount of \$330,000 will not all go to New England. Only about \$175,000 will go to New England. The rest goes to Pennsylvania, Maryland, New York and other States along the eastern seaboard. These States have proposals that

must be surveyed. Let us get on with the business and do what the President of the United States, the Army Engineers and the Budget Director say is our duty.

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

Mr. Chairman, it happens that my district was not visited by either one of the two catastrophes mentioned.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, may I say that neither was my district seriously affected by that disaster. Fortunately, most of the water in my district flows into the ocean.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, I can therefore look at this from an objective angle, just as I view objectively votes I have made throughout the years for projects in other sections of the country and just as I will vote for a bill tomorrow authorizing a project in Oklahoma which I shall vote for with pleasure and which I hope will pass. As I said, I view this objectively. I view this country as a great Nation. I was born in Massachusetts, but others were born in other sections of the country, but we have a great Union. I like to consider the Nation as a whole. Somewhere in this country there is an avenue called National Avenue that we can travel, where we can reconcile our sectional necessities and obligations and viewpoints in the national interest.

New England was very seriously visited on two occasions. That is an indisputable fact. I am very gratified at the feeling which exists among my colleagues on both sides of the aisle who have come to me today. I know my other friends from New England are likewise gratified when our colleagues from other sections of the country state they are going to vote for not only this amendment but for the Boland amendment, which I hope will be adopted.

Like my other colleagues here, I appreciate what the subcommittee has done. If these two amendments are adopted it will be no reflection on the subcommittee. The chairman of the subcommittee and the members of the subcommittee have expedited these hearings and we are very grateful. There is just an honest difference of opinion in some respects. I feel that the appropriation should be made for the full amount that the President asked for rather than taking from some other projects and then later those projects having the hope and expectation that there will be an appropriation made to care for what was taken away from them.

Now, why should we make this appropriation for the full amount of \$34,436,000 or thereabouts? I can see no justifiable reason why we should not do it today. If we do not do it today we are only putting it off until sometime in the future, and at the same time we are going to create fear in the minds of people in other sections of the country that their projects might be affected as the result of a diversion of the money appropriated for their projects and used during the remainder of the fiscal year for these projects.

Now, these projects are located not only in New England, but also in Penn-

sylvania. The two projects in Pennsylvania are necessary from an angle of flood protection. Bethlehem and Allentown are just as important from the angle of flood protection as any of the projects located in New England. I would be down here in this well fighting for California, as I expect I will be if a bill is brought in in connection with the catastrophe out there or in connection with any other section of the country, because they are our people. All over this country they are Americans and they are our people, and in this body it is viewed from that angle. The Army engineers have gone into this very carefully. The six governors of New England have had a number of meetings. There is a unanimity of opinion between them and the New England delegation. The New England delegation has had a number of meetings. We come before this body of our colleagues representing other sections of the country with the President of the United States recommending an amount. With the New England governors, 3 Democrats and 3 Republicans—but above all, they are governors, elected as Republicans and Democrats, but governors—and with the Democrats and Republicans from New England serving as Members of Congress, elected by our respective parties, united, we come before our colleagues and ask you to give to us today what the President of the United States has recommended in his budget message and which every one of the New England governors and the Members of Congress and the people are united for. I hope that this body will pass today an appropriation of thirty-four-million-and-some-odd dollars. So, I urge my colleagues to vote not only for the committee amendment, but to vote for the Boland amendment, which will be offered in a few minutes.

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

Mr. Chairman, I am happy to go along with the committee on the amendment that has been offered, and I intend to vote for the Boland amendment when it is offered, because I look upon flood-control legislation as I do upon disaster-insurance legislation. It is a necessity.

Over and above that, let us just take into consideration the small amount of cost for these flood-control measures as compared to the great loss of life and property suffered during a flood. I heard our colleague from West Virginia [Mr. STAGGERS], a few moments ago recite the incident that he experienced in the last flood. Mr. Chairman, you have to live through one of these floods to really understand what a tragedy it is. When I say to you it is a nightmare, I mean it. When you see aged people and little children unable to help themselves and you realize that their lives are in danger and that unless someone comes to their rescue, you know they will be carried away by the torrents of swiftly flowing water, your heart sinks and you wonder why flood-control measures have not been taken before now. If you realize that, then cost of flood control is nothing. We have just got to be realistic.

Oh, sure, it is going to cost the Federal Government money, which means it is

going to cost the taxpayers money, but the taxpayers of this country have proven time and time again that whenever there is an emergency they respond, and the best proof of that is what was done during these floods in New England last year when the American Red Cross appealed to the people of the Nation and during a period of a few days raised \$11 million. Not only will this flood-control legislation be helpful economically, but it will also save lives and it will save property and thereby save the jobs of many people in these areas.

I have in my home district the city of Woonsocket with a population of some 50,000 to 55,000 people. This city was devastated beyond even the worst picture anyone can think of, even to the point where a large part of the city not only was flooded and the people driven from their homes, but half of a cemetery was washed away. There were the caskets floating down into the residential district, banging up against buildings and breaking up. We had a number of undertakers who voluntarily joined together to pick up the bones and do the best possible job they could to put them into some kind of caskets and put them away. I say to you it was a nightmare. I shall never be able to picture to you in words the scenes that I have seen myself.

Here we have an amendment restoring \$330,000 to the bill for a restudy of the plans that were originally made. There is a reason for that, Mr. Chairman. It is that because the plans now in existence are obsolete as a result of the storms of last year.

I urge the Members not to think simply of the dollars involved but to think of the human beings whose lives are in jeopardy. Think of these people whose homes are washed away, whose jobs are washed out—yes, who themselves are washed out, to use the vernacular.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, the amendment which is before us is supported by myself as well as those who have preceded me and who have spoken so much more ably on this subject than can I.

My district, too, was devastated by this summer's floods. I view this matter not as an act of compassion on the part of a Congress but as an act of economy. The earning power of any number of the people of the United States was literally destroyed, at least for a long period of time this summer.

This devastation was completely unwarranted. The rivers, the harbors, the natural resources of this great land of ours belong to all of the people. Their potential is such that it must be harnessed. The need for further studies I think cannot be better emphasized than by this true story. Only 2 days before the flood practically wiped out the town of Yardley, Pa., in the district of our colleague [Mr. KING] the Army engineers issued a report on a study saying that flood-control measures at Yardley, Pa., were deemed unnecessary. That is not a very persuasive argument when 2 days

later thousands of people were left homeless.

I urge the Members to support this amendment. I cannot say in honesty that they are doing a good or a great thing. They are doing their duty. They are doing something which each and every one of them knows should be done and it must be done not only for those who have been affected by the recent disasters, but those of us from other parts of the Nation who may be in danger in the future.

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

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. McCONNELL. Is it the understanding of the gentleman that the funds I spoke of earlier, with reference to Allentown and Bethlehem would be included in the amendment now pending?

Mr. BOLAND. If the gentleman will yield to me, they are not included in this amendment but will be in the amendment which will follow.

Mr. McCONNELL. In other words, the other amendment will deal with funds for Allentown and Bethlehem?

Mr. BOLAND. That is correct.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. It is my understanding that Mr. BOLAND's amendment which will follow the one pending will take in the broader aspects, including funds for Allentown.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, inasmuch as the leadership on both sides of the House have agreed to this amendment, I ask for a vote.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

*Construction, general*

For an additional amount for "Construction, general," \$31,600,000 to remain available until expended.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BOLAND: On page 2, line 20, strike out "\$31,600,000" and insert "\$34,436,000."

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Chairman, I think I recognize the temper of this House and I will not detain it very long.

This amendment restores to the urgent deficiency appropriation bill every single item that was recommended by the President of the United States when he sent the supplemental of 1956 to the Congress.

The figure of \$34,436,000 represents \$31 million spent to reimburse the Corps of Engineers for money spent under Public Law 875, the disaster assistance law. It includes \$1,586,000 recommended for advance engineering and design. It includes \$1,100,000 for construction. It includes \$150,000 for the project in Woonsocket, R. I. This means a total of \$34,436,000.

The projects and advance engineering and design that would be restored by this amendment would be the North Spring-



field Reservoir, the North Hartland Reservoir, and the Townshend Reservoir—all in the Connecticut River Basin.

It would restore the East Barre appropriation in the Winooski River Basin for modification. It would restore the Wrightsville appropriation for modification. It would restore the Waterbury appropriation, and it would restore the local protective works at Rutland, Vt., all of those being up in the Lake Champlain area of Vermont.

It would restore in Allentown, Pa., \$60,000 and in Bethlehem, Pa., \$50,000 for local protective works.

So every single item which was recommended by the President is now included in this amendment that I have offered and which the Clerk has read.

The only reason, Mr. Chairman, why the Corps of Engineers and the President recommended this particular supplemental is to insure speed to accelerate the flood-control program in New England. Making money available now would speed construction of these projects by 6 to 18 months. We have spent in the entire comprehensive flood-control program \$72 million in the Connecticut River Basin out of a total of \$331 million that must be spent.

I think the recommendation of the President pretty clearly demonstrates its urgency, and I trust that the amendment will be adopted.

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

Mr. Chairman, I first want to commend the subcommittee on appropriations that handled this legislation. On the day that this Congress was reconvened, I introduced a bill at the request of the Governors of all the New England States to handle this emergency appropriation. About 2 weeks later the President proposed to Congress the emergency appropriation bill that we have before us now. The only difference between the administration bill and the one that I introduced was the deletion of one project. This happened to be in the State of Massachusetts, the West Hill project. Other than that, the administration bill is the same as the bill I introduced on the 3d of January at the request of the New England Governors. As soon as this request was received by the committee about the middle of January, the panel chairman, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MARSHALL], along with the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER], held hearings immediately. I do not believe any appropriation committee has ever acted with more speed than this committee has—although I do not agree with the end results. That is why I am here before you supporting the amendment of my friend, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BOLAND]. When this bill was being considered in the committee, I offered an amendment which contained the language of the bill that I had introduced. My amendment was supported by Mr. BOLAND. Mr. BOLAND offered another amendment when my amendment was defeated, and his amendment was also defeated in the committee. That is why we are appealing to the membership of this House to

restore what the President has asked this House to do in this emergency bill.

This is something that everyone is united on in New England whether we are Democrats or Republicans—whether Senator or Representative or governor of a New England State—we are all here together at this time asking the membership of this House to support us in this particular emergency. When other emergencies arise all over the country, whenever it is determined to be an emergency, we expect to give that type of support. We from New England have been supporting these projects for many years. This is the first time in history that New England has come to the Congress of the United States for this type of help and we now come because of flood conditions that existed last August and again last October in our area. I do not think this is asking too much. I received a call from Mayor Kevin Coleman, of the city of Woonsocket in Rhode Island, only this morning. He told me that if these survey sums were not voted by the House today, the work on the Woonsocket project, the new work that was being done on this survey and some work that was being carried on in projects in Connecticut and Massachusetts, would be stopped—that they would be stopped in their tracks as of now. Mayor Coleman is naturally very much concerned about the possibility of this project or survey being held up for lack of funds. In our conversation he once again stressed the great importance the project has to the entire economy of the city of Woonsocket and its environs. He cited the fact that the French Worsted Co., the largest textile manufacturing plant in Woonsocket, with employment of about 500 people, had been severely hit by last year's floods. In addition, the Argonne Worsted Co., the Verdun Worsted Co., and many other textile plants and dye houses had severely suffered. The entire mercantile district, the center of the social district, was devastated in the August flood, causing at least \$2 million in damage.

A particular point which Mayor Coleman asked me to make clear was the feeling of insecurity which so many small concerns had regarding future plans for the area. One of these businesses, a woodworking company owned by the Brodeur family is faced with that problem. Although hard hit last year, they would like to expand their present facilities but they are holding back on their decision until they hear definitely whether or not a flood-control project is to be authorized for the lower reaches of the Blackstone River within the city of Woonsocket. They feel that there is no point in spending more money at the present location if they have no protection. That is a feeling which a good many owners of small businesses have and which is certainly justified.

Mr. Chairman, I think the House is going to adopt this amendment. I think it is worthwhile. I think it is something of a real emergency nature.

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

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield.

Mr. ALBERT. I appreciate what the gentleman has said. The amendment

does not radically increase this item. I think we should go along with the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts. I personally hope the committee will adopt it.

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

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield.

Mr. FLOOD. I would like to say that while the Allentown and Bethlehem projects are not in my district, they are in the district of my colleague, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALTER] who is out of the country at this time on the official business of the House of Representatives. He has asked me that I bring to your attention the importance of these two projects in Allentown and Bethlehem that are a part of one of the most strategic defense areas in the Nation. While it is true that the co-called Bear Creek and White Haven project contains \$300,000 for the construction and is there for the purpose of flood control in the valley, nevertheless, that vast area is in the hurricane pattern and we think the Allentown and Bethlehem projects for design and engineering are vital and necessary to meet the intent of the House of Representatives.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, did I understand the gentleman from Michigan to say that he was going to accept this amendment?

Mr. RABAUT. I am not in charge of accepting any amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Rhode Island has expired.

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Chairman, I rise to urge the approval of this urgent flood control deficiency appropriation bill with the restoration and inclusion of all the flood control projects eliminated by the committee.

As you all know, the President has placed himself on record in favor of granting reasonable Federal Government assistance to the people in the various sections of the country who have suffered so greatly and continuously from flood disasters and he has requested the Congress to appropriate the necessary money.

I speak in particular appeal and quite naturally for full flood relief and protection aid to my home State of Massachusetts and the Northeastern States, while at the same time extending my fullest sympathy and support to the people of the other sections of the country who well understand the heavy loss of life and the widespread property destruction that follows in the wake of flood, hurricane, and other natural disasters.

I speak so earnestly because my own home city of Worcester, Mass., was visited last August by the most severe floods in our history and it is not pleasant to be an eyewitness to the havoc that is wrought upon a community, its people and its property when the roaring waters pour uncontrolled over bridges and through the streets. The aftermath of such flood visitation in loss of life, property damage, lost employment and lost business is staggering to

the imagination, even for an ordinary community. It is beyond human imagination when we try to picture the amount of the destruction of life and damage to property that has occurred in all the States throughout the Nation. Precise figures may, indeed, never be established, but the financial losses are unquestionably up in the billions. We cannot, of course, even approach the placing of any value upon the terrible loss of life involved in these tragedies.

The most recent flood visitations in my area, as well as those throughout the country, have prompted our weather experts to advise that apparently permanent changes have come in the upper air currents and they may well be responsible for continuing and recurring freaks of nature with their accompanying devastation. It would seem wise, then, for us to act in expectation that, unfortunately, more and more of these terrors of nature will strike the North Atlantic Seaboard and the rest of the country. We should, then, further wisely act in expectation of and, therefore, in damage protection of physical disasters of the magnitude of the floods which formerly ravaged annually the valleys of such great rivers as the Ohio and Mississippi and which caused untold destruction along such untamed rivers as the Yellow in China each year.

A practical and sensible look at the path and pattern of this terrible flood damage makes it convincingly clear that the control and prevention problem is not local or statewide but regional and national. It would be worse than useless for each community or State to attempt to set up their own control and protection measures without realization of and relation to the problems of their neighboring communities and States. For the overall national welfare, the vital and imperative need of effective regional coordination must not be overlooked in trying to solve our national flood problem.

In this respect, the Governors of New England have very deeply appreciated that necessity and should be complimented for the harmony and unity in which they are working together on this matter for the common welfare of all our people.

In my opinion, the modern history of congressional action in relation to the water resources and power of this country clearly reveals the continuing congressional conviction and intent that our water resources should be developed in a manner to assure their greatest contribution to the national economic growth, strength, and general welfare.

In pursuit of that policy and intent, the Congress has repeatedly demonstrated their belief that in any regional water control problem the Federal Government should assume a major share of responsibility when Federal participation or initiative is necessary to safeguard the national interest or to accomplish broad regional objectives of national import, where projects, because of size or complexity or potential multiple purposes or benefits, are beyond the

means or the needs of local communities and private enterprise. Within these principles of Federal Government activity, I believe the great regional New England water control problem lies, as it does for the other sections of the country with the same problem. The Federal Government must, with promptness, assume their moral, patriotic, and financial obligation in granting assistance for the solution of the problem in the whole national interest.

This Government and country has granted, in Christian generosity, untold billions of needed aid to desperate people in foreign lands and as a Christian nation we can be modestly proud of such action. It is, at the very least, a gamble on the side of God. However, the willing and patriotic taxpayers of our own country have a prior and predominant claim on the resources of the country, and it will be a national disgrace if the imperative and immediate needs of our flood-ravaged regions are not provided for with full Federal assistance before disaster may strike again.

In that respect, and for the few small voices of prejudiced interest, it may be philosophically beneficial to point out that there is about as much of any socialistic tint to the granting of Federal aid for flood prevention as there is about the current Federal aid being given to the tragic victims of these terrible floods.

Beyond the astronomical property damage from continuing and repeated floods, the family tragedies through the loss of loved members can never be erased from our consciences if we do not take immediate reasonable steps to prevent death from striking our people in this manner again. In the national interest, I ask you to unanimously approve this deficiency appropriation bill without further delay.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Boland amendment restoring the projects which have been deleted after being recommended by our great President. Confirming my remarks made on the committee amendment restoring the \$330,000, when the distinguished minority leader the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN] yielded to me, again I want to emphasize the great anxiety and concern and worry my constituents in my district, the entire State of Connecticut, feel when a new rain-storm or snowstorm approaches. The water table for New England shows an alltime high—the ground is saturated from the unprecedented floods that visited us accompanying hurricanes in August and October—more rain or melting snow immediately causes a serious problem because there is no ground absorption—it must run off, refilling temporary repairs and quickly forming rushing rivers that under ordinary circumstances would be brooks, creeks or rivulets.

I displayed this morning's Hartford Courant which I brought with me from Hartford, by plane. To a reader outside the boundaries of Connecticut the head-

lined story about the 7-inch snow in Litchfield would evince no great worry, but in Winsted, scene of great devastation and havoc, there immediately grew concern about where the water would go since the weather was to turn warmer today and there would be an abundance of water that would have no normal outlet or absorption.

The fears of our people in Connecticut and the New England States can be very largely allayed by the restoration of the projects and the survey today since these funds will mean that help and relief and hope for remedying the problem will be forthcoming. I urge the adoption of the amendment.

Mr. LANE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I realize full well that the House has heard about all that the House can digest this afternoon as far as increasing this appropriation for flood damage. However, I want to briefly state that if the Members had occasion to read the hearings on this particular item, and the questions propounded by my colleague who has offered this amendment, Congressman BOLAND, there is no doubt in my mind but that every Member in the House would be satisfied that this money is needed and should have been in the bill in order to provide relief in this very, very critical situation. My colleagues from Massachusetts [Mr. BOLAND] and from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY], of the House Appropriations Committee, can be congratulated for the amount of work they have put in on that subcommittee in behalf of the restoration of this particular item. The best way to insure against flood losses is to prevent them, by flood-control projects that work. Paper plans, without construction, protect no one. New England needs flood money because we have suffered the losses that have been mentioned so many times this afternoon, due to the failure of our Federal Government to provide dams and reservoirs. Therefore, I think this amendment should be adopted, so that emphasis on the need of meeting flood-control projects in the areas where such disasters have occurred can be met. They have caused the heaviest losses and there should be provided the greatest measure of real protection.

Last year alone, as a result of these two disastrous floods in New England, hundreds of millions of dollars worth of homes, industries, and public facilities were damaged or destroyed.

May I say that since 1927 the Congress has spent \$4.5 billion on flood control for the whole country, but only \$53 million has come to the six New England States.

May I respectfully join with my colleagues, Mrs. ROGERS and Mr. BATES, in their effort to try to do something to prevent further floods in the Merrimack River Basin. However, this particular item has nothing to do with my own area, but, in view of the fact that I know of the disaster, and all of us from New England are conversant with it, I certainly hope that the amendment offered by my colleague will be adopted.



Table showing status of Federal flood-control projects in New England

State	Location (nearest town)	River	Project	Drainage area square miles	Step No. 1		Step No. 2				Step No. 3		Total estimated cost
					Authorized by Congress		Local assurance		State concurrence		Planning funds made available		
					Action	Date	Received	Date	Received	Date	Amount	Date	
Connecticut	Andover	Hop	Andover Reservoir	114	Yes	Aug. 18, 1941	(1)		No				\$4,900,000
Do.	East Hartford	Connecticut	East Hartford local protection <sup>2</sup>		Yes	June 28, 1938	Yes	1938	(1)				2,413,000
Do.	Hartford	do	Hartford local protection <sup>3</sup>		Yes	1938, 1942, and 1950	Yes	1938, 1940, and 1943	(1)				10,403,000
Do.	Mansfield Hollow	Natchaug	Mansfield Hollow Reservoir <sup>2</sup>	139	Yes	Aug. 18, 1941	(1)		Yes				6,400,000
Do.	Norwich	Shetucket	Norwich local protection <sup>3</sup>		Yes	do	Yes	1947	(1)				1,372,000
Do.	South Coventry	Willimantic	South Coventry Reservoir	52	Yes	do	(1)		No	(?)	96,000	1945	10,100,000
Do.	Thomaston	Naugatuck	Thomaston Reservoir	97	Yes	Dec. 22, 1944	(1)		Yes	September 1955	25,000	1946	15,000,000
Do.	Winsted	Mad	Winsted local protection <sup>2</sup>		Yes	Aug. 18, 1941	Yes	1949	(1)				202,000
Massachusetts	Adams	Hoosic	Adams local protection <sup>3</sup>		Yes	do	Yes	Nov. 22, 1949	Yes	Nov. 21, 1950	(?)	(?)	6,490,000
Do.	Athol Royalston	Tully	Tully Reservoir <sup>2</sup>	50	Yes	June 28, 1938	(1)		Yes				1,548,000
Do.	Barre	Ware	Barre Falls Reservoir	57	Yes	Aug. 18, 1941	(1)		Yes	(?)	217,000	1946-50	2,680,000
Do.	Brimfield	Quinebaug	East Brimfield Reservoir	67.5	Yes	do	(1)		Yes	September 1955	70,000	1945	5,320,000
Do.	Charlton	Little	Buffumville Reservoir	26.5	Yes	do	(1)		Yes	December 1955	195,000	1946-56	2,820,000
Do.	Chiloepee	Connecticut	Chiloepee local protection <sup>3</sup>		Yes	June 28, 1938	Yes	1938	(1)				1,988,000
Do.	Colrain	North	Fort Morrison Reservoir	48	No		(1)		No				4,667,000
Do.	Easthampton	Manhan	Easthampton Reservoir	68	No		(1)		No				3,090,000
Do.	Greenfield-Gill	Falls	Falls River Reservoir	34	No		(1)		No				2,676,000
Do.	Holyoke	Connecticut	Holyoke local protection <sup>2</sup>		Yes	June 28, 1938	Yes	1938-45	(1)				3,592,000
Do.	do	do	Springdale local protection <sup>2</sup>		Yes	Aug. 18, 1941	Yes	1945	(1)				757,000
Do.	Huntington	Westfield	Knightville Reservoir <sup>2</sup>	162	Yes	June 28, 1938	(1)		Yes				3,217,000
Do.	do	do	Littleville Reservoir	53	No		(1)		No				5,500,000
Do.	Lowell	Merrimack	Lowell local protection <sup>2</sup>		Yes	June 28, 1938	Yes	1940	(1)				581,000
Do.	North Adams	Hoosic	North Adams local protection <sup>3</sup>		Yes	June 22, 1936, Aug. 18, 1941	Yes	Mar. 3, 1950	Yes	Nov. 2, 1950	(?)	(?)	18,350,000
Do.	North Andover and Lawrence	Shawsheen	North Andover and Lawrence local protection		Yes	June 28, 1938	No		(1)		20,000	1945	1,723,000
Do.	Northampton	Connecticut	Northampton local protection <sup>2</sup>		Yes	do	Yes	1938, 1939, and 1940	(1)				1,110,000
Do.	Oxford	French	Hodges Village Reservoir	30	Yes	Aug. 18, 1941	(1)		Yes	December 1955			3,040,000
Do.	Royalston	Millers	Birch Hill Reservoir <sup>2</sup>	175	Yes	June 28, 1938	(1)		Yes				4,167,000
Do.	Southbridge	Quinebaug	Westville Reservoir	426	Yes	Aug. 18, 1941	(1)		Yes	December 1955	78,600	1945	5,890,000
Do.	Springfield	Connecticut	Springfield local protection <sup>2</sup>		Yes	June 28, 1938, Aug. 18, 1941	Yes	1938-42	(1)				1,209,000
Do.	Uxbridge	West	West Hill Reservoir	284	Yes	Dec. 22, 1944	(1)		No		83,000	1944-46	2,730,000
Do.	West Brookfield	Quaboag	West Brookfield Reservoir	106	Yes	Aug. 18, 1941	(1)		No		67,000	1945-48	8,990,000
Do.	West Springfield	Connecticut	Riverdale local protection <sup>2</sup>		Yes	do	Yes	1946	(1)				1,213,000
Do.	do	do	West Springfield local protection <sup>2</sup>		Yes	June 28, 1938	Yes	1939-41	(1)				1,609,000
Do.	Worcester	Middle	Worcester diversion		Yes	Dec. 22, 1944	No		(1)		70,000	1945-46	5,050,000
New Hampshire	Bennington	Contoosuc	Bennington Reservoir	4142	No		(1)						9,487,000
Do.	Bethlehem	Ammonoosuc	Bethlehem Junction Reservoir	90	No		(1)						9,500,000
Do.	Claremont	Sugar	Claremont Reservoir	245	Yes	June 28, 1938	(1)		No		207,000	1944-45	13,000,000
Do.	Franconia	Ammonoosuc	Franconia Reservoir	30	No		(1)		No				(1)
Do.	Franklin Falls	Pemigewasset	Franklin Falls Reservoir <sup>2</sup>	1,000	Yes	June 22, 1936, June 28, 1938	(1)		Yes				7,921,500
Do.	Hillsboro	Contoosuc	Beards Brook Reservoir	476	No		(1)		No				4,850,000
Do.	Hopkinton	do	Hopkinton Everett Reservoir	490	Yes	June 28, 1938	(1)		No				33,020,000
Do.	Keene	Ashuelot	Surry Mountain Reservoir <sup>2</sup>	100	Yes	do	(1)		Yes				1,731,000
Do.	do	do	Otter Brook (South Keene) Reservoir	47	Yes	1954	(1)		Yes		260,000	1954-55	4,800,000
Do.	Nashua	Nashua	Nashua local protection <sup>2</sup>		Yes	June 28, 1938	Yes	1944 and 1946	(1)				273,000
Do.	Peterborough	Contoosuc	Edward McDowell Reservoir <sup>2</sup>	44	Yes	do	(1)		Yes				2,008,000
Do.	Plymouth	Pemigewasset	Livermore Falls Reservoir	408	No		(1)		No				18,384,000
Do.	do	Baker	Baker River Reservoir	213	No		(1)		No				11,869,000
Do.	Swiftwater	Wild Ammonoosuc	Swiftwater Reservoir	57	No		(1)		No				8,650,000
Do.	Thornton	Pemigewasset	Thornton Reservoir	261	No		(1)		No				11,589,000
Do.	Walpole	Cold	Cold River Reservoir	101	No		(1)		No				7,273,000
Do.	Webster	Contoosuc	Blackwater Reservoir <sup>2</sup>	128	Yes	June 28, 1938	(1)		Yes				1,317,000
Do.	West Canaan	Mascoma	West Canaan Reservoir	80	Yes	Aug. 18, 1941	(1)		No		92,000	1944-45	9,060,000
Rhode Island	Clyde	Pawtuxet	Clyde local protection	106	Yes	do	No		(1)		8,830	1946-47	610,000
Do.	Pawtucket	Blackstone	Pawtucket local protection		Yes	Dec. 22, 1944	No		(1)				202,000
Do.	Pontiac	Pawtuxet	Pontiac diversion	194.7	Yes	Aug. 18, 1941	No		(1)		24,217	1943-44	5,270,000
Do.	Woonsocket	Blackstone	Woonsocket local protection		Yes	Dec. 22, 1944	Yes	February 1954	(1)		125,000	1955-56	2,192,000
Vermont	Bethel	White	Randolph Reservoir	109	No		(1)		No				4,830,000
Do.	do	do	South Randolph Reservoir	63	No		(1)		No				4,284,000
Do.	Bloomfield	Nulhegan	Bloomfield Reservoir	70	No		(1)		No				(1)
Do.	Brockway Mills	Williams	Brockway Reservoir	101	Yes	Aug. 18, 1941	(1)		No				10,700,000
Do.	Cambridgeport	Saxtons	Cambridgeport Reservoir	58	Yes	do	(1)		No				5,170,000
Do.	East Barre	Winooski	East Barre, modification of existing reservoir		Yes	Dec. 22, 1944	(1)		No				3,865,000

Do.....	Gaysville.....	White.....	Gaysville Reservoir.....	226	Yes...	June 22, 1936, June 28, 1938.	(?).....	No.....	12,800,000
Do.....	Groton.....	Wells.....	Groton Pond Reservoir.....	17.3	No.....		(?).....	No.....	(?)
Do.....	Jamaica.....	West.....	Ball Mountain Reservoir.....	132	Yes...	1944 and 1954	(?).....	Yes.....	16,600,000
Do.....	Londonderry.....	do.....	Island Reservoir.....	40	Yes...	do.....	(?).....	No.....	4,370,000
Do.....	Ludlow.....	Black.....	Ludlow Reservoir.....	56	Yes...	June 28, 1938	(?).....	No.....	5,600,000
Do.....	North Hartland.....	Ottawaquechee.....	North Hartland Reservoir.....	222	Yes...	do.....	(?).....	Yes.....	29,000 1946
Do.....	North Springfield.....	Black.....	North Springfield Reservoir.....	158	Yes...	do.....	(?).....	No.....	9,260,000
Do.....	Rutland.....	Otter Creek.....	Rutland local protection.....		Yes...	June 22, 1936, Aug. 18, 1941.	Yes.....	No.....	5,320,000
Do.....	South Tunbridge.....	White.....	South Tunbridge Reservoir.....	102	Yes...	June 28, 1938	(?).....	No.....	5,440,000
Do.....	St. Johnsbury.....	Passumpsic (Moose).....	Victory Reservoir.....	75	Yes...	do.....	(?).....	Yes.....	103,000
Do.....	Townshend.....	West.....	Townshend Reservoir.....	106	Yes...	1944 and 1954	(?).....	Yes.....	71,000 1945-49
Do.....	Union Village.....	Ompompanoosuc.....	Union Village Reservoir <sup>2</sup> .....	126	Yes...	June 22, 1936, June 28, 1938.	(?).....	Yes.....	4,003,000
Do.....	Waterbury.....	Winoski.....	Waterbury, modification of existing res- ervoir.....		Yes...	Dec. 22, 1944	(?).....	No.....	860,000
Do.....	do.....	do.....	Waterbury local protection.....		Yes...	Aug. 18, 1941	(?).....	No.....	5,549,000
Do.....	Wrightsville.....	do.....	Wrightsville, modification of existing reservoir.....		Yes...	Dec. 22, 1944	(?).....	No.....	2,663,000

<sup>1</sup> Unnecessary.  
<sup>2</sup> Completed.

<sup>3</sup> Partially completed.  
<sup>4</sup> Net.

<sup>5</sup> Estimate not completed.  
<sup>6</sup> Gross.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. LANE] has expired.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment close in 5 minutes.

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

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that there is no quorum present.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count. [After counting.] One hundred and fifty-five Members are present, a quorum.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. 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 Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, I live in the lower Mississippi Valley. This is a section of the United States that from earliest recorded history has been vexed with serious and disastrous floods. In the years gone by we in the lower Mississippi Valley have looked upon water more or less as a curse rather than as a benefit to mankind.

Now I am glad to say conditions are slowly changing. Floods which were recurring so often at one time have not been so frequent in the last few years. We believe that this fact is due to the magnificent work of our Corps of Army

Engineers in building dams, dikes, and channel improvements to prevent disastrous floods. I hope this situation continues indefinitely.

During the last 9 months New England has suffered the tragedy of disastrous floods which heretofore had been one of the hardships and lot of those who lived in the Mississippi Valley. The Red Cross report which I have just read is illuminating. It is true that I had read many newspaper accounts and heard many stories and details over the radio, all about the size and destructive effect of the New England floods of last year. In spite of all that I had read and heard, I must confess that the American Red Cross report of recent date gave additional yardsticks by which I gage the scope and size of these disasters. Every Member of Congress should read this report.

New England needs the help of Congress at the present time. Perhaps at a later date California will need the help of those of us in the Congress who support flood control and river development. In the past we from Louisiana have appealed to the people of New England and of California, and at this critical hour in the lives of the people in New England, I think that we from the Mississippi and Red River Valleys should show our appreciation of what support in the past has meant to us. I believe that all of our people, filled with the recollections of the horrible loss of life and property in the crevasses and disastrous floods of the South and Southwest, will likewise support New England in its present effort to recover from the floods of the last year.

As president of the National Rivers and Harbors Congress, I have watched these tragedies developing, and with proper help from Congress, much of the suffering and many hardships of our people, whether they be in the South, East, North, or West, can be prevented in the future.

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BOLAND].

I think that a bit of information I could pass on to this Congress is that recently I read an article telling why the hurricanes were heading into the New England coast. We all received a communication from the gentleman from Florida [Mr. ROGERS] about the tremendous number of hurricanes they have had during the years. For many, many years New England has escaped them, but in the last 10 years we have had 4 hurricanes. It is interesting to note that as those hurricanes come up the Atlantic coast, the Weather Bureau claimed there was a barrier 27 miles high outside of North Carolina, and when the hurricane hit that barrier it veered out to the ocean; but now that barrier has severed, and instead of the hurricane storms bearing out to the ocean, they head right up the coast into Pennsylvania, New Jersey, and on up into New England. New England gets the entire brunt of the disaster.

I believe the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BOLAND] is offered to meet an emergency. Because of the way the weather has changed we do not know how often New

England is going to be hit by these hurricanes.

Secondly, may I ask you, Mr. Chairman, to imagine what it means to the economics of the Connecticut Valley area. If you were an industrialist thinking of setting up a plant in the Connecticut Valley area, either in Massachusetts, New Hampshire, or Connecticut, surely you would think twice before you would do so, knowing that there was this need of dams up in the Vermont area.

I am sure the House will go along with us on this matter. I want to congratulate the chairman and the committee which worked so hard to achieve the results that are placed before you today.

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

Mr. O'NEILL. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. I am in accord with the views that have been expressed by the gentleman and his associates, and hope that the House will adopt the amendment.

Mr. O'NEILL. I thank the gentleman from Oklahoma.

I want also to mention the interest shown by the gentleman from Rhode Island and to state that the entire New England delegation did heroic work, really, during these terrific floods in the summer and fall of last year.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I renew my request that all debate on this amendment and all amendments there-to close in 5 minutes and that the time be allotted to the distinguished gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MARSHALL],



who is chairman of the panel having this matter in charge.

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

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MARSHALL] is recognized to close the debate.

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. Chairman, all of us as Members of the House have certain responsibilities. One of my responsibilities, being assigned to the chairmanship of the eastern panel means that I have a number of items that come up before our committee, many, of course, in which all of us are interested.

I would like to make one point very clear to all of you, that I certainly appreciate all of the courtesies the Members of this House have always extended to me when they have come to me with their problems. They always approach me in a courteous and gentlemanly manner.

I would also like to say that I certainly have no malice to anyone in the New England area or the northeastern part of the United States. I serve on the committee and I sit next to one of the finest Members of this House, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BOLAND]. It is a real privilege to know Mr. BOLAND and to serve with him. I am proud that he is on our panel. I am proud of all of the members of our panel. Service on this panel means hard work. It means in this particular instance that we had to lay aside some of our other chores and certainly I know we laid aside some things that would be much more appealing to us and much more interesting than serving on this particular committee. The service was rendered gladly and the committee worked hard and faithfully on this problem.

Your committee held extensive hearings and certainly I know at this time we want to praise the Army engineers for the excellent work that they did in the New England area. The New England area was visited with a storm; the intensity of which is almost beyond the imagination of man. The loss of life and property was terrific. The Army engineers responded; moved into the area and provided construction work of a temporary nature.

Because the efficiency and know-how of the Corps was put to wise and intelligent use and because they were prompt and efficient, all of us can be proud of their work well done. The result of their work expresses it in a manner far more eloquent than I can express on the floor of the House. Every person appearing before our committee expressed a feeling of gratitude and thanks to the Corps. It seems to me that the expenditure of \$31,600,000 was done as economically and as well as it could possibly have been under the circumstances. We recommend unanimously that this appropriation be made. In addition to that, your committee feels that out of unobligated appropriated funds, we ought to appropriate for advanced engineering and de-

sign for the following projects in the flood areas:

Project	Estimated total Federal cost	Appropriation in accompanying bill
Thomaston Reservoir, Conn.	\$16,000,000	\$140,000
East Brimfield Reservoir, Mass.	5,700,000	140,000
Hodges Village Reservoir, Mass.	4,350,000	140,000
Worcester, Mass.	5,030,000	60,000
Endicott, Johnson City, and Vestal, N. Y.	4,840,000	80,000
Dyberry Reservoir, Pa.	7,630,000	125,000
Stillwater Reservoir, Pa.	9,200,000	120,000
Prompton Reservoir, Pa.	5,860,000	100,000

In addition we are recommending that construction start as soon as possible out of unobligated appropriated funds on the following projects:

Project	Estimated total Federal cost	Appropriation in accompanying bill
Barre Falls Reservoir, Mass.	\$2,680,000	\$300,000
Buffumville Reservoir, Mass.	2,820,000	100,000
Otter Brook Reservoir, N. H.	4,800,000	100,000
Bear Creek Reservoir, Pa.	17,900,000	300,000
Ball Mountain Reservoir, Vt.	16,600,000	300,000
Woonsocket, R. I.	4,200,000	150,000

Two of these construction projects are adjacent to but outside of the flood area. We urge that Members of Congress concur with us in including the items for the Otter Brook Reservoir, N. H., and Ball Mountain Reservoir, Vt. We have been reliably informed that funds are forthcoming for this purpose and that construction can be expedited to the point where we may gain from 6 months to a year. We believe it most desirable that these projects be constructed since they will both alleviate, to some extent, the damage caused by flooding.

Mr. Chairman, your committee on the eastern panel is sympathetic to the people of the Northeastern States. We feel for you up there in the northeastern part of the country when you have these disastrous floods. We wish something more could be done than is being done to alleviate the suffering that was experienced in that territory, but it is a thickly settled region for the most part without adequate area for large reservoirs and water-control works.

But to get back to the work of our committee, because I think sometimes people have wrong notions about the work of the committee, your committee recommended every project we thought could be expedited on which construction could be started this year. We provided funds for every such project. We went outside the flood area. I want to call your attention to page 159 of the hearings where the engineers outlined the projects that were in this particular area and the projects that were out of it. We followed their recommendations in that regard.

We did not allow all of the projects that are being requested in the Boland amendment. You will notice some projects are way outside the flood area up in the northern part of Vermont. We did not feel that that was a matter that

ought to come before the urgent deficiency appropriation bill. We felt that was something that should be weighed in the consideration of projects in other parts of the United States.

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

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

Mr. NICHOLSON. The matter of reservoirs in Vermont and New Hampshire is probably the big answer to floods in Massachusetts. If there were dams up there we would not get that water.

Mr. MARSHALL. I appreciate the gentleman's comment. In talking about these reservoirs in the northern part they can contribute some but actually very little.

Then we threw out some other projects we were considering. We threw out North Hartland, Townshend, and we threw out North Springfield, all outside of flood area. Why did we throw out North Springfield? You have to have the cooperation of the State of Vermont before that project can be started. You would not want our committee that you have assigned the responsibility to in this House to accept projects of that kind which require State cooperation or acknowledgment before we can proceed.

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

Mr. MARSHALL. I yield to the gentleman from Vermont.

Mr. PROUTY. I just want to suggest to the gentleman that the State of Vermont in all probability will concur in that particular flood-control project.

Mr. MARSHALL. I appreciate that and I hope the State does in order that that can be expedited, since we have provided funds for that purpose. We also threw out two projects mentioned heretofore in Pennsylvania. Those two projects are projects that are needed. The committee has never felt they were not needed but the fact is they are dependent upon the Bear Creek Dam, which is the key to those two projects. We are accelerating them as fast as we can, but we are informed that it will be June 1961, before that particular project is ready. Why should we appropriate money for planning so far in advance of that?

May I say that as far as the engineers are concerned, the engineering corps has a great responsibility. The engineering corps is being handicapped because it is difficult in this time to get qualified engineers to get all of the work done that the Engineers have placed on their shoulders. So there is some danger in including certain of these projects that instead of being expedited they may be slowed up.

The three projects that we mentioned above are in the southern part of Vermont. The Engineers do not contemplate completing the planning this year. It will in all probability be extended over a 3-year period. Why bring that in in an emergency appropriation bill?

Mr. Chairman, I hope the pending amendment will be rejected.

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Chairman, as has been pointed out by previous speakers,

we are all aware of the disastrous floods which took place in the summer and late fall in New England.

These floods brought extensive damage to the people of the northeastern section of our country. Property was destroyed and many lives lost. As the Congress was in adjournment at the time, speedy legislative action was at that time impossible. However, since the reconvening of the Congress the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON], has moved with expedition to provide emergency funds to help alleviate conditions in this area. The urgent deficiency appropriations bill now before the House carries a total appropriation of new funds of \$31,600,000 for public works in the disaster area. In addition, the committee has authorized the expenditure of \$2,155,000 for advance engineering and design and construction on some 15 projects in the various States in the New England area.

Also previously appropriated and unobligated funds are authorized for us in this connection. While previous surveys and studies have been made of the flood situation in the New England area, I can certainly envision no damage in the making of a new and additional survey, particularly in view of the recent floods occurring in this area. This work should proceed with all expedition.

As a member of the Public Works Subcommittee on Appropriations and as one coming from an area in which the floodwaters have been controlled by a system of dams in an area where extensive flood damage heretofore occurred, I can express the hope that other areas of our country will in time be similarly protected and I can certainly support, which I gladly do, the pending appropriation in this connection.

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Chairman, we in California have also had recent bereavement come to us as a result of uncontrolled flood waters destroying irreplaceable human lives and washing away millions upon millions of dollars' worth of real property and its improvements.

We, therefore, would be less than aware of our full duty if we did not cordially support both these amendments, the money from which will give the people of New England and Pennsylvania deserved and necessary flood-protection planning.

You cannot construct flood-control protection unless you plan engineering-wise to do so. Let us have the engineers begin immediately to plan against recurring tragedy to property and further death for innocent human beings.

What affects New England and Pennsylvania in flood matters vitally concerns us in California, and vice versa. The interests of all sections of our beloved Nation must go forward together if we as a people are to achieve the greatest prosperity.

We vote millions upon millions to aid foreign countries against flood destruction and for reclamation and huge water reservoirs and dams. Let us not overlook that our own people's need—and

our own physical resources need—deserve our close attention also.

I shall cordially vote for both amendments.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BOLAND]. The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

CHAPTER III  
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA  
OPERATING EXPENSES  
*Executive office*

For an additional amount for "Executive Office," to be available on and after August 12, 1955, for regulating the election of delegates representing the District of Columbia to national political conventions, \$43,500.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word in order to make a brief announcement. When we go back into the House I shall ask unanimous consent to vacate the order previously entered as a result of which the Treasury-Post Office Department appropriation bill was put over until tomorrow. May I inform the Members that if the unanimous consent request is agreed to we will vote on that bill tonight.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I want to pay the gentleman from Massachusetts a compliment on the way in which he has given us information on flood matters. I am grateful to the gentlemen from Massachusetts, Mr. McCORMACK and former Speaker MARTIN, for appointing a committee to study and secure appropriations for flood control. The chairman of that subcommittee, Mr. PHILBIN, did remarkable work.

The Clerk concluded the reading of the bill.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I move the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. KEOGH, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 9063) making appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, and for other purposes, had directed him to report the bill back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill and all amendments thereto to final passage.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en bloc.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

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

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

The bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### ORDER VACATED

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the order heretofore entered into today postponing further consideration of the Treasury-Post Office appropriation bill be vacated.

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

There was no objection.

#### TREASURY AND POST OFFICE DEPARTMENTS AND THE TAX COURT OF THE UNITED STATES APPROPRIATION BILL, 1957

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill, H. R. 9064.

The bill was passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to extend their remarks and that all Members who spoke on the bill may revise and extend their remarks.

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

There was no objection.

#### LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to inquire of the majority leader as to the program for the remainder of the week.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, on tomorrow the first order of business will be a resolution out of the Committee on Armed Services in relation to the sale of a rubber plant at Institute, W. Va. It has to be acted upon before Friday of this week. I have been advised by the distinguished gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON], chairman of the Committee on Armed Services, that they desire to have the matter brought up tomorrow, and I am programming it for tomorrow. He informs me there will probably be a rollcall. I am giving the membership of the House this information for their own benefit.

Mr. MARTIN. I understand that a rollcall is required?

Mr. McCORMACK. I do not know whether that is so or not. My understanding is that he probably will ask for a rollcall. I am alerting the Members so they will be informed of the situation.



After that there will be S. 180 relating to the Washita River Basin reclamation project in Oklahoma.

I might also say that H. R. 8710, to amend the Armed Services Procurement Act of 1947 probably will necessitate a rollcall, and that was scheduled for Thursday. Because of our agreement with the Republican leadership that Thursday would be a light day—and a light day means that there will be no rollcall; that is my promise when I refer to a light day—that will be postponed and will not come up before Wednesday of next week.

Mr. MARTIN. I thank the gentleman.

#### H. R. 9067, A BILL TO GRADUATE CORPORATE INCOME TAXES

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include certain tables and excerpts.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I introduced a bill to graduate the tax rates on corporate incomes. I think this bill will warrant the serious consideration of the Members. Since I made a public proposal for such a bill on January 16, 1956, I have received a great many communications from business firms of all sizes and in all parts of the United States endorsing this proposal.

*Comparison of taxes and effective rates under present law and proposed law (combined normal and surtax)*

Amount of tax On a taxable income of—	Amount of tax			Effective rate	
	Present law	Proposed law	Percent change	Present law	Proposed law
				Percent	Percent
\$25,000.....	\$7,500	\$5,500	-26.7	30.0	22.0
\$100,000.....	46,500	22,000	-52.7	46.5	22.0
\$500,000.....	254,500	150,000	-41.1	50.9	30.0
\$1,000,000.....	514,500	345,000	-32.9	51.5	34.5
\$5,000,000.....	2,594,500	2,105,000	-18.9	51.9	42.1
\$10,000,000.....	5,194,500	4,655,000	-10.4	51.9	46.6
\$50,000,000.....	25,994,500	26,255,000	+1.0	52.0	52.5
\$100,000,000.....	51,994,500	56,755,000	+9.2	52.0	56.8
\$500,000,000.....	259,994,500	312,755,000	+20.3	52.0	62.6
\$1,000,000,000.....	519,994,500	667,755,000	+28.4	52.0	66.8

TAXES WOULD BE REDUCED ON ALL CORPORATIONS HAVING NET INCOMES OF LESS THAN \$50 MILLION

In summary, H. R. 9067 will do the following things:

First. It will reduce the normal tax rate on corporate incomes from the present 30 percent to a new rate of 22 percent. The normal tax will apply, as now, to the total net income of the corporation. It will substitute in place of the present surtax rate of 22 percent, which applies now on all except the first \$25,000 of the corporate income, a series of rates which become progressively larger with progressively larger corporate incomes.

Second. The surtax exemption will be raised from the first \$25,000 as now, to the first \$100,000 of net income. Thereafter the surtax rate will increase gradually over the entire range of income

In both corporate and personal taxes, the Federal Government is taking each year approximately one-fourth of the national income. We can no longer ignore the impact of these taxes. They are rapidly bringing about fundamental changes in the structure of business, none of which are good. Among other things, the tax structure is channeling substantially all of the income available for investment in business growth into a few super-giant industrial corporations, and making them investment bankers. These corporations are rapidly taking possession of all of the productive wealth, yet the result is a slowing down of industrial growth and a disappearance of competition upon which our historic public policy depends for regulation of the free-enterprise system. Small- and medium-size firms are being squeezed out.

If our free-enterprise system is to survive, these trends must be reversed. We need increased business growth to provide jobs for our growing population and children now growing up on farms. We need a wider availability of investment funds, a growth of small business and a restoration of a "middle class" in business firms. We need to check the wave of corporate mergers and consolidations, and we need to encourage a competitive structure of business.

H. R. 9067 will help to establish these wholesome trends. The effect of the bill on corporate taxes of several sample sizes is illustrated with the following table:

sizes, until it reaches a maximum rate of 53 percent on that part of the corporation's net income which is in excess of \$1 billion.

Third. The normal and surtax rates combined will maintain the present effective tax rate on a corporation receiving \$50 million of net income; all smaller corporations would pay less taxes, and all larger corporations would pay more taxes. But the new rates are calculated to yield the same total tax revenue from corporations as the present rates would yield. In other words, it is not intended that Federal revenues will be decreased or increased by this bill.

The surtax begins to apply when a corporation's income is in excess of \$100,000. Thereafter the formula, in general, is this: When the corporate income increases tenfold, the surtax rate

increases by 10 percentage points. Thus the graduation is quite moderate. Compared to the way in which the tax rates on personal income progress, these rates on corporate incomes hardly progress at all. The maximum marginal rate, taking the normal tax and surtax together, is 75 percent. This maximum marginal rate would apply to that part of the corporation's income which is in excess of \$1 billion. Under the excess profits tax, which was repealed in 1953, the maximum marginal rate was 82 percent.

Under the bill, the total effective rate on a corporate income of \$1 billion is 66.8 percent. Prior to the time the excess-profits tax was dropped, the maximum effective rate was 70 percent.

If it is fair and just to have graduated tax rates on individual incomes, then it is equally fair and just to have graduated rates on corporate incomes. But the need for this bill goes far beyond the question of simple justice. Our economic system is rapidly undergoing changes, under the impact of our present tax laws, personal and corporate, which threaten the existence of the free-enterprise system itself.

#### INVESTMENT IN NEW PRODUCTIVE CAPACITY MUST BE ENCOURAGED

First of all, there is a compelling need to encourage investment in new productive capacity. One thing certain about our profit system of business is that the system must continuously grow or it must collapse.

Despite the general impression that 1955 was a boom year, the output of goods and services last year failed to reflect the economic growth we should have had. The gross national product of last year reflected a growth of only 2.8 percent per year in the 3 years since 1952—which is less than the normal increases in productivity, to say nothing of the increases in population. From 1939 through 1952, the growth in the gross national product, measured in 1955 prices, averaged 6.8 percent per year.

The changes which were made in the tax laws in 1953 and 1954 overwhelmingly favored the big corporations and the high-income families. These changes were sponsored on the theory that they would encourage investment in new productive capacity. They have, however, provided the big corporations with an incentive to raise prices and take more profits, and these profits have not found their way into new productive capacity. Dropping the excess-profits tax particularly had the effect of encouraging the big corporations in raising prices. The excess-profits tax tended to place a ceiling on the amount of profits which a corporation could take without increasing its investment in new capacity. Dropping the tax removed the ceiling.

The recent Economic Report of the President shows that in 1955 corporations took \$8.6 billion more in 1955 in tax allowances and in profits after taxes than in 1952. But corporate outlays for productive capacity, including replace-

ment items, was only \$2.1 billion more than in 1952.

#### BIG BUSINESS HAS ACCUMULATED GOVERNMENT SUBSIDIES

Our experience during and since World War II should have driven the lesson home. When the necessities of war demanded maximum output of all kinds of essential goods, farmers expanded output very rapidly, and expanded to a greater extent than did industry. This record of the most competitive segment of the economy was made, not with special subsidies and incentives, but despite the shortages of machinery and fertilizer and despite difficulties of all kinds.

Some of our biggest corporations, on the other hand, were offered speedup amortizations, Government loans, and Government contracts which assured repayment of the loans, amortization of the new plants, and handsome profits. Yet in spite of all this, these corporations had to be prodded, cajoled, and threatened to accept these incentives and go along with the expansions which were desperately needed. The same has been true in the Korean hostilities, and during the so-called defense buildup that the Government has sponsored since that time.

Without naming names, I might remind the Members of the Government incentives which have recently been given some of the biggest corporations in the country, to induce these corporations to make capacity expansions. These include speedup amortizations by which plants are paid for out of taxes. They include agreements by which the Government is maintaining support prices by buying for stockpile all the output which civilian markets do not absorb. And they include contracts by which the Government guarantees premium prices for the output of new facilities.

Again without naming names, I could point out that some of the biggest corporations in the land now have relatively little overhead costs, simply because their plants have substantially all been paid for by the Government. These corporations enjoy reputations for phenomenal efficiency, which many people believe enables them to drive smaller competitors and would-be new competitors out of business. I do not question their efficiency, but I simply point out that the fact that their plant cost has been paid for through Government incentives and subsidies also enables them to drive out small competitors and frighten away new competitors.

These big corporations have received the lion's share of the speed-up amortizations. They have received, and are receiving today, the lion's share of Government production contracts. And despite their highly advertised initiative in research and development, their research is being subsidized to the tune of \$1.5 billion a year by the Department of Defense alone. I do not have the record of the additional research subsidies which they may be receiving from the Atomic Energy Commission and other Government agencies.

The tax concessions to small- and medium-size firms which my bill would

make should help such firms, in a small way, to overcome the obstacles of entering those industries where big competitors have paid for their plants through Government subsidies and have grown fat on Government incentives.

And I might remind the Members that we still have shortages of almost all of the basic materials. If we now had a Federal road program, for example, we would not have enough steel and cement capacity to support such a program.

And I might also remind the Members of the continuing inflation in big business prices and profits. It happens that prices of metals and metal products have gone up during the past 3 years by the same rate that farm prices have gone down. One has gone up 16 percent; the other has gone down 16 percent.

#### SMALL BUSINESS MUST BE ENCOURAGED

For several years now substantially all of the funds for business expansion have come from retained corporate earnings. The bulk of these funds are held, directly or indirectly, by high-income families who own the corporate stocks. Personal income taxes being what they are, it simply does not make sense for these families to take out of the corporation those funds which the family wishes to reinvest. This means that the bulk of the funds available for business growth are accumulating in the high-profit corporations, which means the big corporations.

Yet the big corporations are those least willing to expand capacity—at least in those industries in which they are already well established. These are the quasi-monopolistic industries where a large degree of arbitrary control over prices and production exists, and these industries are naturally reluctant to make capacity expansions which may generate competitive pressures.

The basic solution to this problem is to encourage the accumulation of investment funds in smaller corporations, first, because the smaller corporations are more responsive to expansion opportunities, and second, the growth of smaller companies will generate competition and bring prices down, which is the thing we should expect from investment in new capacity.

There are no reports showing the profit experience of all large and small corporations since the tax changes of 1953. But there are reports for the most important segment—namely the manufacturing corporations.

Nineteen hundred and fifty-two was considered an extremely good year for corporate profits. In the first 9 months of that year, the profits of the giant manufacturing corporations—those with more than \$100 million of assets—were at an annual rate of 11.1 percent of stockholders' equity. This was after taxes, and in addition to generous depreciation, depletion, and amortization allowances which had the effect of returning to the corporation a substantial proportion of its investment in productive

capacity. Stockholders' equity refers to the stockholders' total investment, including original capital plus earnings over the years which have not been paid out in dividends.

In the first 9 months of 1955, the profit rate of the giant manufacturing corporations had increased 27 percent over 1952. Conversely, however, the rate of the smaller corporations—those with less than \$250,000 of assets—had dropped by 39 percent from 1952.

There are other signs that small business is not fully sharing in the business boom. Dun & Bradstreet reports that there were 46 failures for each 10,000 firms listed in its reports last year. These were all small-business failures. In the decade prior to 1953, the corresponding failure rate averaged 20 firms for each 10,000 firms listed by Dun & Bradstreet.

At the end of 1952 corporations with more than \$100 million of assets had 52 percent of all of the assets of manufacturing corporations. Two and one-half years later, 57 percent of the assets were held by corporations of this size. If this rate is not checked, it will take about 20 years for all of the manufacturing assets of the country to become concentrated into corporations of this giant size class.

If the tax rate on small and medium size firms will not allow such firms to accumulate expansion capital, then these firms will not be able to obtain such capital. It is by now undisputed that the capital markets for loan funds are generally not open to small business, and the capital markets for equity funds are even less so.

#### H. R. 9067 IS NEEDED TO CHECK THE MERGER MOVEMENT

While the giant corporations are generally reluctant to expand capacity in those industries in which they are already established, they are not averse to buying up and merging corporations in related and even unrelated lines of business. The pressure of cast accumulations of investment funds building up in the big corporations make such a merger movement almost inevitable. The great wave of corporate mergers and consolidations going on today is principally a result of the accumulation of investment funds in the big corporations, and the scarcity of capital available to finance the smaller corporations.

#### COMPARISONS WITH SENATE BILL

Questions will arise as to how the bill I have introduced compares with the two bills (S. 3128 and S. 3129) introduced in the Senate on February 3, by Senator FULBRIGHT.

Insofar as the tiny one- and two-man corporations are concerned, both bills would do the same. In both bills, 22 percent is the lowest overall rate. Senator FULBRIGHT's bill would give the benefit of this rate on the first \$25,000 of net income. My bill would give the benefit of the 22-percent rate on the first \$100,000 of net income.

In more fundamental respects, however, the bills are in no way similar. The following comparisons might be



made between the effects of my bill and the effects of the two bills introduced by Senator FULBRIGHT, the second of Sen-

ator FULBRIGHT's bills being to replace the revenue loss which would be brought about by his first bill:

On a taxable income of—	Amount of tax under present law	Fulbright bill		Patman bill	
		Amount of tax	Percent change	Amount of tax	Percent change
\$25,000.....	\$7,500	\$5,500	-26.7	\$5,500	-26.7
\$100,000.....	46,500	45,250	-27.0	22,000	-52.7
\$500,000.....	254,500	257,250	+1.1	150,000	-41.1
\$1,000,000.....	514,500	522,250	+1.5	345,000	-32.9
\$5,000,000.....	2,594,500	(7)	-----	2,105,000	-18.9
\$10,000,000.....	5,194,500	5,292,250	+1.9	4,655,000	-10.4
\$50,000,000.....	25,994,500	(7)	-----	26,255,000	+1.0
\$100,000,000.....	51,994,500	52,992,250	+1.9	56,755,000	+9.2
\$500,000,000.....	259,994,500	(7)	-----	312,755,000	+20.3
\$1,000,000,000.....	519,994,500	(7)	-----	667,750,000	+28.4

In other words, the bill I have introduced will make a true graduation, or progression, of tax rates; and it will help some firms of substantial size, not just the tiny firms. I would hope that my bill will help to restore and maintain a middle class in American business, and that it will help check the trend toward a business structure in which there are a few multi-billion-dollar corporations at the one extreme, and a number of very small distributors at the other.

It is time, I think, that we take a more realistic look at the way corporate incomes are distributed.

The latest available report from the Treasury Department, which is for the tax year 1952, shows that only 508 corporate returns reported 48 percent of all the net income of corporations. These 508 returns accounted for, as a maximum only one-tenth of 1 percent of the corporations. Thus almost half of all the net corporate income in the country was income of corporations receiving

more than \$10 million, and if separate figures were available for the really big corporations, they would show that this bulk of the income went to corporations receiving more than \$100 million of net income.

Similarly, the 3,000 corporations receiving more than \$1 million of net income accounted for no more than nine-tenths of 1 percent of the corporations, but they received 71 percent of all the net corporate income.

Conversely, corporations receiving incomes of less than \$25,000, accounted for only 6 percent of the net corporate income, and those receiving less than \$100,000 accounted for only 12 percent of the corporate income.

There have been recent news reports that General Motors net income before taxes last year was in excess of \$5 billion. This was more than the combined income of 98 percent of all the corporations in the country.

#### *How the corporate incomes were distributed in 1952*

Corporate returns with net incomes of—	Returns		Net income	
	Number	Cumulative percent of total	Amount	Cumulative percent of total
\$10,000,000 or more.....	508	0.1	\$19,344,152	47.8
Between \$5,000,000 and \$10,000,000.....	455	.2	3,129,000	55.6
Between \$1,000,000 and \$5,000,000.....	3,020	.9	6,351,075	71.3
Between \$500,000 and \$1,000,000.....	3,243	1.6	2,260,846	76.9
Between \$250,000 and \$500,000.....	5,968	3.0	2,080,626	82.0
Between \$100,000 and \$250,000.....	15,064	6.4	2,335,476	87.8
Between \$50,000 and \$100,000.....	20,623	11.0	1,443,968	91.4
Between \$25,000 and \$50,000.....	33,470	18.6	1,162,855	94.3
Between \$20,000 and \$25,000.....	26,357	24.6	594,566	95.7
Between \$15,000 and \$20,000.....	27,752	30.8	483,872	96.9
Between \$10,000 and \$15,000.....	37,136	39.2	458,022	98.1
Between \$5,000 and \$10,000.....	61,780	53.2	447,571	99.2
Under \$5,000.....	207,201	100.0	340,250	100.0
Total.....	442,577	100.0	40,431,697	100.0

#### **H. R. 9067 MIGHT ENCOURAGE DISSOLUTION OF BIG COMBINES**

It is not to be expected that the progression of tax rates provided in the bill will force any immediate splitup of the big corporations. It is entirely possible, however, that some of the big corporations will find it to their stockholder's advantage to work out voluntary dissolutions. This will be in those situations where the management knows that there are no substantial technological and managerial advantages attached to huge combines, and division into smaller units can be worked out without loss of efficiency. This is the way dissolutions

should be made—by the management that knows how to make them.

There are numbers of big corporations today that are living on the borderline—in the gray zone, as it were—of our antitrust laws. This leads these combines to throw great resources and prestige into political support of the parties and programs which promise them greatest immunity from the antitrust laws—a condition which is unwholesome in itself. Finally, on those rare occasions when the Federal courts are faced with the problem of ordering dissolution of an illegal combine, they have great difficulty in trying to unscramble the as-

sets in such a way that real dissolution will be had and, at the same time, efficient and potentially successful business units will result.

May I suggest that if voluntary dissolutions were made in a few of the more highly concentrated industries, this would go a long way toward solving some of the more troublesome problems that are plaguing us today. I have in mind the increasing problem raised by large numbers of small fabricators or distributors, on the one hand, trying to do business with a very small number of giant suppliers, on the other hand.

We have recently had dramatized, for example, the problems of the automobile dealers. The pressure grows year by year for legislation to regulate, or give a new basis, to relationships between dealer and manufacturer. And all such legislations yet conceived necessarily involve an elimination or restriction on competition between dealers—a solution which is contrary to our traditional policy. Yet the argument is plausibly made that we now find here more of the system of feudalism than free enterprise. The dealer's property rights in his business are abrogated at the manufacturer's whim to cancel his franchise. Investment of money and long years of building good public relations become worthless, or relatively so, and without enforceable claims.

The fact that franchises are cancelable is not, however, the root of the trouble. The automobile business grew up under this arrangement. The point is that not many years ago a man was content to put his money into a sales agency under a cancelable franchise. He then knew that if, say, the Chevrolet Motor Car Co. canceled his franchise, he would, assuming he knew his business, have no difficulty in getting a franchise from another manufacturer. He could sell Buicks, or Oldsmobiles, or Maxwells, or Hupmobiles, or a variety of other makes.

The loss of free enterprise does not result from cancelable franchises; it results from fewer and fewer alternative suppliers seeking dealers.

#### **CONSOLIDATED RETURNS**

Under present law, corporations owning subsidiary corporations are given the option of filing a consolidated return or separate returns. The presumption is that, in most instances, the advantages are on the side of filing a consolidated return, for two reasons: First, when separate returns are filed the corporation first receiving the income pays taxes at the regular rates and, in addition, 15 percent of the payments of dividends from one corporation to another are taxable as income of the corporation receiving the dividends. Second, should any of the corporations in the corporate family have a loss, such losses are more likely to reduce the income liable to tax when a consolidated return is filed, than when separate returns are filed. For these reasons the present law assesses a 2 percent surtax on consolidated returns.

H. R. 9067 does not change these features of present law. If experience with the progressive tax rates shows there is developing a tendency to create

subsidiary corporations, as a means of evading the impact of the progressive rates, then it may become necessary to amend the law further to prevent such evasion—either by requiring consolidated returns, by decreasing the amount of the exemption now provided for intercorporate dividends, or by other means.

This is, however, a matter which can await experience and study. For presently existing corporations, the options have already been elected, and these cannot be changed except with the consent of the Commissioner of Internal Revenue, upon application and presentation of good reason. Therefore, we will have at least a year to consider whether or not some additional amendment may be needed to prevent reorganizations for purposes of evading the new tax.

### THE LATE J. MARK WILCOX

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida [Mr. FASCELL].

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, I regretfully bring to the attention of the House news of the death of J. Mark Wilcox. The former Congressman from the Fourth Congressional District of Florida died on his farm at White Springs, Fla., on Friday, February 3, 1956.

The entire Florida delegation and all Members who served with Mark Wilcox in the 73d, 74th, and 75th Congresses are saddened that the brilliant sage of Willacoochee, Ga., has passed on.

His dedication to public service started in 1911 as solicitor for Jeff Davis County, Ga. He moved to Florida, and for 30 years thereafter, he served the people of his district, State, and Nation faithfully and with outstanding ability.

As a Congressman, his career has few parallels. The Wilcox Municipal Bankruptcy Act saved many cities in this country by permitting them to solve their financial difficulties. As a strong advocate of national preparedness, he sponsored the National Frontier Defensive Act which was the first step toward an adequate frontier defensive system for the United States.

Mark Wilcox leaves a warm spot in the hearts of all his friends and the many people who knew him. His love of people, his legendary wit and humor, have endeared him to all.

J. Mark Wilcox was a man whose life, work, record, and family will forever be a credit to his memory. As attestation of this, I cite a few of the many newspaper accounts of his death:

[From the Miami Herald of February 4, 1956]

#### HIS RECORD, CREDIT TO HIS MEMORY

The unexpected death of J. Mark Wilcox deprives this community of an outstanding citizen.

His services to Great Miami, the county, the State, and the Nation are an inspiring record of achievement for the public good.

Mark Wilcox was a brilliant lawyer. His legal abilities were responsible for salvaging the credit of West Palm Beach through a postboom bonded debt readjustment.

As the Representative in Congress from the Fourth Congressional District, Wilcox from his first appearance on the floor im-

pressed his colleagues with the scope and soundness of his thinking and judgment.

He was among the first nationally to sense the danger of Red Russia. He was an ardent advocate of national preparedness.

As a Congressman he sponsored pioneer legislation for building up military aviation. Today the country accepts what he said 2 decades ago: "Only through the strongest Air Force in the world will America be safe in the future."

Wilcox's grasp of sociopolitical economy was evidenced in his appeal in the depression years to this area to reclaim many sections of land for the development of new business.

He was an ardent pleader for the creation of Everglades National Park, long the president of the citizens' group working for its accomplishment. He warned this community that it could only achieve its full destiny by a cooperative thinking instead of the haphazard, ineffective proposals in which everyone wants to be a general.

His greatest contribution to the community was at the Miami International Airport.

His firsthand knowledge, gained from his airport bill in Congress, his legal skill, his ability to bring dissident groups into a cohesive action brought the airport out of the doldrums of early uncertainty into the careful planning and intelligent handling which have made Miami the gateway of the Americas and the hub for the most highly traveled air route in the Nation.

The people of this country were singularly fortunate in having Mark Wilcox to counsel officials in the airport development. He was as fine a legal representative as any elected body could have.

He was what we like to think is the type of man who merits being called a southern gentleman. Good citizen, good neighbor, he was endowed with the divine gift of liking people.

[From the Miami Daily News of February 4, 1956]

#### WILCOX SERVED US, NATION AND DADE

Sudden death of J. Mark Wilcox, Dade County Port Authority attorney, former congressman and outstanding civic leader, is a tragic loss to this community.

Dade County citizens, particularly Miami, knew Wilcox better in recent years during his residence in Miami, where he moved in the 1930's from West Palm Beach. However, the name of Wilcox is known all over America because of the Wilcox Municipal Bankruptcy Act. This law, still being used, helped Florida cities to refinance boomtime indebtedness they could not pay and other cities to rescheduled payments or better amortization of municipal bonds regardless of their finances.

There were many other remarkable legislative accomplishments to Wilcox's credit during his congressional career. His first term was one of the most effective, if not the most effective, in the annals of Congress. He probably could have been reelected Fourth District Congressman as long as he desired. He was defeated by circumstances and at considerable personal loss when he tried for the Senate in 1938.

Perhaps as important in its way to the Nation, Wilcox served this community faithfully for years as the man who put together the bond issues and legal instruments enabling International Airport to grow. He also fought ably for a new FEC railway station. He was little known to the general public, but he devoted long hours and lately, his entire time to the county business.

The \$21 million International Airport bond issue, now financing the current airport expansion, is the latest monument to his skill and his perseverance in behalf of

this community's greatest public asset. Few will doubt that County Commission Chairman MacVicar spoke the truth when he commented yesterday, "We shall miss him terribly."

Other Miamians will also miss J. Mark Wilcox for other things—for his friendships, for his associations in civic and fraternal organizations, and for his occasional political and other speeches. He was an accomplished orator and wit. All in all, the community can be comforted in that it has honored him and rewarded him in some measure—though little enough—for a lifetime of public service.

[From the Miami Herald of February 4, 1956]  
J. MARK WILCOX, 65, DIES—30-YEAR POLITICAL VETERAN

(By Bert Collier)

J. Mark Wilcox, 65, former Congressman and a public official and political leader for 3 decades, died Friday at his farm near White Springs, where he had gone for a rest.

Mr. Wilcox was stricken with a heart attack while under treatment for asthma and died unexpectedly.

Since organization of the Dade County Port Authority, he had been its attorney, handling the intricate legal details of financing and operating Miami International Airport, Venetian Causeway, and other authority enterprises.

He was a national authority on self-liquidating ventures of local governments.

Noted as an orator and wit, Mr. Wilcox was in demand as an after-dinner speaker and on the political hustings during his active career. He was a brilliant pleader before judge and jury.

In one case, involving a contest of the \$1 million Abram Barker will, he delivered a 13-hour summation, believed to be the longest in the history of the Florida bar.

He also asked a witness a 5,000-word question which required only a 5-word answer.

Called on frequently to read long and technical documents before the port authority, Mr. Wilcox liked to inject the words, "and give your attorney a salary increase." He maintained this kept his auditors awake and alert.

Born in Willacoochee, Ga., from which came in later life his affectionate designation as "the Sage of Willacoochee," Mr. Wilcox studied at Emory University and became a country schoolteacher.

Turning to the law, he practiced in Hazelhurst and Brunswick, Ga., before moving to West Palm Beach in the early 1920's.

After serving as city attorney there, Mr. Wilcox offered for Congress against the late Ruth Bryan Owen Rohde in 1932.

The big issue of the campaign was prohibition. Mrs. Rohde, like her famous father, was strict prohibitionist. Mr. Wilcox was one of the first candidates to favor relaxing the dry laws.

At that time the Congressional district extended along the east coast from Jacksonville to Key West. With enormous energy, the young Mr. Wilcox matched the oratory of the talented daughter of William Jennings Bryan, and won election.

He was reelected in 1934 by the same constituency of 18 counties and again in 1936, when the district was reduced to the counties from Vero Beach to Key West.

In three terms he introduced the municipal bankruptcy law which still bears his name and became the leading expert on legislation to help hard-pressed local governments during the depression. The Bankruptcy Act saved the cities of West Palm Beach, Coral Gables, and others.

He also authored numerous laws increasing the Military Establishment in the face of the growing menace from Nazi Germany. Through his efforts, bills establishing Everglades National Park and the Naval Air Station at Opa-locka were passed.



In 1938, Mr. Wilcox surrendered his seat to campaign for the Senate against Claude Pepper. Though he carried every county in his own congressional district, Mr. Wilcox lost the State.

Urged frequently to offer again for elective office, Mr. Wilcox refused. He became increasingly absorbed in his legal specialty and established his home in Miami. He lived in a downtown apartment hotel.

He is survived by his wife, Mrs. Christine Wilcox, who was with him when he died.

There are two sons, Joel C. Wilcox, assistant manager of the Greater Miami Traffic Association, and J. Mark Wilcox, Jr., an official of the United States General Accounting Office, Frankfurt, Germany, and five grandchildren.

Ben Lanier Funeral Home is in charge of arrangements.

[From the New York Times of February 4, 1956]

#### J. MARK WILCOX, 66, EX-REPRESENTATIVE

WHITE SPRINGS, FLA., February 3.—J. Mark Wilcox, Miami Port Authority attorney and former United States Representative from the old Fourth District, died last night after a heart attack. His age was 66.

As a Member of Congress he was the author of two nationally important legislative measures. He sponsored the Wilcox Municipal Bankruptcy Act, which became law in 1934 and permitted cities to adjust bonded indebtedness, and the National Frontier Defense Act, passed in 1935, the first step toward an adequate frontier defensive system for the United States.

He also was a leading supporter of measures that created the Tennessee Valley Authority and the Everglades National Park.

Survivors include his widow and two sons, J. Mark, Jr., and Joel C.

Mr. Wilcox, a Democrat, served in the 73d, 74th, and 75th Congresses (1933-38).

A leading spokesman for national air defense he campaigned both before and after the passage of the 1935 defense bill to have the armed services construct air bases for defense of the interior.

In 1938, he was defeated by Senator Claude Pepper in the Florida Democratic primaries for nomination for the Senate. Mr. Wilcox had run as an opponent of the New Deal.

[From the New York Herald Tribune of February 4, 1956]

#### J. MARK WILCOX, EX-CONGRESSMAN

WHITE SPRINGS, FLA., February 3.—J. Mark Wilcox, 66, Miami Port Authority attorney and former United States Representative from Florida, died last night.

As a Member of Congress he sponsored the Wilcox Municipal Bankruptcy Act, which became law in 1934 and permitted cities to adjust bonded indebtedness, and the National Frontier Defense Act, which was the first step toward an adequate frontier defensive system for the United States. He also was a leading supporter of measures which created the Tennessee Valley Authority and the Everglades National Park.

#### WARNED OF PEARL HARBOR

Mr. Wilcox's Defensive Act, which became law in 1935, affected airbases throughout the United States, including Mitchell Field, which it expanded to 400 officers and 1,500 men and made a base for 150 planes. In recommending another airbase for Alaska, he warned 6 years before the attack on Pearl Harbor of the danger of such assault by air from Japan.

Mr. Speaker, his family have suffered an irreparable loss, and to them I extend my deepest sympathy and condolences.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend

my remarks and to include certain newspaper articles.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members of the House may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks at this point in the Record.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, the curtain of death has been drawn on a noble and illustrious life and the work and career of a fine man ends. I would like to join in paying tribute to this great American, and a former member of this body, the Honorable J. Mark Wilcox.

Mr. Wilcox, a native Georgian, moved to West Palm Beach in 1925, and became one of south Florida's most outstanding citizens and statesmen, making many contributions to his State and to his Nation. He was elected a member of the 73d Congress from the then Fourth District of Florida in 1933, and was reelected in 1935 and again in 1937 to the 74th and 75th Congresses. His record as a Congressman was brilliant. He was the author of two nationally important legislative measures: The Wilcox Municipal Bankruptcy Act, which became law in 1934, permitting cities to adjust bonded indebtedness; and the National Frontier Defense Act, which was the first step toward an adequate frontier defense system for the United States. He also served while in Congress as a member of President Hoover's Conference on Home Ownership, on the taxation committee. Of primary interest to Florida was legislation introduced by Mr. Wilcox creating the Everglades National Park, and also the survey of the Intracoastal Waterway through Broward County, which was enacted into law during the 74th Congress.

Mr. Speaker, Florida and the Nation have lost a fine citizen and public servant, one who always gave generously of himself in serving his fellowman. He was a great American and rendered invaluable services both in private and public life.

I know that Mr. Wilcox's family and children can look back on history in the years to come on a father who ranks among the great Floridians of his time. To his family I would like to extend my deepest sympathy. May God bless and sustain them in their hour of sorrow.

Mr. Speaker, I would like also to call to the attention of the Members of this House the following editorial from one of our great newspapers in Florida, the Palm Beach Post-Times, which expresses the deep feeling of the people of my district for J. Mark Wilcox:

#### J. MARK WILCOX: LEADING CITIZEN

"Greatness and goodness are not means, but ends.

Hath he not always treasures, always friends,

The great good man?"

—Samuel Taylor Coleridge.

When Congressman J. Mark Wilcox returned to his hometown in 1933 to make the

principal address at the traditional July 4 celebration, reference to him in newspaper accounts of the occasion as "West Palm Beach's leading citizen" was no mere figure of speech.

He was that, and more. Coming to West Palm Beach in 1925, he had won the hearts, confidence, and respect of that city's people by the simple, yet complex, process of being a good citizen and a good man. His brilliance as an attorney, and his genuine interest in his adopted community and its problems, soon won him widespread recognition.

In 1928, he was appointed city attorney. In 1929, he was presented the Civitan "Award of Merit" for outstanding civic achievement in recognition for his work on the city's distressing bond problem. In 1930, he was named general counsel of the Florida League of Municipalities, where he worked untiringly to give other cities of the State the benefit of his study and experience on municipal finance. In 1932, he was overwhelmingly nominated and elected as Member of Congress from what was then the Fourth District of Florida—the east coast from the Georgia line to Key West.

The depression came early to Florida. We were in it in 1928, as a result of the great "bust" which followed the great "boom" of the midtwenties. Characteristically, one of J. Mark's first acts when he became city attorney was to cut his own salary in order to help the city meet its financial crisis.

Generous to a fault, he was just as quick to come to the aid of fellow citizens caught in the economic squeeze of the times, often at a personal sacrifice. He gave not only of his substance, but his time and his talents as well. He was either a leader or a willing worker in every worthwhile program in West Palm Beach, especially those with the aim of helping the unfortunate.

He was, indeed a leading citizen, and if ever a man bore the mark of greatness, that man was J. Mark Wilcox. That became evident to all of Florida and to the whole Nation during his first term in Congress. The freshman Representative sponsored the Municipal Bankruptcy Act, which became law in 1934 and permitted cities to adjust their bonded indebtedness. West Palm Beach is only one of hundreds of cities throughout the United States which owe their present financial stability to that vital legislation.

Later, Representative Wilcox authored the National Frontier Defense Act, which was the first step toward an adequate frontier defensive system for the United States. This was just another example of his remarkable vision and keen analytical mind.

As an amusing sidelight, it is interesting to note that a Miami newspaper, reviewing his accomplishments in 1936, referred to Representative Wilcox as "the Miami Congressman," although J. Mark proudly proclaimed West Palm Beach as his home until November 1938. And the Atlanta Constitution, in a 1935 editorial predicting a brilliant Senate career for the Congressman, took pride in reminding its readers that Wilcox was a native of Georgia and was educated there.

That he was headed for the eminence of being a leading citizen of the Nation there is little doubt, but fate decreed otherwise. Wilcox was always a loyal Democrat, but first of all he was a loyal American. He gave wholehearted support to President Franklin D. Roosevelt's early efforts to lift the Nation out of the depths of the great depression by extraordinary measures, even though he recognized that some of them were potentially dangerous.

However, he soon realized that F. D. R. was determined to lead the Nation toward socialism, and he made use of his great oratorical powers to vigorously oppose extension of Federal control over individual lives and encroachment on States rights. He broke sharply with the administration when

the bold attempt was made to pack the Supreme Court. That cost him the friendship of F. D. R. and his New Deal clan, and eventually ended his political career.

President Roosevelt's plan to raise the court's membership to 15, he said, "could accomplish no good, but would result in doing infinite harm. \* \* \* The proposal to increase the numbers of judges so as to guarantee in advance the sort of decisions desired \* \* \* would bring the judiciary into disrepute and tend to put an end to free government in America."

When Wilcox entered the Florida Democratic primary against Senator Claude Pepper in 1938, Rooseveltian "justice" intervened to defeat him. Through his son and secretary, James, F. D. R. made it known that he wanted Pepper, "who stood for and believed in the things the administration stands for," returned to Washington. And he backed up that desire with a spate of Federal money and projects.

So, J. Mark Wilcox's services to America were lost because he was a real American and wanted to preserve the cornerstone of its greatness. Perhaps we today are in a better position than the electorate of 1938 to appreciate how sound were his reasons for outspoken opposition to tampering with the system which made ours a government of laws instead of a government of men. The future may hold even more positive proof that Representative Wilcox was a "leading citizen" in this issue too.

Now J. Mark Wilcox is dead.

He will be sorely missed—as a husband, a father, and a friend. He will be missed as a defender of justice, a financial expert, a reliable consultant. He will be missed as a brilliant attorney, as a sound mind in a crazy world.

But he will be remembered as a true American who had the best interests of his constituents and his nation at heart; and to those who knew him best he will always be our leading citizen.

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join with my colleagues to pay tribute to my late friend, James Mark Wilcox. While Florida was his adopted State he served it well in many capacities and was still serving Florida at the time of his untimely death. He ably represented the Fourth Congressional District of Florida in the Seventy-third, Seventy-fourth and Seventy-fifth Congresses. He was a good legislator as well as a capable and conscientious man in all his efforts. Mark Wilcox introduced the municipal bankruptcy bill which still bears his name. He was one of the first Members of the Congress to become aware of the menace of Nazi Germany and he worked for increased military establishments in the face of that menace. Through his efforts, the Everglades National Park was established.

After his retirement from the Congress he returned to Dade County, Fla., to practice law. He was the attorney for the Dade County Port Authority since the beginning of that organization. He had charge of the legal and financial operations of the Miami International Airport, the Venetian Causeway, and other port authority projects. He was well known as a national authority on self-liquidating ventures of local governments.

Mark Wilcox was a brilliant lawyer. He once gave a 13-hour summation of a case before the Florida bar, which is believed to be the longest summation ever given in the history of the bar. He was noted as an orator and a wit, and as

such was in great demand as an after-dinner speaker. Consequently, Mark, who was born in Willacoochee, Ga., became known as the sage of Willacoochee.

Mark Wilcox was one of the outstanding men in the political life of our State for many years. We all shall miss him.

I extend to his family and his many thousand friends my deepest sympathy.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I wish to take this opportunity to express my deepest regrets at the recent death of the Honorable Mark Wilcox, distinguished former Congressman from Miami, Fla. Mr. Wilcox served honorably and faithfully in the Congress of the United States from 1932 to 1938.

I was not privileged to serve with Mark Wilcox, but I knew him well for many years, and admired him for his devotion to principle and his courageous adherence to the principles of democracy. His service in Congress was outstanding. He quickly gained recognition and was nationally known for his legislative achievements.

After his retirement from active politics, he continued to show a great interest in public affairs and served the State of Florida in many ways in his business and civic activities.

There are many throughout the Nation who remember him for his achievements and who join with us in the State of Florida in mourning the passing of a distinguished and beloved citizen. My earnest sympathies are extended to all the members of his family.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, the tributes which have been paid here today to the memory of Hon. James Mark Wilcox constitute a real indication of the deep affection in which he was held by everyone. It was my privilege to claim him as a close personal friend for whom I had the highest regard, and I want to add this brief word of mine to the many fine things which have been said concerning him.

Mark Wilcox, as we all knew him, was a Member of the House of Representatives when I came here as a freshman Member 21 years ago. He was one of the most lovable and kindly men it has been my privilege to know, who promptly endeared himself to me by his many kind acts. I soon recognized his ability as an able legislator, and found him to be one of the hardest working and most conscientious members I have ever known.

Most of Mark Wilcox's life was dedicated to the service of his fellow man. His contributions to his State and his country have been great. Our deepest sympathy and love is extended to his wife and family, who have every right to be proud of the splendid heritage which he has left them.

Mr. BENNETT of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I wish to extend to the loved ones of Congressman Wilcox my very deepest sympathy and that of all of my constituents. He was a noble and a great man, of splendid character; and his passing is a loss to us all. He left behind him a splendid memorial in his legislative achievements and in the love of all who knew him.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join with my colleagues from Florida expressing my sadness because of the

death of the Honorable J. Mark Wilcox, who was the former Congressman from the Fourth Congressional District of Florida.

Mr. Wilcox had many friends in the Eighth District of Florida, that I have the high honor to represent. He died on his farm at White Springs, Fla., on Friday, February 3, 1956. This community is in my district, and I think there is a divine providence in the fact that Mark Wilcox died surrounded by the beautiful Suwannee River and the trees that he loved so well.

As a Congressman, his colleagues will remember that his Municipal Bankruptcy Act saved many cities in this country from financial destruction. Mark Wilcox believed in peace through national preparedness, and he sponsored the National Frontier Defensive Act, which was so important in making America conscious of the need for an adequate defensive system.

When Mark Wilcox was a Member of Congress, he represented a district which extended along the east coast from Jacksonville to Key West. With enormous energy he dedicated himself to the task of representing this great area and all of Florida was the beneficiary of his constructive legislative action.

In later years, Mr. Wilcox was busy in the practice of law, which absorbed most of his time. I saw him frequently, however, in Hamilton County in the Eighth District of Florida, and in other areas of that section which he loved so well.

I want to extend to the family of Mark Wilcox, and to his many friends, my heartfelt sympathy, and I know we all recognize with sadness that Florida will sorely miss one of her most illustrious citizens.

#### UPPER COLORADO RIVER STORAGE PROJECT

Mr. DIXON. 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 Utah?

There was no objection.

Mr. DIXON. Mr. Speaker, today I should like to correct some serious misunderstandings that have arisen over the upper Colorado River storage project and its relation to the farm-surplus problem.

The plain fact of the matter is that there is little or no relation between the Colorado project and the existing surpluses—construction of the project will not materially, if at all, contribute to the surplus problem.

It will be at least 10 years before new agricultural production can begin on lands watered by the Colorado project, and 20 to 25 years or more before the project is completely in production.

When all units of the project are in full production, only 132,360 acres will have been added to the farm production of the region and the Nation, and a more complete water supply for an additional 233,000 acres.

Now during all the time that the upper Colorado project is being constructed



and brought into production, this Nation will be losing productive farmland at a startling rate. Cities are being expanded, new highways are being constructed, airports are built or enlarged, new industrial plants go up, more land is set aside for military reservations. All in all, these and other similar conversions of land use make 1 million acres of farmland into nonfarmland each year. And the destructive forces of erosion take another 400,000 acres of agricultural land out of production annually.

That means that in the 10 years while the very first units of the upper Colorado project are being built, the Nation will have lost 10 to 14 million acres of farmland. The four upper Colorado River Basin States—Colorado, New Mexico, Utah, and Wyoming, where the storage project will be built—will themselves lose more land. The four upper basin States are losing 160,000 acres of cultivable land each year. They will lose more land each year than the new land brought into cultivation by the upper Colorado project in 20 to 25 years, and in 3 years they will lose more land than the 132,000 new acres plus the 233,000 acres provided with supplemental water.

It should be remembered, too, that many of the forces that are working to take agricultural land out of production are rapidly accelerating. Highway building is a typical example. We are building highways bigger than ever before, with increasing emphasis on divided highways, so-called freeways that take double the amount of land required by the roads of a decade ago. Recently when it was decided to extend the turnpike from Canton, Ohio to Chicago, it was found that the cost in agricultural lands would be between 80,000 and 100,000 acres. With the President's proposals for a 10-year program of highway building and modernization across the Nation before us, no one can doubt that the amount of farmland that will be covered up by asphalt and concrete will increase substantially in the next few years.

Airports are another example. Each year our planes get bigger and faster and require longer runways to accommodate them. Within a few years we shall have jet transports flying our skies on regular commercial schedules—requiring airports even bigger than those we have today. Again, the cost in farmland will be tremendous.

Both highways and airports tend to take over the very choice agricultural lands, the flat lands that make the best farms. The dollar value of lost farm production is correspondingly great.

The Agriculture Department has warned us that within a very few years we shall no longer be producing more farm crops than we can consume. Rather, we shall be looking for new lands to replace those that have been lost, and to raise larger crops to feed the greatly increased population we shall have a few years hence.

For these reasons, Mr. Speaker, I believe it is conclusively plain that the upper Colorado River storage project can add very little if any to our problem of

agricultural surpluses. It can only help us to meet our expanding food needs in the years to come, when our surpluses will have long ceased to exist.

#### THE RIGHT TO VOTE

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. ROOSEVELT] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, the ladies and gentlemen of the House will remember that in his state of the Union message the President requested the appointment of a commission because of the fact that he was seriously disturbed by the possibility that certain American citizens were being denied the right to vote in their areas.

As the result of that request, on January 31 I addressed a letter to the Attorney General of the United States, the Honorable Herbert Brownell, Jr., in which I asked him certain specific questions.

I first pointed out to him that it was beyond dispute that large numbers of American citizens are being denied the right to vote, and that the threat of violence should they exercise their right to vote is a very real and existing menace. Therefore, I asked him whether in his opinion, and I had in mind particularly the need of the commission which he had requested, there is existing in Federal law sufficient authority to take care of the situation when such exists.

I asked further that if legislation in any degree is needed, does he plan to recommend such legislation to the President for transmission to the Congress.

Thirdly, I asked if such recommendations are planned, and with knowledge that the legislative process is necessarily slow, would these views be made known in the near future so that action could be taken at this session of the 84th Congress.

I am very happy to say that the office of the Attorney General, although my letter is dated only January 31, has prepared an answer which has been received by me as of the date of February 3. I would like to call particular attention to the answers which are in that letter. First, the Attorney General states that in the opinion of the Attorney General existing Federal law is not sufficient to take care of the situation when such a situation exists. Second, he states that the Attorney General plans to recommend such legislation to the President for transmission to the Congress. Third, that the Attorney General is presently engaged in preparing comprehensive legislation in this field and plans to transmit it in the near future so that action may be taken at this session of the 84th Congress.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert the text of both of these letters in the Record at this point, and to add simply that in my opinion the forthcoming message from the President, as a result of the Attorney General's recommendations, are of the greatest importance to many Members of this House and, of course, to the citizens of the

United States who will be affected thereby. I sincerely hope that these recommendations will reach us in time that they may get the study and the action which I am sure they will deserve. I shall watch with great interest the timing of the forthcoming message because many of us have waited for a considerable period before taking action in order that the administration could come forward with their recommendations. We hope that further delay will not ensue and that, therefore, these measures may be considered before the adjournment of the 84th Congress. In any event we shall be prepared to act.

The letters referred to are as follows:

JANUARY 31, 1956.

The Honorable HERBERT BROWNELL, Jr.,  
Attorney General,  
Department of Justice,  
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR GENERAL BROWNELL: As I am sure you are aware, I am deeply concerned that the fundamental issue of civil rights and liberties be given full consideration by both the Congress and the executive branch and that such action as is reasonable and fair be initiated at the earliest practical moment.

It would seem beyond dispute that large numbers of American citizens are being denied the right to vote because of the color of their skin and accident of birth; that the threat of violence should they exercise their right to vote is a very real and existing menace and that, therefore, there exists a grave danger of physical violence among a large portion of the population.

It would seem extremely clear that, among other articles of the Constitution, sections 2 and 5 of article XIV impose a direct duty upon Congress. It would seem to me to be equally evident that any interference with the right to vote requires Federal legislation to make it a punishable crime and that such acts need to be clearly defined.

Would you therefore inform me as to the following:

1. In your opinion is there existing Federal law sufficient to take care of the situation, when such a situation exists?

2. If legislation in any degree is needed, do you plan to recommend such legislation to the President for transmission to the Congress?

3. If such recommendations are planned and with knowledge that the legislative process is necessarily slow, do you plan to make your views known in the near future so that action may be taken at this session of the 84th Congress?

May I urge upon you the seriousness of the situation, and the earnest hope that such suggestions as you may have may be immediately forthcoming in order that our position in the world may not be held up for further ridicule and that justice may be given to American citizens who are without question fully and clearly entitled to it.

Very sincerely yours,

JAMES ROOSEVELT.

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE,

Washington, February 3, 1956.

Hon. JAMES ROOSEVELT,

House of Representatives,

Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN ROOSEVELT: This will acknowledge with thanks your letter of January 31, 1956, to the Attorney General, which in his absence from the city, has been referred to me for reply.

You state that you are deeply concerned that the fundamental issue of civil rights be given full and prompt consideration by both the Congress and the executive branch. You also state that large numbers of Amer-

ican citizens are being denied the right to vote because of the color of their skin and accident of birth; and that their right to vote is being denied by threats of violence. You also state that among other articles of the Constitution, sections 2 and 5 of article XIV impose a direct duty upon Congress; that any interference with the right to vote requires Federal legislation to make it a punishable crime and that such acts should be clearly defined. Finally, you ask three questions each of which may be answered in the affirmative.

1. In the opinion of the Attorney General, existing Federal law is not sufficient to take care of the situation, when such a situation exists.

2. The Attorney General plans to recommend such legislation to the President for transmission to the Congress.

3. The Attorney General is presently engaged in preparing comprehensive legislation in this field and plans to transmit it in the near future so that action may be taken at this session of the 84th Congress.

Please be assured that your interest in this matter is fully appreciated. There is probably no matter within the Department which is of greater concern to the Attorney General than to make meaningful every guarantee of civil rights and liberties contained in the Constitution.

Sincerely yours,

J. LEE RANKIN,  
Assistant Attorney General,  
Office of Legal Counsel.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and insert two letters.

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

There was no objection.

#### LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows to:

Mr. OLIVER P. BOLTON (at the request of Mr. MARTIN), for February 7 and 8, on account of illness in the family.

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee, for February 8 to the 18th of February, 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 were granted to:

Mr. BAILEY, for 1 hour, on Wednesday next.

Mr. GRAY, for 15 minutes, on Thursday, February 16.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. FEIGHAN and to include certain articles.

Mr. VANIK and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee.

Mr. ENGLE and to include an editorial.

Mr. DIXON.

Mr. JENSEN.

Mr. FOGARTY to revise and extend his remarks made in Committee and include extraneous matter.

Mr. BECKER (at the request of Mr. MARTIN) and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania.

Mr. FORAND and to include an address by Senator CLINTON P. ANDERSON at the congressional dinner of the nationalities division of the Democratic National Committee on January 28.

Mr. DAVIDSON.

Mr. CHRISTOPHER and include a newspaper article from the Missouri Farmer, of Columbia, Mo.

Mr. MULTER (at the request of Mr. KEOGH) and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. PATTERSON and include extraneous matter.

Mr. ASHLEY (at the request of Mr. ALBERT) and to include extraneous matter.

#### ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 6645. An act to amend the Natural Gas Act, as amended.

#### SENATE ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 1261. An act to authorize the conveyance of certain lands within Caven Point terminal and ammunition loading pier, New Jersey, to the New Jersey Turnpike Authority;

S. 1683. An act to amend the act of June 13, 1949 (63 Stat. 172), and for other purposes;

S. 1959. An act to direct the Secretary of the Army or his designee to convey a 6.89-acre tract of land out of a 199.959-acre tract of land situated in the vicinity of Houston, Harris County, Tex., to the State of Texas;

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

S. 2990. An act to extend through June 30, 1957, the duration of the Poliomyelitis Vaccination Assistance Act of 1955.

#### BILLS AND A JOINT RESOLUTION PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, bills and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 1078. An act for the relief of Dr. Robert C. Jalbuena;

H. R. 1084. An act for the relief of Dorothy Antonia (Suk-fong) Leong;

H. R. 1092. An act for the relief of George Henry Mahoney;

H. R. 1193. An act for the relief of Dr. and Mrs. Ivan Pernar;

H. R. 1198. An act for the relief of Kenneth K. W. Lau and Romana Say Soat Kheng, also known as Mrs. Anne Say Lau;

H. R. 1208. An act for the relief of Mrs. Esther Moreno;

H. R. 1232. An act for the relief of Salvador, Mercedes, and Miguel Chofre;

H. R. 1657. An act for the relief of Louis B. Prus-Latkiewicz;

H. R. 1907. An act for the relief of James Wilson;

H. R. 2049. An act for the relief of Anastasios Seilemetzidis;

H. R. 2525. An act for the relief of Madiros Kebabjian;

H. R. 2782. An act for the relief of Josefa Martinez Infante;

H. R. 2945. An act for the relief of Joan Frances Feeley;

H. R. 3188. An act for the relief of William Lawler;

H. R. 4025. An act for the relief of Mrs. Donald A. Howard (nee Miss Elsa Ursula Kuchinke);

H. R. 4548. An act for the relief of Michelo Pica;

H. R. 4612. An act for the relief of Vladimir and Svatava Hoschl;

H. R. 4769. An act for the relief of Mrs. Barbara (Pearson) Boycott;

H. R. 5869. An act for the relief of Andreas (or Andrew) Voutsinas;

H. R. 5870. An act for the relief of Jesajahu Braun;

H. R. 6298. An act to amend section 601 (g) of the act entitled "An act to expedite the provision of housing in connection with national defense, and for other purposes," approved October 14, 1940, as amended, to permit transfer of war housing projects to the city of Moses Lake, Wash., and to other communities similarly situated;

H. R. 6645. An act to amend the Natural Gas Act, as amended;

H. R. 7094. An act to amend section 120 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1939 (relating to unlimited deduction for charitable contributions);

H. R. 7197. An act for the relief of Mrs. Mary Christine Dowdy;

H. R. 7930. An act authorizing the completion of the initial stage of development for flood control and other purposes in the Russian River Basin, Calif.; and

H. J. Res. 471. Joint resolution to permit FHA title I repair assistance to new homes damaged by major disasters.

#### ADJOURNMENT

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 27 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, February 8, 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:

1495. A letter from the Deputy Secretary of Defense, relative to 6 reports received from the Department of the Army covering 270 violations of section 3679, Revised Statutes, and Department of Defense Directive 7200.1 entitled "Administrative Control of Appropriations Within the Department of Defense," pursuant to section 3679 (1) (2), Revised Statutes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

1496. A letter from the Secretary of Labor, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to provide temporary disability insurance benefits for employees in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.



## 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. ENGLE: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H. R. 6643. A bill to amend the reclamation laws to provide that excess lands acquired by foreclosure or inheritance may receive water temporarily for 5 years; with amendment (Rept. No. 1748). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. ENGLE: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H. R. 412. A bill to authorize the construction, operation, and maintenance by the Secretary of the Interior of the Frypan-Arkansas project, Colorado; with amendment (Rept. No. 1749). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

## ADVERSE REPORTS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII,

Mr. VINSON: Committee on Armed Services. House Resolution 396. Resolution disapproving the sale of the Institute, W. Va., copolymer plant, Plancor 980 (Rept. No. 1750). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

## PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. COOPER:

H. R. 9120. A bill to amend the public assistance and related provisions of the Social Security Act to provide separate matching of assistance expenditures for medical care, to provide gradually for equal matching of old-age assistance expenditures supplementing old-age and survivors insurance benefits, to make clear the purpose of encouraging States to provide assistance and services to help strengthen family life and to help needy families and individuals attain self-support or self-care, to assist in improving administration of public assistance programs through research and training, to improve aid to dependent children, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ASPINALL:

H. R. 9121. A bill to establish an additional pension program for veterans of World War I; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 9122. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Colorado River storage project and participating projects, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. DAWSON of Utah:

H. R. 9123. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Colorado River storage project and participating projects, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BLATNIK:

H. R. 9124. A bill to provide for the issuance of a special series of postage stamps commemorating the 100th anniversary of the founding of the city of Duluth, Minn.; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. BROYHILL:

H. R. 9125. A bill to amend section 8 (d) (1) of the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, to extend on an equitable basis the increases in annuities provided therein to persons separated from the service with entitlement to deferred annuity; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. BURDICK:

H. R. 9126. A bill to establish an additional pension program for veterans of World War I; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. DIXON:

H. R. 9127. A bill to provide for the establishment of a national seed-storage facility; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. DOYLE:

H. R. 9128. A bill to amend the Japanese-American Evacuation Claims Act of 1948, as amended, to expedite the final determination of the claims, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ELLIOTT:

H. R. 9129. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. KEOGH:

H. R. 9130. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide that the wage credit of \$160 a month for military or naval service, granted to individuals who served in the Armed Forces of the United States, shall also be granted to certain individuals who served in the armed forces of countries allied with the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MILLER of Nebraska:

H. R. 9131. A bill to amend section 1 of the act entitled "An act to authorize the President of the United States to make withdrawals of public lands in certain cases" (36 Stat. 847), approved June 25, 1910, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 9132. A bill to provide for the approval of the report of the Secretary of the Interior on the Ainsworth unit of the Missouri River Basin project; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MILLER of California:

H. R. 9133. A bill to amend the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 to make applicable to Members of Congress the current provisions of section 10 of the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, relating to voluntary contributions; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. OSTERTAG:

H. R. 9134. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act authorizing Federal participation in the cost of protecting the shores of publicly owned property," approved August 13, 1946; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. PELLY:

H. R. 9135. A bill to provide parking space for the automobiles of patrons and postal employees at postal installations; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. RAINS:

H. R. 9136. A bill to amend the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940 to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to purchase loans guaranteed under the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 from the national service life insurance fund, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. SHUFORD:

H. R. 9137. A bill to waive section 142, of title 28, United States Code, with respect to the United States District Court for the Western District of North Carolina holding court at Bryson City, N. C.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. THOMPSON of Texas:

H. R. 9138. A bill to amend the Texas City Claims Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WILLIS:

H. R. 9139. A bill to provide a 1-year period during which certain veterans may be granted national service life insurance; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. ALEXANDER:

H. R. 9140. A bill maintaining the 1955 burley tobacco allotment quota; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. CHUDOFF:

H. R. 9141. A bill to make certain graduates of maritime schools who have served 2 years as licensed officers on United States vessels eligible for appointment as permanent commissioned officers in the Coast Guard; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. DINGELL:

H. R. 9142. A bill to amend the National Labor Relations Act in order to permit supervisors to be considered as employees under the provisions of such act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. HALE:

H. R. 9143. A bill to amend the Cooperative Forest Management Act; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. HOLT:

H. R. 9144. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. KLEIN:

H. R. 9145. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 to provide increases in benefits, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. McDOWELL:

H. R. 9146. A bill to amend section 6 of the act of August 24, 1912, as amended, with respect to the recognition of organizations of postal and Federal employees; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. O'NEILL:

H. R. 9147. A bill to amend the Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act, as amended, to provide increased benefits in case of disabling injuries, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. SHUFORD:

H. R. 9148. A bill to maintain the 1955 burley tobacco allotment quota; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. TUMULTY:

H. R. 9149. A bill to provide that members of the Armed Forces who claim their privilege against self-incrimination shall thereby forfeit their rights to benefits provided veterans; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. UDALL:

H. R. 9150. A bill to provide domestic and community sanitation facilities and services for Indians, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. McCORMACK:

H. J. Res. 517. Joint resolution changing the date for the counting of the electoral votes in 1957; passed House.

By Mr. ABBITT:

H. J. Res. 518. Joint resolution relating to fire-cured and dark air-cured tobacco acreage allotments and marketing quotas; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. DOYLE:

H. J. Res. 519. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FASCELL:

H. J. Res. 520. 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. LANKFORD:

H. J. Res. 521. Joint resolution relating to Maryland tobacco acreage allotments and marketing quotas; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. NATCHER:

H. J. Res. 522. Joint resolution relating to fire-cured and dark air-cured tobacco acreage allotments and marketing quotas; to the Committee on Agriculture.

## PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. FORD:

H. R. 9151. A bill for the relief of Albert Rieksts; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GORDON:

H. R. 9152. A bill for the relief of Maria Gundel; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GRANAHAH:

H. R. 9153. A bill for the relief of Ignacio Maria Segovia de Aparicio; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JACKSON:

H. R. 9154. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Eve Mae Hardy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 9155. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Madeleine (Alessandri) Burns; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LIPSCOMB:

H. R. 9156. A bill for the relief of Eustace Victor Phelan (also known as Robert Phelan); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MILLER of California:

H. R. 9157. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Magdalena Brenner Jackson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PATMAN:

H. R. 9158. A bill to confer jurisdiction on the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Texas, Jefferson Division, to hear, determine, and render judgment on certain claims of George W. Edwards, Jr., against the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RAY:

H. R. 9159. A bill for the relief of Hjalmar Johansen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROBERTS:

H. R. 9160. A bill for the relief of Norman H. Cunningham; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 9161. A bill for the relief of Michael Tony Fenfene; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SHELLEY:

H. R. 9162. A bill for the relief of Ellen G. Marinas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SIEMINSKI:

H. R. 9163. A bill for the relief of Manuel Gonzales Corona; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. SULLIVAN (by request):

H. R. 9164. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Rita Maria Agnes Larski Settlement; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TUMULTY:

H. R. 9165. A bill for the relief of Joseph F. Piggett; 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:

487. By Mr. BRAY: Petition of 99 persons of Monroe County, Ind., in support of H. R. 4627, a bill to prohibit the transportation of alcoholic beverage advertising in interstate commerce; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

488. Also, petition of 59 persons of Monroe County, Ind., in support of H. R. 4627, a bill to prohibit the transportation of alcoholic beverage advertising in interstate commerce; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

489. Also, petition of 143 persons of Monroe County, Ind., in support of H. R. 4627, a bill to prohibit the transportation of alcoholic beverage advertising in interstate commerce; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

490. By Mr. ELLSWORTH: Petition of J. Irene Hanekamp, president, and 21 other ladies of the World Vision Missionary Society of Lighthouse Temple, Eugene, Oreg., urging enactment of legislation to prevent advertisement of alcoholic beverages on television and in newspapers and magazines; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

491. By Mr. FOGARTY: Petition of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Rhode Island, submitted by Mary M. Eldridge, legislative director, and signed by 40 residents of Rhode Island urging the use of the powers of Congress to get alcoholic beverage advertising off the air and out of the channels of interstate commerce and thus protect our people and the rights of States to prevent advertising of commodities which have been declared unlawful by the rights of local option granted them under State law; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

492. By Mr. FORAND: Petition of Mary M. Eldridge, legislative director of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Rhode Island and 93 others from Rhode Island, urging enactment of legislation to remove advertising of alcoholic beverages from the air and out of channels of interstate commerce and thus protect our people and the rights of States by preventing advertising of commodities which have been declared unlawful by the rights of local option granted under State law; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

493. By Mr. NORBLAD: Petition of Mrs. Mabel Krahmer and 15 other citizens of Hillsboro, Oreg., urging that the Townsend plan, as defined in H. R. 4471, be enacted into law; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

494. By Mr. SHORT: Petition of M. Johnson, and other citizens, of Lawrence County, Mo., protesting alcoholic beverage advertising on radio and television; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

495. Also, petition of Rev. Emory Wallace, and other citizens, of Greene County, Mo., protesting the advertising of alcoholic beverages on radio and television; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

496. Also, petition of Mrs. E. C. Allman, and many other citizens, urging the support of S. 923 and H. R. 4627; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

497. Also, petition of John F. Carter, and other citizens, of Aurora, Mo., urging the support of S. 923 and H. R. 4627; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

498. Also, petition of Mr. and Mrs. Ben Baugh, and other citizens, of Lawrence County, Mo., urging the passage of bills S. 923 and H. R. 4627; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

499. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the secretary, Tulare Chamber of Commerce, Tulare, Calif., relative to recommending the establishing of Success Dam on the Tule River and Terminus Dam on the Kaweah River, and requesting the immediate appropriation of funds necessary for their construction; to the Committee on Appropriations.

500. Also, petition of the faithful navigator, Long Island General Assembly, Knights of Columbus, Brooklyn, N. Y., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to expressing their support of the principles of the proposed Bricker amendment to our Federal Constitution; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

## EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

## National Seed Storage Facility

EXTENSION OF REMARKS  
OF

## HON. HENRY ALDOUS DIXON

OF UTAH

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 7, 1956

Mr. DIXON. Mr. Speaker, I sent to the desk a bill to be introduced as a companion measure to S. 3095, a bill to provide for the establishment of a national seed storage facility.

Mr. Speaker, President Eisenhower in his special agricultural message called attention to the fact that "we must find new crops offering new opportunities and benefits" to farmers. Much of the hope for increasing the economic well-being of agriculture and for keeping fully employed our agricultural resources depends upon developing new markets, new uses and new crops.

As you know, the President recommended an increase of 25 percent in the research appropriation for the Agricultural Research Service and for grants-in-aid to State experiment stations.

In the development of new plants and new crops, it is paramount that plant breeders have access to a wide variety of plant stocks since although the plants in themselves may not be valuable as new crops they often contain needed genetic characteristics which can be utilized in producing new commercial crops such as soybeans and grain sorghums which have become so important in our agriculture.

Although Federal and State experiment stations have been doing the best they can to preserve parent stocks of plants and seeds, they neither have adequate space nor appropriate storage facilities for holding such stocks over a long period of time. Since research is a primary activity of the Department of Agriculture and is carried on in the general public interest, it is necessary that

the development of more extensive facilities to maintain crop plant and breeding materials must also primarily be carried on as a national function.

I, therefore, introduce for appropriate reference a bill to authorize and direct the Secretary of Agriculture to establish and maintain a national seed storage facility.

## Seeking God's Way for World Peace

## EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

## HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, February 7, 1956

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an address I delivered at the First Methodist Church,